EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SPEAKER McCORMACK PROVIDES EXCELLENT SUMMARY ON ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO DATE OF 91ST CONGRESS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend and thank you in the strongest possible way for the excellent summary and report which you provided in October on the accomplishments and achievements of the 91st Congress to date.

This report is factual and precise with depth and perspective—and is worthy of review and study by the press and the people of the country.

In this connection and because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place the report in the RECORD for reprinting and commend it to the attention of all Members of the Congress and the country.

The report follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 14, 1970]

THE 91ST CONGRESS—A RECORD OF INITIATIVE AND INNOVATION

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 reduction 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 unemploy-

ment 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 explosives, 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 State 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 vtial 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 sidelines 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 non-legislative 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 1960. 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 admin-

istration'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 heatlh 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 $69 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 administratilon. 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 veneral 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 passsed 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 programs 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 the 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 for 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 opposi-

tion, 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 administration 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 recommital 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, doubled-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 indorsement 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 pauper's 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 be 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 office 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 banking 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 ours 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 meausre 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.

FESTIVAL AT FORD'S

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I had the pleasure and honor this morning to be host to a reception and luncheon for a stellar cast of the Nation's top performers who are in Washington this week for Ford Theater's "Festival at Ford's"—a special performance at Ford's Theater on November 18, to be telecast on Thanksgiving night, November 26. With me this afternoon were Andy Williams, Tennessee Ernie Ford, Bobbie Gentry, Pearl Bailey, Henry Mancini, The Supremes—Mary Wilson, Cindy Birdsong, Jean Terrell, and Mr. and Mrs. James Stewart, as well as Producers Patricia Rickey, Mr. and Mrs. Bob Henry, and Jim Loakes, Jean DiMaio, Wayne Weisbart, and Mrs. Don "Frankie" Hewitt.

The festival is a real tribute to the performing arts, human understanding, and communication, and to Ford's Theater.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the press releases issued by Ford's Theater describing these events.

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

FESTIVAL AT FORD'S

WASHINGTON, D.C., Nov. 13.—Festival at Ford's, a star-spangled salute to America's music will present a stellar cast of the nation's top performers before an invited audience of government dignitaries, and patrons of the arts from all parts of the country at 8 p.m. November 18 at historic Ford's Theatre in the Nation's Capital.

President and Mrs. Nixon have expressed their hope to attend, thus becoming the first Presidential family in 105 years to view a performance at America's most historic theatre. The First Lady is serving as Honorary Chairman of the "Festival." Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, whose husband as President signed the legislation in 1954 which initiated the more than $2 million restoration of the theatre, also plans to attend.

In a message to Ford's Theatre Society, President Nixon wrote that music ". . . is a most powerful and persuasive international language. It furthers human understanding and fosters the kind of communication which can lead to peace and progress among men and nations."

Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel, whose Department through the National Park Service oversees the unique 740-seat theatre, a building where he says "one nevers feels a stranger," personally helped to recruit the cast. He and Mrs. Hickel, "Festival" National Chairman, will be joined by other Cabinet members and their wives including Secretary of the Treasury and Mrs. David M. Kennedy, Secretary of Labor and Mrs. James D. Hodgson, Secretary of Agriculture and Mrs. Clifford M. Hardin, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and Mrs. Elliott L. Richardson.

Television star Andy Williams will be "Festival" host, and veteran actor James Stewart, narrator for the program which will also feature Pearl Bailey, Tennessee Ernie Ford, Bobbie Gentry, Henry Mancini, The Supremes and Dionne Warwick in a salute to two centuries of America's music—from folk to rock. Bob Henry, currently producer of the successful Flip Wilson comedy series, adds "Festival at Ford's to his many credits.

A one-hour special telecast of the "Festival" is scheduled to be shown Thanksgiving night, Thursday, Nov. 26, at 8:30 EST on NBC–TV.

Following the "Festival," members of the cast will be honored at a gala reception, hosted by the Ford's Theatre Society Board of Governors, in the Lincoln Gallery at the National Collection of Fine Arts, located at Eighth and G Streets, only a short walk from Ford's Theatre. The reception will take place in the same elegant surroundings as President Lincoln's second Inaugural Ball and banquet of March 6, 1865.

Guests will enjoy musical selections by American symphonic composers performed by the Dupont Consortium, under the direction of Frank Roberts. The National Collection of Fine Arts, under the directorship of Dr. Joshua Taylor, contains more than 11,000 pieces of traditional and contemporary American art.

Mrs. Don Hewitt, President of Ford's Society, the non-profit organization mandated by the Department of the Interior to help turn the theatre into a "living" memorial to Lincoln's interest in the performing arts, announced that the American Gas Association, through its advertising agency, J. Walter Thompson, has subscribed $100,000 to help Ford's establish an American drama production fund.

The Society, through its Board of Governors and interested patrons, hopes to raise an additional $150,000 to underwrite low cost student tickets for interested younsters who come to Washington each year from all parts of the country. The Society plans to start a commissioning program of new dramatic works by American writers with emphasis on productions of historical relevance.

"We hope that our festival will give the American people a chance to share an awareness of this unique century-old theatre which thrives today in the Nation's Capital," said Mrs. Hewitt who has served Ford's since it was ". . . just a hole in the ground with four walls."

Mrs. Walter J. Hickel said the Society hopes to expand the student ticket program. "This season we expect to have 15,000 to 20,000 students come to see a play at Ford's, the majority of whom have never before seen a professional production of a play. It is our aim to make it possible for these young people to have an opportunity to see major American plays for approximately the same amount that they would spend going to a first-run movie."

The Ford's Theatre Society Board of Governors under the Chairmanship of C. William Verity, Jr., Pres., Armco Steel Corp., Middletown, Ohio, includes American business leaders and patrons of the arts: E. E. Trefethen, Jr., Pres., Kaiser Industries Corp., Oakland, California; D. R. McKay, VP, IBM, Armonk, N.Y.; Thomas E. Wilshire, Jr. Exec. VP, Western Pennsylvania National Bank, Pittsburgh, Pa.: David P. Reynolds, Exec. VP, Reynolds Aluminum, Richmond, Va.; Dr. Armand Hammer, Chrm. of the Bd., Occidental Petroleum Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.; O. P. Thomas, Chrm. Exec. Comm., Atlantic Richfield Corp., New York, N. Y.; Charles A. Dana, Jr. of New York City; Gregory S. DeVine, Pres., the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., Cleveland Ohio; Willard F. Rockwell, Jr., Pres., North American Rockwell Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Dan Seymour, Pres., J. Walter Thompson Co., New York, N. Y., Sanford D. Greenberg, Chrm. of the Bd., EDP Technology, Washington, D. C.

President Lincoln, who went to theatrical performances 40 times during his White House residency, attended Ford's 10 times. He was interested in the performing arts and helped Ford get the lumber to rebuild his theatre.

The beautiful building, authentically restored as an historic site by the National Park Service, was reopened on February 12, 1968 for the first time as a theatre since the assassination of President Lincoln took place April 14, 1865. The Lincoln Museum is located on a lower level of the theatre at 511 Tenth Street in downtown Washington.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON FORD'S THEATER

Ford's Theatre is a national historical site owned and maintained by the government. To my knowledge, it is the only theatre owned by the government. Ford's Theatre Society is the tax-exempt, non-profit organization given the responsibility—through a co-operative agreement with the Department of the Interior—for perpetuating living theatre in this beautifully restored historic building.

When Ford's Theatre was reopened in early 1968—after being "dark" for more than a century—it was dedicated as a living memorial to Abraham Lincoln's love for the performing arts. Of all our Presidents, Lincoln was the one who most consistently demonstrated his interest in the performing arts by his regular attendance at the theatre, opera, musicales and variety shows. (Historians have documented at least 40 such events he was known to have attended while serving as President. In fact, in the midst of the Civil War, President Lincoln helped John Ford secure hard-to-get materials to construct the new Ford's Treatre because he felt that the besieged capital needed a place to find respite as he, himself, did.)

The theatre was reopened in January, 1968, with an all-star salute to Lincoln's love for the performing arts featuring Helen Hayes, Fredric March, Robert Ryan, Andy Williams, Henry Fonda, Harry Belafonte, Richard Crenna, Odetta, Carmen de Lavallade and Patricia Brooks. It was shown on the CBS–TV network as a news special, sponsored by the Lincoln National Life Insurance Company which made a large grant to the Ford's Theatre Society so that we could launch the program of live theatre at Ford's.

Using that highly successful event as a precedent, we have planned the November 18th "Festival at Ford's" as the first in a series of annual programs honoring specific areas of the American performing arts. This first show will be a salute to America's music in which the leading artists who best represent each category of American music have been asked to perform for an invited audience of Capital dignitaries, American business leaders and leading representatives of the American performing arts.

Television cameras will record the event and a one-hour special telecast has been scheduled for Thanksgiving night, Thursday, November 26, on NBC–TV. The telecast will be sponsored by the American Gas Association, which has subscribed $100,000 to the Ford's Theatre Society for television rights. The Society will use these funds to start a revolving production fund for the theater, to help finance a low-cost student ticket program for the thousands of youngsters who come to Washington each year from all over America and to start a program of commissioning new dramatic works by American writers with particular emphasis on material that has historical relevance.

TRIBUTE TO COUNCILMAN JOHN S. GIBSON, JR.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to a man who has devoted his life to the betterment of his country, his community, and his fellow man.

On November 22, the San Pedro B'nai B'rith Lodge No. 1106 is recognizing Los Angeles City Councilman John S. Gibson, Jr., as the "Man of the Year." The many years of Councilman Gibson's outstanding public service have been marked by an unsurpassed record of achievement. I wish to take this opportunity to trace the steps that led to Councilman Gibson's selection as the well-deserved recipient of this coveted award.

The year 1923 was especially significant to Councilman Gibson, for in that year he was married to the former Mina Workman, and he was elected mayor of Genesco, Kans.—at the time, he was the youngest mayor in the United States. In addition, he served as city police judge.

Councilman and Mrs. Gibson's two children: Mrs. Marlyn Buehler and Mrs. Dixie Blackwelder—have blessed them with 10 grandchildren.

While his roots are in Kansas where he attended high school and college, he has long adopted San Pedro as his home. In 1935, 8 years after coming to San Pedro, he was the founder of the first Boys Club of California. In 1936, Councilman Gibson was honored by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce as the recipient of the Distinguished Service Award.

He was recognized for his work with youth by receiving the Distinguished Service Award from the Civitan Service Club International in 1938.

From 1935 through 1937, Councilman Gibson served as vice president of the California State Junior Chamber of Commerce. He served with distinction on several committees.

From 1951 to the present, John Gibson has served on the Los Angeles City Council. For 8 of those years, he was selected by his colleagues to the presidency of the city council—a position he now holds.

From 1954 to 1960, he was the president of the California-Israel Chamber of Commerce.

An activist in his church as well as other civic organizations, Councilman Gibson is a member of the Board of Deacons in the First Baptist Church of San Pedro. In addition, he served as vice president, Pacific Southwest Youth for Christ in Los Angeles.

Councilman Gibson is a charter member of the Los Angeles 10th District, National Congress of Parents and Teachers; a member of the Al Malaitan Shrine; and a member of the San Pedro Lodge No. 966 of the BPOE.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize Councilman John Gibson and pay tribute to his record, and to his public service. It is, indeed, an honor to endorse his selection as "Man of the Year."

PUBLIC APPROVES ANTIPOLLUTION PROPOSALS—EDITORIALS REVIEW ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGES

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, among the other results of the 1970 election was a resounding endorsement by the American voters of efforts to clean up the pollution that is adversely affecting our country.

Questions relating to the environment were on the ballots in a number of States and localities. The public response to these requests for money to fight environmental contamination was overwhelmingly favorable. This reaction is even more indicative of the public mood when we realize that bond issues and financing questions for other public purposes continued to receive lukewarm voter approval.

I have said frequently that the American public is willing to pay its share of the admittedly high cost of a clean environment. The action at the polls on November 3 certainly is proof that our people are ready to support their demands for environmental action with the cash outlays necessary to do the job. Voter approval of antipollution proposals is gratifying, not as it proves the validity of my observations, but as a demonstration once again of the desire of the American citizenry to meet critical issues directly.

Our citizens are serious about the environment. They have had enough of the neglect and abuse of our natural surroundings, and they want immediate, effective action.

Mr. President, the environmental questions we face were recently discussed in two editorials in the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 9, 1970]

THE NEW ENVIRONMENTAL JOB

Washington is so crowded with departments, agencies, bureaus and commissions that another addition to the list is hardly noticed. Accordingly, when the Environmental Protection Agency was created last July in a presidential reorganization, most people probably did not notice. They should have, because EPA could well become a major force in the seventies for the protection of America's land, air and water and, in direct extension, for the protection of all of us. EPA is now topical because of the appointment Friday of William D. Ruckelshaus to head it. Mr. Ruckelshaus, 38, has a competent record at the Justice Department where he ran the civil division. In his native state of Indiana, he wrote the air pollution law of 1963 and later prosecuted violators.

The Environmental Protection Agency, with a budget of $1.4 billion and work force of nearly 6,000, will be independent of any cabinet department. It will combine environmental programs now scattered throughout five separate agencies—for example, the Federal Water Quality Administration now in Interior, the National Air Pollution Control Administration now in HEW, the presticide programs now in Agriculture. One reason the environment has been so easily polluted is that the Federal enforcement muscle was flat and spread out—there, perhaps, but with no pull or punch.

The recent report of the Council on Environmental Quality shows just how simple it was for an industrial polluter to evade the law: "A manufacturing firm (in New Jersey) was required by court order to control air pollution pouring from the stacks of one of its large factories. The firm installed control devices which converted the gaseous wastes into a liquid. But then the wastes were dumped into a nearby river, and the firm is now back in court for violating water quality standards." The EPA will not guarantee a total end to such tricks, but its centralized enforcement power will considerably tighten up the loopholes.

Regardless of how strong the new agency is on paper, an aggressive man at the top means almost everything. The pressure on Mr. Ruckelshaus will be immense—from politicians who are committed only rhetorically to anti-pollution, from businesses which ask for "more time" before obeying the law, from the lone citizen who has nowhere else to turn. The anti-pollution movement must now go beyond promises and speeches. Our land, air and water are in such critical conditions that we have a clear choice—make a breakthrough or suffer a breakdown.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 10, 1970]

ELECTION AFTERTHOUGHTS: THE ENVIRONMENT ISSUE

It's always difficult to sort out one issue in a national campaign and generalize about it. But there was fresh evidence last week that the environment has become a matter of more than just talk. The evidence comes primarily from the votes cast on bond issues and from the promises of politicians, although the environmentalists and conservationists also point with considerable elation at the outcome of at least two specific races for public office. What all this suggests is that the public has taken the problem of pollution to heart and is willing to put up some money for corrective and preventive efforts and that the politicians know it.

The bond issues are exhibit A. In 1968, the voters approved only about half of the issues submitted to them. In 1969, the percentage approved dropped to one-third. Last week, the approval rate went up to about 75 per cent, thanks to the high level of support given to issues for sewer projects, recreation areas and so on. The closed pocketbook attitude of the voters in the two previous years was still reflected where governments asked for bonds for educational purposes; about half of those requests were defeated.

The range of projects approved was tremendous. Maine's voters authorized a $4 million bond issue to aid in cleaning up oil spills. Illinois' voters approved $750 million for attacking water pollution, mostly with sewer construction, although two years ago they turned down a $1 billion proposal to fight water and air pollution. California voted for $310 million in two sets of bonds, one for cleaning up water and one for recreation and wildlife purposes.

There are other bits of evidence in the election returns, although on non-bond issue questions the record is spotty. Virginia and Rhode Island adopted constitutional provisions aimed at improving conservation practices. Maine and Nebraska adopted new categories of land-use taxation aimed at preserving green space. Oregon adopted restrictions on shore-line developments. But in Washington a proposal to ban nonreturnable containers was beaten as was a proposal in California to authorize the use of some of the funds raised by the gasoline tax for fighting smog and helping rapid transit.

The two candidates whose defeat the conservationists particularly hail are Gov. Don Samuelson of Idaho and Rep. George Fallon of Maryland. Samuelson was a target because of the support he gave to open pit mining and the effort poured into that state by conservationists is given some of the credit for his defeat. Fallon, a favorite of the highway lobby, was beaten in the primary in which his opponent received substantial financial help from conservationists.

Perhaps more important, however, is the degree to which politicians saw the need to be on the side of antipollution measures. Congressional Quarterly reported before the election that 92 per cent of the candidates for the Senate and 75 per cent of those for the House favor creating a federal pollution board with power to close industrial plants which discharge dangerous pollutants. It also said that 72 per cent of the senatorial candidates and 65 per cent of the House candidates favor banning the internal combustion engine if the auto industry can't figure out a way to decrease its polluting impact within the next few years. Indeed, House Minority Leader Gerald Ford saw fit to rest his support for tax exemptions for public service law firms—support given just before the election—on their role in helping to clean up the environment.

Put all that together and it looks, at long last, as if the country is ready to do something about the dirty air, dirty water, junkyards, garbage piles, and so on that are turning a magnificent country and countryside into a wasteland.

OF SAINTS AND STRANGERS—THE COMING OF THE PILGRIMS—PROLOG: LAND HO

REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the ship rocked softly in the predawn ground swell, becalmed, for there was as yet no wind. To the west, darkness still shrouded the sky; to the east, the first faint glimmer of daylight flickered, then gathered confidence and poured over the horizon.

It was the beginning of the 65th day of the voyage. Capt. Christopher Jones and Master's Mate Clark peered anxiously over the rail. The water had changed from blue to emerald; Clark had been to Virginia the year before and to his eye it was a sign land was near. The sounding of the day before had shown no bottom at 100 fathoms, but Captain Jones' noon sight had shown him very near to the 42d parallel of north latitude which was that of Cape Cod. So head her west, and keep her steady; by now the sun was up and the letters "*Mayflower* of London" stood out sharp and clear on the stern.

Now the slack sails began to billow out from the masts as the morning east wind gathered and blew. Jones snapped orders; the morning watch tumbled to the deck; the lookout man dashed aloft; and the leadsman swung out the lines for sounding. "Bottom at 80 fathoms, sir," and almost before Captain Jones grasped the reality that he had at last reached the shelf of the American continent, a cry rang from the maintop that thrilled the ship: "Land ho. Two points on the weather bow."

There it lay ahead, stretching to north and south, as far as they could see. It was 7 o'clock in the morning, November 19, 1620. William Bradford wrote years later that "they were not a little joyful."

The Pilgrims had with them the Psalter, with music. In it was "Old Hundredth," written for one voice. Very possibly, on that morning, for the first time, its words rang out over the Atlantic:

> Showt to Jehovah all the earth,
> Serv ye Jehovah with gladnes,
> Befor him come with singing mirth,
> Know that Jehovah he God is.

The voyage was over.

OUR SPIRITUAL ANCESTORS

It is often hard to say exactly when a country's history began, but I am sure, for most Americans, that our country started with the arrival of the Pilgrims in 1620. November 21, 1970, will mark the 350th anniversary of the day the *Mayflower* dropped anchor in what is now Provincetown Harbor, Cape Cod. Plymouth Rock, it has been accurately noted, looms upon the American horizon like Gibraltar. Whether the Pilgrims really landed on it or not—they probably did not—makes no difference. The symbolism of the rock and of that tiny group of 102 men, women, and children, is of probably greater significance to the American Republic than any other single event in our history. And, it is safe to say, probably in the history of no other country did such an act by so few assume such great significance in later years.

Oddly enough, it has not always been the case with the Pilgrims. For 150 years after they landed, the rock itself was unmarked and almost unnoticed. Even in 1820 little was known about the Pilgrims outside the town of Plymouth, Mass., itself. Not until 1849 did anyone really know where the original congregation had been formed; the name "Pilgrim" itself did not come into common usage until 1840.

Part of that is the Pilgrims' fault. They saw themselves as doing nothing particularly out of the way, or special. Many were illiterate; few had formal schooling; the first task was to survive, and not to write chronicles. They did not even keep town records until 1632, 12 years after they arrived.

Two major works are all we have to go on. The first, Mourt's "Relation," was published in 1622 and is probably written by Gov. William Bradford and Edward Winslow. The second, William Bradford's "Of Plimouth Plantation," is by far the more valuable; it is summed up by Samuel Eliot Morison as "a story of a simple people inspired by an ardent faith to a dauntless courage in danger, a resourcefulness in dealing with new problems, an impregnable fortitude in adversity that exalts and heartens one in an age of uncertainty, when courage falters and faith grows dim. It is this story, told by a great human being, that has made the Pilgrim Fathers in a sense the spiritual ancestors of all Americans, all pioneers."

History aids those who study that particular muse in strange ways. Bradford was a member of the original congregation; he had an eye for the overall pattern, and a keen sense of history, along with a feeling for character, color, drama and a gift at writing prose. The task took 20 years; in 1630, Bradford himself notes, he began what he termed his "scribled writings" that were "peeced up at times of leesure afterwards" and by 1650, when he stopped, he had a manuscript of 270 folio pages telling the story of the Pilgrims from 1606 to 1647, the most critical period of a constantly eventful career.

But he was not writing for publication. The manuscript was handed down through generations with little attention paid to it and it wound up in a library in the tower of Old South Church, in Boston. Old South was used as a stable by the British during the Revolution. An inventory of the library after the British left showed the manuscript missing. In 1793, some of Bradford's letters in manuscript form turned up in a grocery at Halifax, Nova Scotia, being used for wrapping paper. The history itself seemed lost until 1855.

A student of Massachusetts history was fretting over a dull and laborious ecclesiastical volume published in England in 1845. Suddenly he noted some passages attributed to an unknown author; he recognized they could have only come from Bradford. The manuscript was traced and found in the library of Fulham Palace, on the outskirts of London, long a popular summer residence of the bishops of London. How it got there was never known but in 1856 a transcript was made. Pilgrim history can be said to date from that year.

Unfortunately, we are apt to think of the Pilgrims as meek, colorless, and uncomplaining. We are wrong; they were true children of the great Elizabethan age, and as one historian has so colorfully put it:

> Given to speaking their minds plainly, they expressed themselves in the language of Marlowe and Shakespeare, in the torrential and often rafter-shaking rhetoric of Elizabethan England, with no slightest regard for the proprieties and polite circumlocutions of a later day.

They were, truly, Elizabethan to the core. There was no self-denial, no asceticism in their creed. They liked to eat, and they liked to drink, especially "strong waters" and beer, preferably beer, and they complained only when hardship made them drink water—no beer in sight—because water, they suspected, caused human ills. They married early, often, and late; records also show they were as much heirs to the sins of the flesh as anyone else of the age.

We picture them as moping about in somber, funeral black and gray. Not at all; it was the Puritans at Boston—with whom the Pilgrims are often confused—who passed laws against "gay apparel." Ruling Elder William Brewster, probably the most upright of all "ye saincts"—Bradford's term—had for wear—but probably not all at one time—a red cap, a white cap, a quilted cap, a lace cap, a violet coat, and "1 paire of greene drawers."

When the Pilgrims sailed from England in 1620, in all probability men were alive who had known members of the crews of Columbus' *Nina, Pinta,* and *Santa Maria.* The world of 1620 had a good idea for the most part where things were; it had little idea at all of what was there once the new lands were reached. The story of the people and the voyage, colorful and stirring though it is, has to be set against the equally colorful backdrop of how it all came to pass.

> The deep
> Moans round with many voices, Come, my friends,
> 'Tis not too late to seek a newer world . . .
> To sail beyond the sunset, and the baths
> Of all the Western stars . . .

No man knows for sure who came first, or when. There is that odd writing on a piece of Georgia sandstone, disturbingly similar to that used by Hebrews living in Bronze Age Palestine. The Mandan Indian Tribe of the Dakotas—wiped out to a man by smallpox in 1834—had the curious racial characteristics, customs, and words of their speech that were unmistakably—Welsh. A mysterious carving on a rock by a lake in Massachusetts distinctly resembles a Phoenician ship of the days of Tyre. The Kensington Rune Stone of Minnesota tells of a battle between Indians and Vikings, in that area, in the 12th century A.D.

Or does it? No man knows.

Columbus' 1492 voyage is summed up in one masterful paragraph by Samuel Eliot Morison in his "Oxford History of the American People":

America was discovered accidentally by a great seaman who was looking for something else; when discovered it was not wanted; and most of the exploration of the next fifty years was done in the hope of getting through or around it. History is like that, very chancy.

Very chancy, indeed; it was chance that gave the Pilgrims the opportunity to seek refuge in New England, on the North American Continent. A series of chances, really; an English king sulking because he had turned down Columbus and now saw Spain and Portugal dividing the New World; a transplanted Italian merchant living in England; Queen Elizabeth's "bloody little pirate"; and a procession of merchant-explorer-adventurers who would as soon fire a broadside on the uproll at the nearest Spanish plate fleet as plant a colony somewhere beyond the seas.

Henry VII, of England; John II, of Portugal; Charles VIII, of France; they all shared the dubious distinction of having turned a deaf ear to Columbus' proposals. But Portugal, immediately after Columbus' first return, angrily claimed sovereignty over his discoveries under terms of a papal bull of 1455.

Ever since Pope Adrian VI had given Ireland to Henry II, the Vatican had advanced claims on newly discovered countries. The Portuguese had a friend somewhere in the Vatican; the 1455 bull authorized Portugal to conquer all infidels and possess their lands, and in 1481 Lisbon had been granted all lands from Cape Bojador "ad Indos"—to the Indies.

Spain appealed; fortunately for Ferdinand and Isabella, the ruling Pope was Alexander VI, Spanish, a native of Valencia. Three of his bulls in 1493 gave Spain everything found, and yet to be found, to the west, in the south, and in the direction of the Indies. This was not enough; Spain wanted the Indies mentioned. Alexander obliged with yet a fourth bull giving Spain everything gained by sailing south and west until even India might be reached.

This cut Portugal off from using the southwest trade winds, the south-flowing Brazilian current and the eastward Antarctic current. Spain was willing to compromise, so on June 7, 1494, the Treaty of Tordesillas moved the line of demarcation to a point where the Portuguese could—and did—lay claim to Brazil.

No other maritime government ever accepted this. Least of all the England of Henry VII; it was right on the verge of repudiating papal sovereignty, anyway—to be accomplished under Henry VIII, in a few years—and Henry VII felt this arbitrary drawing of lines was an infringement on his own sovereignty. Henry had, as a subject, a fellow countryman of Columbus, one Giovanni Caboto, a wealthy merchant-adventurer living in Bristol under the anglicized name of John Cabot, whose imagination had been fired by talking with Arab spice traders at Mecca about sailing west across the Atlantic to spice-producing lands.

And so, in 1496:

Henry by the grace of God, king of England and France, and lord of Ireland, to all to whom these presents shall come. Greeting.

Be it knowen that we have given and granted, and by these presents do give and grant for us and our heires, to our well-beloved John Cabot citizen of Venice, to Lewis Sebastian, and Santius, sonnes of the sayd John . . . full and free authority, leave and power to saile to all parts, countreys, and seas of the East, of the West, and of the North, under our banners and ensignes, . . . to seek out, discover, and fine whatsoever isles, countreys, regions or provinces of the heathen and infidels whatsoever they be, and in what part of the world soever they be, which before this time have bene unknowen to all Christians . . .

Cabot, 18 men, and the little ship *Matthew* left Bristol sometime in May 1497. He made landfall somewhere on June 24; he was back on August 6. To have accomplished this, it must have been southern Newfoundland, but no man knows; Cabot was an incredibly sloppy recordkeeper and nothing survives written by his own hand. Sebastian, his son, was more careful:

In the yeere of our Lord 1497 John Cabot a Venetian and his sonne Sebastian (with an English fleet sent out from Bristol) discovered that land which no man before that time had attempted, on the 24 of June about five of the clocke early in the morning. This land he called Prima vista, that is to say, First seene, because as I suppose it was that part whereof they had the first sight from sea. That Island which lieth out before the land, he called the Island of S. John upon this occasion, as I thinke, because it was discovered upon the day of John the Baptist. The inhabitants of this Island use to weare beasts skinnes, and have them in as great estimation as we have our finest garments.

In their warres they use bowes, arrowes, pikes, darts, woodden clubs and slings. The soile is barren in some places, and yeeldeth little fruit but it is full of white beares, and stagges farre greater than ours. It yeeldeth plenty of fish, and those very great, as seales, and those which commonly we call salmons; there are soles also above a yard in length; but especially there is great abundance of that kinde of fish which the Savages call baccalaos. In this same Island also there breed hauks, but they are so black that they are very like to ravens, as also their partridges, and egles, which are in like sort blacke.

No gold or spice in *Matthew*'s holds, just a few Indian fish nets, but it meant 20 pounds sterling pension a year for Cabot, an admiral's commission, and yet another order to go out, this time "to found a factory in the land of the Great Khan." Back in 1498; he had tried to sail northwest but was blocked by storms and ice; Henry VII granted him patents for yet a third voyage, but he never returned. Somewhere he and his ships were lost with all hands.

Cabot had given England title to all North America east of the Rockies and north of Florida. Just 6 years later, the area got its name.

In 1504 to 1505 the printing presses of Florence ground out what was supposed to be letters from one Amerigo Vespucci, giving details of voyages along the coast of Brazil and probably around the Gulf of Maracaibo. Vespucci helped fit out Columbus' voyages but had never commanded one himself. Aside from this the letters gave the impression he did, and Vespucci—or whoever edited the letters—claims for Vespucci discovery of the continent of South America in 1497, a year before Columbus. Vespucci is made to say, in the letters, that—

These regions we may rightly call *Mundus Novus*, a New World, because our ancestors had no knowledge of them . . . I have found a continent more densely peopled and abounding in animals than our Europe or Asia or Africa.

The letters made a great impression on a young teacher named Waldseemueller, at the College of St. Die, in eastern France. He was then bringing out a fresh version of Ptolemy, to include a new map of the world, and in his "Cosmographiae Introductio" of 1507, he wrote:

Since Americus Vespucius has discovered a fourth part of the world, it should be called after him . . . America, since Europe and Asia got their names from women.

By 1530, every European country, save Spain and Portugal, called the New World America.

Thomas Hariot, Raleigh's secretary, prepared a list of commodities to be found there. Among them was a plant, whose leaves "were dried and brought in powder. The inhabitants take the fume or smoke thereof, by sucking it through pipes made of clay, into their stomach and head; from whence it purgeth superfluous phlegm and other gross humours, and openeth all the pores and passages of the body—the Spaniards generally call it tobacco."

In 1585, Raleigh's second expedition, under Grenville and Lane, planted a colony on Roanoke Island; 1 year later Drake, stopping off at Roanoke after sacking and burning the Spanish fort at St. Augustine, picked up the by-then discouraged colonists and took them back to England. His sails had hardly disappeared over the horizon when Grenville returned with a fresh crew, to try it again, and in 1587 Raleigh's third trip brought 150 more. But Grenville's settlers were gone; their fate unknown.

English superiority of the seas was made factual beyond all doubt in 1588. The Spanish Armada was hammered into shingles and splinters in the Channel; those that survived and tried to make their way around the north end of the British Isles were mostly lost when they wrecked off the Irish coast. Spanish sailors who were not lucky enough to find English soldiers to surrender to—Queen Elizabeth sent the survivors home—were killed by the Irish.

A trip was made back to Roanoke Island in 1590 by John White, grandfather of Virginia Dare, first white child born in North America. He was never to see his granddaughter again. On August 18, 1590, he wrote:

We let fall our Grapnel neere the Shore, & sounded wtih a trumpet a Call, & afterwardes many familiar English tunes of Songs, and called to them friendly, but we had no answere.

When they landed there was nothing to be found, except, in White's words:

About the place many of my things spoyled and broken, and my bookes torne from the covers, the frames of some of my pctures and Mappes rotten and spoyled with rayne,

and my armour almost eaten through with rust.

There was the word "Croatan" carved on a tree, which was the Indian name for an island about a hundred miles southwest, on which Cape Hatteras is situated. The relief expedition returned to England. To this day no one knows what became of the colony. Starvation for some, death at the hands of Indians for others, with very likely adoption of the children into the Indian tribe. The Croatan—Lumbee—Indians of southeastern North Carolina, to this day, maintain the blood of the ill-fated colonists run in their veins.

For almost 50 years England neglected her new territories. Not out of choice; English sovereigns were constantly quarreling with Parliament for money and there was no venture capital of any sort to finance major voyages. Then in 1558 Elizabeth I took the throne; the daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn let loose her seadogs and they dashed off yelping wildly after the hunt.

In 1567, John Hawkins took 300 Negro slaves from Guinea to Haiti, traded them for sugar, pearls, and spices, at a huge profit, and returned to England with news of Florida. In 1572, Sir Francis Drake made his first voyage against the Spanish, crossed the Isthmus of Panama, and saw the Pacific. In 1576, Martin Frobisher headed northwest for the Northwest Passage. He discovered Baffin Land and came back to England with an Eskimo and ore believed to contain gold. Then, in 1577, Drake set the Elizabethan England seal on the North American Continent with his stunning 34-month voyage that circumnavigated the globe.

Drake had sailed with Hawkins and been with him when the Spanish swept down at Vera Cruz. Burning for revenge, and, after seeing the Pacific, "resolved to sail an England ship in these seas." he also knew Spanish plunder might be more lucrative on the Pacific coast of South America.

The *Golden Hind* swept through the Strait of Tierra del Fuego, picked up a treasure galleon off Peru, landed not far north of San Francisco and hammered a brass plate into a tree to mark the spot—it was found in 1938—possibly went as far as Vancouver Island, picked up cloves in the Spice Islands and returned to England. The profits were almost $9 million in gold; Queen Elizabeth, fond of her "bloody little pirate," as she called him, knighted him herself on the deck of his ship and by so doing served notice to Philip II of Spain to keep his hands off North America.

In 1578, Sir Humphrey Gilbert set out on his first voyage with a patent from Elizabeth giving him right to "inhabit and possess at his choice all remote and heathen lands not in the actual possession of any Christian prince." The first voyage failed; in 1583 he set out again to plant a colony. He took possession of Newfoundland, and, on the way home, was lost on his ship with all hands.

In 1584, Sir Walter Raleigh sent an advance fleet under Amadas and Barlow to what is now Croatan Sound, N.C. On Roanoke Island they were feasted by Indians. In response to a question of the name of the country, and the grunted Indian reply that sounded like "Wingandacoa," that was the name given the new land. There would be a State of that name today if Elizabeth had not "consented" to have it named, instead, Virginia, in her honor.

At the close of the 16th century England did not even have a trading post in North America, much less a colony. But in 1602, Gosnold, the first Englishman to step on the New England coast, sailed from Maine to Cape Cod trading for furs with the Indians. He was followed by Pring in 1603; by Weymouth in 1605; Pring again in 1606 for the newly chartered Plymouth Company; the Virginia settlements were reestablished by 1608; in 1609, famine and disease reduced the Jamestown settlement from 500 to 60; Capt. John Smith's "Map of Virginia" was published in 1612; and in 1614 Smith charted and named the New England coast. In 1619, the first American iron works went into operation in Virginia, and a shipload of marriageable females was sent to Virginia by the Virginia Company; they were to be sold to planters at 120 pounds of tobacco each. The London slums were raided; 100 orphan and wandering children were scooped up and followed the boatload of brides as apprentices.

In 1606, a Separatist congregation had been organized at Scrooby, in England. In 1608, the congregation had gone stealthily from England to Amsterdam; from there to Leyden in 1609. But things did not go well in Holland; in 1619, in Bradford's words, the little congregation "begane both deeply to apprehend their present dangers, & wisely to foresee the future, & thinke of timly remedy. In the agitation of their thoughts, and much discours of things hear aboute, at length they began to incline to this conclusion, of remoovall to some other place."

THAT THE "TRUETH" MIGHT "PREVAILE"

In a very real sense the history of the Pilgrims begins when "that stubborn monk" Martin Luther thudded his hammer into the door of Wittenberg Cathedral, in 1517. His challenge to papal authority sparked a wave of antiauthoritarianism that swept into religious, social, political, and economic aspects of 16th century life.

After the wave broke over England, Henry VIII had displaced Rome with the Church of England, with himself as Pope. With few exceptions, however, the Anglican Church remained Roman, until Henry's sickly 9-year-old son came to the throne as Edward VI, with the Duke of Somerset as Lord Protector. Somerset sponsored reform; under him the first Book of Common Prayer—1549—and the Edwardian Service Book—1552—were the first steps towards a really Protestant ritual. Then Edward died, in 1553, and Mary, daughter of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon, a staunch Catholic, took the throne.

Henry's Anglican church was suppressed; Catholic bishops were restored; hundreds of Anglicans—men, women, and children—were hanged, or burned at the stake, and many Protestants fled to the Continent. "Bloody" Mary had 5 years, then was succeeded by Elizabeth I, Anne Boleyn's daughter.

Elizabeth knew England was primarily Catholic in belief, but Protestantism was an assertion of national independence. So she played one side off against the other. Church and State were one; this meant compliance and absolute uniformity of belief, to be enforced by the Court of High Commission, dominated by the bishops.

Hundreds of "heretics" were sought out. Most were jailed; some were hanged, or burned, and the hideous dungeons that passed for prisons were filled with poor wretches awaiting the bishops' pleasure, or displeasure. But none of this could stifle the voices of the reformers, who sought to restore the church. As Bradford put it, to see "the trueth prevaile, and the churches of God reverte to their anciente puritie and recover their primative order, libertie, & bewtie."

Dr. Laurence Chaderton, one of those who later gave the Christian world the rolling thunder and drum-fire prose of the King James Bible, said in a sermon at Cambridge in 1578 that:

> The church was a huge masse of old and stinkinge workes, of conjuring, witchcraft, sorcery, charming, blaspheming the holy name of God, swearing and forswearing, profaning of the Lord's Sabbothe, disobediance to superiours, contempt of inferiours; murther, Manslaughter, robberies, adulterye, Fornication, covenant-breaking, false witness-bearing, lieing.

Cambridge was to become a hotbed of sentiment for religious reform. Two years after Chaderton's sermon, 15-year-old William Brewster clattered right into the middle of it. The son of the bailiff-receiver of Scrooby Manor, lying near the little hamlet of the same name, about halfway from London to the Scottish border right off the Great North Road, the future Ruling Elder of the Pilgrims was to have as classmates and close friends youths destined to die on the gallows for their faith.

In 1589 he returned to Scrooby, having left Cambridge without taking a degree—but he had "attained some learning, viz. ye knowledge of ye Latine tongue, & some insight in ye Greeke," and having spent a few years at Court, in London, in the service of one of Elizabeth's most trusted and able diplomats, Sir William Davison. Brewster's career came to an end when Davison's did. Davison had signed the death warrant on a charge of treason for Mary Queen of Scots. Elizabeth did not wish the responsibility of sending her cousin to the block, so Davison was made the scapegoat, charged with exceeding his authority, and was confined in the Tower of London for 2 years. Brewster remained with him, performing "manie faithfull offices of service in ye time of his troubles."

Back in Scrooby in 1589, young Brewster took over many of his father's duties, and lived in "good esteeme," with his neighbors, "espetially the godly & religious." In Pilgrim phrase, this meant he moved in reformist circles. A strong and zealous Puritan, he was far from being sour or solemn or harsh.

At the village of Babworth, about 6 miles away, lived Richard Clyfton, rec-

tor and preacher of the Puritan school. He had attracted a considerable following; the Brewster family was among his regular congregation. And, soon, Brewster took under his wing a young orphan boy who walked through Scrooby each Sunday to Clyfton's sermons—William Bradford.

The reformers had some hope when Elizabeth died in 1603 and was succeeded by Mary's son, James VI of Scotland. James I of England had passed through Scrooby on his way down the Great North Road to his London coronation, and noted its "exceeding decay." In all probability, Brewster, Bradford, and Clyfton stood and watched him pass. But James would have none of the reformers. To make it worse, English public sentiment began to turn. Puritanism was becoming a moral doctrine, as well as religious. It was still very much "Merrie England" and most Englishmen were outraged when they heard the beloved Maypole on the village green cursed by Puritans as "that Stynking Idol." James retaliated by commanding use of the Book of Common Prayer, Anglican communion three times a year, and suppression of all private religious meetings. The reform tide began to ebb. James began to embroider on the theory of the divine right of kings.

The authorities hit the Scrooby congregation in 1607:

Some members were taken & clapt up in prison; others had their houses besett & watcht night and day, & hardly escaped their hands; and ye most were faine to flie & leave their howses & habitations, and the means of their livelehood.

Brewster had a daughter born about this time; she was named "Fear." He had to resign his postmastership—probably under pressure—and early in 1608 was made to appear at York before the feared Court of High Commission for being "disobedient in matters of religion." He and his fellow defendants were fined 20 pounds—$1,000 each; they were lucky to get off so easily.

The congregation began to plan to flee to the Netherlands. But no one was permitted to leave the realm without permission of the Crown. This meant escape by secrecy, and high payment to some ship captain to take them across.

The first attempt ended in disaster. The little group had to go to the town of Boston, on the Wash, about 60 miles away, on foot, in wintertime. After 2 days' harrowing delays, the ship put in and all climbed on board. But the instant the captain collected the agreed-on fare, he turned his passengers over to the authorities, as he had agreed to do. The constables rifled their belongings, and searched each and every one for gold. Bradford: "Yea! and ye women furder than became modestie.!" The whole company was bundled back into Boston as "a spectackle & wonder to ye multitude" and then jailed. A few weeks later all but a few were released. Seven, including Brewster, were arraigned for trial, but they were never indicted and eventually set free.

Back to Scrooby; there were no homes but all managed to find shelter. A few of the timid withdrew, but in the spring of 1608 they tried again. This time they were successful, but not without considerable trial. First, the women, children and all baggage had been placed on a small bark. The bark ran aground on a shoal when the Dutch ship, which was to pick up all of them, came down the coast. The Dutchman asked for the men to come on board, until the tide would float off the bark. About half were aboard when a large mob was seen approaching. Bradford:

Both horse & foote, with bills, & gunes, & other weapons; for the countrie was raised to take them. The Dutch-man, seeing that, swore his countries oathe 'Sacramente,' and having the wind faire, waiged his Ancor, hoysed sayles, & away.

Those at sea faced the greater danger. A gale whirled down and drove the ship out into the North Sea, almost to the Norway coast. The voyage should have taken at most 2 days but it was 2 weeks before the battered load of Scrooby farmers was landed at Amsterdam. Nothing but the coats on their backs, not a penny in their pockets, and their hearts aching over the fate of those left behind.

But they had not done too badly. The mob had seized the women and children and the rest of the men, and shuffled them from one town to another for awhile, but no one really wanted anything to do with them so they were released to their own homes. This time they slipped away a few at a time; Clyfton and Brewster stayed to the very last to help the weaker. By the summer of 1608 all were together in Amsterdam where they "mett togeather againe according to their desires, with no small rejoycing."

They did not stay in Amsterdam long. There was a larger English group already settled there, but doctrinal and other differences led to a separation. In early 1609 the Scrooby congregation asked permission of Leyden to settle there. The burgomasters were willing, but the English Ambassador complained, implying they were fugitives from justice. The Leyden officials politely but firmly told the Ambassador to mind his own business, and by May 1609 the move to Leyden was completed.

Little is known of the first few years of their existence in Leyden. At first, all had to work for wages. Prosperity came, but it was slow in coming, and for some time they were barely able to eke out a living. By late 1617 the congregation was getting increasingly restless. Some of the reasons are obscure to this day. Absorption by the Dutch was one fear; they wished to retain a separate identity. And, too, their children were in danger of seduction by "ye great licentiousnes of youth in that countrie and ye manifold temptations of ye place." The children were drifting quickly into "extravagante & dangerous courses, getting ye raines off their neks, & departing from their parents."

The majority decided to move on, after much deliberation, and "not out of any newfangledness or other such like giddie humour." But where? The New World? It was a long voyage; they needed funds; starvation and disease was a danger and there were always the Indians, "cruell, barbarous, & most trecherous" and just reciting Indian cruelties caused "ye bowels of men to grate within them."

Bradford; it is one of the most noble statements in the entire book:

It was answered, that all great & honourable actions are accompanied with great difficulties, and must be both enterprised and overcome with answerable courages. It was granted the dangers were great, but not desperate; the difficulties were many, but not invincible. For though their were many of them likly, yet they were not cartaine; it might be sundrie of the things feared might never befale; others by providente care & the use of good means, might in a great measure be prevented; and all of them, through the help of God, by fortitude and patience, might either be borne or overcome. True it was, that such attempts were not to be made and undertaken without good ground & reason; not rashly or lightly as many have done for curiositie or hope of gaine, &c. But their condition was not ordinarie; their ends were good & honourable; their calling lawfull, & urgente; and therfore might expecte the blessing of God in their proceding. Yea, though they should loose their lives in this action, yet might they have comforte in the same, and their endeavors would be honourable.

So to London, two emissaries, to approach the First—or London—Virginia Co., which was floundering and anxious for colonists. But the Pilgrims needed not only a patent for settlement but also free shipping. The Virginia Co. was almost bankrupt, and could not provide this.

Then the New Netherlands Co. offered what seemed a generous arrangement: free passage, plus furnishing each family with cattle, if they would settle at New Amsterdam, the trading post at the mouth of the Hudson, and enjoy freedom of religion the same as in Holland. This was inspiring; negotiations were underway; and in February 1620 the company directors had asked the Prince of Orange for two warships for protection en route and until they were settled at New Amsterdam. Then a friend from London, Thomas Weston, an ironmonger, appeared, advised them to break off with New Netherlands and he and his friends in the London financial world would finance them. As soon as possible; they would "neither feare wante of shipping nor money."

Wrangling over the contract reached such a point and went on so long that at the last minute, almost, many of those who had planned to depart were either unable or unwilling. The merchant adventurers in London, providing the backing, solved this by rounding up colonists from the London streets, without any regard to religious beliefs. In June 1620, however, the *Mayflower*, 180 tons, had been chartered by the London merchants, and the Leyden Pilgrims had bought *Speedwell*, 60 tons, to take part of the group and remain in the New World for "fishing and shuch other affairs as might be for ye goode & benefite of ye colonie."

Fifty from Leyden embarked on *Speedwell* at Delftshaven on July 22, 1620. Some were leaving their children behind; Bradford and his wife decided to leave 5-year-old John, who was never to see

his mother again, and not see his father for many years.

They met *Mayflower* around the end of the month at Southampton and the two departed together on August 5. *Speedwell* was unseaworthy; they put in at Dartmouth for repairs on the 13th, and departed once more on August 23. Three hundred miles out to sea *Speedwell* was behaving so badly it could not go on. Both ships returned, and this time *Mayflower* set out alone. The voyage really began, then, on September 16, 1620.

Speedwell was oversparred, her masts being too tall and heavy for Atlantic winds, in relation to her hull. This meant the hull would "work" and seams would open. Some authorities think that the crew, noting this and not overly happy at the prospect of a winter's voyage across the Atlantic, crowded on sail to aggravate the weakness. It is known that after *Speedwell* was sold and her rig cut down she proved seaworthy and profitable. Bradford himself acknowledged all of this.

THE SHIP

The most famous ship in American history was not even mentioned by name by her passengers. Not until 1623, at the time of the division of land in Plymouth, when "The Falles of their grounds which came first over in the *May-Floure*" were parceled out, are we to first read the name. Bradford only referred to her as the "biger ship" and to her master as "Mr. Jonas." Priscilla Mullins' father wrote his will on board the *Mayflower* in Plymouth Harbor on February 21, 1621; one of its witnesses was "Christopher Joanes" and the Admiralty Court Records as well as the London Port Books show a "Christopher Jones" had been *Mayflower's* master since 1609, at least.

In that year Jones had taken her to Norway; a terrible gale on the return passage almost swamped her and a large part of the cargo of tar, herring, and so forth, had to go overboard. This meant a lawsuit; in May 1612, during trial, a seaman on the Norway voyage testified Jones had been her master for "fower or fyve yeares." There were plenty of the same name around; this particular ship may have dated back to 1588.

Mayflower was in the Thames in London in 1611 and 1613; again, in 1616 with a wine cargo—probably—and certainly there with 161 tons of wine in January 1620. She made yet another run to La Rochelle for more wine in March 1620 and was back by May 15. In all probability, *Mayflower* was lying idle, or being cleaned and painted, when chartered for the Pilgrims' voyage sometime before July 19, 1620.

For speed, by modern standards, she was certainly slow, and probably made no more than 2 miles an hour coming over. But she was bucking the Gulf Stream—which Jones did not even know existed—and it was the season of westerlies. In addition, the bottom was no doubt foul with grass and barnacles from having been in the water through hot months, and she was deeply loaded. On the return trip, in April 1621, lighter, with the winds behind her, and pushed by the Gulf Stream, she averaged 4 miles an hour. If this still seems slow, compare her speed with five crack tea clippers, two centuries later. The fastest type of sailing ships ever built, all five cleared from Foo Chow, China, within 2 days of each other, in late May 1865. Ninety-nine days later, three docked at London on the same tide; the other two were only 2 days behind. Over 16,000 miles, every kind of weather at an average speed for the whole course of the three first ships of—6 miles an hour.

Jones had been, it is known from the records, in the business for some years. According to the Rotherhithe Parish Registers, in Surrey, England, he had a son, Christopher, and a daughter, Joan. First master of the *Jason*, he had sailed to Bordeaux in 1606 or 1607; since then he had been to various ports with *Mayflower*. It is possible he had also at one time been to Greenland, but never, as far as is known, to the North American continent. One-quarter of *Mayflower* was under his ownership, which gave him an extra incentive.

Master's Mate Clark, his chief officer, had been to America before; so had Master's Mate Coppin—probably transferred from *Speedwell*. One of the seamen had been to Newfoundland. The crew were a tough lot, but no man shipped before the mast into the Atlantic in those days who was green or weak at the knees. Almost half of them, including gunner, boatswain, three quartermasters and the cook, were never to see England again. They were victims of that first sad winter.

The Pilgrams themselves showed respect and confidence in all their references to Captain Jones. They parted the following spring on the best of terms. And, this volage was probably has last; 10 months to the day after his arrival in England, he was buried in the Rotherhithe Churchyard. The ordeal of the terrible winter, plus scurvy, had claimed Captain Jones as it already had claimed half the passengers and crew, now buried in New England.

What became of *Mayflower* is not known for sure. After her master's death she lay idle in the Thames until 1624, when she was appraised for sale at a total of 160 pounds—about $8,000. There is considerable circumstantial evidence that she was broken apart, and her timbers used to build a barn that still stands in England. It is true that a beam in the barn does have a mayflower carved into it; that one great beam shows signs of having been cracked through at one time, and marks in the wood that could mean it was the main beam of *Mayflower* repaired during the voyage with the Pilgrims' jackscrew. But no one knows.

THE PEOPLE

Bradford:

Sept. 16 (1620) These troubls being blowne over, and now all being compacte together in one shipe, they put to sea againe with a prosperus winde, which continued diverce days togeather, which was some incouragmente unto them; yet according to the usually maner many were afflicted with seasicknes.

Bradford says very little about the voyage itself. Understandably; it could not have hardly been a pleasure cruise by any stretch of the imagination. Loss of *Speedwell* meant losing even more of the company. About 20 had to turn back; Bradford:

Those that went bak were for the most parte such as were willing so to doe, either out of some discontente, or feare they conceived of the ill success of the vioage, seeing so many crosses befale, & the year time so farr spente; but others, in regarde of their owne weaknes, and charge of many yonge children, were thought least usefull, and most unfite to bear the brunte of this hard adventure; unto which worke of God, and judgmente of their brethren, they were contented to submite. And thus, like Gedions armie, this small number was devided as if the Lord by this work of his providence thought these few to many for the great worke he had to doe.

Ships of the day had only the most elementary conveniences. There were no provisions for bathing or even washing—even if it had been the custom of the day to do so, which it was not. The North Atlantic is always cold; keeping warm and dry was impossible. The diet was always the same, except for a rare hot dish: hard tack, "salt horse," dried fish, cheese and beer. *Mayflower*, no doubt, had some odors about her reminiscent of the days when she had hauled fish, timber, turpentine, and tar from Norway, but she was also, in the sailing vernacular of the time, a "sweet ship" due to having been in the southern wine trade for the past 4 years. Sanitation, unknowingly, 17th century style: This no doubt had purified the ship beyond what was usual for the age, the constant slopping and sloshing of wine from leaky barrels, and its running into every crack and cranny of the vessel, had made it as nearly disease-free as was humanly possible. Only two died on the entire voyage.

The 102 passengers were by no means a homogeneous lot. Only three were from the original Scrooby congregation; just a little over a third came from Leyden. The balance, in Bradford's term, were the "strangers." They were Church of England members, merely because they had been baptized in that faith, and had no connection with or real interest in the separatist doctrine of the Pilgrims. They were seeking economic opportunity; religious liberty was of no concern to them at all.

But all were bound together by one common bond: They were lower class to a man, and in revolt against aristocratic principles.

Fate plays funny games at times. The greatest fame of any of *Mayflower's* passengers is accorded to three "Strangers"—Myles Standish, John Alden, and Priscilla Mullins. Priscilla's father had been a shopkeeper and had been one of the first other than Pilgrims to sign up for the venture.

Her future husband, John Alden, was a "hopfull yonge man" from Harwich, Essex. Remembered by his children as tall, blond, and quite powerful in strength and build, he had signed up under a contract that would keep him in the colony for a year, after which time he was free to do as he pleased. On ship he plied his trade of cooper; barrels of beer, plain water, and "strong water" took up much space in the hold and it was his all-important job to keep them tight and occasionally sample their contents to make sure none had turned rank.

Myles Standish—"Captaine Shrimpe" to his enemies because of his lack of height—had red hair and a ruddy complexion which became redder yet when he was angry, which was often. A soldier of fortune, of sorts; his life is almost blank until the day he boarded the ship.

There were in addition five hired men, neither saints nor strangers. Alden was one, and there were two ordinary seamen and two master mariners, hired to handle the long boat carried in the hold.

Fourth was the much larger group of indentured servants. Not servants in our sense, they were to do the heaviest labor, and whatever their masters ordered, for the period of indenture which was usually 7 years. No wages; food, clothing, housing and that was about it, for the full term of indenture. Among them were four orphan waifs dragged out of the London streets, all with the name of More. This was a common practice of the day, encouraged by the Lord Mayor and the Bishop of London as a method of getting rid of excess poor in the city. Only one survived the next few months to live to a ripe old age.

The remaining group was important as any: officers and crew of the ship. Around 30 seamen in the crew, they were by all accounts both ungodly and intemperate with little use for the piety of the Pilgrims. "Pukestocking louts" was a favorite term of the crew for the Pilgrims, and Bradford notes that the crew was given to "cursing them dayly with greevous execrations." One of the worst tormentors used to deliberately taunt the weak and sick, and when reproached, "he would curse & swear most bitterly." But he himself was stricken one morning. was dead that afternoon, and he was first of all to go over the side. Bradford notes that it was "ye just hand of God upon him."

Then, suddenly, the fierce westerlies were upon them. For days at a time they could raise no sail, and the helmsman wrestled with the ship to keep her headed into the wind. Mountainous wave after wave crashed into her, standing her right on her beam ends. Cracks opened in the deck and superstructure and icy water cascaded onto the thoroughly terrified and shivering passengers.

One day John Howland could not endure it any longer, and went up on deck. He was instantly swept overboard, but by great good luck the ship was trailing some topsail halyards and Howland grabbed one of these. Bradford: Howland was "something ill with it, yet he lived many years after, and became a profitable member both in church and commone wealthe."

The storm hit a new peak, and then with a crack like a cannon shot, a main beam split and buckled. This was serious indeed but fortunately someone had brought from Leyden a "great iron scrue"—probably for a printing press—which was used to push the beam back into place until it could be reinforced. There was muttering among the crew over turning back, but Captain Jones, after much discussion and careful examination, pronounced the ship tight and sound under water. Bradford: "so they commited themselves to ye will of God and resolved to proseede."

On November 16 young William Butten, servant to Deacon Fuller, died; he was quietly and simply buried at sea. Three days later the lookout sighted land; they were staring at the wrist of Cape Cod.

First they swung south but almost came to grief on the shoals and breakers that had been named Tucker's Terror 3 years earlier by Capt. Bartholomew Gosnold, whose fishing expedition in the area had given the Cape its name. They headed back up the coast, and lay out to open sea.

Early on the morning of the 21st, they rounded the Cape into what is now Provincetown Harbor, as fine a harbor as any on the entire continent. The anchor went down with a roar of chains; the decks were stable under foot once again. It was 66 days out of Plymouth, 98 out of Southampton, almost 4 months out of Delft Haven.

But trouble was not over. Muttering had started among the passengers when the ship came into harbor. The bolder became defiant and said quite openly that—Bradford—"when they came ashore, they would use their own libertie, for none had power to command them . . ."

Out of the threatened mutiny came the famed Mayflower Compact. Bradford probably drew it up, familiar as he was from his Scrooby duties with legal terms and jargon of the day. Oddly enough, it passed into oblivion and was ignored until John Quincy Adams in 1802 cited its importance in the Republic's history. It has been credited with being many things it certainly was not, but probably the most accurate evaluation of it has been made by one authority in these words:

> For its day it was an extraordinary document, a remarkable statement of revolutionary new principles, an important milestone in our long, hard, and often bloody ascent from feudalism, from that degrading "aristocratic" system of power and privilege for the few which had held Europe in irons for centuries, vestiges of which still remain to plague us.

They had no illusions about what lay ahead of them. Bradford wrote of it years later:

> Being thus arrived in a good harbor and brought safe to land, they fell upon their knees and blessed the God of heaven, who had brought them over the vast and furious ocean, and delivered them from all the periles and miseries thereof, againe to set their feete on the firme and stable earth, their proper elemente. . . . But hear I cannot but stay and make a pause, and stand half amased at this poore peoples presente condition; and so I thinke will the reader too, when he well considers the same. Being thus passed the vast ocean, and a sea of troubles before in their preparation (as may be remembered by that which wente before), they had now no friends to wellcome them, nor inns to entertaine or refresh their weatherbeaten bodys, no houses or much less townes to repaire too, to seeke for succoure. . . . What could now sustaine them but the spirite of God and his grace? May not and ought not the children of these fathers, rightly say: Our fathers were Englishmen which came over this great ocean, and were ready to perish in this willdernes.

EPILOG: "WHAT SOUGHT THEY THUS AFAR?"

The Pilgrims' story, as has been noted, is shot through with ironies of history, fate and chance. And one of the greatest of all is that the most famous poem to commemorate their landing was written by a woman in Wales who had never even heard the story until she was unwrapping her groceries one day in 1826.

Mrs. Felicia D. Hemans, a native of Rhyllon, Wales, knew almost nothing about America, and less about the Pilgrims. Until one day, unwrapping a delivery from her grocer, she noted the items had for some unknown reason been wrapped in Boston newspapers of 1824. Among the crumpled sheets was an account of the celebration of Forefathers' Day, for that year, in Plymouth. Inspired by what she read, she sat down and composed the lines that have probably done as much or more than any others ever written to make the landing the symbol it is today.

THE LANDING OF THE PILGRIM FATHERS

The breaking waves dashed high on a stern and rock-bound coast,
And the woods against a stormy sky their giant branches tossed;
And the heavy night hung dark the hills and waters o'er,
When a band of exiles moored their bark on the wild New England shore.

Not as the conqueror comes, they, the true-hearted, came;
Not with the roll of the stirring drums, and the trumpet that sings of fame;
Not as the flying come, in silence and in fear;
They shook the depths of the desert gloom with their hymns of lofty cheer.

Amidst the storm they sang, and the stars heard, and the sea;
And the sounding aisles of the dim woods rang to the anthem of the free.
The ocean eagle soared from his nest by the white wave's foam,
And the rocking pines of the forest roared,—this was their welcome home.

There were men with hoary hair amidst that pilgrim band;
Why had they come to wither there, away from their childhood's land?
There was woman's fearless eye, lit by her deep love's truth;
There was manhood's brow serenely high, and the fiery heart of youth.

What sought they thus afar? Bright jewels of the mine?
The wealth of seas, the spoils of war? They sought a faith's pure shrine!
Ay, call it holy ground, the soil where first they trod;
They have left unstained what there they found—freedom to worship God.

GOOD WORKERS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in a recently completed survey, the Civil Service Commission states that the job performance of severely handicapped employees of Government agen-

cies was as good as, and often better than, that of the nonhandicapped workers doing the same kind of work. Of the handicapped surveyed, 36 percent had received one or more promotions since being hired and more than half of the workers show promise for assignment to more responsibilities.

Richard Wolter of Hartford, Wis., has amply demonstrated that handicapped workers in the private sector are not exception to the rule.

The President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped, in connection with Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, singled out Mr. Wolter, who, although blind since 1951, has continued to work successfully as a carpenter contractor. The committee credits his success to his ambition, determination, and the ingenuous tools which compensate for his handicap.

I think my colleagues will share my admiration for Mr. Wolter when they read the following editorial which appeared in the October 5, 1970 Sheboygan *Press:*

GOOD WORKERS

Although blind since 1951, Richard Wolter of Hartford, Washington County, has continued to work successfully as a carpenter-contractor.

The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped credits his success to his ambition, determination, and some unusual tools which compensate for his handicap. The committee has distributed an article about Richard Wolter in connection with the observance of Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, Oct. 4-10.

Richard Wolter uses a transistorized level that buzzes until perfectly horizontal. His measuring tape locks in place so he can saw lumber to a specific size. He has a hammer exactly 16 inches long which he uses when spacing studs. His power saw has a special device that guides the direction of his cut. He uses a braille ruler to draw house plans.

What really drew our attention was the account of Richard Wolter's experiences while building a three-sided A-frame house at Big Green Lake. Mr. Wolter reminisces that it was a long drop from the peak of the A-frame to the ground. His assistant was nailing along the edge of the peak, but the drop-off was too much for him. It was Mr. Wolter who finished the job. He said that he could feel nails protruding at an angle. His predecessor apparently had been reluctant to lean far enough out to drive the nails straight. With Mr. Wolter it didn't matter, and his comment later was that sometimes being blind has its advantages.

There is no end of examples of physically handicapped persons who hold good jobs and develop exceptional talent for certain types of work. The President's Committee refers to them as highly productive employees, safer on the job than most, conscientious, rarely absent from work, and extremely reliable. Our own observations convince us that this assessment of the handicapped is no exaggeration.

PIRACY IN THE SKY

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Southern States Industrial Council recently provided the readers of the Wall Street Journal with an article on the problem of aircraft hijacking. The article, reprinted from the council's bulletin, was a very thoughtful analysis of the problem. It was authored by the president of SSIC, Mr. Art Stewart, also a Texan I am pleased to say. I ask that the article be reprinted in the RECORD for the benefit of other Senators and those interested in exploring solutions to this problem.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 1, 1970]

PIRACY IN THE SKY

Our ancestors solved the problem of piracy on the high seas. They acted firmly and quickly, and a pirate knew that punishment would be quick, final, and not subject to any appeal. In addition, our ancestors were resourceful and self-sufficient and they made sure that the ships which would be exposed to possible attempts at piracy were equipped to defend themselves properly.

Their common sense approach worked, and the same principles have been applied successfully by Israel to prevent hijacking of the jets flown by EL AL, the Israeli airline. In fact, their methods are so successful that the pirates have now captured airplanes owned by our airlines and those of other countries and are trying to ransom the kidnapped passengers and crews in exchange for the agents who were captured in aborted attempts to hijack the EL AL airplanes. Such attempts and failures have been more numerous than reported in the news media.

Piracy is a form of guerrilla warfare and it will continue to exist as long as the possible gain is worth more than the risks involved. If airplanes continue to fly unprotected, there is very little if any risk to the would-be hijacker. Punishment before an international tribunal at some future date is not much of a deterrent to people who are members of a fanatical or hate group, or who are mentally disturbed. However, these people still value their own lives highly, and they do not volunteer for suicide missions. The fact that the Arab guerrillas are trying to obtain the release of captured hijackers proves this. Proper defense against hijacking is therefore the only practical solution.

Many of the more senior Captains flying for the various airlines are contemporaries of mine in that we learned to fly in the 1930's and a few were students of mine when I was active in the flight training business. We are still flying under similar circumstances in that we use the same electronic equipment, common communications and control procedures, encounter the same weather, and cruise at the same altitudes and speeds. However, there is one very important difference. I know the passengers on my jet, but the airline Captains must fly with a group of strangers.

Methods of checking baggage and passengers have been instituted at some airports during the past year, but as recent events show, do not provide full protection. If a potential hijacker succeeds in boarding an airplane, there is no defense against him unless the Captain is a rugged individualist who intends to use the gun he is illegally carrying in his navigation kit. With this one exception, the armed hijacker will always be successful if he can just manage to get aboard the airplane.

This is not the way we became a nation and have survived as a nation. Even our stage coaches out West had better protection than this. Certain procedures can be instituted which would greatly improve the security of aircraft against hijack attempts. We must accept the fact that some shooting will occur and that a few bullet holes through the skin of a modern jet airplane would not create a serious problem because of loss of pressurization or weakening of the fail safe structure. We must also realize that danger and injury to a few is far better than the loss of a complete airplane and all the people aboard as will happen if the present situation continues.

The Captain should be fully responsible for the safety of his aircraft, crew and passengers, just as the captains of ships were when they faced similar problems. He and his crew should be properly trained and equipped so that they can successfully protect themselves and the airplane.

The procedures used by EL AL are practical and are working. They can be improved so that the security guard's station will be better protected and he will be better equipped. A study of the types of weapons and explosives which can be carried on board by prospective hijackers would soon develop methods to use in the thwarting their use. A program of positive action must be undertaken because this problem of hijacking will not be solved until it becomes reasonably impossible for people to hijack airplanes. The development of the necessary procedures to protect the airplane, passengers, and crew is the responsibility of the airline which in turn should ask for and receive assistance and cooperation from law enforcement agencies of the government. The Captain must then use these procedures properly and assume full responsibility during flight. It is up to him to see that his airplane reaches its proper destination and prevention of hijacking is his job.

The protection of the passengers, crew, and aircraft after a hijack is the responsibility of our government. Our government should take some old fashioned, prompt, and courageous action to protect our citizens and property in connection with the aircraft piracy events on the Labor Day weekend.

JOHN LEWIS STONE SEES A SOLUTION TO AMERICA'S OVERCROWDED CITIES

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a recent article by Mr. John Lewis Stone, managing editor of the Muskogee Phoenix & Times-Democrat.

Mr. Stone expresses concern over the future of our metropolitan areas and their inhabitants. As we have seen, growth of population in the cities has caused many problems—traffic congestion, power shortages, and housing deficiencies, to name but a few. Mr. Stone's article suggests the possibility of rechanneling this overpopulation to some of the vast, less populous areas across the country, by shifting the economic bases to which they are drawn.

While traveling on the newly opened south section of the Indian Nation Turnpike between McAlester and Hugo, Mr. Stone felt fortunate that eastern Oklahoma is one of those lesser populated areas which is preparing for the relocation of industry and resultant influx of people. This relocation may be exemplified by the recent American Airlines announcement that they will center their computer operations in Tulsa, bringing in some 30 families from the New York City area. Although this one situation may

seem inconsequential when considering the magnitude of the problem, there must be a gradual reversal trend in our population concentration, to insure that something will be done about the crowded condition of our cities.

After evaluating the conditions in some of our major cities, Mr. Stone is not altogether pessimistic about the possibility of their correction. He sees eastern Oklahoma and other areas like it as a workable solution to one of our Nation's greatest domestic problems. I commend him for his excellent article and include his remarks in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

CITY PEOPLE NEED TO MOVE

(By John Lewis Stone)

Having been unfortunate enough to be in some rather large cities of these United States the past few weeks and experienced their traffic jams, their electricity shortages and the general inconvenience of big city life, we couldn't help but note the vast area of sparsely populated territory which is now served with the opening of the south section of the Indian Nation Turnpike, between McAlester and Hugo.

We drove down to the Antlers Interchange Thursday for the official dedication ceremonies on Thursday and then on down the turnpike to Hugo and on down the free four-lane to the Red River and into Paris, Texas.

It is a beautiful drive, winding its way through some beautiful mountainous terrain of Eastern Oklahoma.

We listened as Governor Dewey Bartlett told of how such fine roads had helped to increase the tourist revenues for the state of Oklahoma and how they would tend to attract new industry into that section of Oklahoma.

We couldn't help but think about how the government could devise some tax incentives to bring about a reverse flow of population and the relocation of industry necessary to provide an economic base for that population.

And how perhaps federal housing and community development programs might even be focused on the creation of new towns planned from scratch to be fit for human living.

There seems little doubt that unless the population pressure is eased in the nation's major metropolitan areas, the cities will not begin to cope with their staggering difficulties so that they will once again be a joy to visit and a pleasure in which to live.

When we read the other day that American Airlines was going to center its computer operations in Tulsa and that some 30 families would be moved from New York City in the immediate future to begin the installation and training for the facility, that these 30 families were among the very fortunate. And they are to be envied by the millions of residents who will be left behind in New York.

We who live here in Eastern Oklahoma seldom stop to realize how fortunate we are in our environment.

It's bound to come, and those who make the move early are the smartest.

A MOVING PRAYER

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, Oma S. Umhey, the vice president of the California Federation of Republican Women, recently wrote another articulate and moving prayer that has been used across the Nation. I wish to now share its beauty and timeliness with my colleagues:

Our God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come.

Without You there could be no American form of government . . . nor an American way of life. Our Founding Fathers saw this and our Governor often asks that we return to our religious heritage.

We thank You for the fellowship and friendship we have here. We ask that You lead us from ourselves to You. And while we are surrounded by beauty and comfort let us not forget our hard-working, dedicated leaders, our men in the military, and above all O God, do we seek Your help for the prisoners of war and their loved ones. May it be Your will that they be together again. We realize that for the last several generations we have killed our finest young men with senseless wars which we can see will bring our Nation to decay and disaster unless we maintain the fine leadership we have in Washington today. Where we have defected from discipline and gone from the spiritual to the sensual we ask Your forgiveness.

May each person here feel she has added purpose to her activities by working for good government.

We recognize the mysteries of Your works in the beauties of the earth, the sun, and the stars. But we also believe that You care for each one of us as individuals . . . So give to us we pray: The joy that dwells in the hearts of the believers and the happiness of those who walk with You.

We present this prayer in the name of the living God. Amen.

CONGRESSMAN SAM STRATTON REPORTS TO THE PEOPLE OF UPSTATE NEW YORK ON THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 91ST CONGRESS

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to present to the people of upstate New York, whom I am privileged to serve in the House, this report on the record and accomplishments of the 91st Congress. This is a report I have made regularly each year, during the 12 years I have served in Congress, so that the people we serve may have a precise accounting of our service and stewardship in their behalf.

Of course this Congress has not yet completed all its business. We are scheduled to reconvene after the November 3 election, to complete action on a number of important measures, particularly the remaining appropriations bills for fiscal 1971. But the bulk of our work is behind us, and as we pause for this brief recess we have a good opportunity to see just how much has been done in these past 2 years.

VIETNAM WITHDRAWAL

Perhaps the most significant area of progress in these 2 years has been in implementing our Nation's policy in Vietnam. Early last year the President outlined his proposal to withdraw our combat troops at a steady pace and turn over the actual fighting to the South Vietnamese. The only stipulation was that this turnover should be carried out slowly enough so that the South Vietnamese could pick up the burden effectively and thus be prepared to defend themselves when our troops are finally withdrawn. This policy of deliberate, phased withdrawal and deescalation was given overwhelming bipartisan support by the Congress last December with the enactment of the Peace and Freedom in Vietnam resolution. I was proud to be one of a small bipartisan group who initiated that resolution, lined up broad support for it, and was later invited to the White House to be personally thanked for that effort by the President.

Under that policy more than 160,000 troops have now been withdrawn from Vietnam, and all of our ground combat troops will be out of the fighting there by May 1, 1971. Already—as I saw in my most recent visit to Vietnam in May of this year—very substantial sections of South Vietnam are already being defended by South Vietnamese troops alone. They have greatly improved their combat skill in these past 2 years and show every promise now of being able to handle the job by themselves by next May.

Meanwhile, as the fighting continued, our Government has put forward some 39 different proposals for effective peace arrangements in Vietnam. All have been rejected. President Nixon recently offered a 40th proposal, his comprehensive stand-still, cease-fire plan for Vietnam. This, too, has been rejected by the Communists, although there is some feeling that perhaps it may later come in for more serious attention, possibly in secret talks.

I do think it is important, however, to recognize that this cease-fire proposal would never have been possible except for the success of our operation last May and June in cleaning out the dangerous threats to our withdrawing troops that were located in the Cambodian sanctuaries. Despite the popular outcry at the time, and the rather violent reactions on many of our college campuses, Congress supported the President's action in Cambodia. And today the result of that action now makes possible a speedup in our troop withdrawals, testifying to the wisdom of Congress at the time.

ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

The most significant new development on the international scene during this session of Congress has been the increasing threat of open hostilities in the Middle East. The Soviets have been pouring weapons, advisors, even combat pilots into Egypt in an effort to overwhelm the State of Israel. Meanwhile the President hesitated—very wrongly, in my opinion—in turning over to Israel the remainder of those 50 Phantom jets which had been promised under President Johnson. Last summer, after long negotiations, the United States finally persuaded both Egypt and Israel to begin peace talks through a third party, Ambassador Jarring of the U.N., with the understanding that while these talks

were underway both sides would cease firing and "stand still" in their present position along both sides of the Suez Canal.

For a time it looked as though we might finally have achieved a real breakthrough in the search for peace in the Middle East. Then suddenly the Egyptians, with the support of their Russian backers, began an immediate, and easily detectable, violation of the standstill agreement by moving their SAM missiles forward into the neutral zone. The projected peace talks were called off.

At this very moment my own subcommittee was making a quick survey trip in the Mediterranean, including a brief visit to Israel. On that stop we had the unusual privilege of an hour-long private conference with Prime Minister Golda Meir, as well as lengthy talks with Foreign Minister Abba Eban and with top Israeli defense leaders. From them we brought back to Washington Israel's urgent appeal for some $800 million worth of aircraft and other military equipment, plus an urgent request for the prompt enactment of legislation to permit the sale of this equipment on credit rather than strictly cash. This report was quickly made to our Government and the needed legislation—long stalled in another committee—was hastily added to the defense authorization bill for 1971, with my strong support as one of the House conferees on the bill. Congress should have passed such legislation much earlier in the session, but the bill to do this, the Foreign Military Sales Act of 1970, had been loaded down with unrelated issues and thus was bottled up in the conference committee.

Frankly, I am proud to have been able to help to provide this needed help to Israel quickly. I am convinced it will be the most effective way of insuring peace and deterring open war in the Middle East, since the Egyptians and the Russians will never launch strikes against Israel so long as they are clearly aware that we intend to back up Israel and not allow her to be driven into the sea. Our earlier hesitation about the 50 Phantom jets proved a dangerous blunder, because it raised serious doubts as to our intentions. But the prompt action of Congress in underwriting needed help to Israel on reasonable credit terms has now removed that doubt, and thereby it greatly increases the chances for peace.

OTHER MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

While there have been suggestions that this 91st Congress has not been as productive as it should have been, a careful inspection of the record shows a rather remarkable list of significant legislative accomplishments, real landmark pieces of legislation. For example:

MAJOR DRAFT REFORM

This action, instituting a draft lottery and limiting the personal vulnerability of young men to the draft to a single 1-year period, was originally contained in a bill which I introduced early in 1969. It was passed in late 1969.

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASES

The decision of Congress to provide a 15-percent increase in social security benefits last year stemmed from action which 50 Congressmen, including myself, took in September 1969 to urge an immediate 15-percent boost, rather than the inadequate 7-percent boost, not to become effective until April 1970, recommended by Mr. Nixon. Now Congress has in the mill still another piece of legislation, which I fully support, to give a further 10-percent increase this year, raise the minimum benefit to $100 a month, increase the amount that can be earned on the outside to $2,000, and provide a benefit escalator clause to insure that in the future social security benefits keep pace automatically with increases in the cost of living.

THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

This measure—which I first introduced in Congress over 8 years ago—will become effective in January. Some people are nervous over the impact of the 18-year-old vote. But I do not share this concern. Instead, I do think the right to vote will have the effect of persuading young people to use their talents and energies to bring about changes within our system, rather than simply trying to blow everything else and bring about revolution and chaos.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORAL REFORM

Early last year the House passed a constitutional amendment to end the electoral college in presidential elections and substitute a direct popular election. I supported that move, but it has died in the Senate, chiefly because of opposition from the smaller States. Actually, I believe that a less drastic change—which I had initially recommended—would have a better chance of enactment in the Senate and in the States, and yet it would have ended the "time bombs" which now exist in our presidential election machinery.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

I have long cosponsored this amendment and was one of the first to sign the discharge petition to get it out of committee and get it passed. Unfortunately, it, too, appears at the moment to be in trouble in the Senate.

TAX REFORM

In 1969 Congress passed the most sweeping tax reform bill in over 20 years. It plugged many—though not all—of the more flagrant tax loopholes, and it also provided something even more welcome, about $9 billion in tax reductions, which will become fully effective in 1972. These include the ending of the surtax, an increase in the standard deduction, lower tax rates for single women, and a gradual increase in the personal exemption to $750.

POSTAL REFORM

The postal reform and postal pay legislation which we passed this year will take the Post Office fully out of politics by the middle of next year. I have strongly supported this action for many years. In fact, it may be of interest to recall that when I had the recommending authority, I nominated a career postal employee for postmaster in Schenectady, and also a career employee for postmaster in Amsterdam.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

We finally got around this year to passing the most sweeping set of reforms in congressional procedures in 24 years. The bill we passed was an outgrowth of an investigation which started some 4 years ago, pursuant to legislation which I had cosponsored. While seniority will always play some role in the operations of Congress, just as it does in labor unions, colleges, and most other institutions, I was disappointed that our reform bill did not include some limitations on the use of seniority alone in selecting committee chairmen. I supported that limitation amendment, but we failed to muster a majority.

CRIME CONTROL

Important steps were taken in crime control by the 91st Congress. We passed a tough crime bill for the District of Columbia, a tough bill to crack down on organized crime, and we extended the Safe Street Act which provides financial help to local police departments to beef up their own effectiveness.

DRUG CONTROL

We also passed a tough drug control bill, to crack down on drug pushers, conduct further drug research, help cut off the illegal flow of drugs from places like Turkey, France, and Mexico, and increase the number of Federal narcotics agents.

REORDERING PRIORITIES

On four separate occasions Congress clashed with the President on where our money ought to be spent as a priority matter. Although in 2 years we cut the President's budget by $8.5 billion, we did seek to add $1.5 billion to education, an extra $500 million to hospital construction, and $500 million more to housing and veterans' medical care. President Nixon vetoed four of these add-ons. Congress overrode one veto of the education bill and the veto of the hospital construction bill. I share the President's desire to hold the line on inflation and overall spending. But I believe Congress has an equal right to say just where, and in what amounts, the money we do spend should go.

PROTECTION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

The House has passed a bill, which I cosponsored, to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment, to underline our concern in this area. We also approved an extra $1 billion for the fight to clean up our waters, and passed legislation to require the development of a nonpolluting auto engine by the auto industry by 1975.

STRATTON BILLS

Several other bills which I introduced and in which I have had a special interest have also come in for attention in this 90th Congress.

Extension of the west front of the Capitol: Largely because of my one-man battle the costly $60 million plan to deface and destroy the historic west front of the U.S. Capitol is still on ice. At the moment some further studies are being made. But as each day passes the chances improve that the west front will no longer be destroyed but only repaired and re-

stored to make it structurally safe and sound.

Tractor safety: My move to require roll bars and seat belts on farm tractors led this year to enactment of a law requiring a full Federal study of tractor hazards and accidents, which will be made available to the new 92d Congress when they come back in January. Meanwhile Wisconsin—which I visited in March to address a tractor safety forum—has become the latest State to adopt my safety proposals as mandatory equipment on all State-operated tractors.

Pornography: Congress did adopt tougher rules to prevent the flood of pornography through the mails. But unfortunately an even tougher version, which I had introduced and pushed, was turned down.

Federal health insurance legislation: Congress approved a compromise version of my bill to increase the Federal contribution to employee health insurance programs to 50 percent, but they settled for 40 percent.

Veterans pension protection: Action is finally underway on a bill I have long sponsored, to preserve veterans' pensions from reductions every time social security benefits go up. This bill, which Congress is expected to pass before Christmas, will, I believe, cover not only last year's 15 percent but also this year's 10 percent.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

In this 91st Congress I have taken a lead within the Armed Services Committee in making searching and often highly critical inquiries into military practices and procedures.

My investigation into Army tank procurement procedures, for example, led to a hard-hitting and very critical report on the "billion dollar boo-boo" of the Army's Sheridan tank. It stimulated no cheers in the Army high command, I might add. Production of that tank has now been suspended by the Army itself.

Another investigation, into why the Navy allowed the nuclear Submarine *Guittaro* to sink alongside its pier before it could even be completed, was also highly critical and led to reforms that forced a complete overhaul of the Navy's ship construction command.

And the 8-month-long investigation into the real facts of the My Lai incident, carried out in the face of almost constant opposition and obstruction from the Army, produced a penetrating document critical of the Army brass and widely hailed for pulling no punches. I am proud to have had a major role in the shaping and the drafting of that no-holds-barred report.

HELP ON LOCAL PROBLEMS

One very important function of Congress—and Congressmen—is to provide help with problems affecting local areas. Here are some of the highlights of the help we have been able to provide in our office in connection with people, installations, and communities in the Capital District of upstate New York.

FUTURE OF THE WATERVLIET ARSENAL

The historic Watervliet Arsenal is one of the most important defense installations in the entire country. This spring it was hit with a 466-man reduction in force and its future seemed to some to be in doubt.

First, a New York congressional delegation subcommittee, which I chaired, received assurances from Defense Secretary Laird in March that there would be no further cuts in fiscal 1971 if the defense budget was not drastically reduced.

Second, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I pushed through a $1.3 million construction grant for the expansion of existing laboratory facilities at Watervliet. Who wants to close an installation when new construction is underway? The bill has now been approved and signed into law.

Third, at the request of distraught Watervliet employees, I learned from defense authorities that an earlier press conference purporting to announce the closing of one of Watervliet's most important buildings, No. 135, was completely unauthorized and untrue. No decision has yet been made to close this building, and it may never be made in view of the information below.

Finally, as a result of the decision to provide credit sales of military equipment, Watervliet's workload has been significantly increased and its continuation without any personnel cutbacks is assured for at least the next 2 years. Thus the Watervliet picture today is far more encouraging than it was last February.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAY 88

Last spring it was clear from the public hearing held, in accordance with law, at the Schalmont High School in Rotterdam, that the decision of the State transportation department to terminate Interstate Highway 88 at Schenectady Thruway exit 25 was overwhelmingly opposed by the people of our area.

At that time I met with local citizens of Guilderland and Rotterdam on this matter and later arranged for them to come to Washington to meet with Federal highway officials to determine the exact status of the highway. We were told that no firm decision had actually been made to locate the terminus at exit 25. They agreed that exit 27 at Amsterdam, or some other new exit somewhere in between, could be equally acceptable. But the Federal Government cannot act until the State first makes its recommendation.

So far the State seems bent on ignoring the wishes of the people of the area and going into exit 25 anyway. But recently there have been indications that cooler heads, as well as discreet pressure from Washington, may force the State to come up with a compromise exit, very possibly a new exit, either east or west of exit 25, so that the new highway will not destroy a valuable new suburban residential area.

Thus State officials will, in the end, find themselves forced to obey the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, in which Congress included an expanded hearing provision, precisely to give people, like those in Guilderland and Rotterdam, a chance to have a say in the location of all new interstate highways.

CENSUS PROPOSALS

When preliminary census figures were made public this summer, great dissatisfaction was voiced by the city of Albany, the town of Colonie, and the town of Guilderland. All felt their communities had been improperly counted by the census people. In response to these complaints I made direct arrangements for census officials to meet with leaders from all three communities to work out differences and disagreements.

To date, unfortunately, although all three communities have filed evidence of counting errors, very little has been done by the census people to correct their figures.

I believe more time is needed to consider these differences before the figures are certified as official. I have introduced legislation to this effect. I also believe that we need to set up some impartial census court of appeals to rule on such disputes. The House Census Subcommittee is currently giving serious consideration to my proposal in this regard.

NEW YORK TO ALBANY METROLINER

Announcements made earlier this year by the Penn Central and other leading railroads that still more intercity passenger trains will be dropped has increased the urgency of Federal action, not only to keep railroad passenger service going, but to give us at least the same kind of high-speed modern passenger service the Japanese have had for several years.

This spring I testified in person in Albany at an ICC hearing on these train cancellations and urged the ICC not to allow these runs to be dropped unless Penn Central agrees to extend to the New York-to-Albany run the same kind of fast, dependable metroliner service now operating between New York and Washington.

Shortly before the present recess the House passed an extension of the High-Speed Ground Transportation Act. This measure provides Federal help for developing new high-speed passenger routes. I believe some of this money ought to be used to get a New York-to-Albany metroliner into operation, and I will continue to press for that objective.

NEW WORK FOR KAPL IN SCHENECTADY

Action by Congress last month in providing an additional $435 million for urgently needed new ships for the Navy—ships which the Navy has long sought, but which Defense Department analysts had opposed until the recent crises in the Mediterranean disclosed some of our Navy's serious weaknesses—will mean extra work for the Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory in Schenectady. Two of these ships are the new, fast nuclear submarines developed by Admiral Rickover. The technical know-how to build their nuclear powerplant is located in Schenectady. In the past few months some $50 million in additional nuclear ship business has come to Schenectady General Electric.

THREATS FROM IMPORTS

At the same time that Schenectady General Electric and Watervliet have benefited from additional defense busi-

ness, other sections of local industry—General Electric, Alleghany Ludlum, and the textile plants in Amsterdam—are being threatened by an increasing flood of foreign import competition.

Over the past several months the Government has made repeated efforts to persuade Japan and other importing countries to accept voluntary limitations on the quantity of their imports. But all such efforts have been unsuccessful.

As a result a substantial number of Congressmen, myself included, joined in sponsoring import control legislation designed to protect American workers and American jobs against the damage that too heavy foreign imports could cause. The final bill has now been reported out of committee and is expected to be up for action when Congress reconvenes on November 16. It contains provisions to limit not only textile imports but also excessive imports of steel—which are hurting Alleghany Ludlum—and electronic imports—which are hurting such companies as General Electric. I was happy to cosponsor this legislation and believe it is very much needed.

THERMAL POLLUTION

With all of the attention being focused these days on the need to protect our environment from pollution, one new aspect of this problem which has only recently come in for major attention is thermal pollution, that is, the damaging of our lakes and streams by overheating their waters as a result of industrial operations.

In this 91st Congress I am proud to be able to report that I took the lead in the battle against this new threat of thermal pollution. Although the Water Quality Control Act in this Congress did not end up containing as strong a provision against thermal pollution as I would have liked, the issue was raised very clearly and the legislative history demonstrates the intent of Congress to set tough enough water quality standards to prevent thermal pollution.

One very significant victory was chalked up when the New York State Electric & Gas Co., about a year ago, withdrew its earlier application for construction of a nuclear powerplant on Cayuga Lake, one of the most scenic of the Finger Lakes. As originally projected, this plant would have contained no towers or other devices to cool the water being used by the nuclear plant before it was fed back into the lake. The withdrawal decision which resulted from a combination of local protests and our action in Congress should guaranty that when the new plant is built it will be built with the proper cooling devices. This is a clear-cut opening victory in the fight against the thermal pollution of all small inland lakes and streams.

HELP FOR AMSTERDAM

Dedication this month of the new Amsterdam senior citizens housing projects points up the substantial amounts of Federal help that have come into Amsterdam in recent years to help in the modernization of that city. More than $5.9 million have now been allocated for urban renewal in Amsterdam. The two Federal housing projects now in operation, including the senior citizen project, total $3.6 million in value. Early in 1969, as a result of my intervention, funds for the OEO program for Montgomery County were restored after an earlier bureaucratic attempt to cut them off. In the past 2 years Amsterdam has also received some $600,000 of Federal money for the expansion of the Amsterdam Memorial Hospital, $650,000 for a new Montgomery County infirmary, $210,000 for a mental retardation center for the Amsterdam School District, and $111,000 for a practical nurses manpower training program. Here, too, close cooperation between the city and the Federal Government has resulted in substantial benefits for this city, once so hard hit by the flight of textile industry to the South.

ATTENDANCE AND COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

In spite of the demands of committee investigations and complications resulting from the latest congressional reapportionment, I am happy to report that I have continued to maintain a high voting attendance average, about 80 percent for this 91st Congress. This still gives a lifetime voting attendance record, covering my 12 years in Congress from two different districts and 11 different counties, of 88 percent, still one of the highest attendance averages in Congress.

I have been very pleased with my continued membership on the Armed Services Committee, and with the subcommittee chairmanships and additional responsibilities which my 12 years of service on that committee have recently made possible. It is perhaps worth noting, however, that because of my longer service in Congress I may soon be eligible, if I so desire, to fill New York State's new vacancy on the powerful, tax-writing Ways and Means Committee. I am frankly not sure whether I would want to shift committees and go back to the bottom of the class, so to speak. But the Ways and Means Committee does offer a considerable challenge, since it handles not only all tax matters, but also all social security, welfare, and tariff legislation.

OFFICE BUSINESS

Since Congress will now undoubtedly be remaining in session until the Christmas holidays, let me remind you that my district offices will also be open during this time, to render to you any assistance that we possibly can.

My Amsterdam office can be reached by calling either 843–3400 or 842–1302. I can also be reached in Schenectady on 374–4547. It is a pleasure and an honor to serve you and I do hope you will call on me any time that my staff or I can serve you.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I have been pleased to join with Senators BAYH, KENNEDY, JAVITS, GOODELL, COOK, and DOLE in sponsoring a proposed constitutional amendment to guarantee women equal rights.

This new proposal would make it clear in the Constitution, once and for all, that women shall be entitled to equal protection of the laws.

The key language in the proposal is as follows:

> Neither the United States nor any State shall, on account of sex, deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The language conforms closely to the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. This is a legal point, but an important point. It would be clear under the proposed amendment that discrimination on the basis of sex, as well as on the basis of race, would be constitutionally prohibited.

Courts have been interpreting similar language for more than 100 years. Our new amendment would permit the courts to continue building on that 100 years of precedent.

It could be expected that the Supreme Court would hold that the proposed language prohibits arbitrary discrimination against women, but does not preclude reasonable classification recognizing differences between the sexes.

Equal rights for women has been a worthy goal for a long time. Since the 19th amendment was adopted 50 years ago to give the women the right to vote, many distinguished women's groups have pursued a campaign to eliminate discrimination based on sex, in education, employment, and in other fields.

I strongly support the objectives of this campaign.

While I have not opposed the House-passed version of the equal rights amendment, I believe the new language now proposed is preferrable from a legal point of view. I have been concerned that a number of unfortunate consequences, some unintended, could flow from adoption of the House-passed version.

For example, the weight of authority indicates that, under the House-passed version, women would be subject to compulsory military service; and would be assigned to duty on the same basis as men. While I realize that some proponents want and intend such a result, I believe that most Americans and most Senators do not.

Some will say that this new proposal would add little to the Constitution as it now stands. That may be true, but the little it will add can be very important for women.

Proponents of an equal rights amendment have argued, with some basis, that there is doubt about the applicability and meaningfulness of the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment in the situations of discrimination based on sex.

The new amendment we have sponsored would make it clear that equal protection of the laws does apply to sex discrimination, as well as to discrimination in other areas.

Mr. President, I believe this new proposal will guarantee equal treatment for women without some of the undesirable side-effects which could flow from the House-passed version.

I commend this new proposal to the Senate and to the American people.

ADOPT A NATIONAL FOOD POLICY, SAYS RODNEY LEONARD

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thought-provoking speeches delivered at the recent conference on nutrition was given by Rodney E. Leonard, consultant to the Children's Foundation and former Administrator of Consumer and Marketing Service of the USDA.

Mr. Leonard's observation that U.S. farm policy should be a part of a national food and nutritional policy, makes his analysis well worth reading.

The speech follows:

STATEMENT BY RODNEY E. LEONARD TO THE DEMOCRATIC STUDY GROUP JOINT TASK FORCE HEARINGS, SEPTEMBER 19, 1970

I appreciate the invitation to appear before you to discuss a national food—or nutritional—policy for the 1970's. My name is Rod Leonard. I am a consultant on child nutrition programs to the Children's Foundation, and editor of the Community Nutrition Institute Weekly Report.

During the 1960's, I served in the USDA on the staff of the Secretary, as Deputy Assistant Secretary and as Administrator of Consumer and Marketing Service. The latter agency operated programs of food assistance, food industry regulation and marketing services to producers. These positions gave me full access to the policy making function in food and agriculture, and my observations are based on these experiences and the continuing study of food policies, programs and public management I have made as a private citizen.

It took several years in the USDA before I fully understood how Executive agencies function, how the Congress develops policy and who most often controls the policy making apparatus. Many of us initially had assumed the job of making policy rested with policy makers. That, unfortunately, is not often the case. It particularly is not true in the area of nutritional policy. By default, more than anything else, a few nice ladies in soft hats and low heeled shoes really make nutritional policy—that little there is.

In the past decade, for example, the major policy development has been to place foods into four categories—meat, dairy products, bread and grains, and fruits and vegetables. This must have been a fairly momentous decision, since the nutrition world is divided into advocates of the 4's against the champions of the 7's. It often appears that the experts in food and nutrition go to conferences and decry the lack of nutrition education, draw rewarding consulting fees from food companies and complain bitterly about Bob Choate.

The complaints are not aimed so much at his lack of competence as toward his rudeness in exposing their expertise as an empty box. Where else than in nutrition could a non-expert hold his own before a Congressional committee with a battery of experts looking over his shoulder. In other societies the same condition exists when one witch doctor denounces another.

This confrontation bears directly on the purpose of these hearings, since it may help explain what is happening. As a non-expert, I feel qualified to make these observations:

First: Nutrition and food is an area where emotions have, and will hold greater sway than reason. How else can we explain the quacks, faddists and charlatans who abound in nutrition.

Second: The experts have been waiting for the non-expert to tell them what to do. More bluntly, the policy makers are neglecting their jobs.

For example, Food policy is the responsibility in the Congress of the Agriculture committees where this vital topic is shunted off to an unimportant sub-committee. The economic aspects of food—production, most importantly, then processing and distribution—have been the primary consideration. Congress is alert to social and economic consequences of food and nutrition as it affects the user only when health or human life are threatened.

The practice is hallowed tradition. Meat was first inspected in the 1880's as a step to save the export market in Europe. The consumer in America was given equal protection some 26 years later, and only after Upton Sinclair wrote "The Jungle."

The Food and Drug Administration was founded in 1906—after a U.S.D.A. scientist fed borax to convicts to prove the chemical then used as a preservative was harmful to health. But even today it is fair to say that FDA gives food a secondary consideration after drugs.

Beneficial reforms in meat and poultry inspection were enacted in 1967 and 1968, but only after some involved maneuvering. Similar action is needed in fish and egg products, but the bills languish in committee. While fish is not under the Agriculture committee, the attitude is the same: The committees feel uncomfortable with subjects other than food production, and so does the Congress.

If I sound as though all the fault belongs to Congress for failing to develop a realistic nutrition policy, I want to be equally clear that the Executive branch has never seriously challenged the concept that food policy is the flea on the farm dog.

Every administration since 1862 has professed a desire to give maximum support to the goal of food abundance—or to production economics. The user has always been an object to be manipulated. Both the Congress and the Executive have felt this definition of priorities would produce the maximum good, and no great harm would be done, in any event. The food being grown is nutritious and, if consumed in a balanced diet, will insure a healthy population. Other than for ignoring the impact of poverty, all the better nutritionists were agreed.

Occasional flare-ups where a few people died, or were made sick, could be handled politically by proposing and sometimes enacting legislation, prosecuting a few hapless individuals, and seizing an occasional carload of lettuce or case of canned peas with a publicity fanfare.

Until recently this policy and procedure has worked. Although never clearly stated, the policy concept defines quality as a matter of taste and eye appeal, and not nutritional adequacy. This emotional matrix has been accepted by most professionals. They busy themselves with test tubes, measuring nutrient values, developing recipes and preparing menu packages. Some concentrate on processing techniques which preserve or enhance conventional appearance, but which greatly reduce unit costs. The nutritional changes which also take place are usually ignored.

The Congress, and the Executive, quite obviously believe this quite limited definition of food policy still exists, since matters affecting the food needs of an urban nation are still decided on economic issues presented by producer and processor groups.

For example, during the same period Congress was enacting better meat and poultry inspection laws, it also was voting to restrict meat imports into the United States. And, while the Executive sometimes berates the Congress for spending, it took steps to increase the price of milk this spring which added millions of dollars to consumer food costs.

These practices will continue until the Congress and the Executive realize that nearly 30 years ago farm policy became part of food policy. The problems we face in food and nutrition are not how to find symbols of taste and eye appeal to apply to problems of food marketing and nutrition education, but to develop standards for an age when the food factory becomes more important than the farm.

Hanging the corporation as the bad guy who wants to starve our kids at breakfast is a bit of charming hyperbole—or diverting demogoguery for the corporation executive who can find no standards the Congress will supply to guide his actions.

What good is it to talk about providing sufficient income to enable low income families to purchase an adequate diet when some nutritionists are beginning to fear the consumer cannot gain adequate nutrition regardless of income?

How can the consumer exercise his function as the decision maker when he cannot always relate nutritional quality to appearance or taste? What is a hot dog? Is the TV dinner nutritionally equivalent to a meal prepared in the kitchen? Does the label on a can of stew tell you what it contains, or how it was prepared?

The food service industry has been growing at an annual rate of 10 percent over the last decade, compared to about 4 percent for retail grocery sales. Public policy until 1970 was to prohibit the industry from applying the talents to solving hunger and malnutrition through schools. Even now the policy is not clear, nor is any real effort being made to utilize this capacity for delivering nutritional services.

Is it any wonder today that in the area of food policy, industry is confused, the consumer is befuddled and the retailer is searching desperately for a marketing strategy that makes sense?

This uncertainty—this symptom of instability—cannot be removed or cured by bandaids. It will require major reforms in the Congress and Executive, reforms which can help initiate a food policy for an urban nation.

In the Congress, the Agriculture committee must become policy instruments which treat farm programs as an area for one subcommittee, with food policy the overall strategy imperative. Urban congressmen should be fighting to get on the food policy committee rather than fighting to stay off the farm policy committee.

Questions of food policy are now handled by several committees—Agriculture, Education and Welfare, Interior. The responsibility should be placed under a single jurisdiction.

In the Executive, the same dispersion of administrative responsibility should be corrected. Food programs logically should be brought to the Department of Agriculture, but in this case logic might not produce the best results. However, I am not any more sanguine about bringing together food policy agencies under the HEW banner, or any existing agency banner.

The problem in the Executive is less one of good intention than of bureaucratic structure and management responsiveness. In FDA, for example, the answer to incompetency is not to remove the responsible officials from the scene by building new layers of management. In the USDA, the major problem is to find techniques which allow the consumer as much of a voice in personnel, budgeting and defining priorities as special interests have come to enjoy.

Neither building new layers or insulating the decision process are good ways to conduct business in an institutional structure, either public or private. The restructuring of Executive programs must involve a yet undefined

method of involving the individual citizen in the process of defining program and administrative policy.

Thus, in this matter, the Executive has a doubly hard problem: it must finally accept the fact that farm policy is part of the broader question of food policy, or nutrition programs; and it must also find the means of communicating the thought to civil servants that public agencies do not exist for the purpose of earning pensions.

While this difficult and time consuming process is confining the Executive's attention, the Congress with its new or revitalized committee structure can begin defining the food, or nutritional policy of the U.S. in the 1970's. These are some of the questions which must be recognized:

What programs should be developed to encourage medical science to use nutrition as a technique of preventive medicine?

How should food be defined? As a main dish, side dish, dessert?

Under what circumstances, and within what standards, should processed protein be used in products which traditionally are limited to animal protein?

What are the hazardous microbiological levels in processed foods, and how will the levels vary at different stages of processing? How will these standards be enforced?

How much protection should the public expect? Within budget priorities, how much should be spent on regulation, protection and consumer services?

What should the role of State and local governments be?

Obviously, it is a lot easier to ask questions than to answer them. But we must ask them if the urban economy is to function; and, sadly, hardly anyone is now asking them, let alone search for answers.

The answers we find will form a national food policy. It should assure us the food we eat is free of contamination, safe to the pocketbook, and will promote nutritional health.

THE IMPEACHMENT CHARGES AGAINST MR. JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on April 15 of this year, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) opened impeachment charges against Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

The Constitution provides that Federal judges shall hold office "during good behavior"; and that they may be impeached for "treason, bribery, or other high crime and misdemeanors."

Mr. FORD asserted on April 15 that a Federal judge may be impeached whenever his behavior is not good, even if his behavior does not amount to "treason, bribery, or other high crimes or misdemeanors." Indeed, Mr. FORD claimed that "good behavior" is "whatever a majority of the House of Representatives considers it to be at a given moment in history."

On August 10, 1970, Mr. FORD inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a legal memorandum which supported his earlier assertion that "impeachment will lie for conduct not indictable nor even criminal in nature." This conclusion was based on the statements of a few textbook writers, by the isolated statements of the House of Representatives "managers" who argued the case for impeachment in particular Senate trials, and by the statements of individual Senators during the impeachment trials of certain judges.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the vaunted independence of the American judiciary rests on so slender a reed. I do not believe we in this House can impeach a judge because a majority of us at any particular moment disapprove of his decision in a controversial case.

Mr. Speaker, the study supplied us by Mr. FORD rests, as I said, on individual comments made during the partisan trials of the eight judges impeached by the House and tried by the Senate. I am more interested in what this House has done since the first impeachment charge was filed against Judge George Turner in 1796 than I am in what individual Members of this or the other Chamber have said on sporadic occasions. Accordingly, I requested Daniel H. Pollitt, a professor of constitutional law at the University of North Carolina to survey the 51 impeachment proceedings in this House during the intervening years.

I want to make several comments on this survey.

First, it shows that impeachment works. Thirty-three judges have been charged in this body with "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors." Twenty-two of them resigned rather than face Senate trial; three chose to fight it out in the Senate; and seven were acquitted by the vote of this Chamber against further impeachment proceedings.

Second, it shows that never since the earliest days of this Republic has the House impeached a judge for conduct which was not both job-related and criminal. This body has consistently refused to impeach a judge unless he was guilty of an indictable offense.

Third, it shows that never before Mr. FORD leveled his charges against Justice Douglas has it ever been suggested that a judge could be impeached because, while off the bench, he exercised his first amendment rights to speak and write on issues of the day.

Mr. Speaker, the constitutional framers in Philadelphia rejected a proposal that Federal judges should be removable upon a petition by a majority of each House of Congress, because it would make the judiciary dangerously dependent on the legislature.

Mr. Speaker, in 1804 the Republican House of Representatives argued that Supreme Court Justice Samuel Chase should be impeached because he held "dangerous opinion"; and the Senate rejected this theory of impeachment.

Mr. Speaker, 1970, Chief Justice Warren Burger stressed the necessity for a "total and absolute independence of judges in deciding cases or in any phase of the decisional function."

Mr. Speaker, in 1835 the French observer De Tocqueville wrote that—

A decline in public morals in the United States will probably be marked by the abuse of the power of impeachment as a means of crushing political adversaries or ejecting them from office.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that adoption of the views of Mr. FORD will lead to this decline in public morals and deny us an independent judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to make this excellent study by Professor Pollitt available to all Members:

IMPEACHMENT OF FEDERAL JUDGES: AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

"The Place of Justice is an hallowed place, and therefore ought to be preserved without scandal and corruption." These were the words of Francis Bacon, philosopher, scientist, and the most gifted of the English Renaissance men. But in his capacity as Lord Chancellor, he came a cropper. In 1621, the highest judicial officer in England was impeached for accepting bribes from litigants—sometimes from litigants on both sides of the case—and his only defense was that he never gave the briber his due unless he deserved it on the merits. Bacon was charged by the House of Commons, found guilty by the House of Lords, and sentenced to imprisonment in the Tower "during the King's pleasure." King James liberated him from the prison within a few days and gave a full pardon. But Bacon never regained his lost glories. In 1626 he contracted a cold while stuffing a goose with snow in order to study the effects of refrigeration on putrefaction. The exposure proved fatal to both.

The Bacon impeachment illustrates the problem raised by the Roman philosopher Jevenal: *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes*, or, who is to judge the judges. The matter was debated in the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention when John Dickinson proposed that federal judges should be removed from office on petition to the President by both the House of Representatives and the Senate. This was the practice then in effect in England, and in seven states, but it was decisively rejected by the Founding Fathers on the theory that it would make the judiciary dangerously dependent upon the whim of the current legislatures. Instead, the Constitutional Framers provided that federal judges "shall hold their offices during good behavior"; and at a salary not subject to cut by the Congress. Like all other civil officers of the United States, they were subject to removal from office "on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors." Moreover, the Framers deliberately created a complicated and cumbersome process for the removal of federal judges to prevent hasty, unthinking action.

The House of Representatives has "the sole power of impeachment," and plays a role roughly comparable to that of a grand jury. Impeachment is initiated by a resolution to investigate the conduct of a judge. If the resolution is adopted, the matter is referred to a committee (usually, but not always the Judiciary Committee) for investigation. If the investigating committee finds the evidence sufficient, it may issue a report favoring impeachment. The report is then voted up or down by the whole House. If the House votes impeachment, it notifies the Senate and appoints "managers" to argue the case for the House before the Senate.

The Constitution delegates to the Senate "the sole power to try all impeachments;" and the Senate acts much like any court, hearing evidence first from the prosecution, and then from the defense. Witnesses are sworn, examined and cross-examined, and at the close of the trial the Senate votes on each article of impeachment separately. A two-thirds vote of the Senators then present is necessary to convict.

If the Senate votes in favor of impeachment, the only permissible judgment extends no further then "removal from office," and

"disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor" under the United States. But the person so convicted remains liable to indictment, trial, judgment and additional punishment by other tribunals "according to law."

William O. Douglas is the latest federal judge put to this gauntlet.

On April 15, 1970, Congressman Gerald R. Ford of Michigan opened the attack on the Supreme Court justice with a four-pronged charge. The first concerned Mr. Justice Douglas' associations with Ralph Ginzburg, the publisher of magazines described by Congressman Ford as "not commonly found on the family coffee table." Ginzburg was tried and convicted of sending an "obscene" publication named *Eros* through the mails. Justice Douglas was one of the four justices who dissented from the conviction. This was in 1966. In 1969, Justice Douglas received $350.00 from *Avant Garde* magazine for an article he wrote on "Appeal of Folk Singing." *Avant Garde* is also published by Ralph Ginzburg. But there is more, according to the Republican House Leader. Ginzburg had another magazine called *Fact* and during the 1964 Presidential campaign, *Fact* ran an article to the effect that Barry Goldwater had a "severely paranoid personality and was psychologically unfit to be President." After the campaign Goldwater sued Ginzburg for libel, and recovered a verdict of $75,000. Ginzburg appealed to the Supreme Court, and Justice Douglas was one of the dissenters who ruled in favor of Ginzburg on the theory that "the Constitutional guarantees of free speech and free press are absolute." This was in 1970. Congressman Ford finds fault in the failure of Mr. Justice Douglas to disqualify himself in the Goldwater-Ginzburg controversy because of his "substantial interest" in the outcome.

The second prong of the attack on Justice Douglas also concerned his publications: this time, a 97-page book called "Points of Rebellion." Congressman Ford objected because the book is "a fuzzy harangue evidently intended to give historic legitimacy to the militant hippie-yippie movement." Congressman Ford also found it offensive that "the most extreme excerpts from the book" were republished in the April, 1970 issue of *Evergreen* magazine, in company with "shocking" arty nudes of the kind "the U.S. Supreme Court's recent decisions now permit to be sold to your children and mine on almost every newsstand."

The other two grounds for attack concerned Justice Douglas' associates. Mr. Douglas, until recently, had received $12,000 a year as Chairman of the Parvin Foundation, a tax-exempt charitable organization to educate the developing youth leadership in Latin America with scholarships in the United States. This is well and good on its face, but the Foundation was financed by Albert Parvin, who operated hotels and gambling casinos in Las Vegas. According to Mr. Ford, the ties of Mr. Parvin with "the international gambling fraternity never have been sufficiently explored." This is guilt of association twice removed, based on rumor and speculation.

Finally, Congressman Ford charged that Justice Douglas is a "long time consultant" and "member of the board of directors" of the Center of the Study of Democratic Institutions. The "offense" here is that the Center is headed by Dr. Robert Hutchins, the former President of the University of Chicago, and in 1965 the Santa Barbara Center "sponsored and financed the National Conference for New Politics which was, in effect," the Congressman surmised, "the birth of the New Left as a political movement."

These four charges are not offensive to most Americans, even if true. Most certainly, they do not constitute Treason, Bribery, or "other high Crimes and Misdemeanors." This is admitted by Congressman Ford, whose entire argument is that "an offense need not be indictable to be impeachable."

The term of federal judges, recites the Congressman, is "during good behavior:" and when behavior ceases to be good, the right to hold judicial office ceases also. Further, contends the Congressman, "good behaviour" (and an impeachable offense) "is whatever a majority of the House of Representatives considers (it) to be at a given moment in history;" and conviction in the Senate should result "from whatever offense or offenses two-thirds of the other body considers to be sufficiently serious to require removal of the accused from office."

Congressman Ford reached his conclusion from a study of "our history of impeachments." This "history," however, does not support his conclusion, whether one considers only the eight judges who have been impeached in the House and tried in the Senate, or the much larger number of federal judges whose fates have been decided in the House of Representatives without trial in the Senate.

THE EIGHT COMPLETED IMPEACHMENT CASES

Eight federal judges have been impeached (or charged) by the House of Representatives and tried by the Senate. Four were acquitted and four were convicted. The first such case was in 1804, the most recent in 1936. The first two cases—those of John Pickering and Samuel Chase—must be considered together, and in light of the political events of the period.

When the Jeffersonian Republicans won the Presidency and both Houses of the Congress in 1802, they were bent upon a "political purge" of the federal judiciary, and not without cause.

President John Adams and the Federalist majority in the House of Representatives and the Senate sought to win the election by enactment and rigorous enforcement of a Sedition Law, which made it illegal to criticize the United States or the incumbents in office. Matthew Lynn, a Vermont Congressman, was the first victim of this law. He was tried, convicted and sentenced to a fine and four months in jail because of a political speech in which he accused President Adams with "an upbounded thirst for ridiculous pomp, foolish adulation, and selfish avarice." The Editor of the Bennington Gazette sought to raise funds to pay the fine by a lottery, and advertised with a caption addressed "to the enemies of political persecutions in the western district of Vermont." A New York Senator was indicted and arrested under the Alien and Sedition Law because he circulated a petition to Congress among his neighbors asking for its repeal. Jeffersonian candidates and supporters, felt the fangs of this law deeply. Indeed, things got so bad under this law that when President Adams campaigned in Newark, and the New Jersey local artillery company fired a salute in his honour, a bystander was convicted for an idle remark that he "wished the wadding from the cannon had been lodged in the President's backside."

The Jeffersonians disliked the law, they disliked even more the men who enforced the law: the Federalist United States Marshals, who selected juries of sympathizers; the Federalist Judges, who presided in partisan manner. They especially disliked Justice Samuel Chase because of his repeated jury charge that "if a man attempts to destroy the confidence of the people in their officers, he effectually saps the foundation of the government." This charge was first announced in the trial of a Pennsylvania editor, who was convicted because of an editorial asserting that President Adams had "saddled (us) with the expense of a permanent navy, threatened (us) with the existence of a standing army."

Jefferson and his Republicans had other grievances against the Federalists. Jefferson had promised the Chief Justice-ship of the United States to his political lieutenant, Spencer Roane of the Virginia Supreme Court. But before Jefferson took office, Chief Justice Oliver Ellsworth. a staunch but aging Federalist from Connecticut, retired prematurely, creating the opportunity for President Adams to appoint his Secretary of State John Marshall to this post.

And there was more. After the political sweep of the Republicans at the polls, the lame-duck Federalist Congress met and in the Judiciary Act of 1801: (1) created sixteen federal circuit court judgeships for defeated Federalist politicians; (2) created forty-two justice of the peace positions in Washington, D.C. for lesser Federalist office holders; and (3) reduced the size of the Supreme Court from six to five members (as of the next vacancy) to deprive Jefferson of an appointment for the foreseeable period of his Presidency.

Jefferson thundered that, "The Federalists have retired into the judiciary" and "from that battery all the works of republicanism are to be beaten down." He would have none of this; and when his party assumed office, President Jefferson pardoned all persons convicted under the Alien and Sedition Law, and fired all the United States Marshals and United States Attorneys who had enforced it. Meanwhile, his Congress repealed the Sedition Law and the Judiciary Act of 1801 and thereby the judgeships created for the defeated Federalist opponents. When Chief Justice Marshall threatened to declare the repeal of the 1801 Judiciary Act unconstitutional as an illegal short-cut of the impeachment process, the Jeffersonian Congress cancelled the terms of the Supreme Court for the next fourteen months. During this interval, the Jeffersonian Congress went after the federal judiciary via the impeachment process, with Marshall himself as the ultimate target. The impeachment proceedings against John Pickering and Samuel Chase are part of this tumultuous, explosive political partisanship.

John Pickering, judge of the federal district court in New Hampshire, has the dubious distinction of being the first judge to be impeached by the House, tried by the Senate, and removed from office; and for reasons unrelated to "treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors." Senator William Giles of Virginia, the Jeffersonian leader in the Senate, was quite blunt on this score. He told his Federalist colleagues, in language not unlike that of Congressman Gerald Ford, that "We want your offices, for the purpose of giving them to men who will fill them better." His announced theory was that removal by impeachment is nothing more than a declaration by Congress that: "You hold dangerous opinions, and if you are suffered to carry them into effect you will work the destruction of the Nation." Federalist Senators objected that this interpretation of the Constitutional impeachment clause, would make "our Judges as independent as spaniels;" but they argued in vain. Giles insisted, with majority backing, that federal judges were removable. "For any cause that a dominant political party considers to be sufficient."

The choice of Judge Pickering as the first target of the Jeffersonian onslaught against the federal judiciary was excellent political strategy. The unfortunate old man had been an insane drunkard for some time, and was clearly unable to perform his duties as a federal judge. The Judiciary Act of 1801 had provided for such cases as Pickering's by authorizing the circuit judges to appoint one of their own members to exercise the functions of any district judge who became incapacitated. Under this Act, the circuit judges determined that Pickering was indeed incapacitated, and assigned Circuit Judge Jeremiah Smith to take over his duties. With the repeal of the 1801 Judiciary Act, and the elimination of the circuit judges, Pickering resumed his judicial functions.

His family and friends urged that he resign, but Portsmouth Federalist leaders advised strongly against a resignation as the "successor will be a man whom we cannot approve," referring to John Samuel Sherburne, the newly appointed Republican United States Attorney.

So Judge Pickering stayed on the Bench, and one of the first cases to reach him involved the ship *Eliza*, seized by the Republican custom officials for smuggling. The ship belonged to Eliphalett Ladd, a prominent Federalist merchant, who filed suit for its return.

On the opening day of trial, Pickering came to the courthouse thoroughly intoxicated. He staggered to the bench and ordered the court to open. Then, apparently feeling lonely, he ordered a young lawyer named John Wentworth to sit beside him. The startled attorney demurred, and the judge started down from the bench to cane him. But seeing a former British Naval officer among the spectators, he ordered him to sit and give advice on these nautical matters. Thus fortified against the "Jacobins," Pickering roared: "Now damn them, we will fight them" and ordered the parties to proceed.

United States Attorney John Sherburne began to read the pleadings, but the Judge interrupted that he had heard enough and would decide the case in four minutes. He suddenly ordered that the ship *Eliza* be returned to his long-time political ally Eliphalett Ladd. Attorney Sherburne protested that his witnesses had not yet been allowed to testify, and the Judge replied, "Very well, we will hear everything—swear every damn scroundel that can be produced—but if we sit here four thousand years the ship will still be restored." A few minutes later, however, he shut off the witness and ordered the case dismissed. When the Government sought an appeal order, the trial judge refused to sign one, although the law clearly commanded that he do so.

The impeachment charges against Pickering related to his above conduct and rulings. Pickering did not appear at the Senate trial, but his son did, and moved to dismiss the charges because they did not allege "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors," and in the alternative argued that his father lacked the mental capacity to have the "intent" to commit a crime. The Senate rejected the underlying theory behind this defense, and ruled by a party-line vote of nineteen Republicans against seven Federalists that federal judges were removable from office for any reason that the dominant political party considered to be sufficient. Five Republicans refused to convict, but rather than offend their party, left the Senate chamber during the vote.

Thus, a partisan body of judges gave to poor crazy John Pickering the unwelcome distinction of becoming the first victim of the first judicial purge in our national history. The impeachment would have seemed less brutal if its innocent victim had not been one of New Hampshire's most distinguished citizens. The author of her constitution, a revolutionary patriot, Pickering had been universally admired until he became incapacitated at the end of his long public career.

The fact that the Senate so quickly reversed its position on the underlying Constitutional issues has made the Pickering impeachment trial a minor development in a continuing story rather than the historic landmark it seemed at the time. John Pickering was convicted by the Senate on March 12, 1804. Within an hour, the House voted to impeach Samuel Chase.

Samuel Chase, a Baltimore lawyer, was aggressive and militant in everything he did. As a young man, he opposed the British Stamp Act, and led the Sons of Liberty on midnight raids against public offices, where they rifled the files, destroyed the records, and set fire to the stamps. His militant opposition to British rule gave him a notoriety which resulted in election to the First Continental Congress, where he championed the Declaration of Independence and became one of its signers. He was a leader of the Maryland Convention that ratified the National Constitution, and in 1796, President Washington appointed him an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Supreme Court did not have a busy docket in the early days of the Republic. It met for two brief terms a year in Washington, and during the remaining months the six Justices "rode circuit" sitting as Circuit Court judges with jurisdiction to preside at the trial of important cases, and hearing appeals from District Court judges in lesser matters.

Justice Chase was a terror on the bench. He "bullied counsel, brow-beat witnesses, ruled juries," and with his sallies from the bench, "brought down the laughter of the spectators" on helpless and unfortunate defense counsel. Even his friend, John Marshall, admitted on cross-examination during the Senate impeachment trial that Chase, as a judge was "tyrannical, overbearing and oppressive."

Marshall was testifying about the conduct of Chase during the trials under the Alien and Sedition Laws, and it is here that Chase proved most obnoxious to the Jeffersonians, because of his vigorous and overbearing enforcement of these laws during the Presidential political campaign against John Adams.

He presided at the trial of Thomas Cooper, the editor of the "Sunbury Gazette" in Pennsylvania, and directed the jury to convict on the theory that any criticism of public officials "effectually saps the foundation of the government." He presided at the trial of Fries, a Pennsylvania farmer who had refused on grounds of principle to pay certain federal taxes. Chase charged that this was "treason," and sentenced the defendant to be "hanged by the neck until dead." The resulting Republican uproar resulted in a Presidential pardon.

Chase then went to Baltimore, where he impaneled a large number of grand jurors, and during the process denounced the Republican proposal for universal suffrage because it would "sink" the country "into a mobocracy, the worst of all popular governments."

Chase then hurried to Richmond, to preside at the trial of a noted editor named Callender who had published a tract hostile to President Adams. Chase read the pamphlet prior to trial, and announced in a public coach that "he would certainly punish" the editor, and "teach the lawyers of Virginia the difference between the liberty and the licentiousness of the press." When trial began, Chase (i) refused to excuse a juror who announced that he was morally-bound to find the defendant guilty, (ii) refused to hear distinguished witnesses offered by the defense, and (iii) throughout the trial was "tyrannical, overbearing and oppressive."

Chase then went to New Castle, Delaware, where he refused to dismiss a grand jury until it returned an indictment against a Jeffersonian newspaper publisher. When the grand jury refused to indict, he ordered the United States Attorney to read all back issues of the paper, and report any abusive language to the jury. But that body reported that it discovered nothing "treasonable," except a brief and unpleasant reference to Chase himself. Chase let the matter drop.

The impeachment charges issued by the House of Representatives against Chase related to these actions and rulings while on the bench. Admittedly, they did not constitute "high crimes and misdemeanors;" but Senator Giles announced here, as he had earlier in the impeachment of John Pickering, that the process of impeachment "is nothing more than an inquiry by the two Houses of Congress whether the office of any public man might not be better filled by another."

The Federalists responded, as they had in the Pickering trial, that such a theory of impeachment undercut "the vital necessity of the independence of the Judiciary" and put in peril "the integrity of the whole National judicial establishment."

This time they fared much better. The Republican senators who had absented themselves during the Pickering vote bolted Party ranks and the fight was over.

There were thirty-four Senators, nine of them Federalist, twenty-five Republicans. Two-thirds, or twenty-two votes, were necessary to convict. Six of the Republicans—mostly from the Northern and Western states—answered non-guilty on every article of impeachment.

John Randolph of Virginia (a House manager who argued the impeachment) rushed from the scene of defeat to the floor of the House where he offered a Constitutional amendment providing that the President might remove federal judges on the joint address of both Houses of Conrgess. Congressman Micholson, another floor manager, was almost as frantic with wrath, and followed with a proposal to amend the Constitution so that State Legislatures might recall their United States Senators at will. Neither proposal progressed very far, and President Jefferson remarked that "impeachment is a farce which will not be tried again."

On the other side there was jubilation. As John Marshall's biographer Albert Beveridge put it, "For the first time since Jefferson's election, the National Judiciary was rendered independent. For the first time in five years, the Federalist members of the Supreme Court could go about their duties without fear that upon them would fall the avenging blade of impeachment. . . . One of the few really great crises in American history had passed."

But Beveridge spoke too soon. There was to be one more test case, that of *James Hawkins Peck*.

Freed from the threat of Congressional impeachment, the Supreme Court under John Marshall began to strengthen the powers of the central government and protect the interest of the industrial and monied classes. This was at the expense of the small farmer in the South and West, and required the nullification of the laws of many states. By 1825, the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional the laws of at least ten states. Naturally, there was a good deal of resentment against the Supreme Court, with a number of "court curbing" plans.

Jefferson proposed that the Constitution be amended so that all federal judges serve an initial term of six years, with the possibility of re-appointment by the President, but only with the consent of both Houses of Congress.

Senator Johnson of Kentucky introduced a Constitutional amendment that whenever the Supreme Court declared the laws of a state to be unconstitutional, there would be a further appeal to the United States Senate for final decision. A proposal which received even more support but also failed to muster majority backing would have required the vote of five of the then seven Supreme Court justices (instead of a simple majority) to overturn a state law.

It was during this period of growing antagonism toward the federal courts that James Hawkins Peck was appointed the United States District Judge for Missouri. In effect, he was the "federal presence" and he was disliked not only in principle, but also because of his arbitrary abuse of judicial authority.

When Judge Peck took office, he was faced with a number of suits by the early settlers of Missouri (the Upper Louisiana Territory)

claiming title to large acreages under grants from the Spanish crown. The United States resisted these claims, and countered that the land was part of the public domain and available for future distribution. A lawyer named Luke Edward Lawless represented many of these claimants, including the heirs of one Antoine Soulard.

The Soulard case was tried first, and Judge Peck ruled for the government. He then wrote a letter to the editor of the Missouri Republican, explaining the basis for his decision. Attorney Lawless promptly wrote an answering letter to a rival newspaper, the Missouri Advocate, in which he challenged the facts and legal conclusions of the Judge.

Judge Peck was incensed. He ordered the attorney arrested, brought to court, and without a trial, held him in contempt. He imposed a sentence of twenty-four hours in jail and disbarment from the federal court for a period of eighteen months.

Congressman John Scott of Missouri promptly presented a Memorial requesting the House to inquire into the conduct of Judge Peck. On April 21, 1830, the House overwhelmingly voted (123 to 49) to impeach the judge because of his "unjust, oppressive and arbitrary contempt order.

Judge Peck might well have shown a lack of "good behaviour;" but his on-the-bench activities did not constitute "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors." For this reason, the Senate decided on January 23, 1831, in favor of Judge Peck by a vote of 21 guilty, 22 not guilty. This was just short of a majority, and far less than the two-thirds vote necessary for removal from office.

This vote did not mean that the Senate approved of what Judge Peck had done. Far from it. Within two weeks, on February 10, 1831, the Senate enacted a bill denying federal judges the power to punish for contempt except in cases of misbehavior "in the presence of the court, or so near thereto as to obstruct the administration of justice." This bill swept through the House, and was signed into law by the President on March 2, of that year.

The heirs of Antoine Soulard were also vindicated when they appealed Judge Peck's adverse decision to the Supreme Court and there won a unanimous reversal.

Be that as it may, the House of Representatives has never again voted impeachment against a federal judge because of his rulings or conduct on the bench. Nor has it ever voted to impeach a judge because of private activities or association unrelated to judicial duties.

West H. Humphreys, of the United States District Court for Tennessee was the next judge to be impeached by the House and tried in the Senate. The charges, filed in 1862, were "Treason," that he had incited "revolt and rebellion" in Tennessee "against the Constitution and Government of the United States" by "openly and unlawfully" advocating an "ordinance of secession." The judge was summoned by the Senate "to appear and answer certain articles of impeachment," and upon his refusal, the Senate voted unanimously that he be removed from office. Judge Humphreys was then serving as a judge on the "District Court of the Confederate States of America."

The next four impeachment cases tried by the Senate involved allegations of "high Crimes and Misdemeanors," although all were not provable.

Charles Swayne, the United States Judge of the District Court in Florida, was impeached and tried in 1904. Always a vigorous and forthright person, he had been appointed by Republican President Harrison over the protest of all the Democratic members of the Senate. His job was to convict the Florida Democrats who had violated the voting rights of Republicans in the last election. He was relentless in this task, extending court sessions to bring all offenders to his bar of justice.

He was equally vigorous in pursuit of his personal goals. Thus, in 1901, a number of suits were filed in Pensacola concerning title to what was known as the "Rivas Tract." One Florida McGuire was the principal plaintiff, and one Edgar was the principal defendant. Prior to trial, the lawyers for Miss McGuire requested the Judge to disqualify himself, because they had learned that defendant Edgar had sold part of his interest in the land to the Judge. The Judge refused the motion to excuse himself, saying that he had not purchased the land interest, but that a relative of his had done so. Later, it developed that this relative was his wife.

Unwilling to try the case before Judge Swayne, the plaintiffs filed a new, but identical, suit in the state court against the old defendant Edgar, with Judge Swayne added as a new defendant. They then went into the federal court to have the old case dismissed. Judge Swayne was presiding, and quickly expressed his feelings about the new suit against him in the state court in Escambia County. After a few "abusive remarks," he held the attorneys guilty of contempt, sentenced them to ten days in jail, a fine of $100 each, and disbarment from the federal court for a term of two years.

This abuse of judicial power, reminiscent of Judge Peck, undoubtedly fueled the flames of impeachment. But the serious charges related to various "high Crimes and Misdemeanors," namely, that the Judge (1) was not a resident of his judicial district as required by law (the Judge admittedly was a native of Delaware and lived there with his family while not holding court in Florida), (2) padding his expense account (the Judge admitted that he always claimed the maximum $10.00 per diem expenses, whether he spent that much or not) and (3) accepting favors from litigants before his court (the Judge admitted that he had accepted from a railroad then in bankruptcy proceedings before his court a free ride to California and back for himself, his wife, his sister-in-law and her husband, and subsequently approved of the costs of the trip as part of the necessary expenses of operating the railroad).

Judge Swayne's only defense was a legal one—that the offenses were not "impeachable." He argued, in effect, that the particular bribery, expense account padding, and failure to abide by the law requiring that he reside in the judicial district, were all minor or "low" crimes and misdemeanors. The Democratic House of Representatives rejected this defense and "impeached" by an almost solid party-line vote. The Republican Senate, also by party-line vote, acquitted on all charges.

Robert W. Archbald, Judge of the United States Commerce Court, was impeached and convicted in 1912 on charges of selling justice, of "having used his judicial office and influence for his personal financial gain."

Like Judge Swayne, Judge Archbald had accepted a free trip for himself and his family from a railroad then in litigation before his court. The only distinction between the two situations was that whereas Judge Swayne went to California, Archbald made a grand tour of Europe.

There are other, and political, differences between the two situations. Judge Archbald had accepted a "purse" from certain lawyers who practiced before him, and he served on a very unpopular court when the federal judiciary as a whole was under attack.

The Commerce Court of which Judge Archbald was a member was created by the administration of President William Howard Taft to review the orders and decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Increasingly, the Commerce Commission ruled against the railroads on behalf of the consumers, and just as insistently, the Commerce Court ruled against the Commission when the railroads appealed.

The Commerce Court, as an institution, became the fulcrum of a bitter political controversy. Teddy Roosevelt, campaigning for the Presidency, promised to abolish the Commerce Court if elected; but the Democratic majority in Congress pre-empted this issue (and the popular appeal) by voting to abolish the court during mid-campaign.

The general adverse reaction against the Commerce Court undoubtedly hurt the members of that Court, including Judge Archbald. So did the general anti-court sentiment of that period. Around the turn of the century, the Granger Movement swept through the agrarian mid-west, resulting in state legislation regulating the railroads, the graneries, and other utilities in favor of the consumer. At the same time, labor began to show political muscle in the industrial states, with the enactment of laws regulating child labor, maximum hours and minimum wages for women. The federal courts, almost as matter of routine, declared all these state laws to be unconstitutional.

LaFollette, Norris, Shipstead, Hiram Johnson and other progressive legislators introduced a series of anti-court Constitutional amendments to reduce the terms of federal judges to a fixed number of years, to authorize their recall upon petition, and to require a two-thirds vote or more when declaring a state law unconstitutional.

It was in this political climate that the Democrats, and their Roosevelt "Bull Moose" allies in the Senate, voted to affirm the impeachment charges of the House and remove Judge Archbald from his office.

Harold L. Louderbach, Judge of the United States District Court in California, was impeached by the House of Representatives in 1932, and it is not altogether certain that the accusation met Constitutional standards. The charge against him was "favoritism in the appointment of incompetent receivers" and the "allowance of excessive fees." This is not "good behavior," but is it a crime?

Judge Louderbach owed his job to Senator Samuel Shortridge, and when it came to the appointment of receivers in the bankruptcy and reorganization cases that came before him, the Judge saw to it that Samuel Shortridge, Jr., the son of the benefactor, got more than his share of the lucrative positions. There was no evidence that Judge Louderbach—unlike Judge Archbald—received any direct personal financial gain from these appointments. The Senate voted to acquit.

Halsted L. Ritter is the last of the federal judges to be both impeached by the House and tried by the Senate. He was convicted. A successful lawyer in Denver, Ritter moved to Florida in 1925 for reasons of family health. Four years later, President Coolidge appointed him to a federal judgeship on recommendation of his Postmaster General. The appointment was opposed locally by both Republicans and Democrats.

This opposition was justified. He was impeached by the House of Representatives in 1936, and the principal charges were: (1) participating in champertous proceedings brought before him for a cash consideration, and (2) preparing and filing false income tax returns. What he had done was (1) accept a bribe from the Florida Power and Light Company in connection with a pending case, (2) appoint a former law partner to a "receivership" which paid $75,000 fee, with a $4,500 kick-back, and (3) conceal this income when filing his annual tax returns.

The odd element in this case was the Senate action. Eighty-four Senators voted, which required fifty-six votes for the two-thirds majority required by the Constitution in impeachment cases. This fifty-six figure was reached, but barely. Forty-nine Democratic Senators were joined by five Republicans

who usually bolted party ranks (Borah of Idaho, Capper of Kansas, Cousins of Michigan, Frazier of North Dakota, and Norris of Nebraska) and the two Senate independents (Shipstead, Farmer-Labor from Minnesota, and LaFollette, Progressive from Wisconsin).

This completes the "history" of the eight federal judges impeached by the House and tried by the Senate. In 1803, Judge Pickering of New Hampshire was impeached and found guilty of conduct certainly not "good" but also admittedly not constituting "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors," unless blasphemy and public drunkenness fall within this category. Not since that time has the Senate removed a judge from office in an impeachment trial because of behavior which is not good, unless that behavior is also criminal.

Supreme Court Justice Chase was acquitted by the Senate in 1804, although his behavior in presiding at the Alien and Sedition trials of his Jeffersonian opponents was "tyrannical, overbearing and oppressive."

District Court Judge Peck was acquitted in 1831 by the Senate, although its disapproval of his abuse of the "contempt" power was written into a federal law.

Since that date, almost 150 years have passed with no impeachment charges by the House because of behavior which is not good.

West H. Humphreys was charged with "Treason," and convicted by the Senate in 1862 when the Tennessee judge threw his lot in with the Confederacy.

Charles Swayne, the Delaware lawyer who sat on the United States Court in Florida, was acquitted by the Senate in 1904 on the House charges of defrauding the government with false expense accounts, and of accepting favors from litigants before his court.

Robert W. Archbald was convicted by the Senate in 1912, and removed from his judgeship on the Commerce Court for accepting cash bribes and other favors from litigants before his court.

Harold L. Louderbach was acquitted by the Senate in 1932 upon a finding that his judicial appointments to lucrative posts were motivated by personal gratitude to his political mentor, rather than by hope of financial gain.

Halstead Ritter was convicted by the Senate in 1936 for bribes, kick-backs, and income tax evasion, certainly judicial behavior which is not good, but also clearly within the Constitutional grounds of impeachment for "Treason, Bribery, and other High Crimes and Misdemeanors."

In short, the Constitutional history as reflected by the eight "completed cases" demonstrates that Congressman Ford is in error when he asserts that the Congress has authority under the Constitution to impeach Mr. Justice William Douglas (or any other judge) for whatever conduct a sufficient majority of the Congress considers to be an "impeachable offense" "at any given moment in history."

B. IMPEACHMENT CASES RESOLVED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITHOUT SENATE ACTION

The eight impeachment cases tried by the Senate reflect merely the top of the iceberg. The qualifications of at least forty-seven other federal judges have been questioned in the House of Representatives since 1796, when impeachment charges against George Turner of the Northwest Territory were dropped on the assurance of Attorney General Harry Lee that he would initiate grand jury proceedings against the Judge.

The decisions and actions of the House of Representatives in connection with these federal judges is an important part of the impeachment history and teaches that the House refuses to impeach because of judicial misbehavior unless the offense charged falls within the Constitutional framework of "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors."

1. Treason

In 1862, Judge West Humphreys was impeached by the House and convicted by the Senate when he joined the Confederacy. The only other "Treason" charge was brought against Harry Innes in 1808, on the allegation that the federal Kentucky judge had joined forces with Aaron Burr and conspired with Spain to "seduce Kentucky from the Union." The judge denied the charge, and a House Investigating Committee found him not guilty.

2. Bribery and financial irregularity

Thirty-three federal judges have been charged with offenses directly involving financial corruption. Twenty-two did not accept the challenge and their resignations ended any further inquiries by the House of Representatives. Five were "censured" but not impeached; four were acquitted of wrong-doing after investigation; and a House Committee turned the other two cases over to the Attorney General for possible criminal prosecution, without impeachment recommendations.

In the earlier history, some of these judges were driven to bribes and kick-backs through excessive consumption of whiskey. Thus, in 1839, Judge Philip K. Lawrence of Louisiana was charged with corrupt conduct, and "intemperate use of ardent spirits.' In 1872, Judge Mark H. Delahay of Kansas was charged with corrupt transactions and "intoxications." In 1874, Judge Edward H. Durell of Louisiana was charged with improper procurement of money and "drunkenness."

In more recent periods, the judges were caught in an economic squeeze from the Crash of 1929 and could not resist the subsequent temptations that came their way—temptations, incidentally, from the highest corporate offices in the land. A notable example is Martin T. Manton, Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals for an area including New York, Connecticut and Vermont.

Manton began his judicial career in 1916; at thirty-six he was the youngest federal judge in the country. In the following twenty-three years he well justified his early appointment. His well-reasoned decisions, his articles in the professional journals, were cited as authority by bench and bar alike. He testified before Congressional Committees on complicated aspects of patent and bankruptcy law, and he was in great demand as a speaker before the American Bar Association, the Academy of Political Science and other distinguished assemblies. Honorary degrees came from all sides: from Columbia, Fordham, Manhattan, Vermont, and others. He was generally regarded by lawyers and knowledgeable lay persons as the tenth-ranking judge in the United States, a slight edge below the nine Justices on the Supreme Court.

But Manton was equally active in the business world, and his holdings crashed around his head during the Great Depression. This did not lessen the public shock when on January 29, 1939, young Manhattan District Attorney Tom Dewey wrote the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives an itemized list of corruption. This included, in small part, a $12,500 kick-back from John M. McGrath, a bankruptcy receiver he appointed, and bribes from litigants in cases pending before his court: $77,000 from the Dictograph Products Corporation, $250,000 from the American Tobacco Company (in the form of a loan to Manton's former legal partner), and $50,000 from Warner Brothers (in the form of a personal loan from Harry Warner).

After the story broke, Judge Manton tendered his resignation to President Franklin Roosevelt, who accepted it on the spot.

This prompt resignation avoided impeachment proceedings ("Why kick at the place where the fellow used to be?" asked Chairman Hatton Sumners of the Judiciary Committee), but the State of New York was not so forgiving. Manton was tried, convicted, and sentenced to two years in jail.

The investigation of the Manton bribes and kick-backs led over the Hudson to similar investigation of corruption by Judge J. Warren Davis of the United States Court of Appeals for the area including New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Like Manton, J. Warren Davis was one of the most esteemed American jurists.

An ordained Baptist Minister, Davis turned first to the law, and then to public service. Elected to the New Jersey Senate in 1911, he acted as floor leader for Governor Woodrow Wilson. When Wilson was elected President, he appointed Davis the United States Attorney for New Jersey in 1913, and to the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in 1920.

Davis quickly earned his laurels as a judge, but he did not do so well on the stock market. With the crash of 1929, he ended up head over heels in debt (he owed $85,000 to various banks), an expensive style of living, an annual salary of $10,000, and power to decide the financial future of desperate men. This spells trouble and it was not long in coming.

The Fox Film Corporation was in bankruptcy and William Fox, its founder and President, was struggling to maintain corporate control against the demands of its creditors. The plum was a juicy one, for Fox Film claimed patent rights to "talking pictures." This claim, if established, would put Fox Film in a position to dominate the industry, and William Fox back in control of Fox Film.

On five occasions from 1935 to 1939, the trial court ruled against William Fox on his various claims, and on five occasions, the Court of Appeals reversed and ruled for him. All these Court of Appeals decisions were signed by Judge Joseph Buffington, appointed to the Bench by President Benjamin Harrison in 1892. By the time of the Fox litigation, Buffington was in his eighties, deaf, practically blind, and he refused to have a law clerk to look up the law, read briefs and help write decisions. The decisions favorable to Fox were signed by Buffington but actually written and sold by Judge Davis.

Subsequent investigations disclosed that Fox had paid Judge Davis substantial bribes in fifty and one-hundred dollar bills; once in a hallway at the corner of Twelfth and Chestnut Streets in Philadelphia, more often in the apartment of Fox's attorney Morgan S. Kaufman.

Kaufman knew a good thing when he saw one, and after the Fox litigation ended, he acted as counsel and go-between with Judge Davis on behalf of the Universal Oil Products Company, the American Safety Table Company, and other important business concerns not unwilling to spread a little cash wherever it would advance their corporate interests.

Judge William E. Clark, the third member of the Court of Appeals, grew suspicious of his colleagues Davis and Buffington, and relayed these suspicions to the Department of Justice. On November 8, 1941, Attorney General Francis Biddle requested Congress to investigate and impeach Judge Davis. Davis blocked this move with a prompt resignation, and a waiver of all pension and retirement rights. He retired to his Norfolk, Virginia childhood home, and died a broken man in 1945.

Unlike Manton and Davis, Judge Albert W. Johnson chose to bluff out the corruption charges until the verdict was certain.

Born in 1872, Johnson began his adult life as a school teacher in Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, and "read law" at night without the benefit of formal legal training.

Admitted to the bar in 1898, he became active in public affairs. He was elected on several occasions to the state legislature, and

served as the national president of the Patriotic Orders of the Sons of America.

Johnson was appointed to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania by President Calvin Coolidge in 1925, over the strenuous objections of the local bar associations and the local press.

Criticism soon erupted again, when in 1931 the "Philadelphia Inquirer" disclosed that Judge Johnson had appointed his son-in-law Carl Schug as trustee in eleven of the first twenty bankruptcy cases filed that year. Subsequent newspaper stories revealed that the Judge and his sons owned an exclusive hunting club called the Tea Springs Lodge. The high initiation and annual dues were apparently worth the price, for eighty-two per cent of the members were appointed by Judge Johnson to lucrative posts as appraisers, receivers, trustees, attorneys for trustees, special masters, or referees in bankruptcy.

Subsequent investigations came hot and heavy. In 1933, Attorney General Homer Cummings announced a federal inquiry into the "receivership racket" in Pennsylvania. In 1934, a Pennsylvania grand jury looked into the matter, and in 1936, and again in 1939, there were subsequent federal probes of his judicial behavior. In 1941, Judge Albert L. Watson, who sat on the same court with Judge Johnson (and who was subsequently impeached) officially complained to the higher Court of Appeals that Judge Johnson was "hogging" the bankruptcy business.

Judge Johnson miraculously survived all this, but he came a cropper in 1943 when the United States prosecuted a clothing manufacturer for stealing cloth from the government.

The government attorneys had an "air tight" case, so they were not worried when the Judge's son was associated with the defense. But they were dismayed at the subsequent shuttle cock exchange between the judge and jury. The Judge charged the jury to find the defendant innocent of all charges. The jury refused this instruction and found the defendant guilty. Judge Johnson refused to accept this verdict, berated the jury and sent it back to the jury room with instructions to bring in a verdict of not guilty. The jury compromised this time, and found the defendant guilty on some accounts of the indictment and not guilty on others. Then came the sentence. A local reporter predicted to the government attorneys that the defendant would withdraw the motion for a new trial then pending, throw himself on the mercy of the court, and that Judge Johnson would do no more than impose a nominal fine. This came to pass, and the government attorneys returned to Washington boiling.

Congressman Sautoff of Wisconsin was informed of the case, and discussed it on the floor of Congress. A few days later the House passed a resolution authorizing an investigation by the House Judiciary Committee. Judge Johnson than met his match, for the investigation was conducted by Congressman (later Senator and Presidential candidate) Estes Kefauver of Tennessee.

Kefauver went at it with vigor, and after lengthy hearings into all phases of the Judge's activities, issued a scathing report. He concluded that Judge Johnson had "notoriously engaged in the barter and sale of court offices," and that his "decisions, decrees, orders and rulings commonly were sold for all the traffic would bear." The clothing manufacturer who got off (despite his guilt of wartime theft of scarce materials) with a small fine, was merely small potatoes. The Bethlehem Steel Company, for one of many given examples, had paid Judge Johnson $250,000 for a decision in a bankruptcy case where it, as a creditor, wanted a favored priority position over other creditors.

The Kefauver report showed that very little had escaped the avarice of Judge Johnson. He owned an apartment house where all the court attaches were required to live at rents higher than those paid by other tenants for similar quarters. He even required his government secretary to begin her day's work cleaning and dusting his home and preparing the Judge's breakfast.

Judge Johnson resigned after the report was issued, and the House Committee voted to let the matter drop because the "Senate is engaged in the consideration of so many issues vital to the welfare of the nation."

The most baffling aspect of the whole situation is that Judge Johnson was elected president of the local bar association when he returned to the private practice of law.

There were others like Judge Johnson who resigned when charges were made in the House that they had sold justice or taken kick-backs: Judge T. Sherman of Ohio, who actually threatened to sue the New York Stock Exchange in 1873 when it reneged on its promised payment; Judge Francis A. Winslow, when Congressman LaGuardia charged in 1929 that he had organized a "bankruptcy ring" in New York City and taken "improper considerations" from a lawyer with a large practice in his court; Judge Daniel Threw Wright of the District of Columbia Supreme Court, who was charged by the House in 1914 with appropriating court money for his own use; Judge Ferdinand A. Geiger of Wisconsin, who thereby avoided the necessity in 1939 of explaining why he had abruptly dismissed a grand jury before it could report an anti-trust indictment against Chrysler, Ford, and General Motors.

Judge George H. English of Illinois delayed his resignation until the day the Senate was due to begin his impeachment trial. He owed his appointment as a judge to a politican named Charles B. Thomas, and the charge was that the Judge appointed Thomas to bankruptcy positions, that Thomas in turn appointed George H. English, Jr. as his attorney, that the Judge approved outrageous fees out of the bankrupt estates for his former mentor and son, and they in turn made "loans" to the Judge. Other parts of the impeachment charge were that the Judge deposited the court funds in a hithertofore obscure bank which he and his relatives controlled, and the bank made large loans to the Judge with little or no collateral, and at little or no interest.

The charges against the judges whom the House of Representatives "reprimanded" but did not impeach, are equally serious: that in 1890 Aleck Boarman of Louisiana took the money of the court for his personal use, and "borrowed" additional funds from the court marshall; that Judge Emory Speer of Georgia accepted railroad passes in 1914 and deposited bankruptcy funds in favored banks; that in 1930, Judge Grovery Moscowitz continued a business interest in hisformer New York law firm, and appointed members of that firm to high-paid receiverships, and so on.

The Judges whom the House of Representatives acquitted of wrong-doing were all charged, at least on the surface, with bribery or "other high Crimes and Misdemeanors," even though the evidence did not support the charge: that Judge Charles Tait of Alabama in 1822, Judge Henry Blodgett of Illinois in 1879, and Judge Augustus Ricks of Ohio in 1895 borrowed court funds for personal use, and that Judge William Van Ness of New York in 1818 failed to exercise vigilance over the court funds with the consequence that a clerk made off with it.

The charges filed against Mr. Justice William O. Douglas by Congressman Gerald Ford obviously are not of the same heinous nature as those detailed above, nor do they approach in character the bad behavior of judges who were charged, but not impeached by the House of job-related misconduct which does not constitute "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors."

3. Scandalous or improper job-related behavior

In 1804, the House impeached and the Senate convicted John Pickering on a multitude of charges, one being that he "did appear upon the bench in a state of total intoxication, produced by the free and intemperate use of inebriating liquors." Since that early date, the House of Representatives has declined to impeach a judge when the only charge against him is alcoholism. Thus, in 1808, the legislature of Mississippi requested the House to impeach Territorial Judge Bruin for this reason, but the House refused to do so. And, one hundred or more years later in 1925, the Judiciary Committee recommended against the impeachment of West Virginia Judge William E. Baker, although it was charged that he was drunk on duty, drunk, moreover, on liquor confiscated by prohibition agents and stored in the court house for safe-keeping.

Drunkenness is only one kind of scandalous judicial behavior which is not good. Some judges abstain, or leave their liquor at home, and carry with them to the court room a quick temper, a sharp prejudice, a vanity which is openly displayed at the expense of counsel, litigants, and witnesses.

The House of Representatives impeached Mr. Justice Chase and Judge Peck for abusive misuse of their judicial authority, but in neither situation did the Senate agree that such behavior was an impeachable offense. Since those early years of the past century, the House has consistently refused to impeach for this reason: when it was charged in 1804, that Judge Richard Peters of Pennsylvania engaged in on-the-bench misconduct in the trial of Sedition cases; in 1825, that Judge Buckner Thurston was "rude, insolent, and undignified" while presiding on the circuit court for the District of Columbia; in 1933, that Judge Benjamin Johnson of the territory of Arkansas displayed "favoritism of counsel, irritability, rudeness, and habitual intemperance"; in 1908, when it was charged that Judge Lebbus R. Wilfley of the United States Court in China maintained a "dictatorial attitude" on the bench; and in 1935 when Congressman (later Senator) Dirksen charged that Judge Samuel Alschuler sat on a case and openly favored the Pullman Company, represented by the son of former governor Dunne, with whom the Judge had long political ties.

More germane to the charges against Mr. Justice William O. Douglas that he ruled in favor of Ginzburg's pornographic magazines, is the history in the House of Representatives, since getting off to a bad start with Justice Chase and Judge Peck, of refusing to impeach a judge because of his rulings in a particular case, or because of a line of decisions.

In this century, the House refused to impeach Judge Alston G. Dayton when Congressman (later Senator) Neeley charged him in 1914 with "improperly issuing injunctions to prevent the miners from exercising their just and legal rights under the laws of West Virginia."

The House refused to impeach Judge Frank Cooper of New York in 1927 when Congressman LaGuardia charged that he "ignored and disregarded the law of the land" in permitting government agents to decoy persons into violation of the Prohibition laws.

The House refused to impeach Judge James A. Lowell when Congressman Howard Smith of Virginia charged him with "disregard of the Constitution . . . and the decisions of the Supreme Court" because the Massachusetts judge had refused to extradite a Negro fugitive back to Virginia for trial because "negroes there were excluded from jury service."

The House refused to impeach Judge Joseph W. Molyneaux in 1934 when Congressman Shoemaker charged that the judge had balked an investigation of several banks by the Minnesota State Commerce Commission with an illegal injunction.

It is for this reason that impeachment charges against Judge Harold Cox never reached the House floor, although the behavior of the Mississippi judge was not good when he repeatedly referred to Negro litigants before his court with racist slurs (he called them chimpanzees). For the same reason, the Ku Klux Klan of Richmond, Virginia, did no more than whistle Dixie when it threatened to institute impeachment proceedings against federal Judge Robert R. Merhige if he incorporated a "busing" provision in the city's school desegregation plan.

In summary, the charges against Justice William O. Douglas are unique in our history of impeachment. The House has stood ready to impeach judges for Treason, Bribery, and related financial crimes and misdemeanors. It has refused to impeach judges charged with on-the-job misconduct when that behavior is not also an indictable criminal offense. Only once before has a judge even been charged with impeachment for non job-related activities—in 1921, when Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis was charged with accepting the job as Commissioner of big-league baseball—and the House Judiciary Committee refused to dignify the charge with a report pro or con. Never in our impeachment history, until Congressman Ford leveled his charges against Mr. Justice Douglas, has it ever been suggested that a judge could be impeached because, while off the bench, he exercised his First Amendment rights to speak and write on issues of the day, to associate with others in educational enterprises.

* * * * *

This brief history of Congressional impeachment shows several things. First, it shows that it works. It is not a rusty, unused power. Since 1796, fifty-five judges have been charged on the Floor of the House of Representatives, approximately one in every three to four years. Presumably, most of the federal judges who should be impeached, are impeached. Thirty-three judges have been charged with "Treason, Bribery, or other High Crimes and Misdemeanors." Three of them have been found guilty by the Senate and removed from office; twenty-two additional judges have resigned rather than face Senate trial and public exposure. This is one "corrupt" judge for approximately every seven years—hopefully, all there are.

Second, by its deeds and actions, Congress has recognized what Chief Justice Burger recently described as "the imperative need for total and absolute independence of judges in deciding cases or in any phase of the decisional function." With a few abberations in the early 1800's, a period of unprecedented political upheaval, Congress has refused to impeach a judge for lack of "good behaviour" unless the behavior is both job-related and criminal. This is true whether the judge gets drunk on the bench, whether the judge exploits and abuses the authority of his robes, or whether the judge hands down unpopular or wrong decisions.

How could it be otherwise? The purpose of an "independent judiciary" in our system of government by separation of powers, is to check the excesses of the legislative and executive branches of the government, to cry a halt when popular passions grip the Congress and laws are adopted which abridge and infringe upon the rights guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution. The judges must be strong and secure if they are to do this job well.

John Dickinson proposed at the Constitutional Convention that federal judges should be removed upon a petition by the majority of each House of Congress. This was rejected, because it was contradictory to judicial tenure during good behavior, because it would make the judiciary "dangerously dependent" on the legislature.

During the Jeffersonian purge of the federal bench, Senate leader William Giles proclaimed that "removal by impeachment" is nothing more than a declaration by both Houses of Congress to the judge that "you hold dangerous opinions." This theory of the impeachment power was rejected in 1804 because it would put in peril "the integrity of the whole national judicial establishment."

Now Congressman Ford suggests that "an impeachable offense" is nothing more than "whatever a majority of the House of Representatives considers it to be at a given moment in history."

Does he really mean that Chief Justice Warren might have been impeached because "at a given moment in history" a majority of the House and two-thirds of the Senate objected strongly to his opinion ordering an end to school-segregation, or to his equally controversial decision against school prayer? Does he really mean that Judge Julius Hoffman is impeachable if a majority of this or the next Congress decides that he was wrong in his handling of the Chicago Seven? Does he really want a situation where federal judges must keep one eye on the mood of Congress and the other on the proceedings before them in court, in order to maintain their tenure in office?

If Congressman Ford is right, it bodes ill for the concept of an independent judiciary and the corollary doctrine of a Constitutional government of laws.

In 1835, the French observer de Tocqueville wrote that:

"A decline of public morals in the United States will probably be marked by the abuse of the power of impeachment as a means of crushing political adversaries or ejecting them from office."

Let us hope that that day has not yet arrived.

CONTINUING TRAINING AND EDUCATION DURING WORKING LIFE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the week of July 6 through 10, an international conference was held in Copenhagen, Denmark on continuing training and education during working life. As we all know, the knowledge explosion, plus the rapid advances in technological development, frequently work to make obsolete the skills and working knowledge of many of our citizens and those of other nations. I think it timely and important that the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—arranged this important international conference and invited scholars from its member nations to present papers and debate and discuss the implications for industry, government, labor, and education of such changes. Dr. Howard A. Matthews, of the U.S. Office of Education, had the honor to present a paper on behalf of the U.S. discussion on the problem of continuing education and training and its implications to industry, education, labor, and government. Dr. Matthews has made important contributions in this field. His remarks deserve careful review and analysis. The remarks follow:

CONTINUING TRAINING AND EDUCATION DURING WORKING LIFE

(By Howard A. Matthews, Ph. D.)

1. Education must be available to people throughout their lifetime or it fails to meet their needs either today or tomorrow. Education is the process by which we learn such fundamental things as to talk in early childhood, and it extends through an almost infinite number of experiences and applications of this simple (but complex) ability to communicate to highly specialized skills and sophisticated applications of knowledge. The formalized public and private educational enterprise which builds upon this childhood acquired learning must be organized so as to permit the individual to engage in the learning process at any stage of his learning or development so that new knowledge can be continually applied to his living and working. The formalized education process is often the only hope for a second chance for the economically and socially disadvantaged persons for whom other channels of earning or learning may have failed.

2. This view of education—that is, continuing or life-long education—is still not completely or adequately recognized by many educational establishments public and private, and also by those developing national educational policy. Efforts at all levels of the American society—federal, state and local—too often are scattered, fragmented, underfunded and out of step with the times. Many times fragmentation in education grows out of artificial questions raised in the learning hierarchy: vocational schools seeking academic recognition or some comparable insignia of respectability; teachers of standard academic subjects fighting for preeminence; some advocates of and educable elite resenting the infringement of mass education; those committed to the research ideal opposing expenditure of time on other disciplines; and, all types of institutions competing for students and popular support. Often times I am amazed that our system works as well as it does.

3. In this paper, no distinction is made between "education" and "training", or "vocational" or "occupational" education. In my judgment these are not different "kinds" of education, but rather they are specialized or specific functions of the educational process. Therefore, throughout this paper the lack of distinction should be kept in mind because I use the words, "education", "training", "education and training" interchangeably and as synonyms. I believe that the division of the learning process into compartments with these several labels is induced more for social and fraternal reasons than for professional and technical reasons.

4. Ability to manage change—whether keeping up with developments in professions or re-tooling for new jobs—requires education (in my definition) to be available to everyone whenever they need it. Access to education governs the pace at which new knowledge is absorbed, adjustments are made to new technologies, and solutions are reached to related social, political and economic problems.

5. Even a superficial analysis of current manpower data in Western countries suggests that there is a very high and positive correlation between the amount of formal education a person has and his continuing attachment to the labor force. This suggests that for all practical purposes, attachment to the working world is really governed in the final analysis more by the "mental ingredient"—the education, mental attitudes, aspirations and fears—than by the application of this ingredient to performance tasks and jobs. Perhaps it also suggests that the

most effective way for people to develop a lasting attachment to the labor force is for them to increase and broaden their formal conceptual training (commonly called "education"), while at the same time being helped to raise their aspirations and hopes for long-range success.

6. In the United States we are currently engaged in dialogue on the matter of developing a national manpower and education policy. One basic consideration now being discussed is how should the regular or general education, the remedial and the continuing education, be arranged or provided for the individuals that the traditional education systems and processes have not served well—those who for lack of education and/or skills are unemployed and underemployed. It is sort of a question of "who should do what and how?".

7. Some have suggested that private industry should assume a greater responsibility for the training and retraining of workers and for bringing about social change. Others ask, are the private, profit-making industries really best able to assume this type of responsibility when one also considers the interests and rights of the worker in the context of the history in America of the labor movement?

8. Suppose for purposes of discussion that private industry is the place to fix greater responsibility for training, retraining and social change. If it is, then we must also remember that several considerations must permeate all industry planning. First, any company, including the industrial giants, must be operated in our economic system in such a way as guarantees a profit, and this must be taken into consideration in everything that is done.

9. Now, as a matter of practical fact, while this does not mean that everything that a given industry does at any single moment in time must show a profit, it does mean that the enterprise as a whole over any specified period of time must be profitable. Education or training must obviously be considered in this light. Secondly, it must be remembered that because industry, which is in the business of selling educational services or products in the marketplace has to assume that it is going to be in business for as long into the future as anyone can see, it simply cannot make long-range decisions by pragmatically looking at the money that can be made next week or six months from now on a federal contract to provide job training. If industry training programs are to be inexpensive, and if they are to be woven into the fabric of industry on a long-range basis, industrial planners must also consider such programs in the light of the constraints caused by union contracts; competition; obsolescence of the skills of people; equipment and processes; tax laws; and, many other forces.

10. It is also important to recognize that manpower predictions made today based on reasonable projections of technological advancements can be rendered obsolete almost overnight by change and innovation no one anticipated. Many individual industries admit that they find it impossible to project total or even partial training needs or production schedules over any appreciable period of time, and very few companies can predict with any degree of accuracy even five years from now the types of hardware they will have in the market place, what major products they will sell or buy, and what specific types of skills they will need to do so.

11. Current manpower studies suggest that perhaps the best analysis of industrial manpower needs for the years ahead can only be stated in very broad and vague occupational categories rather than in terms of specific job requirements, e.g. agricultural, managerial, technical, as opposed to machinist, key-punch operators, etc. This also suggests that perhaps the most effective pre-employment preparation of both disadvantaged and other youngsters for jobs of the future may be that which is very broadly based, enabling an individual to function in a number of jobs throughout his work life, many of which may actually be unrelated as to content or skill requirements. Skill training narrowly conceived simply cannot accomplish this, although I am convinced that some types of it have much more transfer value than educators have recognized in the past.

12. Moreover, little evidence exists from either the past or the present to suggest that the production or work processes *per se* in private industry have the capability (or can develop such) to lend themselves to the kind of education programs as an *integral part of the production process* that can bring about forceful benefits to large numbers of unemployed and underemployed persons any faster or more effectively than the public school systems, working in cooperation with industry and many different agencies.

13. There is increasing evidence that one of the most effective ways to educate, train or retrain people (whichever term you prefer)—whether displaced as a result of automation or unemployed because of educational, physical, social or economic disadvantage—is through cooperative education programs. In such "person-centered programs," the school develops instruction best suited to the classroom and helps a potential employee develop specific work skills at the job site. But the responsibility for this education process rests with the school, the one institution that touches the lives of all citizens.

14. The American educational establishment is a gigantic enterprise. It is not really a single system, but over 20,000 local autonomous systems. In 1969 there were approximately 58.6 million students enrolled in public and private (non-public) elementary and secondary schools and colleges at a total cost of $64.7 billion. Included in these data are some 2 million students enrolled in junior and community colleges.

15. Although we know little about the characteristics of the adults who engage in continuing education in the United States, we are reasonably sure that our data do not reflect the actual magnitude of the number of adults engaged in some type of educational activity.

16. The National Center for Education Statistics of the United States Office of Education set out to learn about the kinds of people who participate in adult education programs. What was learned was disconcerting—many persons did not report their occupational training or other activity, apparently because they did not think of the types of learning experiences that they were undergoing as "education". For many people, the activity was probably considered part of the job, a natural participation, or just a part of everyday living.

17. Even in view of the under-reporting, the results were nevertheless astounding. Over 13 million adults indicated they were participating in some form of adult education activity. This number is larger than the reported enrollment in all post-secondary institutions in the United States.

18. It is difficult to determine to what extent leisure-related courses such as art appreciation, crafts and music, in community adult education courses designed to enhance the quality of life, are included in these data. In view of the increasing importance in our lives of the uses of leisure, this lack of information is unfortunate.

19. The 13 million persons participating in adult education programs represent 1 person in 9, or 11 per cent of all Americans age 17 or over who are not full-time students. It includes 13 per cent of the white males, but only about 8 per cent of non-white males. It includes about 10 per cent of all females, with equal distribution between white women and those of other ethnic designations. When we consider not only the needs of a rapidly changing technology but the social imperatives of our time, these figures are less notable for being large than for being small.

20. Before programs can respond to the actual needs of the people, we must have some idea why people engage in continuing education programs; how many there are; who they are; and, what they expect of the programs they enter.

21. With the amount of information available doubling each ten years or less, we can *not* go on trying to add to the content of education, hoping that we can cram into the head of a youth all that he needs to know by graduation time. Rather we must make life itself a part of the continuing education process—something which both the rigidities of industry and education now make rather difficult.

22. The challenge to public policy now is to create new arrangements and new and continuing opportunities for the growth and development of adults. Each of the agencies and institutions involved in the educational enterprise frequently works in ways unrelated to each other and sometimes in opposition to the total national interest. Relationships between employment, education, and social service policies must become more interrelated. They are not mutually exclusive domains.

23. Often the methods for overcoming the shortcomings of the public school systems in the United States can be learned more effectively from remedial or continuing education programs for persons the schools have not served well, than in any other way.

24. School systems are archaic if they only prepare students for the next level of education. Unfortunately, we have so perpetuated the artificial prestige values of college degrees and other educational artifacts such as diplomas, professional certificates and the like, that many young people today in our regular school systems are socially embarrassed to admit to their friends that they would really like to stop short of a degree from some prestigious college. The practical learning function of the schools is frequently impaired because of compulsory attendance, minimum wage laws, wage-hour laws, etc., which are designed chiefly to keep the young people out of the competitive labor market, rather than keep them in school to guarantee them an education appropriate to their needs, wants and desires.

25. Too often this results in young people being forced to attend schools which were organized with someone else in mind—those preparing for more education rather than the world of work.

26. Most people agree that any local educational system is not doing its job if it concentrates its major energies on the one-third of its students headed for the next level of education—college or university—giving little or no attention to the two-thirds who are not.

27. In my opinion, high schools in our country are seriously deficient when their counselors have little or no idea what high school courses would be the most useful to a young man interested, for example, in an electrical apprenticeship. Too often counselors can only help those who want to know what courses, grades, and tests are required for admission to prestigious universities.

28. Nevertheless, the schools usually have done what they have been asked to do, prepare the white middle class majority for life in an increasingly complex and urban setting. They have done less well for those in the lowest economic and social strata.

29. Current education problems stem not from the fact that the schools have changed,

but rather that they continue to do precisely the job they have always done. A shrinking unskilled job market requires fewer men and fewer young men, and so the schools are expected to fill the gap—which, of course, tradition has not dictated nor funds afforded. The problems of providing continuing education for such persons are thereby compounded.

30. A well-balanced system of continued public education must provide a comprehensive program of educational opportunity for persons with varying educational attainments and varying motivations and needs in all areas of the state—for as we have shown it will also have to serve those the "regular" system has failed to serve.

31. In a properly oriented continuing education program the high school dropout would be able to find a program which encourages his re-entry to school or prepares him for a job, and the technologically displaced Ph.D. an opportunity to probe more deeply into a special field or to broaden his general background. Such possibilities require an open-ended system with students free to enter, to leave when other experiences seem more fruitful, and possibly to re-enter later.

32. Life-long education programs can be designed without regard to the conventional administrative (but not educational) conveniences of quarters, semesters, six-week or nine-week terms, Carnegie units, and quarter-hour and semester hour formulas. Flexible programs can be developed so the student may leave to take a job at any time or stay for advanced school work without regard for the school calendar or the college catalog. Such a system can become a reality only through the coordinated efforts of public schools, community colleges, vocational schools, universities, and employers.

33. There is a special need for broader and deeper opportunities for those adults whose basic education is deficient. About 30 million members of the present labor force in the United States lack high school diplomas—the basic credential for mobility in our society. Some 8 million of these have not completed the eighth grade. One-sixth of American youth cannot qualify for military service because they are unable to pass a seventh grade equivalency test. Yet opportunities for open-ended adult basic education are few, and knowledge of how to overcome the problems of teaching adults needs further exploration.

34. In 1968, the federal program to support adult basic education efforts totaled $38.9 million and served 153,303 adults. This program supports training leading only to eighth grade equivalency—a modest goal in an age requiring highly skilled and educated workers. Considering those who have not completed an education of eighth grade equivalency, approximately 8 million, this number is relatively small but nevertheless of great magnitude in the impact such training has had on the lives of the individuals who participated.

35. Retraining programs must be organised in such a way that a significant percentage of the local labor force is retrained annually. Training provided thus far by the Manpower Development and Training Act (M.D.T.A.) has demonstrated that this is practical and that a significant capacity for training and retraining exists outside the public school framework. It has also uprooted some entrenched ideas about how long it takes for the American workers to develop the skills necessary for an entry-level job or on-the-job training or to have education skills upgraded.

36. The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, developed to offset structural unemployment, created a new array of education and work training programs for out-of-school youths and adults who had not been served by the existing vocational education and private apprenticeship and training systems. A variety of education and training programs are made possible by this legislation:

Education and training for individuals handicapped by lack of education and work experience;

Refresher training for unemployed professionals who require such training to continue in their professions;

Part-time training of persons, employed or not, who through further education and training can help fill jobs vacant in occupations of critical skill shortages; and,

Experimental, developmental and pilot projects to improve techniques and to demonstrate the effectiveness of specialized methods in training the disadvantaged, including pilot programs in correctional institutions.

37. The Manpower Development and Trainment Act is jointly the responsibility of the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (H.E.W.). The office which I administer, the Division of Manpower Development and Training, in the United States Office of Education is directly responsible for classroom instruction placed by this law with the Secretary of H.E.W.

38. The Department of Labor selects individuals to be trained and the Office of Education enters into argeements with state education agencies to provide the training needed. Contracts are also negotiated with public or private education and training institutions to establish classroom instruction when states are unable to provide necessary institutional training.

39. As of June 1969, over 1.2 million persons had enrolled in M.D.T.A. programs, 848,400 of them in institutional training and 382,000 in on-the-job training at a total federal cost of $1.6 billion. In fiscal year 1969, some 220,000 (institutional and on-the-job) persons were trained. In the light of a June 1969 rate of unemployment at 3.4 per cent (coincidentally, 3.4 million persons), the national efforts at training and retraining are relatively small.

40. Programs under the Manpower Act, particularly institutional training, seek not only to provide an individual with skills which will enable him to get a job and progress higher on that job, but also provide him with the necessary related instruction and basic education which will permit him to move to another job or progress in the career potential of his current job.

41. The recent emphasis on manpower training and development in the United States should not obscure the fact that the new programs, while playing an important role in alleviating unmet problems and deficiencies in education, training, and the employment process, supplement the ongoing education and training system.

42. Unlike the centralized education systems found in many countries, there is considerable diversity in education curricula throughout the American system. Schools at all levels are operated by public authorities and also by private non-profit and profit-making organisations. While public education is within the exclusive legal jurisdiction of the individual states, the federal government, through the Office of Education by means of grants and subsidies to state education departments and to the public or private training institutions has a catalytic influence on American education systems.

43. M.D.T.A. in particular has been a catalyst in bringing state and local agencies together in working out solutions to critical retraining problems, while at the same time promoting change in institutional patterns and goals—a benefit not envisioned at the time of Congressional enactment in 1962. Federal funds for manpower training are viewed as "seed" money aimed at bringing any number of related agencies—school districts, employers, employment services, etc.—together on local problems.

44. Largely because of the institutional and agency involvements mandated in the legislation, M.D.T.A. has influenced change in public education institutions and formed a bridge so needed between education and industry as well as other groups having expertise in adult training, retraining and education.

45. Notable among the new institutional patterns evolved under the M.D.T.A. by the public school systems in the United States are the Manpower Training Skills Center—now some 70 in number and located throughout the United States.

46. The centers are centralized self-contained facilities, distinct from regular public school facilities, operating on a full-time basis, generally under public school administration. They are designed to provide on a continuous basis counseling and related services, work orientation, basic and remedial education, health and other personal services and institutional skill training in a variety of occupations for trainees recruited from a broad geographic area. The centers are characterized by a high degree of flexibility, and serve all types of trainees and all types of training projects, including multi-occupation and single occupation projects, individual referrals and classroom components of coupled on-the-job training programs.

47. One of the unique contributions of the skills center is the arrangement of instructional units, which permits continuous trainee intake and exist from center programs. Skills centers operate the year around, and in some instances people can also go to them at any time around the clock—24 hours a day. This we call "open-entry/open-ended" scheduling because it affords a completely individualized program. The amount of time and the types of program offerings—whether basic or remedial education, skills training, counseling, health or other supportive services—all can be geared to the needs and wants of each individual trainee.

48. Open-ended programs reduce the time lag that often occurs in regular programs between the time a person is selected for training and his actual entry into a training situation. Our experience suggests that where this time lag is significant, trainee aspirations and motivations tend to vanish and a person who was once excited about training tends to become more resistant toward future retraining.

49. There are positive benefits for employers in the "open-entry/open-ended" training programs. Historically, schools have operated on a "school year" basis with most people completing their education either in January or June. The "open-entry/open-ended" process provides for a steady flow of entrants into the labor market as opposed to large groups completing once or twice a year. In the "open-entry/open-ended" process, if there are periods of cyclical unemployment, trainees can be retained or recycled into other training as a "holding action" as an alterative to their being exited to a non-responsive labor market.

50. The skills centers, thus have become a buffer between employment and unemployment. During periods called "holding action", trainees can vary or broaden their knowledge or skills and make themselves more employable at a higher level in a competitive labor market.

51. Linked closely with industry, or several industries, skills centers can and do cushion the effects of a fluctuating economy for those who feel it most—the last hired—thereby enhancing their individual well-being and reducing their social and economic dislocaton and disruption.

52. In contrast to the skills centers, the public schools have been characterized as inflexible and insensitive to the needs of individuals and the requirements of the labor market. In reorienting to these problems it

is significant to note that skills centers, for the most part, are operated by any local public schools that have indicated their willingness to cooperate with industry in developing more flexible programs. By operating skills centers, the schools have learned how to provide for the needs of industry and at the same time break down the traditional barriers between what has been called "education" and "training".

53. There have been other breakthroughs in learning how to articulate the educational enterprise with industry's needs. For example, the Office of Education has two educational programs presently underway with the basic steel and railroad industries of this country which illustrate a major job of "bridge-building" between industry and the public school systems.

54. These programs are basically "educational" even though all of the activities attendant to them are carried out on the premises of the industry. The educational program is defined in terms of what the student does, and not where it takes place or the labels appearing on the doors.

55. In both of these programs the instructors go into the plant, or to the premises of the company. They meet their trainees either before or after shift work which may be at midnight or at four o'clock in the morning—it makes no difference.

56. We have been able to demonstrate that in as short a time as 100 clock hours, some steel workers have been able to improve significantly their reading and arithmetic skills. The School took the student where he was and helped him with his educational problem.

57. While the primary purpose of the steel industry project was to give the worker the educational tools necessary for his upward mobility in career jobs made more difficult by increased technology, it was soon discovered that mobility was impeded by seniority practices. Even though the worker was educationally competent to bid for more sophisticated and better paying jobs, he was precluded from doing so by seniority practices. One of the important by-products of this program is a new dialogue between unions and management on the function of seniority in promotion practices and upward mobility.

58. In August of 1969, the United States Office of Education signed a contract with the Association of American Railroads (representing 7 railroad companies), the Railway Labor Executives Association (representing 27 railroad brotherhoods) and the Board for Fundamental Education, a private non-profit training agency, also providing the basic education in the steel contract. This program provides basic education and coaching for the examination of high school equivalency for about 2,000 railroad employees. The purpose of the program is similar to the steel industry program—to remove education barriers that impede upward job mobility. The program is progressing well in terms of its educational objectives, but it is anticipated that, like the steel industry contract, mobility may be impeded considerably by seniority rules.

59. The Federal Government through national contracts, such as the one the United States Office of Education has with the United Business Schools Association (the professional representative of the private for-profit schools), is also bringing about broader participation of private secretarial-clerical schools in adult training/retraining programs. Private institutions frequently have a special expertise that can be brought to bear on the training and retraining problems of disadvantaged persons. Often the private school capability is underutilized in identifying educational resources for upgrading training for underemployed persons.

60. Because some educational programs for the preparation of teachers and supervisors are often found ineffective in preparing personnel to work with the out-of-school and out-of-work person, the United States Office of Education established a network of institutions called Area Manpower Institutes for the Development of Staff (A.M.I.D.S.) to provide training and technical assistance in the preparation of such personnel. A.M.I.D.S. programs are a pragmatic response to the problem of preparing personnel recruited from industry to teach, counsel, or administer programs designed for individuals—largely disadvantaged—they have never before worked with either on the assembly line or in school.

61. The A.M.I.D.S. programs focus on understanding and teaching the disadvantaged person, on human resource development, and upon the learning and human needs of persons engaged in manpower training and upgrading activities. While A.M.I.D.S. was originally designed for M.D.T.A. instructors, participation has been expanded to include employers, industrial supervisors, federal employees, public agency personnel offices, and people from private and public schools, penal institutions, and training and career development agencies and offices.

62. One of the real tasks in continuing education lies in getting educational institutions to adjust their procedures to accommodate the needs of people who cannot be reached through conventional educational methods or processes. This is what A.M.I.D.S. programs attempt to do.

63. The primary purpose of any education system should be to provide a variety of options for all citizens. This includes not only such options as flexible entry and exit into training, retraining and education required for employment, but also opportunities for the individual to learn to make wise use of leisure time especially when one looks at such forces as the changing role or function of work in our culture. For a moment, let us examine the function of "work" in establishing human value systems.

64. Until about a decade ago, we were a production-oriented society. A majority of our labor force was engaged in producing goods and articles or products with which it was relatively easy for most people to identify their own individual physical and mental efforts and from which most workers gained a significant measure of self-respect and fulfillment. Then a reasonably simple cause and effect relationship was apparent. For most people a job was, in fact, both a social and moral requirement. The right thing to do was to get and hold a job. We worked, were paid, took a vacation, in that order. And at that time young people were an economic asset both to their families and to the country.

65. America is now a service-oriented society with more people selling goods and services than producing goods and there is increasing over-specialization of tasks whether we are producing or selling. The identification of the job by most people with something in which they can take personal pride and accomplishment is an increasingly difficult thing. Even in the production-oriented tasks today man is increasingly a machine baby sitter who is conditioned to respond to a procedure or sequence of activities to follow when a certain colored light appears on a panel. He actually knows his job is going well when nothing happens—the lights aren't changing—not much self-satisfaction or human fulfillment in that!

66. These simple facts suggest that the job and its concomitant pay check may no longer have the social and moral impact they once had. The real world creating the value systems of our youth today tells them, for example, that the Protestant-Puritan ethic which established the work-reward-leisure sequence, is no longer relevant and that leisure may not be the reward for hard work. These youth know that in our "credit card culture" we are encouraged to travel or otherwise enjoy first and pay later which, in reality, may mean that work at best is psychologically a punishment for having enjoyed or taken leisure first. Or more importantly, it could mean that more and more people of all ages no longer believe that there is any need or excuse to work—hold a payroll job—just in order to comfortably enjoy life, take leisure, or otherwise find self-expression.

67. Yet in the face of shifting attitudes toward the role of work, many of us carry the marks of the traditional work ethic. Harvey Cox—in his excellent book, *The Feast of Fools,* tells us that mankind, at least Western industrial man, has paid a terrible price for his present affluence. At the cost of a staggering impoverishment of his life, he has purchased prosperity. With industrialization, we grew more sober and industrious, less playful and imaginative. Work schedules squeezed leisure activities to a minimum. The habits formed are still so much with us that we use the leisure bought with technology either to "moonlight" or to plan sober consultations on "the problem of leisure" or to wonder why we are not enjoying our "free time" the way we should.

68. In summary then, it would seem to me that perhaps the formidable task of continuing education is to make sure that educational opportunities of all types are available when and where they are needed to help develop to the maximum the potential of every human being—whether it be to cushion his layoff—to prepare him for an initial job—to upgrade him in his present job or to change careers; or to help him make better use of free or leisure time which in turn makes him a better employee and/or citizen. In the final analysis, education must be concerned with what people do and not the labels we put on things, or the social class systems that have tended to surround certain types of jobs. I am reminded that a person from history who has had one of the most profound impacts for good upon all mankind was not a college professor, a scholar or an academician, but rather a simple carpenter whose cabinet was made up of common men—fishermen.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, in the 91st Congress, the House Republican policy committee held 38 meetings and adopted 21 policy statements.

The discussions held and the actions taken by the committee have played a major role in fostering sound legislative action and in furthering public knowledge and understanding of the Republican position in critical areas of congressional interest.

In the 17 instances in which floor action reflected Republican response to policy committee recommendations, 88 percent of the Republican members voted in agreement.

Present members of the House Republican policy committee are as follows: JOHN J. RHODES, chairman, GERALD R. FORD, LESLIE C. ARENDS, JOHN B. ANDERSON, WILLIAM C. CRAMER, RICHARD H. POFF, ROBERT TAFT, JR., BOB WILSON, H. ALLEN SMITH, CHARLES M. TEAGUE, PAGE BELCHER, JAMES HARVEY, JACK EDWARDS,

JOHN KYL, ROBERT J. CORBETT, ALEXANDER PIRNIE, DAVID W. DENNIS, THOMAS S. KLEPPE, ROBERT D. PRICE, LAWRENCE J. BURTON, JOHN W. BYRNES, WILLIAM O. COWGER, JOHN R. DELLENBACK, PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, and ROBERT T. STAFFORD. Four Members, J. GLENN BEALL, JR., RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, WILLIAM H. HARSHA, and WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR. served for a portion of the 91st Congress.

Summaries of House Republican policy statements and Republican floor votes in support of committee recommendations are as follows:

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENTS AND FLOOR VOTES, 91ST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

I. Urged the immediate consideration and passage of election reform legislation. February 25, 1969.

For the past three years Republican Members have urged the consideration and enactment of legislation to revise and update present laws dealing with election campaigns, to ensure honest reporting of campaign contributions and expenditures and to streamline enforcement procedures. Numerous bills proposing the basic reforms of the election process have been sponsored by Republican Members. The Subcommittee on Elections of the House Administration Committee held but one day of hearings (May 6, 1970) on but one of the bills (H.R. 12773, Mr. Lipscomb and Mr. Devine). No further action has been taken.

II. Urged immediate extension of the President's authority to submit to the Congress plans to reorganize the Executive Branch. February 25, 1969.

S. 1059 extended until April 1, 1971, the authority granted the President under the Reorganization Act of 1949 to develop and effect reorganization proposals, subject only to a limited right of veto by the Congress.

Passed March 18, 1969. Republican vote: Yeas, 166; nays, 4.

Percentage, 98%.

III. Urged the prompt enactment of legislation to modernize and improve the Legislative Branch of the Government. March 4, 1969.

H.R. 17654, the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1970, was subsequently supported by the House Republican Policy Committee July 13, 1970, and passed September 17, 1970. (See Statement No. IX, 91st Congress, Second Session)

IV. Urged the establishment of the federal debt ceiling in the amount of $365 billion, and the provision of an additional temporary borrowing authority of $12 billion to be available until June 30, 1970, to accommodate seasonal financing peaks during the calendar year. March 11, 1969.

H.R. 8508 provided a limited increase in the public debt to enable the Federal Government to meet obligations incurred by the previous administration.

Passed March 19, 1969.

Republican vote: Yeas, 140; nays, 41.

Percentage, 77%.

V. Recommended extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to June 30, 1972. April 15, 1969.

The amendment to H.R. 514 limiting the extension to two years assured the Congress a seasonable opportunity to eliminate inequities and weaknesses found to exist in ESEA programs.

Adopted April 23, 1969.

Republican vote: Yeas, 175; nays, 9.

Percentage, 95%.

VI. Urged prompt submission to the States of a Constitutional amendment to improve the Presidential election mechanism. September 9, 1969.

H.J. Res. 681 proposed a Constitutional amendment which would abolish the electoral college system and provide for direct popular election of the President and Vice President.

Adopted September 18, 1969.

Republican vote: Yeas, 154; nays, 26.

Percentage, 86%.

VII. Recommended immediate consideration and passage of President Nixon's multifaceted crime control package. September 23, 1969.

Of the Administration's major crime proposals forwarded to the Congress April 23, 1969, action has been completed on but six:

1. District of Columbia Omnibus Crime Bill. Forwarded to the President July 23, 1970. (See Statement No. II, 91st Congress, Second Session)

2. Youth-Corrections Act. Presented to the President July 6, 1970.

3. Controlled Dangerous Substances Act. Presented to the President October 14, 1970. (See Statement No. X, 91st Congress, Second Session)

4. Organized Crime Control Act of 1969. Presented to the President October 12, 1970. (See Statement No. XII, 91st Congress, Second Session)

5. Criminal Justice Act Amendments. Presented to the President October 12, 1970.

6. Explosives Regulations Proposals and Amendments. Major provisions were incorporated in the Organized Crime Control Act of 1969, cited above.

The Congress has failed to complete action on the following Presidential anti-crime proposals:

1. The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Amendments.

2. Wagering Tax Amendments.

3. Bail Reform Act Amendments.

4. Protection of Minors from Pornography. Title I provisions were incorporated in the Postal Reorganization Act presented to the President.

5. Prohibiting Prurient Advertising.

VIII. Endorsed President Nixon's proposals for the reform of the selective service call-up procedures and urged the enactment of H.R. 14001. October 21, 1969.

Passage of H.R. 14001 permitted the President to establish a "random" system of selection in lieu of the "oldest first" system, thus minimizing the impact and maximizing the equality of military draft.

Passed October 30, 1969.

Republican vote: yeas, 175; nays, 1.

Percentage, 99%.

SECOND SESSION

I. Urged support of President Nixon's veto of the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Bill. January 27, 1970.

H.R. 13111, which appropriated $1.3 billion more than that requested by the President, was vetoed because the provided increases for HEW was mandatory, misdirected and excessive.

Sustained January 28, 1970.

Republican vote: yeas, 27; nays, 156.

Percentage, 84%.

II. Endorsed the passage of the District of Columbia Omnibus Crime Bill. February 25, 1970.

H.R. 16196 reorganized the District court system, revised the District juvenile and criminal laws and procedures, created a vastly improved Bail Agency and established a full public defender service.

Passed March 19, 1970.

Republican vote: Yeas, 154; nays, 1.

Percentage, 99%.

III. Urged support of President Nixon's FY 1971 proposals for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. March 17, 1970.

H.R. 16516 authorized for NASA in FY 1971 $3,600,875,000, an increase of $267,875,000 over the Administration's request.

Passed April 23, 1970.

Republican vote: Yeas, 106; nays, 51.

Percentage, 67%.

The Conference report on H.R. 16516 authorizing for NASA in FY 1971 $3,410,878,000, at $189,997,000 less than previously approved by the House, but $77,875,000 above the Administration's request, was approved by voice vote on June 22, 1970.

H.R. 17548 appropriating for NASA in FY 1971 $3,197,000,000, a reduction of $136 million from the Administration's request and $408,875,000 from the authorization previously adopted, was passed by voice vote May 12, 1970.

The Conference report on H.R. 17548 appropriating for NASA in FY 1971 $3,268,675,000, $64,325,000 less than the Administration's request was approved by voice vote August 4, 1970.

President Nixon on August 11, 1970, vetoed H.R. 17548 which increased the appropriations for FY 1971 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the VA, NASA and other independent agencies $541 million above the budget request.

Sustained August 13, 1970.

Republican vote: Yeas, 23; nays, 155.

Percentage, 87%.

IV. Urged the enactment of H.R. 16311, the Family Assistance Act of 1970. April 7, 1970.

President Nixon's landmark welfare reform plan would provide basic benefits to low income families with children, in a manner designed to encourage employment and family stability, and would establish nationwide more uniform standards of eligibility and aid.

Passed April 16, 1970.

Republican vote: Yes, 102; nays, 72.

Percentage, 59%.

V. Opposed the passage of H. Res. 960 to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1970. May 12, 1970.

The resolution would have nullified President Nixon's proposed reorganization of the Executive Office submitted March 12, 1970. Under the proposal the Executive Office would be modernized to strengthen the role of the agencies by providing needed support in development of domestic policies and programs, in program performance and coordination, in evaluation of existing programs and improvement in the flow of information about them, and in formulation of programs for recruitment, training and development of executive talent.

Rejected May 13, 1970.

Republican vote: Yea, 6; nay, 155.

Percentage, 96%.

VI. Supported the passage of H.R. 15424, the Administration's Maritime Program Bill. May 19, 1970.

The bill incorporated Administration's proposals establishing a ten-year construction subsidy program for building 300 merchant marine ships to engage in foreign trade.

Passed May 21, 1970.

Republican vote: Yeas, 130; nays, 0.

Percentage, 100%.

VII. Supported legislative proposals to protect and expand the voting rights of all citizens whatever their race or color, wherever they live, and indicating preference that the proper voting age be established by Constitutional amendment. June 2, 1970.

H.R. 4249, as amended, broadened the coverage and extended for five years the effect of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, suspended the use of literacy tests, set minimum residence requirements for Presidential elections, and lowered to 18 the voting age for all Federal, State and local elections after 1970.

Adopted June 17, 1970.

Republican vote: Yeas, 100; nays, 76.

Percentage, 57%.

VIII. Supported passage of H.R. 17495, the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970. June 23, 1970.

To stimulate private investment in mortgages, H.R. 17495 authorized $250 million to be used by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to reduce interest rates charged to member associations, expanded the purchase authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to include conventional mortgages, authorized establishment of a secondary market facility to purchase residential mortgages, increased authority of the Government National Mortgage Association to $1.5 billion to provide additional special assistance for low income housing, and extended authority of HUD Secretary and VA Administrator to set maximum interest rate of FHA and VA loans.

Passed June 25, 1970.

Republican vote: Yeas, 136; nays, 1.

Percentage, 99%.

IX. Urged prompt consideration and passage of H.R. 17654, the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1970. July 13, 1970.

The reform bill will, by improving the structure and procedures of the Congress, foster its more informed, open, democratic and equitable operation.

Passed September 17, 1970.

Republican vote: Yeas, 140; nays, 6.

Percentage, 94%.

X. Urged the immediate passage of H.R. 18583, the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970. September 15, 1970.

The act enables a comprehensive attack on the drug problem, and includes provisions dealing with treatment, rehabilitation, prevention and drug abuse education, as well as with drug laws and their enforcement.

Passed September 24, 1970.

Republican vote: Yeas, 150; nays, 0.

Percentage, 100%.

XI. Supported the passage of H.R. 19200, the Occupational Safety and Health Act. September 22, 1970.

Passage of the act will assure safe and healthful working conditions by establishing and enforcing mandatory safety and health standards, by fostering State efforts to assure safe and healthful working conditions and by providing for research, information, education and training in the field of occupational safety and health. Passage of the act awaits further action of the House.

XII. Urged the passage of S. 30, the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, as amended by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives. October 6, 1970.

A major measure in the Administration's war on crime, the act strengthened the evidence-gathering process; limited challenges to wiretap evidence; extended Federal jurisdiction over major gambling operations; authorized the use of anti-trust remedies against commercial operations corrupted by racketeers; authorized increased sentences for dangerous habitual, professional and organized offenders; strengthened Federal law with respect to illegal use, transportation or possession of explosives; and established a National Commission on Individual Rights.

Passed October 7, 1970.

Republican vote: Yeas, 160; nays, 0.

Percentage, 100%.

XIII. Urged the passage of H.R. 19519, the Comprehensive Manpower Act. October 13, 1970.

Passage of the act will assure an opportunity for employment to every American seeking work and make available the education and training needed to any person to qualify for employment.

Passage of the act awaits further action of the House.

REPORT LISTS ACHIEVEMENTS MADE BY 91ST CONGRESS

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, in order to help keep my constituents informed of my legislative activities and voting record, I issue a periodic newsletter about three or four times a year.

The October 1970 report contains the achievements compiled by the 91st Congress so far, and also cites some of the domestic problems facing our Nation.

The contents of the newsletter are as follows:

REFORM GAINS TO FEATURE 91ST CONGRESS

The 91st Congress (1969–70) will adjourn later in the year with a productive record, highlighted by important achievements in tax, postal and legislative reform that will benefit every American.

Perhaps the most notable accomplishment of all the reform measures was the one in the area of taxation. Since 1939, when the last reform measure was enacted, taxpayers have clamored for legislation that would make our tax laws more equitable. The tax reform-relief bill I helped sponsor is the most extensive in our history and a giant step down the road toward tax relief for all our citizens. Provisions range from higher personal exemptions, which will reach $750 by January 1, 1973, to reducing the oil depletion allowance. This legislation also provided for a reduction, and as of June 30th the elimination of the surtax.

Another significant reform achievement was the Postal Reorganization Act, a victory that was shared by the Administration, postal workers, and the American public. This reform bill, which cleared the Congress in August and is now public law, creates an independent U.S. Postal Service that will put our mail system on a business-like basis and provide greater efficiency in deliveries.

The third reform program passed by the House was a reorganization of congressional operations. Although the bill contained some improvements, like recording names of members on teller votes and disclosing votes in closed committee sessions, the measure was a disappointment to me. What really featured the bill was not the provisions passed, but the meritorious ones rejected. The antiquated seniority system of selecting committee chairmen will still exist, and many sessions will remain closed to the public. I supported amendments to change the seniority system. While these amendments have thus far been rejected, I intend to continue to press for their enactment.

OTHER IMPORTANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Other legislation passed by the 91st Congress included: (not all was approved by both Houses and signed by the President as this newsletter went to press) Extension of Federal aid to education . . . Prevention and control of drug abuse . . . Improvement of the student loan program . . . Reform of the electoral college system . . . Extension of the Voting Rights Act . . . Protection of minors from sexually-oriented mail . . . Construction and modernization of hospitals . . . and providing additional funds for the slumping home mortgage market.

Also passed were: Expansion of the Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, a bill I helped sponsor in 1968 . . . Federal grants for building sewage treatment works . . . Creation of a Youth Conservation Corps . . . Intensification of air pollution control . . . Extension of the National Commission on Product Safety . . . Increased Social Security benefits . . . Urban Mass Transportation . . . Expansion of veterans benefits . . . Extension of the anti-poverty program . . . Equal rights for women . . . Extension of the Older Americans Act to help senior citizens. Expansion of the arts and humanities was another program I helped sponsor.

I voted for all of these bills and urged my colleagues to press for their enactment into public law. I will continue to work for legislation of this caliber which seeks to resolve the many problems facing our Nation. Your views will be appreciated as we debate various proposals in the Congress.

INFLATION TOP CONCERN IN MIDDLESEX COUNTY

My recent questionnaire revealed that most constituents consider inflation the main domestic problem facing the Nation, with crime and pollution next. And a Harris survey on Aug. 20, 1970, reported that 58% of the American people believe this country is in the throes of a recession. At the same time, 71% believe that the prices of most things they purchase are still rising faster than a year ago.

During September, the wholesale price index increased again and because of rising costs for farm products, housewives now face the unhappy prospect of paying still higher prices for meat and other grocery items. People are more than concerned about the economy. They are alarmed—with good reason. Millions of investors have also lost billions of dollars in paper profits due to the stock market decline and farmers are also caught in the squeeze. No realist can deny that an economic crisis is here and instead of the economy improving, it may actually get worse. This concern was indicated in a Gallup survey on Oct. 8th, which disclosed that three times as many Americans expect unemployment to increase during the next 6 months, as those who believe it will decrease. Increasing unemployment and rising prices remain a serious challenge to the Administration and are serious threats to the economic security of our people, as well as representing a grave threat to the Nation itself.

THE ECONOMIC CRISIS

The American people are suffering from the effects of rising prices and mounting unemployment—the paradox of both inflation and recession at the same time. This paradox is almost without precedent.

Every person suffers from inflation, but the most tragic victims are those with fixed incomes—over 29 million retired and disabled Americans. Social Security and Railroad Retirement benefits were increased by the Congress 15% last year, but these gains have been all but wiped out by rising prices. The House has now voted an additional increase of 5% in Social Security benefits. I fought for this increase and also for the new provision which will provide for automatic future adjustments that will reflect changes in the cost of living.

The crippled housing industry—third largest in the nation—is another victim. The highest interest rates in over 100 years have almost paralyzed this key area. In many cases, apartment house owners are taking advantage of the housing shortage, and knowing that most couples cannot afford to buy a home at today's sky-high interest rates, are charging exorbitant rents. The prime lending rate for commercial banks has increased 28% since November, 1968, and is now 8%. Tight money is strangling the economy. For instance, a couple buying a $20,000 home will actually pay $55,000 by the time a 30-year mortgage is paid off, at the going interest rates.

NATIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT HIGHEST IN 7 YEARS

Another stricken area is the employment market. In January, 1969, the unemployment

rate was 3.3%. Since then, the rate has continued to rise and reached 5.5% of the nation's work force in September, 1970—the highest in 7 years. Unemployment in the Perth Amboy—New Brunswick Labor Area, which includes Middlesex and Somerset Counties, has reached a critical level. A report issued in mid October disclosed that in September of this year, there were 18,700 persons unemployed in the Area, representing 5.7% of the work force. A year ago, 12,100 were out of work—3.9% of the employment force. Over a period of a year, the number of jobless in the Perth Amboy—New Brunswick Labor Area increased by 6,600—a leap of 55%!

ACTION NEEDED TO STRENGTHEN ECONOMY

I have supported legislation to lower interest rates and have urged the Administration to take steps to stop this rampant inflation. Such action could stop rising prices without further unemployment or reductions in productivity.

Besides lower interest rates to revitalize the slumping housing industry, manpower development and training programs need to be expanded to upgrade the skills of unemployed and unskilled workers, and job placement centers established to send persons to areas where work is available. What is also needed, however, is a reordering of national priorities. We need better education, more housing, and improved health programs. The Federal budget should continue to be cut, but in the right places. Last year Congress voted to slash the Administration's budget by $6.4 billion—and I supported that reduction. On October 6th, 1970, the Appropriations Committee on which I serve, also cut the Pentagon budget by $2 billion. I will continue to cut non-essential programs.

WORDS TO REMEMBER AND THINK ABOUT

"Let us stand together with renewed confidence in our cause—united in our heritage of the past and our hopes for the future—and determined that this land we love shall lead all mankind into new frontiers of peace and abundance."—From remarks intended for delivery on Nov. 22nd, 1963, by President John F. Kennedy.

OMNIBUS WILDERNESS BILL

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include as part of my previous remarks the text of the omnibus de facto wilderness bill, H.R. 19784:

H.R. 19784

A bill to designate certain lands as wilderness

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 3(b) of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 890; 16 U.S.C. 1132(b)), the following lands are hereby designated as wilderness:

(1) certain lands in the Helena, Lewis and Clark, and Lolo National Forests, Montana, which comprise approximately two hundred and forty thousand five hundred acres as depicted on a map entitled "Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness—Proposed", dated June 1968, which shall be known as the "Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness";

(2) certain lands in the Snoqualmie and Gifford Pinchot National Forests, Washington, which comprise approximately one hundred and thirty thousand acres as depicted on a map entitled "Cougar Lakes Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 1970, which shall be known as the "Cougar Lakes Wilderness";

(3) certain lands in the Medicine Bow National Forest, Wyoming, which comprise approximately twenty-five thousand acres as depicted on a map entitled "Laramie Peak Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1969, which shall be known as the "Laramie Peak Wilderness";

(4) certain lands in the Bitterroot and Nez Perce National Forests, Idaho, which comprise approximately two hundred and fifty thousand acres as depicted on a map entitled "Upper Selway Wilderness—Proposed," dated December 1965, which shall be known as the "Upper Selway Wilderness";

(5) certain lands in the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, Oregon, which comprise approximately eighty thousand acres as depicted on a map entitled "Minam River Wilderness—Proposed," dated February 1969, which shall be known as the "Minam River Wilderness";

(6) certain lands in the Roosevelt and Arapaho National Forests, Colorado, which comprise approximately seventy-five thousand acres as depicted on a map entitled "Indian Peaks Wilderness—Proposed," dated March 1970, which shall be known as the "Indian Peaks Wilderness";

(7) certain lands in the Monongahela National Forest, West Virginia, comprised of three separate areas which shall be known as:

(a) the "Cranberry Wilderness" comprising approximately fifty-three thousand acres;

(b) the "Otter Creek Wilderness" comprising approximately fifty-three thousand acres; and

(c) the "Dolly Sods Wilderness" comprising approximately ten thousand two hundred and fifteen acres, all as depicted on maps dated March 1970;

(8) certain lands in the Tahoe National Forest, California, which comprise approximately thirty-six thousand acres as depicted on a map entitled "Granite Chief Wilderness—Proposed," dated March 1970, which shall be known as the "Granite Chief Wilderness"; and

(9) certain lands in the Flathead National Forest, Montana, which comprises approximately twenty-one thousand acres, as depicted on a map entitled "Jewel Basin Wilderness—Proposed," dated October 1969, as revised October 1970, which shall be known as the "Jewel Basin Wilderness."

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of each wilderness area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

SEC. 3. Wilderness areas designated by this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

THE "TURNED-ON CRISIS"—WQED PITTSBURGH'S DRUG INFORMATION AND ACTION PROJECT

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, WQED, Pittsburgh, the Nation's first community educational television station has developed a month of special programing to educate the public on drug abuse which is an outstanding example of how noncommercial television can serve as a catalyst for community dialog on important issues.

The October project includes more than 120 hours of prime-time special programing on drug information, prevention, rehabilitation, and legislation, as well as the convening of more than 108 community-based "Mini-town Meetings" in more than 27 locations throughout western Pennsylvania. It was my pleasure recently to appear on one of these programs.

The Public Broadcasting Service, created by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, National Educational Television, and the Nation's public television stations to operate the national interconnection of noncommercial television stations, advises they have already been in discussion with WQED and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting about a national series on drug information which is to develop from this massive community effort on the part of WQED.

I was appalled to learn that WQED estimates that one of every four schoolchildren in our county has experimented with drugs, and as I stated during the floor debate when the House passed the Comprehensive Drug Abuse and Prevention Act of 1970 in September, current estimates cite 10,000 to 15,000 drug users in the county.

WQED deserves high praise for their monumental response to the devastating problem of drug abuse, and I hope that every teenager, parent, teacher, school administrator and all concerned citizens have been able to watch and participate in the project.

Those of us who sponsored legislation to provide funds for public broadcasting in the Congress can take great pride from programs such as WQED's "Turned-On Crisis."

I include for the attention of my colleagues a recent Pittsburgh Post Gazette editorial commending the series in support of my remarks:

THE TURNED-ON CRISIS

The drug scene is not one which lends itself to instant analysis. Narcotics addiction is a subject which is more conducive to hysteria than to rational appraisal. Drug abuse is no longer largely confined to squalid slum areas but has spread insidiously to every sector of society. The horror of drug-related deaths and the rising incidence of drug addiction have seared the national consciousness. The need for a dispassionate survey of the narcotics problem becomes more urgent with each passing hour.

Few projects in the history of public television are more relevant to the times than the series of nightly programs on drug abuse launched this week by Station WQED. The month-long series "The Turned-On Crisis" will systematically examine the psychological and social roots of drug abuse, describe the biochemical effects of narcotics, and explore techniques of prevention and rehabilitation.

The staff of WQED has displayed typical intelligence and energy in enlisting the services of a wide range of professional advisers, organizations, religious and ethnic groups to produce an in-depth study of the drug problem in Western Pennsylvania. "The

Turned-On Crisis" project will feature documentaries, panel discussions, weekly Town Meetings and commercial films dealing with drug abuse.

As an adjunct to the provocative Town Meetings, WQED has organized community Mini-Town Meetings throughout a ten-county viewing area. These discussion groups will approach the complex problems of drug addiction with special reference to the needs of their own communities.

Thoughtful viewers of "The Turned-On Crisis" series, running through October at 8:00 p.m., may achieve fresh insights into a social question which directly or indirectly involves them. The WQED team which undertook the organization of a vast diversity of material deserves the gratitude of a community it has labored to enlighten.

HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION OF 1956

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, known in America as Hungarian Freedom Day, October 23 marks the 14th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. I take this opportunity to join with freedom loving people everywhere to commemorate this noble attempt of a spirited people to win self-determination for their nation, a basic right of all of the world's peoples.

On October 23, 1956, a group of university students in Budapest organized a rally demanding independence, free elections, and the end of Soviet domination. Joined by massive crowds in the streets of the capital, the crowd grew in size and intensity until Premier Gero called Hungarian police and Soviet troops to the scene. Firing aimlessly into the crowd, those troops ignited mass insurrections all over the country.

The demonstration had become a revolution, organized and directed by revolutionary councils and committees who led the inflamed Hungarian people to the seizure of the reigns of government.

On October 30, Imre Nagy, a liberal, former premier established a ruling coalition government and restored the Hungarian nation to its pre-Communist state. The old one-party domination of the Communists was abolished, free elections were planned, and preliminary steps were taken to secure the withdrawal of all Soviet occupation troops. It appeared that the revolution had succeeded and that the Russians would not forcibly interfere. All over Hungary, the people rejoiced in the long-awaited establishment of a free and independent nation.

But the fruits of revolution were not allowed to attain their expected permanency. Suddenly, on November 4, Soviet troops surrounded the capital of Budapest and blocked off all access to and from the country. Hoping for foreign assistance and the intervention of the United Nations, Premier Nagy determined to resist the Soviet intimidation which culminated in the invasion of Budapest on November 4.

Refusing to back down in the face of Soviet tanks, the Hungarian people struggled with their invaders for weeks, while thousands were killed and an estimated 160,000 fled the country. For many weeks after, a general strike paralyzed the nation, demonstrating the continued resistance of the Hungarians to Soviet oppression.

Ultimately crushing the rebellion, the Soviet Union extended even more repressive restrictions on Hungarian freedom and dispatched an army of 80,000 occupation troops to subdue and supervise the rebellious people.

From 1957 to 1958, the Soviet reprisals resulted in the execution of Premier Nagy and thousands of his supporters. Many more thousands were imprisoned or forced to leave the country.

The courageous stand of the Hungarian people, taken against an alien and repressive regime will long stand as an inspiration to free people and those who long to be free. Those thousands did not die in vain, for their cause will one day be vindicated when all nations everywhere will win the right to a free and unencumbered independence. Let us never forget the thosuands of slain Hungarians who fought and died for that goal.

THE 14TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, in October 1956, the people of Hungary told the world dramatically that they wished an end to the Communist domination of their country.

The tragedy that followed is well known. But less well known is the continued determination of Hungarians still living in their country, and the many thousands who voted with their feet and who now live in the United States, to resist what is being done to Hungary by the foreign power which dominates there.

On this 14th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution it seems appropriate to have printed in the RECORD the lead article in the October 1970 issue of the Hungarian Freedom Fighter.

The author of the article is anonymous.

The article, entitled, "The New Generation, 14 Years After the Revolution" merits the attention of all who respect and admire the Hungarian people for what they sought to accomplish for themselves and their children 14 years ago.

The article was brought to my attention by Mr. Istvan B. Gereben, copresident of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation.

The article follows:

THE NEW GENERATION, 14 YEARS AFTER THE REVOLUTION

(NOTE.—This article was written by an intellectual American tourist who—contrary to many others confused by propaganda—perceived the real attitude of the young Hungarian generation. And he was only dramatically confirmed by the three young Hungarians who recently escaped by forcing a Rumanian aircraft, bound to Prague, to alter its course and land in Munich. Nevertheless, we are absolutely sure that this young Hungarian generation will be fighting for freedom the same way as we did in 1956, would the circumstances allow or force them to fight.)

The opera season in Budapest's Erkel theater opened this fall with Erkel's classical masterpiece Bank Ban, a tale of Hungary oppressed by foreigners. With words lent the libretto by the renowned author, Jozsef Katona, the opera's hero Tiborc agonizes "They have torn the soul from this land." And so it seems today.

The Magyars last grasp for freedom in 1956 was in many ways the turning point, not alone in politics and economics, but in the spiritual dynamics of the new, socialist, generation. Their hope was crushed. The Party, never really swayed by the popular demand for relaxation and reform, was to remain intransigent on the issues of substance. The West, to which Hungary had traditionally tied her culture and linked her values, was not to be counted on for more than condolences. The nation of Magyars, could not reassert her identity. The terror of the tanks gave way to the calming pleas of Kádár. Some old economic grievances with the Soviet Union were redressed. . . . But no rise in the living standard could efface the ultimate spiritual disillusionment of the youth who had led and bled for the Revolution.

As Kádár learned to accommodate the Kremlin, the new generation learned to bend its spirit to the State and the System. Revolutionaries became evolutionaries; idealists, existentialists; believers, agnostics. Cynicism filled the spiritual vacuum.

The young were saddled with a double disability; psychotic amnesia aggravated by an enforced myopia. The amnesia is both cultural and personal. The trauma of the 1956 October, coupled with an inborn tendency to cast out the old, herald in the new, have created a generation gap of almost incurable proportions. Memory of Hungary's past glories, of her national dream, are little mentioned by the regime; proper schooling assures that they are decently forgotten. The trappings of national destiny, gypsy music (cigány), folk-songs (népdal) and dances (csárdás) have become antique oddities, tourist attractions. Just as lifeless are the personal hopes of better days to come.

The myopia has been produced by the lack of contact with rest of the world, and the West in particular. Mass media are carefully censored before inappropriate material from Western sources can filter in; what does penetrate is as harmless as the Beatles and blue-jeans. More importantly, travel outside the country is prohibited to those under thirty; there is no chance for a personal awakening. Without contact, there can be no substantive comparison of system, ideologies, lifestyles. Views become sterile, ideas parochial.

Without a past, without perspective, the youth is bound to a contemporary reality which totally forms his goals, beliefs, and symbols. Is it a reality which dictates poverty, anonymity, and loneliness.

The poverty enforced by the economics of Soviet-style socialism at once equalizes society and forces the individual to be ultra-pragmatic. A suit will cost a young man a month's wages, a motorcycle more than a year's; an automobile is so far beyond reach that it can be regarded only as a status symbol. Dinner with friends at a better restaurant is another month's salary (so you eat, and meet, at home); a modish dress for the wife is two months' work (so she sews, or knits, her own); a major household appliance another year's (so you do without).

The government and massive bureaucracy depersonalise, kill personal incentive. Since the State decides what your job will be, how fast you will rise, what you will be paid, there is neither ambition nor desire for career. Neither is there incentive to work hard, to please the customer; and there is a negative incentive to be innovative—it rocks the precautiously balanced boat. It is a country of PhD taxi drivers, of MA secretaries, of incredibly rude retail clerks. After all, it's easier on them if you never walk through that door—and they let you know it! There are a few who, simply to sustain some semblance of self-pride, work hard, think, innovate. They become the living proof that all of it gets you exactly nowhere.

State engendered fear atomimizes society. Almost any groan or gripe about current conditions, favorable mention of the West, undue personal ambition, or praise of pre-War Hungary can be treasonous. Such thoughts are aired in discrete tones and in private. Only the home and Western visitors can be trusted. That may explain why any given taxi driver, during any given five minute ride, can verbally decimate Lenin, Kadar and modern Hungary. But in a home in which both husband and wife must work even the basic social unit loses the warmth and safety of close interpersonal contact. The divorce rate has grown almost fifty percent since 1949, the length of an average marriage dropped to seven years. Even in the happy marriage there is no inheritance, for the children. Neither fame nor fortune can be built outside the Party. The children face a hard world; alone, anonymous, poor.

They learn to be clever, shrewd, to forget self-esteem, to be intensely egotistic. Many girls of better than average look (and there is an incredible proportion of them in the Magyar lot) learn to use them. Vaci Street and the Cafe Belle Italia have become the most awesome amateur Reeperbahn in Europe. For the pleasure of being seen with a Westerner in the best hotels and bars, or having a meal in one of the better restaurants, they offer the only thing they have to give. They start at sixteen.

As for the general state of Hungarian morality it is unwise to practice your religion publicly, send your children to private schools, talk with or harbor foreigners, have loud parties at home. One scientist was forced to choose between the presidency of a scientific commission and sending his children to a Catholic school. A man of strong persuasions, he opted for the Catholic schooling, was relegated to janatorial duties in a provincial factory.

If you are one of the lucky ones who earn enough to save something from your salary, you must engage in patently illegal black market exchange and Western bank accounts to sustain the value of your savings. Swiss bank accounts so acutely drained the economy that the regime was recently forced to change the laws to permit retention of a part of legal foreign currency earnings in hard currency accounts at the State bank. One may infer that the niggardly retention quota has not induced many to "save Hungarian"—black market rates have failed to show any fluctuation.

If you are not caught and jailed for black-marketeering or hoodwinking the wrong official, you may consider yourself lucky. If you own a private business, the State may step in at the moment it becomes too profitable, or embarrassingly large. Hungarian businessmen are grand masters of the tax and revenue evasion game. Outside of the Party, a real career is open only to professional athletes, and scientists in strategic fields. Yet in 1968 statistics, the total of all athletes and scientists is a fraction of one percent of the population.

Lacking hope of any real career, wealth, or security, the young must be content with their phantoms, their symbols. As in Plato's cave, the symbols are taken for reality itself. For some indeterminant reason, the symbols are maniacally lifted from the West. They are chosen with all the perspicacity of a baby in a candy store. Gloss, color, ready availability are main determinants of selection. No matter that the rock records are atrociously out of date, or worse, Polish copies of the Beatles; that blue jeans are not elegant evening wear. Popular American songs are sung in Hungarian night clubs with great gusto and an appalling lack of soul.

The car of a visiting Westerner is appraised by its size alone; a gigantesque ancient Mercedes runs a long lead over a small new XKE. Simultaneously, there is a noticeable decline of interest in the music and theatre of the masters. The price of a pair of imported panty-hose equals that of a dozen concerts; panty-hose are selling like hotcakes. To have a few such things is to be wealthy, to have a job that pays enough to buy them is a career, to enjoy them for a while is security.

If Western youth is materialistic, that of modern day Hungary with its petty nickel and dime materialism makes us seem idealist. If sexual freedom is the method in Western schools, consider a country in which every Friday is ("step right up—absolutely free") Abortion Day, where the live birth rate is one of the world's lowest. The American Now Generation is existentialist by choice, that of Hungary by compulsion. Hungary's suicide rate is the world's highest. If we have become a less spiritual generation, theirs is adamantly agnostic. (Is there a God where there is no hope for the future?)

And the cause of this degradation? Enslavement. Soviet Hungarian speaking officials still dictate every important Hungarian bureaucrat. Hungary's economy remains totally subservient to the USSR. People are still jailed for expressing themselves. The young still remember the brutal aftermath of the Revolution. They fear a repetition, yet they cannot surrender. So they destroy themselves the only way they can; through self-degradation.

GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, in June of this year I joined with my colleagues, Senators SCOTT, HARTKE, and HART, in introducing S. 4026, a bill to establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania. General Kosciuszko, a Polish-American patriot, contributed significantly to the success of the American Revolution, and I think it is entirely fitting that we make his home in Philadelphia a historic site.

The Philadelphia Historical Commission adopted a resolution on September 29, 1970, memorializing the President and Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior to take all possible steps to obtain passage of S. 4026 and its companion bill in the House, H.R. 18161, in this session of Congress. I fully support this resolution and ask that it be reprinted in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the preservation, protection, and enhancement of all historically significant buildings has done much to bolster Philadelphia's rich heritage involving the birth of our nation; and

Whereas, the brick house at 301 Pine Street, built by a member of the Carpenters' Company in 1775, was the last residence in America of General Thaddeus Kosciuszko, a hero of the American Revolution, and played an important role in his life; and

Whereas, the President and Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Department of the Interior are engaged in saving such historic sites as tributes to the contributions of individuals who have helped to make this nation what it is; and

Whereas, a number of Senators and Congressmen have introduced identical bills to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish General Kosciuszko's last residence in America as a national historic site; and

Whereas, the sponsors of this legislation and millions of their fellow Americans are anxious to restore the house in which Thomas Jefferson frequently visited General Kosciuszko in time for the Nation's Bicentennial Celebration: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Philadelphia Historical Commission, That we hereby respectfully memorialize the President and Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior to take all possible steps to obtain passge of H.R. 18161 and S. 4026 in this session of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chairman of the Philadelphia Historical Commission transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the two United States Senators from Pennsylvania and to each Representative from Philadelphia in the Congress of the United States.

PETITION FROM VIETNAM IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 19241

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, 20 members of the 37th Infantry Platoon Scout Dog, supporting the 1st Air Cavalry Division Airmobile in Vietnam, have asked that their petition in behalf of my bill, H.R. 19241, which provides for the humane disposition of military dogs, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am proud to insert the supporting statement of these men in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and do so with my sincere appreciation for their concern and interest.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
37TH INFANTRY PLATOON SCOUT DOG,
APO San Francisco, October 3, 1970.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We members of the 37th Infantry Platoon Scout Dog supporting the 1st

Air Cav Division in Vietnam read of your proposal to redeploy war dogs to the U.S. after their service overseas and would like to express our wholehearted support for the measure.

As scout dog handlers our mission is to walk point for infantry units, and we are able to testify to the service military dogs perform for the men in Vietnam. A common regret among handlers has always been that the dogs were unable to return to the states. Thus, we, who work with the dogs covered in your bill, stand behind your work, and in the hope that it will further passage we members of the 37th and other units using dogs are sending this petition for entry into the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

Sgt. Daryl Yoder, Lt. Glenn M. Flake, Sp5c. George M. Hardaway, vet. tech., Sp4c. William R. Kenney, vet. tech., Sp4c. Ronald D. Smitley, Sp4c. Larry V. Dugan, and Sp4c. Gary Danns.

Sp4c. Dean A. Fulton, Sp4c. Kenneth M. Sloan, Pfc. James D. Block, Sp4c. Thomas A. Nelson, Cpl. Ronald E. Howard, Sp4c. Arthur F. Schneck, and Pfc. Donald DeLay.

Pfc. Richard A. Danner, Pfc. Gilbert W. Blunt, Pfc. Lawrence E. MacPierson, Pfc. Paul V. Wassermann, Pfc. Dennis L. LaMaster, and Sp4c. David J. Chasman.

FULTON SPONSORS VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING LEGISLATION

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I am privileged to join with the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) in sponsorship of two major pieces of legislation designed to assist our returning veterans in this grim time of unemployment and high mortgage interest rates.

The need for this legislation springs from the administration's record of neglect of our veterans and from the administration's fiscal and economic policies which have tended to support high interest rates and growing unemployment.

The first bill, necessitated by the excessive unemployment which the administration's fiscal and economic policies have generated, would guarantee a job opportunity at an appropriate level to those veterans who for one reason or another choose not to enroll in an educational program or have no need to do so.

The high level of unemployment which we are now experiencing is making it more difficult for veterans to obtain employment than when they entered service. They, least of all, should suffer as a result of a decline in the economy that occurred while they were defending the Nation.

Also, the inflation which has, in part, been caused by the war economy, has increased interest rates and made it increasingly difficult for veterans to make sizable downpayments. The result is that they are considered poor prospects in the conventional market.

This would be alleviated by the second bill I am introducing which would permit veterans who are interested in purchasing a home to do so on the same basis as student veterans and other students who are able to finance their education under the guaranteed loan program or the Veterans' Educational Assistance Act.

I see no reason why the veteran seeking a home for his family should not have the same credit benefits as one seeking education in one of our institutions of higher learning.

THE COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER ACT

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, regretably the House did not have an opportunity to work its will prior to our election recess on H.R. 19519, the Comprehensive Manpower Act.

The bill has been scheduled, however, for consideration on Tuesday, November 17.

While I regret the delay, it may well have been useful in that Members will now have had an opportunity to study the contents of the legislation in detail and to clear up any misconceptions an initial hasty review might have created.

On October 14 several of our colleagues spoke out against certain provisions of H.R. 19519. For the record, I would simply like to clarify some of the statements made by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

A careful reading of H.R. 19519 and the accompanying House Report No. 1557 will show that this bill represents a significant departure from the Federal approach to manpower programs in the past. Under the present system, the Secretary of Labor now has over 10,000 direct contracts with States, local governments, public and private organizations, and so forth for the operation of manpower training programs. This has strained the ability of the Secretary to conduct these programs with maximum efficiency; created duplication and inefficiency; and most importantly frustrated the efforts of the individual at the local level to receive the help he so desperately needs.

H.R. 19519 would focus most of the manpower activities being conducted through 300 to 350 prime sponsors.

H.R. 19519 would consolidate most of the major Federal manpower programs in operation today and provide for their coordination of the other programs which are maintained under separate statutory authority. Those programs which will be decategorized under H.R. 19519 include MDTA institutional training, OJT, programs in correctional institutions, JOBS—job opportunity in the business sector—CEP—concentrated employment program—Neighborhood Youth Corps, Operation Mainstream, and New Careers. Under H.R. 19519, rather than prescribing at the national level, a specific, uniform combination of services which will be provided locally, title I authorizes the Secretary of Labor, principally through agreements with Governors and mayors of larger cities, acting as "prime sponsors" to provide a comprehensive delivery system for manpower services including the types of programs and services which formerly were provided by the categorical programs listed above.

In addition, each prime sponsor must establish a manpower service counsel who will represent other agencies, organizations, and institutions who operate programs related to manpower training and placement and are necessary for its success, such as vocational education and rehabilitation, social service programs, apprenticeship programs, business, labor, veterans representatives and representatives of the poor.

Thus, it is untrue that H.R. 19519 "offers a renewal of the same old familiar programs that have offered training without jobs and have spent money without tangible evidence of success."

Second, it was alleged that the role in H.R. 19519 given to the community action agencies was such as to "make it impossible to have a meaningful delivery of manpower programs at the local level."

Community action agencies have a history of involvement in manpower programs for the poor, it is thus important for them to be represented on the manpower service councils along with vocational educators, employment service personnel, apprenticeship people and others who have all been involved in operation or service aspects of manpower programing. As a part of the council, CAA's like the other participants will be involved in planning and writing the prime sponsors comprehensive plan and application for assistance. They are specifically mentioned in section 104(b)(6), but section 104(b)(4) also provides for similar participation of other council members. Again, in section 106(3) CAA's are specifically assured the right of review of a prime sponsor's application, however, since the CAA's are members of the Manpower Service Council, they along with other agencies will be involved in the planning and application process from the start. Further this right of review is not a right of approval or rejection, but merely review and any group can submit similar comments to the Secretary for his consideration in accepting or rejecting a plan.

In section 105(b)(5) of the bill CAA's along with other community based organizations serving the poverty community, must be given an opportunity to participate in the conduct of the programs. This is similar to section 105(b)(6) which says that the services and facilities of such groups as the employment service, vocational education and

rehabilitation agencies, area skill centers, local educational agencies, postsecondary training and education institutions must be utilized to the extent appropriate in carrying out local plans.

In all of the above situations, CAA's, along with other manpower related organizations, are expected and encouraged to participate. Lack of participation by any of these groups would make the local or State manpower plan and program less than comprehensive. Their participation is designed to enhance rather than thwart the success of a comprehensive program at the local level.

CAA's are given the opportunity to be "prime sponsors" if and only if a unit—or combination of units—of general local government eligible to be a prime sponsor does not submit an acceptable plan. Review of a rejected plan, by the way, is subject to a public hearing where all elements of the community must be heard. If a CAA did qualify to submit a plan it must represent the particular geographical area, and most important it must meet all the requirements which governmental prime sponsors meet, thus it must demonstrate an ability to formulate and carry out a plan, it must have its plan approved, and it would be advised by a manpower service council.

The proper role of CAA's was discussed at length during committee hearings. We heard from Wesley Hjornevik, Deputy Director of OEO, Stephen W. Berman, vice chairman of the Connecticut Manpower Executives Association, which represent all of the CAA manpower administrations in Connecticut, and William Freeman, representing the National Association of Neighborhood Youth Corps Directors, which is affiliated with the National Association for Community Development. CAA's role was also discussed with business, labor, academic, education, employment service and other witnesses which appeared before the Committee.

It was also alleged that H.R. 19519 downgraded the role of State governments. While that role is not as strong as I envisioned in my bill H.R. 10908, it must be emphasized that our House committee strengthened the role of the States over what the Senate provided in their bill, S. 3867. Under H.R. 19519, any State seeking assistance under the Comprehensive Manpower Act or the Wagner-Peyser Act shall submit an annual State comprehensive manpower plan to the Secretary which provides for coordination and cooperation of State agencies involved in manpower services; sets forth a plan for the development and sharing of resources and facilities; and provides for coordination of employment service programs with those conducted under the Comprehensive Manpower Act. This virtually assures manpower planning at the State level, since every State participated in the Wagner-Peyser Act, and this plan will give the States the background and information they need to intelligently comment on plans submitted by local prime sponsors, a right which is guaranteed to the Governor, and to formulate their own plans for State operated programs.

Finally, the gentlewoman from Oregon stated that under H.R. 19519:

This new program of public employment can now become a permanent new way of life.

We took careful pains to prevent this from happening and in fact just the opposite is intended to be the case. Under section 302(h) each application for a public service employment program must include objectives for the movement of persons into public or private employment not supported under this act and section 302(i) provides that if the employer has not achieved these objectives, the Secretary shall reduce the Federal share in any continuation or extension of the agreement unless certain conditions made compliance impossible. This carrot and stick formula is specifically designed to move people off subsidized employment. In addition, no person could even be considered for participation in a subsidized job unless every reasonable opportunity to find suitable regular employment had been exhausted, and section 307 obligates the Secretary of Labor to maintain a continuing review of the status of each enrollee to assure that he is receiving consideration for referral to suitable regular employment or to manpower training programs.

This explanation has been lengthy, Mr. Speaker, and yet the importance of H.R. 19519 to the reform and improvement of our manpower programs demands that the facts be clearly stated.

PRAYER—VOLUNTARY OR IMPOSED

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks the text of a letter I have addressed to a child constituent in Tennessee on the subject of prayer in schools, together with statements on the subject by several religious groups or churches.

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

NOVEMBER 13, 1970.

Miss LORETTA MCMULLIN,
139 West Lincoln Street,
Alamo, Tenn.

DEAR LORETTA: Your letter is in my hand. I have not at any time voted against or expressed opposition to voluntary prayer in school. On the contrary, I support and have always supported the right of voluntary prayer by anyone anywhere, a guarantee of the United States Constitution.

What I am and have been against, both as a citizen and as a Senator, is a proposed amendment to our Constitution to give to an official of government the power of "providing" a prayer and thus to impose a particular prayer upon school children and perhaps upon others. This, in my view, would be an abridgement of the right of religious freedom.

I am glad that you and other disturbed children in Tennessee have written me about this because a clarification of my record and views on this question, even now, might be in your interest. Yes, Loretta, I believe in God and in prayer, as do other Senators and many church groups and religious leaders who stand as I do on this matter. But is reverential worship and true prayer a matter of politically "providing" for a practice or manner of so-called prayer, or is worship of God and prayer a matter of the spirit and devout supplication from the heart of the one who prays?

If government at any level should be granted the constitutional authority for "providing" for prayer in public buildings, then it can provide for a particular kind of prayer and can thus exclude other kinds of prayer. In other words, a government or school official, clothed with such constitutional authority and protection, could impose his own religious preference upon students or others, however much their own religious beliefs might differ. An official, thus empowered, could provide for either a Christian prayer or a Moslem prayer, a Protestant prayer, a Catholic prayer, a Jewish prayer, a Quaker prayer, a "non-denominational" prayer (whatever a "non-denominational" prayer is, or rather whatever the Courts might ultimately decide this to mean), or he could provide for the exclusion of either or all these forms of prayer in favor of still some other kind of prayer. I wonder if the members of your seventh grade class would consider this to be religious freedom?

I have strongly believed since childhood that every American citizen has the right under our Constitution to worship God according to the dictates of his or her own conscience, not according to the dictates of any government official or school official or any other political official whatsoever at any level.

As you develop and advance in your studies, you will learn that many of the bitterest, bloodiest and most heart-rending struggles in history were caused by arguments over the right of each man to worship God in his own way.

It may seem like a small thing, Loretta, and now politically expedient, to give a governmental agency—a school board, a school superintendent, a Governor, or a court—the power of "providing" prayer, but freedom is more often lost in small steps than in big ones. America was founded on the principle of freedom of religion and separation of church and state. I believe this is best for the government, best for religion, and best for the people.

With best wishes to you and to all your classmates, I am

Sincerely,

ALBERT GORE.

P.S.—For your further benefit and that of your class, I am attaching hereto the positions taken on this question by various church and religious groups.

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENTS ADOPTED BY VARIOUS RELIGIOUS BODIES [1]

1. Resolution adopted by the *Southern Bapist Convention,* meeting in Atlantic City,

---

[1] Complete texts of these statements are available on request from the public relations office, Southern Baptist Convention, 460 James Robertson Parkway, Nashville, Tenn.

N.J., May 22, 1964, and reaffirmed by the SBC Meeting in Detroit, Mich., May 27, 1966:

"We, the messengers of the Convention hereby affirm our support for the concepts and the vocabulary of the First Amendment, including both its prohibition upon government roles in religious programs and its protection of free exercise of religion for the people.

"We appeal to the Congress of the United States to allow the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States to stand as our guarantee of religious liberty, and we oppose the adoption of any further amendment to that Constitution respecting establishment of religion or free exercise thereof. . . ."

2. Resolution adopted by the *American Baptist Convention,* meeting in Atlantic City N.J., May 22, 1964, and reaffirmed by the ABC meeting in Knasas City, Mo., May, 1966.

"Baptists have long opposed any compulsion to conformity in religious belief or in the practice of religion. The first amendment has supported this freedom. The proposed change in that amendment could weaken it and bring the power of the state to bear on individuals to conform and to participate in prescribed religious practices.

"An amendment to permit compulsory Bible reading and prayer in the public schools is not only a danger to the freedom of non-believers, it is also a threat to the religious well-being of the believer. It is because of a deep respect for worship, and the recognition that prayer is essential and should be a vital encounter between man and God, that Baptists oppose devotional exercises that are more rote than worship. Therefore we affirm our belief in the separation of church and state as written in the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States . . . ."

3. Resolution adopted by *General Conference of the United Methodist Church* meeting in Dallas, Tex., April 23, 1968:

"The United Methodist Church is opposed to all establishment of religion by government. Therefore, we are in agreement with the Supreme Court's decision declaring unconstitutional required worship services as part of a public school program. We believe these decisions enhance and strengthen religious liberty within the religious pluralism that characterizes the United States of America . . ."

4. Statement adopted by the *Board of Parish Education, Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod,* July 29, 1966:

"The Board of Parish Education of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, feels that the Dirksen Amendment fails to recognize fully the religious pluralism of the American scene. We believe that Christians cannot join with non-Christians in addressing God in circumstances that deny Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord. We believe likewise that non-Christians should neither be expected to participate in Christian prayer, nor should they expect Christians to join them in prayers that deny Christ.

"We support the idea that home and church have the responsibility for a religious education which seeks commitment and provides time for prayer or devotional exercises . . ."

5. Resolution adopted by the *National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church,* meeting May 26–28, 1964:

"Whereas recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court relate only to prayer and Bible reading which are part of official exercises in public schools; and

"Whereas we believe that these decisions are not hostile to religion, and that it is no proper functions of government to inculcate religious beliefs or habits of worship; and

"Whereas we are advised that nothing in these decisions prevents voluntary expressions of reverence or religious sentiments in the schools, nor forbids the offering of prayers on public occasions, such as inaugurations;

". . . Now, therefore, be it resolved that the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church record its considered opinion that United States of America which seek to permit devotional exercises in our public schools should be opposed."

6. Action of the 176th *General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.,* meeting in Oklahoma City, May 1964:

"A careful reading of the . . . Supreme Court's decision will indicate that our children may still pray in school as the spirit moves them. Teachers may still teach objectively about the religious heritage of our country. The Bible may be used in connection with courses in world history, literature, etc. Christians and others with differing beliefs in God may still invoke His name and His aid as they fulfill the duties of public office. . . .

"No social issue ever pronounced on by a recent general assembly has been more thoroughly and responsibly studied than this one. The committee recommends that the General Assembly affirm the 175th General Assembly's approval of the church-state support" (which urged opposition to any change in the wording of the First Amendment to the Constitution.)

7. Statement of Policy voted by the *Board for Homeland Ministries, United Church of Christ,* May 28, 1964:

"Measures now pending in Congress, such as the Becker amendment, would give legal sanction to prayer and devotional Bible reading in the public schools. Proponents of this legislation contend that such Bible reading and prayer are 'good things' and therefore belong in the public schools. They close their eyes to the real issues raised by the proffered constitutional amendments. These issues are religious liberty and the roles of government, the home, and religious institutions in the practice of religion in America. . . . The Supreme Court has properly ruled that it is not the business of government to write and prescribed prayer for public schools. . . ."

STATEMENT OF CONCERN

We, the undersigned, deeply regret that the matter of prayer and Bible reading in public schools has been interjected as a "political issue" in the U.S. Senate election in Tennessee. As religious leaders, we obviously are concerned about prayer and Bible reading in public schools, as well as in all other places. We do not feel however, that this issue should be dramatized in such as to garner votes for one candidate or create opposition to another.

We would remind the members of our respective religious faiths, and the public at large, of the votes taken by many of our national, regional and local religious organizations warning Congress of the dangers in changing the First Amendment to the Constitution. Such statements have been adopted by the Southern Baptist Convention, the United Methodist Church, the Lutheran Church in America, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the International Convention of Christian Churches, the United Church of Christ, the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., the Legal Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the American Baptist Convention, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, and many others.

We believe that the First Amendment provides adequate protection for freedom of religion and separation of church and state. We oppose any effort to change this cherished "Bill of Rights" provision.

Furthermore, it is our considered opinion after study of the issue that the U.S. Supreme Court did NOT ban or prohibit voluntary prayer or Bible reading in public schools. Rather, it prohibited authorship of compulsory prayers by public officials, and prohibited official sponsorship of religious devotions in public schools.

We deeply regret that an emotional appeal is being made for Tennessee voters to support or oppose candidates on the basis of their voting records on so-called "prayer amendments" to the Constitution. We would remind the members of our denominations that those Congressmen who voted against such amendments were concurring with the actions taken by these official church bodies.

We would not want anyone, however, to interpret our statement of concern as endorsing one candidate over another. Tennesseans should vote their convictions on November 3, but they should beware of emotionalism on the issue of Bible reading and prayer in public schools.

Bishop H. Ellis Finger, Tennessee Conference, United Methodist Church.

Rev. Leland Caulder, pastor, First Lutheran Church (American Lutheran).

Rev. Allen Estill, regional minister, Tennessee Association of Christian Churches (Disciples of Christ).

Bishop Joseph A. Durick, Roman Catholic Bishop of Tennessee.

Msgr. Leo Siener, director of Catholic Charities for Tennessee.

Rev. Foy Valentine, executive secretary, Southern Baptist Convention Christian Life Commission.

Jim Newton, Assistant Director, Baptist Press (Southern Baptist).

Rabbi Randall Falk, The Temple, Nashville.

Rev. Thomas C. Barr, minister, Trinity Presbyterian Church.

Rev. D. P. McGeache III, minister Westminister Presbyterian Church.

Rev. Kelly Miller Smith, minister, First Baptist Church, Capitol Hill, Nashville (American Baptist).

Rev. Roy Clark, minister, West End Methodist Church, Nashville.

CONGRESSMAN FRASER'S VOTING RECORD 1969–70

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to set out in the RECORD a list of my votes on all rollcalls during 1969 and through September 30, 1970.

The description of each bill or motion voted on was prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. In many cases I have made additional statements in the RECORD, expressing my views at the time of the vote. I stand ready to describe more fully the nature of any issue and to explain my vote.

The record referred to follows:

1969 VOTING RECORD OF HON. DONALD M. FRASER, OF MINNESOTA

Yes—For No—Against NV—Not voting NVA—Not voting, paired against NVF—Not voting, paired for

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
2	Jan. 3	To elect the Speaker. (McCormack 241; G. Ford 187; "Present" 2)	McM
3	Jan. 3	H. Res. 1: Previous question: to permit Mr. Powell to take the oath of office. (Failed 176 to 248)	YEA
4	Jan. 3	H. Res. 1: Second attempt to order the previous question. (Failed 172 to 252)	YEA
5	Jan. 3	H. Res. 1: MacGregor amendment to establish a special committee to investigate Mr. Powell's right to take the oath and to his seat. (Failed 131 to 291)	NAY
6	Jan. 3	H. Res. 2: Previous question: that Mr. Powell take the oath, be fined $25,000 and that his seniority begin as of the 91st Congress. (Passed 249 to 171)	YEA
7	Jan. 3	H. Res. 2: On passage: that Mr. Powell take the oath, be fined $25,000 and that his seniority begin as of the 91st Congress. (Passed 254 to 158, "Present" 6)	YEA
9	Jan. 6	Counting electoral votes. Objection to N.C. vote for George Wallace and Curtis LeMay in that they did not win a plurality in that state. (Failed 170 to 228)	YEA
14	Feb. 5	H. Con. Res. 124: To adjourn until February 17, 1969. (Passed 240 to 125)	YEA
16	Feb. 18	H. Res. 89: Previous question: to change name of Committee on Un-American Activities to Committee on Internal Security. (Passed 262 to 123)	NAY
17	Feb. 18	H. Res. 89: On passage: to change name of Committee on Un-American Activities to Committee on Internal Security. (Passed 307 to 80)	NAY
20	Mar. 12	H. R. 33: Recommittal motion: to increase U.S. participation in the International Development Association. (Failed 155 to 241)	NAY
21	Mar. 12	H.R. 33: On passage: to increase U.S. participation in the International Development Association. (Passed 247 to 150)	YEA
23	Mar. 18	S. 1058: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to extend authority of the President to submit reorganization plans. (Passed 335 to 44)	YEA
25	Mar. 18	H.R. 2171: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to establish a Commission on National Observances and Holidays. (Failed 164 to 213)	YEA
27	Mar. 19	H.R. 8508: On passage: to increase the public debt limit. (Passed 313 to 93)	YEA
31	Mar. 27	H. R. 7757: On passage: to authorize fiscal 1969 supplemental military appropriations for aircraft procurement and modification. (Passed 341 to 21)	NAY
33	Apr. 1	H. Res. 270: Recommittal motion: to authorize expenditure of certain funds by the Committee on Internal Security. (Failed 74 to 283)	YEA
34	Apr. 1	H. Res. 270: On passage: to authorize expenditure of certain funds by the Committee on Internal Security. (Passed 305 to 51)	NAY
37	Apr. 16	H. R. 4148: On passage: to amend Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. (Passed 392 to 1)	YEA
46	Apr. 23	H. R. 514: Green substitute amendment, as amended: to extend the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act for two years, to consolidate Titles II and III of ESEA and III(a) and IV(a) of NDEA, (Passed 235 to 184)	NAY
47	Apr. 23	H. R. 514: On passage: to extend programs of elementary and secondary education assistance, and for other purposes. (Passed 400 to 17; "Present" 1)	YEA
51	Apr. 29	H. R. 4153: On passage: to authorize fiscal 1970 appropriations for Coast Guard vessels, aircraft, and construction of shore and off-shore establishments. (Passed 384 to 2)	YEA
53	May 1	H. Res. 17: On passage: creating a select committee to investigate all aspects of crime in the U.S. (Passed 345 to 18)	YEA
55	May 6	H. R. 5554: On passage: to extend indefinitely the special milk program of the Child Nutrition Act. (Passed 384 to 2)	YEA
58	May 21	H. Res. 414: On passage: waiving all points of order against H.R. 11400 to make supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1969, and other purposes. (Passed 326 to 53)	NAY
59	May 21	H. R. 11400: Scherle amendment: to prohibit the use of funds in the bill for subsidizing interest on college construction loans to any institution not complying with the law which directs institutions to deny federal aid to students found guilty of participating in campus disorders. (Passed 329 to 61; "Present" 2)	NAY
60	May 21	H. R. 11400: On passage: fiscal 1969 supplemental appropriations. (Passed 349 to 40)	NAY
64	May 27	H.R. 11612: Conte amendment: to prohibit crop support payments in excess of $20,000 per annum to any producer, except for a sugar producer. (Passed 225 to 142)	YEA
65	May 27	H.R. 11612: On passage: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations to the Department of Agriculture and related agencies. (Passed 322 to 50)	YEA
66	May 27	H. Res. 424: On passage: to waive all points of order against section 502 (suspending the employment ceiling specified in P.L. 90-364) of H.R. 11582 making fiscal 1970 appropriations to the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and Independent Agencies. (Passed 345 to 12)	YEA
68	May 27	H.R. 11582: On Smith of Iowa amendment: to limit to $20,000 the total cost, exceeding revenues to the P.O. Dept., for providing postal service to any distributor of second-class mail. (Failed 100 to 239)	NV
69	May 27	H.R. 11582: On passage: to appropriate fiscal 1970 funds to the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and Independent Agencies. (Passed 326 to 6)	NV
72	June 2	H.R. 763: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to provide for a study of State laws and regulations governing the operation of youth camps. (Failed 151 to 152)	YEA
73	June 2	H.R. 693: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to provide VA hospital care for veterans 72 or older without their having to declare inability to pay, and for other purposes. (Passed 302 to 3)	YEA
76	June 4	H.R. 11102: On passage: to amend the Public Health Service Act relating to construction and modernization of hospitals and other facilities. (Passed 351 to 0; "Present" 1)	YEA
78	June 10	H.R. 11271: On passage: to authorize appropriations for N.A.S.A. for research and development, construction of facilities, research and program management, and other purposes. (Passed 330 to 52)	NAY
80	June 11	H.R. 1035: On passage: to prohibit encampments, sit-ins, or overnight use of parks or other public property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. (Passed 327 to 51)	NAY
85	June 18	H.R. 6543: Recommittal motion: to extend public health protection regarding cigarette smoking. (Failed 138 to 252; "Present" 3)	YEA
87	June 24	H.R. 12167: On passage: to authorize fiscal 1970 appropriations for Atomic Energy Commission. (Passed 406 to 3)	YEA
89	June 24	H.R. 12307: On passage: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations for independent offices and for H.U.D. (Passed 388 to 6)	YEA
91	June 25	H. Res. 357: On passage: to provide an additional clerk for all Members. (Passed 204 to 195)	YEA
93	June 25	H.R. 7906: On passage: to foster and regulate interstate commerce by providing system for taxation thereof. (Passed 311 to 87)	YEA
95	June 27	H.R. 8644: Adoption of conference report to make permanent temporary suspension of duty on chicory roots, and to relax limitations on aid to families with dependent children. (Passed 269 to 65)	NV
97	June 30	H.R. 12290: On passage: to continue the surtax and excise taxes on automobiles and communication services temporarily; to terminate investment credit; to provide low-income allowances. (Passed 210 to 205; "Present" 2)	NAY
99	July 8	H.R. 11249: Recommittal motion: to amend John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize additional funds. (Failed 162 to 217)	NAY
100	July 8	H.R. 11249: On passage: to amend John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize additional funds. (Passed 210 to 163)	YEA
102	July 9	H.R. 11400: Adoption of conference report to make supplemental fiscal 1969 appropriations. (Passed 348 to 49)	NV
103	July 10	H.R. 11702: On passage: to extend and improve provisions relating to medical libraries and related instrumentalities assistance in the Public Health Service Act. (Passed 370 to 3)	NV
104	July 10	H.R. 4284: On passage: to authorize appropriations for the Standard Reference Data Act. (Passed 365 to 2)	NV
106	July 15	H.R. 4018: On passage: to renew and extend certain sections of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. (Passed 273 to 103)	NV
109	July 17	H.R. 7491: Recommittal motion: to clarify tax liability of national banks. (Failed 123 to 227; "Present" 7)	NV
110	July 17	H.R. 7491: On passage: to clarify tax liability of national banks (Passed 345 to 4: "Present" 7)	NV
112	July 21	H.R. 11609: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to amend act of Sept. 9, 1963, authorizing entrance road to Great Smoky Mountains National Park. (Passed 341 to 3)	YEA
113	July 21	H.R. 11651: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to amend National School Lunch Act to provide free and reduced-priced meals to needy children not being reached. (Passed 352 to 5)	YEA
115	July 22	H.R. 12781: On passage: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations for Department of Interior and related agencies, as amended. (Passed 399 to 6)	YEA
119	July 23	H.R. 9825: Derwinski recommittal motion with instructions: to eliminate provision that benefits be calculated on basis of high-three-year average salary and that provision liberalizing benefits for Congressional employees. (Failed 129 to 281; "Present" 1)	NAY
120	July 23	H.R. 9825: On passage; to strengthen the financing of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund and liberalize some of its benefits. (Passed 359 to 48)	YEA
122	July 24	H.R. 12964: On passage: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations to Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies, as amended to provide additional funds for E.E.O.C. (Passed 366 to 31)	YEA
124	July 28	H.R. 9553: On passage: to amend D.C. Minimum Wage Act to authorize computation of overtime for hospital employees on a 14-day work period. (Passed 220 to 141)	NAY
125	July 28	H.R. 255: Recommittal motion: to authorize banks and other regulated lenders in D.C. to charge or deduct interest in advance on installment loans. (Passed 356 to 14; "Present" 2)	YEA
126	July 28	H.R. 2: On passage: to amend Federal Credit Union Act to provide for independent agency to supervise federally chartered credit unions. (Passed 357 to 10)	YEA

1969 VOTING RECORD OF HON. DONALD M. FRASER, OF MINNESOTA—Continued

Yes—For No—Against NV—Not voting NVA—Not voting, paired against NVF—Not voting, paired for

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
129	July 30	H.R. 13080: On passage: to temporarily extend surcharge for 15 days. (Passed 307 to 105)	YEA
131	July 31	H.R. 13111: On Joelson of N.J. amendment: to increase by $894,547,000 the funds in the bill for various aid-to-education assistance programs. (Passed 294 to 119)	YEA
132	July 31	H.R. 13111: On Sikes-Smith amendment: to prohibit monetary assistance to any individual involved in campus disorders and to any college or university which fails to cut-off aid to anyone convicted of disruptive campus activity. (Passed 316 to 95)	NAY
133	July 31	H.R. 13111: On passage as amended: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations for Depts. of Labor, H.E.W., and related agencies. (Passed 393 to 16)	YEA
136	Aug. 4	H.Res. 509: Agreeing to resolution: to concur in Senate amendments to H.R. 9951 to extend tax surcharge until Dec. 31, 1969. (Passed 237 to 170)	YEA
138	Aug. 4	H.J. Res. 764: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to authorize appropriations for President's Council on Youth Opportunity. (Passed 396 to 7)	YEA
139	Aug. 4	S. 1611: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to establish National Center on Educational Media and Material for the Handicapped. (Passed 365 to 22)	YEA
142	Aug. 5	H.R. 13018: Recommittal motion: to strike provision making picketing of military installation or personnel a crime. (Failed 87 to 323)	YEA
143	Aug. 5	H.R. 13018: On passage: to authorize construction at military installations. (Passed 376 to 30)	NAY
145	Aug. 6	H. Res. 513: On passage: to consider H.R. 13270 to reform income tax laws. (Passed 264 to 145)	YEA
148	Aug. 7	H.R. 13270: Recommittal motion: to reform income tax laws. (Failed 78 to 345)	NAY
149	Aug. 7	H.R. 13270: On passage: to reform income tax laws. (Passed 395 to 30)	YEA
153	Aug. 12	H. Res. 269: On passage: to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct investigations. (Passed 196 to 132)	NAY
155	Sept. 3	H.R. 10105: On passage: to amend National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Act to authorize fiscal 1970 and 1971 appropriations. (Passed 321 to 0)	NV
157	Sept. 4	H.R. 7621: On passage: to amend Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from hazardous mechanical, electrical, or thermal toys and other articles. (Passed 327 to 0)	YEA
158	Sept. 4	H.R. 12085: On passage: to amend Clean Air Act to extend research program relating to fuel and vehicles. (Passed 332 to 0)	YEA
161	Sept. 8	H.R. 11039: Recommittal motion: to amend further Peace Corps Act. (Failed 144 to 186)	NAY
162	Sept. 9	H.R. 11039: On passage: to amend further Peace Corps Act. (Passed 282 to 52)	NV
164	Sept. 9	H.J. Res. 247: On passage: relating to administration of the national park system. (Passed 334 to 55)	NAY
169	Sept. 15	H.R. 13194: On motion to suspend rules and pass: to amend Higher Education Act of 1965 to assure that students have reasonable access to loans for education. (Passed 322 to 60; "Present" 3)	YEA
176	Sept. 18	H.J. Res. 681: Recommittal motion: to propose amendment to the Constitution for direct election of President and Vice President. (Failed 162 to 245)	NAY
177	Sept. 18	H.J. Res. 681: On passage: to propose amendment to the Constitution for direct election of President and Vice President. (Passed 339 to 70)	YEA
179	Sept. 19	H.R. 13763: On passage: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations for the legislative branch. (Passed 177 to 94)	NV
181	Sept. 23	H.R. 12549: On passage: to amend Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to establish a Council on Environmental Quality. (Passed 372 to 15)	YEA
183	Sept. 24	S. 574: On passage: to authorize Secretary of Interior to investigate water resource developments with respect to feasibility. (Passed 364 to 16)	YEA
188	Sept. 29	H.R. 13369: On passage: to extend authority to set interest rates on mortgages to veterans. (Passed 338 to 21)	YEA
189	Sept. 29	H.R. 4314: On passage: to permit joint labor-management funds for scholarships and child care centers. (Passed 354 to 1)	YEA
193	Sept. 30	H.R. 13300: On passage: to amend Railroad Retirement Act and Railroad Retirement Tax Act. (Passed 372 to 17)	YEA
195	Oct. 1	H. Res. 561: On passage: to consider H.R. 14000, to authorize fiscal 1970 appropriations for military procurement. (Passed 324 to 61)	NAY
198	Oct. 3	H.R. 14000: Previous question: to authorize fiscal 1970 appropriations for military procurement, and to prescribe the personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces. (Passed 223 to 141)	NAY
199	Oct. 3	H.R. 14000: Recommital motion: by O'Konski with instructions to eliminate from the bill appropriations for research, development, and deployment of the ABM. (Failed 93 to 270; "Present" 2)	YEA
200	Oct. 3	H.R. 14000: On passage as amended: to authorize fiscal 1970 appropriations for military procurement, and to prescribe the personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces. (Passed 311 to 44; "Present" 1)	NAY
202	Oct. 6	H.R. 14127: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to carry out recommendations of the Joint Committee on Coinage. (Failed 205 to 148) [2/3ds vote required]	YEA
203	Oct. 6	H.R. 13304: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to provide educational assistance to gifted children. (Passed 352 to 0)	YEA
204	Oct. 6	H.R. 13310: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to provide programs for children with learning disabilities. (Passed 350 to 0)	YEA
205	Oct. 6	H.R. 372: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to establish new income exclusions for veterans and their widows, liberalize bar on payments to remarried widows, and liberalize oath requirement for hospitalization of veterans, as amended. (Passed 352 to 0).	YEA
207	Oct. 7	H.R. 10878: On passage: to authorize appropriations for National Science Foundation. (Passed 384 to 5)	YEA
209	Oct. 8	H.R. 14159: Previous question: to make fiscal 1970 public works appropriations for water, pollution control, and power development. (Passed 215 to 187)	NAY
210	Oct. 8	H.R. 14159: On passage: to make fiscal 1970 public works appropriations for water, pollution control, and power development. (Passed 396 to 3)	YEA
212	Oct. 9	H.R. 11612: Motion to table: a motion instructing House conferees to insist on Conte amendment to fiscal 1970 Department of Agriculture appropriations [see Roll Call 64 for amendment]. (Passed 181 to 177)	NAY
213	Oct. 9	H.R. 8449: On passage: to reduce from 16 to 12 the working hours of railroad crew employees. (Passed 370 to 0)	YEA
214	Oct. 9	H.R. 7737: Recommittal motion: with instructions to reduce from $20 to $10 million the 1970 authorization for the Public Broadcast Corporation. (Failed 131 to 170)	NAY
215	Oct. 9	H.R. 7737: On passage: to amend Communications Act of 1934 to provide grants for construction of educational television and radio facilities and relating to support of Corporation of Public Broadcasting. (Passed 279 to 21; "Present" 1)	YEA
218	Oct. 14	H.R. 13000: Gross amendment: to provide that both Houses must approve within 60 days the rates of pay increases recommended by the Federal Salary Commission as submitted by the President in order for them to take effect. (Passed 191 to 169)	NAY
219	Oct. 14	H.R. 13000: Recommittal motion: to implement a Federal employee pay comparability system, Federal Salary Commission and Board of Arbitration. (Failed 81 to 281; "Present" 1)	NAY
220	Oct. 14	H.R. 13000: On passage: to implement a Federal employee pay comparability system, Federal Salary Commission and Board of Arbitration. (Passed 310 to 52; "Present" 1)	YEA
221	Oct. 14	Motion to adjourn. (Failed 99 to 210; "Present" 1)	NAY
224	Oct. 14	Motion to adjourn. (Passed 112 to 110).	NAY
228	Oct. 15	H.R. 14127: On passage: to carry out recommendations of the Joint Commission on the Coinage. (Passed 257 to 65)	NV
231	Oct. 16	H.R. 13194: Agreeing to conference report: to amend Higher Education Act of 1965 to assure students will have access to insured loans for education. (Passed 326 to 10; "Present" 2)	YEA
233	Oct. 16	H.R. 4293: On passage: to continue authority for regulation of exports. (Passed 272 to 7)	YEA
235	Oct. 20	H.R. 14195: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to revise laws governing contested elections of Members of the House. (Passed 311 to 12)	YEA
241	Oct. 23	H.R. 13763: On motion to table motion to instruct conferees: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations for legislative branch. (Passed 199 to 165)	NAY
243	Oct. 23	H.R. 13827: On passage: to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development. (Passed 339 to 9; "Present" 3)	YEA
248	Oct. 29	H.R. 13950: On passage: to provide protection of health and safety of persons working in coal mining industry. (Passed 389 to 4)	YEA
252	Oct. 30	H. Res. 586: Previous question: to consider H.R. 14001, to amend Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to modify selection of persons into Armed Forces (draft lottery). (Passed 265 to 129)	NAY
253	Oct. 30	H.R. 14001: On passage: to amend Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to modify selection of persons into Armed Forces (draft lottery). (Passed 382 to 13; "Present" 1)	YEA
254	Oct. 31	H.R. 14252: On passage: to authorize Secretary of H.E.W. To make grants for educational programs concerning drug use, and for other purposes. (Passed 294 to 0)	YEA
255	Oct. 31	H.R. 4244: Recommittal motion: pertaining to the Administrative Conference. (Failed 130 to 134)	NAY
256	Oct. 31	H.R. 4244: On passage: pertaining to the Administrative Conference. (Passed 133 to 127)	YEA
260	Nov. 5	H.R. 6778: Recommittal motion: to amend Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. (Failed 124 to 245; "Present" 11)	NAY
261	Nov. 5	H.R. 6778: On passage: to amend Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. (Passed 351 to 24; "Present" 12)	YEA
264	Nov. 6	H.R. 14465: On passage: to expand and improve the Nation's airport, airway system, and for the imposition of user charges. (Passed 337 to 6)	YEA
267	Nov. 12	H.R. 2777: On passage: to enable potato growers to finance a research and promotion program. (Failed 171 to 198)	YEA

1969 VOTING RECORD OF HON. DONALD M. FRASER, OF MINNESOTA—Continued

Yes—For No—Against NV—Not voting NVA—Not voting, paired against NVF—Not voting, paired for

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
268	Nov. 12	H. Res. 603: Previous question: to consider H.J. 589, a joint resolution expressing the support of Congress, and urging the support of the Federal agencies, for the international biological program. (Passed 230 to 100)	YEA
270	Nov. 13	H. Res. 677: On passage: to waive points of order against H.R. 14751 making fiscal 1970 military construction appropriations for Dept. of Defense. (Passed 326 to 43)	NAY
271	Nov. 13	H.R. 14751: On passage: to make fiscal 1970 military appropriations for Dept. of Defense. (Passed 343 to 32)	NAY
272	Nov. 13	H.R. 14705: On passage: to extend and improve Federal-State Unemployment Compensation Program. (Passed 337 to 8)	YEA
273	Nov. 17	H.Res. 675: On passage: agreeing to conference requested by Senate on H.R. 12829 providing for extension of interest equalization tax. (Passed 316 to 31)	NV
274	Nov. 17	S.J. Res. 121: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to authorize appropriation for National Council of Indian Opportunity. (Passed 316 to 31)	NV
277	Nov. 18	H.R. 14794: On passage: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations for Dept. of Transportation and related agencies. (Passed 362 to 25)	YEA
281	Nov. 19	H.R. 11612: Previous question on agreeing to conference report: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations for Dept. of Agriculture. (Passed 214 to 172)	NAY
282	Nov. 19	H.R. 12829: Agreeing to conference report: to extend interest equalization tax. (Passed 334 to 47)	NAY
284	Nov. 20	H.R. 14580: Sikes amendment: to amend fiscal 1970 Foreign Aid Authorization Act to provide an additional $54,500,000 in military assistance to Nationalist China. (Passed 176 to 169)	NAY
285	Nov. 20	H.R. 14580: Recommittal motion: with instructions to reduce development loans by $50,000,000. (Passed 185 to 158)	NAY
286	Nov. 20	H.R. 14580: On passage as amended: fiscal 1970 Foreign Aid Authorization Act. (Passed 176 to 163; "Present" 4)	YEA
288	Nov. 24	H.R. 11193: Gross amendment: to strike $150,000 for feasibility study of extending transit line to Dulles Airport. (Failed 52 to 256)	NAY
289	Nov. 24	H.R. 11193: On passage: to authorize a Federal contribution toward the D.C. transit development program. (Passed 285 to 23)	YEA
290	Nov. 24	H.R. 14916: On passage: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations for the District of Columbia. (Passed 305 to 9)	YEA
292	Nov. 25	H.R. 14741: On passage: to revise due date of cost estimate for Interstate Highway System, to amend law relating to highway safety, and for other purposes. (Passed 342 to 1)	YEA
294	Dec. 1	H. Res. 722: Previous question: to provide for consideration of H. Res. 613, "Toward Peace With Justice in Vietnam." (Passed 225 to 132)	NAY
295	Dec. 1	H. Res. 722: Agreeing to rule: to consider H.Res. 613. (Passed 251 to 100)	NAY
299	Dec. 2	H. Res. 613: Recommittal motion: with instructions to amend H. Res. 613 to urge the President to press N. Vietnam to abide by Geneva Convention in treatment of prisoners of war. (Passed 392 to 0)	YEA
300	Dec. 2	H. Res. 613: On passage: "Toward Peace With Justice in Vietnam [in support of President]." (Passed 333 to 55; "Present" 1)	NAY
306	Dec. 8	H.R. 15090: On passage as amended: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations for Dept. of Defense. (Passed 330 to 33)	YEA
309	Dec. 9	H.R. 15149: Broomfield amendment: to add $50,000,000 in military assistance for Nationalist China and S. Korea to fiscal 1970 appropriations for Foreign Assistance. (Passed 250 to 142)	NAY
310	Dec. 9	H.R. 15149: On passage as amended: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations for Foreign Assistance. (Passed 200 to 195; "Present" 2)	YEA
312	Dec. 10	H.R. 4293: Agreeing to conference report: to provide continuing authority for exports regulation. (Failed 157 to 238)	YEA
316	Dec. 11	H.R. 4249: G. Ford substitute amendment: nationwide to suspend literacy tests; nationwide to extend Atty. General's authority to oversee elections and initiate voting rights lawsuits; to establish uniform residency requirements for presidential elections; to establish presidential commission to study voting practices. (Passed 208 to 204)	NAY
317	Dec. 11	H.R. 4249: On passage as amended: to extend 1965 Voting Rights Act. (Passed 234 to 179)	NAY
318	Dec. 11	H.R. 15209: Recommittal motion: with instructions to eliminate funds for the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts from fiscal 1970 supplemental appropriations bill. (Failed 142 to 243)	NAY
320	Dec. 12	H.R. 12321: Recommittal motion: with instructions to make Anti Poverty Act into a State program. (Failed 163 to 231)	NAY
321	Dec. 12	H.R. 12321: On passage as amended: to provide continuation of Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and for other purposes. (Passed 276 to 117)	YEA
323	Dec. 15	H.R. 15095: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to increase Social Security benefits by 15 percent. (Passed 397 to 0)	YEA
324	Dec. 15	H.R. 14646: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to grant consent of Congress to the Connecticut-New York railroad passenger transportation compact. (Passed 352 to 49)	YEA
325	Dec. 15	H. Con. Res. 454: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to call for humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war by N. Vietnam and Vietcong. (Passed 405 to 0)	YEA
327	Dec. 16	S. 740: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to establish a Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-speaking People, and for other purposes. (Passed 314 to 81; "Present" 2)	YEA
328	Dec. 16	H.R. 14213: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to provide for 2 additional members on the Smithsonian Institution Board of Regents. (Passed 273 to 119)	YEA
331	Dec. 17	H.R. 15091: Patman amendment: to strike provisions authorizing Federal Reserve Board to purchase federally guaranteed mortgages. (Passed 231 to 171; "Present" 1)	NAY
332	Dec. 17	H.R. 15091: Patman amendment: to strike provisions authorizing purchase by Federal Reserve Board of $6 billion in federally guaranteed mortgages. (Passed 233 to 170; "Present" 1)	NAY
333	Dec. 17	H.R. 15091: Recommittal motion: with instructions to report back bill with language provided in S. 2577, a Senate-passed bill. (Failed 193 to 206; "Present" 1)	NAY
334	Dec. 17	H.R. 15091: On passage: to provide additional mortgage credit, to authorize standby presidential authority to institute selective credit controls, to authorize lending authority to the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes. (Passed 259 to 136; "Present" 3)	YEA
335	Dec. 17	S. 2917: Recommittal motion: with instructions that House conferees insist on House-passed provisions relating to compensation for black-lung disease. (Failed 83 to 258)	NAY
336	Dec. 17	S. 2917: Agreeing to conference report: to improve health and safety conditions in coal mines. (Passed 333 to 12)	YEA
338	Dec. 18	H.R. 14944: On passage: to authorize adequate police protection for the White House and foreign embassies. (Passed 394 to 7)	YEA
339	Dec. 18	H.R. 13111: Motion to lay on the table the motion: to instruct House conferees to accept Senate amendment, which adds the words "except as required by the Constitution" to the Whitten amendment prohibiting the expenditure of Federal funds for busing to force racial integration of schools. (Failed 180 to 216)	NAY
340	Dec. 18	H. Res. 572: On passage: to authorize Members and staff of the Committee on Education and Labor to make certain studies abroad. (Passed 224 to 153)	YEA
342	Dec. 19	H.R. 14580: On agreeing to conference report: to authorize appropriations for fiscal 1970 Foreign Assistance. (Passed 208 to 166)	NV
343	Dec. 19	S. 2577: On agreeing to conference report: to provide additional mortgage credit, to authorize standby presidential authority to institute selective credit controls, to authorize lending authority to the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes. (Passed 358 to 4; "Present" 2)	YEA
345	Dec. 20	H.R. 15149: Recommittal motion: to instruct House conferees to accept Senate amendment eliminating funds for fighter planes for Nationalist China. (Failed 136 to 220)	YEA
346	Dec. 20	H.R. 15149: Agreeing to conference report: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations for Foreign Assistance (Passed 181 to 174)	NAY
347	Dec. 20	S. 3016: Agreeing to conference report: to continue programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Passed 243 to 94)	YEA
350	Dec. 22	H.R. 13111. Previous question on conference report: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations for H.E.W. and related agencies. (Passed 261 to 110)	YEA
351	Dec. 22	H.R. 13270. Adoption of conference report: to reform income tax laws. (Passed 381 to 2)	YEA
352	Dec. 22	H.R. 15209. On conference report: to agree to Senate amendment continuing appropriations at the fiscal 1969 level for agencies not yet provided their fiscal 1970 appropriations. (Passed 276 to 99)	YEA
353	Dec. 22	H.R. 15209. On conference report: to agree to Senate amendment to limit application of the so-called Philadelphia plan to eliminate job discrimination. (Failed 156 to 208; "Present" 1)	NAY

1970 VOTING RECORD OF HON. DONALD M. FRASER, OF MINNESOTA

Yes—For No—Against NV—Not voting NVA—Not voting, paired against NVF—Not voting, paired for

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
4	Jan. 27	H.R. 15149: To make appropriations of $2.5 billion for Foreign Assistance and related programs for fiscal 1970. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 202 to 162)	NVA
5	Jan. 27	H.R. 860: To amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit, in certain instances, employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products. On passage. (Passed 189 to 186)	YEA
7	Jan. 28	H.R. 13111: To make appropriations of $19,747,153,200 for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for fiscal 1970. To override veto. (Failed 226 to 191; 2/3 vote required)	YEA
9	Jan. 29	H.R. 14864: To amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 to authorize measures to protect defense production and classified information released to defense industry against acts of subversion. On passage. (Passed 274 to 65)	NAY
12	Feb. 16	H.R. 1049: To amend the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act of 1965, relating to the conservation of Anadromous fishing resources. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 301 to 19; 2/3 vote required)	NV
14	Feb. 17	H.R. 15062: For the relief of sundry claimants. Hall motion to strike title I (H.R. 3732) to provide for the relief of Robert G. Smith. (Failed 59 to 288)	NAY
15	Feb. 17	H.R. 15062: Gross motion to strike title II (H.R. 5000) for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido. (Failed 56 to 290)	NAY
16	Feb. 17	H.R. 15062: Brown motion to strike title III (H.R. 6378) for the relief of Noel S. Marston. (Failed 67 to 288)	NV
17	Feb. 17	H.R. 15062: Duncan motion to strike title IV (H.R. 2214) for the relief of the Mutual Benefit Foundation. (Failed 51 to 306)	NV
18	Feb. 17	H.R. 15062: To provide for the relief of sundry claimants. On passage. (Passed 318 to 51)	NV
22	Feb. 18	H.R. 15165: To establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. On passage. (Passed 371 to 13)	YEA
25	Feb. 19	H.R. 15931: To make appropriations of $19.4 billion for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal 1970. Previous question. (Passed 238 to 157)	NAY
26	Feb. 19	H.R. 15931: Michel recommittal motion with instructions to provide authority for the President to withhold 2 1/2 percent of the funds. (Failed 189 to 205)	NAY
27	Feb. 19	H.R. 15931: On passage. (Passed 315 to 81)	YEA
29	Feb. 24	H.R. 10937: To authorize a study of the construction of an Eisenhower National Memorial Arena. On passage. (Failed 136 to 230)	YEA
30	Feb. 24	H.R. 10335: To revise certain laws of the District of Columbia relating to offenses against hotels, motels and other commercial lodgings. On passage. (Passed 246 to 117)	NAY
31	Feb. 24	H.R. 14608: To change the procedure for return and cancellation of liquor licenses in the District of Columbia. On passage. (Failed 97 to 262)	YEA
33	Feb. 26	S. 2523: To amend the Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act, to extend programs of assistance to community mental health centers, for the treatment of alcoholics and narcotic addicts, and for the mental health of children. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 369 to 0)	YEA
34	Feb. 26	H. Res. 799: To provide for the consideration of H.R. 12025, the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act. On passage. (Failed 150 to 228)	NAY
36	Mar. 3	H.R. 15931: To make appropriations of $19.4 billion for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for fiscal 1970. Motion to lay on table the motion to instruct House conferees to agree to the amendments of the Senate. (Failed 164 to 222)	NAY
37	Mar. 3	H.R. 15931: Motion to instruct House conferees to agree to amendments of the Senate. (Passed 231 to 152)	YEA
39	Mar. 3	H.R. 15931: Adoption of conference report. (Passed 324 to 55)	YEA
40	Mar. 4	H. J. Res. 1112: To prohibit strikes or lockouts in the railroad dispute until 12:01 a.m. April 11, 1970. On passage. (Passed 343 to 15)	YEA
42	Mar. 5	H. Res. 862: To provide for the consideration of S. 2910, to amend Public Law 89-260 to authorize additional funds for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building. On passage. (Passed 289 to 62)	NV
43	Mar. 5	S. 2910: Snyder recommittal motion with instructions not to report back until plans and designs are completed. (Failed 150 to 196, "present" 1)	NAY
44	Mar. 5	S. 2910: On passage. (Passed 209 to 133, "present" 1)	NV
46	Mar. 11	H.R. 15945: To authorize $429,300,000 in fiscal 1971 to build and operate American merchant ships. On passage. (Passed 370 to 12)	YEA
48	Mar. 16	H.R. 15143: To provide the grade of Lieutenant General for the Chief of the National Guard Bureau. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 269 to 44; 2/3 vote required)	NV
49	Mar. 16	H.R. 14896: To provide for the preservation of additional historic properties. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 317 to 9; 2/3 vote required)	NV
54	Mar. 18	S. 952: To provide for the appointment of additional Federal district judges. On passage. (Passed 366 to 18)	YEA
56	Mar. 19	H.R. 16196: To reorganize the courts of the District of Columbia; to revise the procedures for handling juveniles in the District of Columbia; to codify title 23 of the District of Columbia Code. On passage. (Passed 294 to 47, "present" 1)	NV
59	Mar. 23	H.R. 15728: To authorize the loan of surplus naval vessels to foreign countries. On passage. (Passed 281 to 66)	NAY
61	Mar. 24	H.R. 15628: To extend the Foreign Military Sales Act through fiscal 1972. On passage. (Passed 351 to 26)	YEA
62	Mar. 25	H. Res. 884: To authorize the expenditure of $450,000 for the expenses of the House Committee on Internal Security. On passage. (Passed 307 to 52)	NAY
63	Mar. 25	H.R. 4148: To amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 358 to 0)	YEA
66	Apr. 7	H.R. 514: To extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education, aid to impacted areas, and other education legislation. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 312 to 58)	YEA
67	Apr. 7	H.R. 15733: To amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide a temporary 15 percent increase in annuities. On passage. (Passed 379 to 0)	YEA
70	Apr. 9	H.R. 16844: To increase the pay of Federal employees. Corbett recommittal motion with instructions to delete sections establishing unrelated allowances or benefits for Army Corps of Engineer dredge workers and certain personnel who perform duty at remote worksites. (Passed 261 to 124)	NAY
71	Apr. 9	H.R. 16844: On passage. (Passed 372 to 7)	YEA
73	Apr. 13	H.R. 16900: To make appropriations of $9,492,702,000 for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President and certain independent agencies for fiscal 1971. On passage. (Passed 333 to 3)	NV
75	Apr. 14	H. Res. 909: To concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendment to S. 3690 (H.R. 16844), to increase the pay of Federal employees. Previous question. (Passed 309 to 65)	YEA
77	Apr. 15	H. Res. 916: To provide for the consideration of H.R. 16311, the Family Assistance Act. On passage. (Passed 205 to 183)	YEA
80	Apr. 15	Motion to adjourn. On agreement. (Passed 81 to 75)	NV
82	Apr. 16	H.R. 16311: To authorize a family assistance plan providing basic benefits to low-income families with children; to provide incentives for employment and training to improve the uniformity of treatment of recipients under the Federal-State public assistance programs; and to otherwise alter such programs. Collier recommittal motion with instructions to delete the word "suitable" from the description of the employment welfare recipients must accept. (Passed 248 to 149)	NAY
83	Apr. 16	H.R. 16311: On passage. (Passed 243 to 155)	YEA
85	Apr. 20	H.R. 10666: To establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 261 to 11; 2/3 vote required)	NV
86	Apr. 20	H.R. 780: To authorize $28.5 million for the Merlin Division, Rogue River Basin Project, Oregon. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 271 to 15; 2/3 vote required)	NV
89	Apr. 23	H.R. 16516: To authorize appropriations of $3,600,875,000 to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1971. On passage. (Passed 229 to 105)	NAY
91	Apr. 27	H.R. 14714: To encourage, through the National Park Service, travel in the United States. Recommittal motion. (Failed 111 to 222)	NAY
92	Apr. 27	H.R. 14714: On passage. (Passed 238 to 94)	NV
93	Apr. 27	H.R. 14385: To authorize subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees affected by the transfer to the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Maryland. On passage. (Failed 64 to 273)	YEA
95	Apr. 28	H.R. 16200: To extend through fiscal 1971 and 1972 authorizations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Gross recommittal motion with instructions to reduce funds from $17.5 million to $13.125 million. (Failed 87 to 280)	NAY
96	Apr. 28	H.R. 15693: To prohibit the mailing of obscene materials to persons under 17 and to permit persons to preclude such materials from coming into their homes by mail. On passage. (Passed 375 to 8)	YEA
100	May 4	S. J. Res. 193: To provide for appointment of James E. Webb as citizen regent of the Smithsonian Institution. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 309 to 16; 2/3 vote required)	YEA
103	May 6	H.R. 17123: To authorize fiscal 1971 appropriations of $20,237,489,000 for procurement of military equipment and weapons, and for other purposes. Previous question on recommittal motion. (Passed 248 to 146)	NAY

1970 VOTING RECORD OF HON. DONALD M. FRASER, OF MINNESOTA—Continued

Yes—For No—Against NV—Not voting NVA—Not voting, paired against NVF—Not voting, paired for

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
104	May 6	H.R. 17123: On passage. (Passed 326 to 69)	NAY
107	May 7	H.R. 17399: To make supplemental appropriations of $5,764,115,791 for fiscal 1970. Previous question on recommittal motion with instructions. (Passed 220 to 134)	NAY
108	May 7	H.R. 17399: On passage. (Passed 334 to 6)	YEA
110	May 11	H.R. 17138: To amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1968, and the District of Columbia Teacher's Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries. On agreeing to committee amendments. (Passed 183 to 142)	NV
111	May 11	H.R. 16595: To authorize fiscal 1971 appropriations of $527,630,000 for National Science Foundation. Roudebush recommittal motion with instructions to cut authorizations from $527,630,000 to $500,000,000. (Failed 137 to 188)	NV
112	May 11	H.R. 16595: On passage. (Passed 312 to 6)	NV
117	May 13	H.R. 14465: To provide for the expansion and improvement of the Nation's airport and airway system, to be financed in major part by user taxes. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 362 to 3)	NV
118	May 13	H. Res. 960: To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1970 creating a Domestic Council and enlarging the Bureau of the Budget, to be called the Office of Management and Budget. On passage. (Failed 164 to 193)	NV
120	May 14	H.R. 17575: To make appropriations of $3,106,956,500 for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and for the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal 1971. On passage. (Passed 321 to 14)	NV
121	May 14	H.R. 14685: To amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote foreign travel to the United States. On passage. (Passed 173 to 88)	NV
123	May 18	S. 2624: To alter the judicial machinery in customs courts. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 301 to 0; 2/3 vote required)	NV
124	May 18	S. 1508: To amend provisions of the law relating to the retirement of Federal judges. Motion to suspend the rules and pass. (Failed 109 to 198; 2/3 vote required)	NV
125	May 18	H.R. 3328: To authorize annexation of the Soboba Indian reservation to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California to provide for construction of a water supply for the reservation. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 287 to 11; 2/3 vote required)	NV
127	May 19	S. 952: To provide for the appointment of additional district judges. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 331 to 21)	YEA
130	May 20	H.R. 17604: To authorize $1,999,634,000 for military construction. Previous question on recommittal motion. (Passed 251 to 133)	NAY
131	May 20	H.R. 17604: On passage. (Passed 335 to 47)	NAY
132	May 21	H. Res. 1022: To provide for the consideration of H.R. 17550, to increase Social Security benefits by five percent. Previous question. (Passed 201 to 181)	NAY
133	May 21	H. Res. 1022: On passage. (Passed 297 to 83)	NAY
135	May 21	H.R. 17550: Betts recommittal motion with instructions to add amendment providing for automatic cost-of-living increases. (Passed 233 to 144)	YEA
136	May 21	H.R. 17550: On passage. (Passed 344 to 32)	YEA
137	May 21	H.R. 15424: To amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1934. On passage. (Passed 307 to 1)	YEA
139	May 25	H.R. 17601: To exempt FHA and VA mortgages and loans from D.C. usuary laws until April 1972. On passage. (Failed 118 to 176)	NAY
140	May 25	H.R. 15073: To amend the Federal Deposit Act to require insured banks to maintain certain records; to require that certain transactions in United States currency be reported to the Department of the Treasury. On passage. (Passed 302 to 0, "present" 1)	YEA
141	May 25	H. J. Res. 1117: To create a Joint Committee on Environment and Technology. On passage. (Passed 285 to 7)	YEA
143	May 26	H. Res. 796: To amend House rules relating to financial disclosure. On passage. (Passed 335 to 1)	YEA
146	May 27	H.R. 17755: To make appropriations of $2,579,579,937 for Department of Transportation and related agencies for fiscal 1971. Previous question on recommittal motion. (Passed 176 to 162)	NAY
149	June 3	H. Res. 1051: To provide for consideration of H.R. 17802, to raise the temporary and permanent debt ceilings. Previous question. (Passed 273 to 85)	NAY
150	June 3	H.R. 17802: On passage. (Passed 236 to 127)	NAY
152	June 4	H.R. 17867: To make appropriations of $2,220,961,000 for Foreign Assistance and related programs for fiscal 1971. On passage. (Passed 191 to 153)	YEA
154	June 8	H. Res. 976: To authorize an Indochina Study Committee. On agreeing to Committee amendment to enlarge from 11 to 12 members. (Passed 227 to 95)	NAY
155	June 8	H. Res. 976: Previous question. (Passed 246 to 80)	NAY
156	June 8	H. Res. 976: On passage. (Passed 223 to 101)	YEA
157	June 8	H. Res. 976: On agreeing to Committee amendment to strike the preamble. (Passed 210 to 84)	NAY
161	June 10	H.R. 11102: To extend authorizations for three years for Federal grants for modernization and construction of health facilities. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 378 to 0)	NV
162	June 10	H. Res. 1069: To provide for the consideration of H.R. 17255 to authorize the Secretary of HEW to establish nationwide air pollution standards. On passage. (Passed 336 to 40)	NV
164	June 10	H.R. 17255: On passage. (Passed 374 to 1)	NV
167	June 11	H.R. 17970: To make appropriations of $1,997,037,000 for military construction and family housing. On passage. (Passed 308 to 57)	NAY
168	June 15	H.R. 17958: To increase the rates of disability compensation and to alter criteria for determining the eligibility of widows for benefits. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 313 to 0, "present" 1; 2/3 vote required)	NV
169	June 15	H.R. 15361: To establish the Youth Conservation Corps. On passage. (Passed 256 to 54)	YEA
171	June 16	H. Res. 1077: To provide for the consideration of H.R. 17070, to reorganize the postal system. Previous question. (Failed 139 to 219)	NAY
175	June 17	H. Res. 914: To provide for agreeing to Senate amendments (including the lowering of the voting age to 18 and uniform residency requirements for voting in presidential elections) to H.R. 4249, to extend and amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Previous question. (Passed 224 to 183, "present" 2)	YEA
176	June 17	H. Res. 914: On passage. (Passed 272 to 132)	YEA
179	June 18	H.R. 17070: To reorganize the postal system. Gross recommittal motion with instructions to report the bill back with a recommendation to delete the entire bill except an 8-percent pay raise for postal employees and a reduction to 8 years required to reach the top pay steps within a grade of postal field service. (Failed 77 to 306)	NAY
180	June 23	H.R. 17070: On passage. (Passed 359 to 24)	YEA
182	June 22	S. 2315: To restore the golden eagle program for annual permits of entry to all national parks and forests. On passage. (Passed 314 to 1)	NV
184	June 23	H.R. 11833: To extend and amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act. On passage. (Passed 339 to 0)	YEA
188	June 25	H.R. 11102: To extend program of Federal grants for construction and modernization of health facilities. To override veto. (Passed 279 to 98, "present" 2; 2/3 vote required)	YEA
189	June 25	H.R. 17399: To make supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1970. Cohelan motion to agree to Senate amendment adding $587.5 million for urban renewal grants. (Failed 137 to 236)	YEA
190	June 25	H.R. 17495: To alter the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of housing. On agreeing to committee amendment to provide for establishment of National Development Bank. (Passed 216 to 112)	NAY
191	June 25	H.R. 17495: On passage. (Passed 324 to 2, "present" 1)	YEA
194	June 30	H.R. 16916: To make appropriations of $4,420,145,000 for the Office of Education for fiscal 1971. Flood motion to table motion of Cohelan to instruct House conferees to agree to Senate amendments striking provisions prohibiting use of funds for busing or the closing of schools and providing for freedom of choice plans. (Passed 191 to 157)	NAY
195	June 30	H.R. 17825: To authorize $3.15 billion in Federal law enforcement assistance funds for fiscal 1971, 1972, and 1973. On passage. (Passed 345 to 2, "present" 1)	YEA
196	June 30	S. J. Res. 88: To create a commission to study bankruptcy laws. On passage. (Passed 334 to 12)	YEA
197	June 30	H.R. 16065: To authorize funds through fiscal 1973 for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. On passage. (Passed 262 to 78)	YEA
199	July 6	S. 3592: To amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act, to permit custom slaughterers to engage in the retailing and wholesaling of meat. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 297 to 2; 2/3 vote required)	YEA
201	July 7	H.R. 16327: To authorize appropriations for the Peace Corps. Gross recommittal motion with instructions to reduce authorizations by $28.8 million. (Failed 118 to 245)	NAY
202	July 7	H.R. 16327: On passage. (Passed 316 to 46)	YEA
203	July 7	H.R. 8673: To establish a civil remedy for misrepresentation of the quality of articles composed in whole or in part of gold or silver. On passage. (Passed 351 to 9)	YEA
205	July 8	H. Res. 1031: To authorize the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to investigate lobbying and campaign contributions. On passage. (Passed 382 to 0)	YEA
206	July 8	H.R. 279: To exempt from antitrust laws certain joint newspaper operating arrangements. On passage. (Passed 292 to 87, "present" 2)	NAY
207	July 9	H.R. 15628: To amend the Foreign Military Sales Act. Previous question on agreeing to send to conference. (Passed 247 to 143)	NAY
208	July 9	H.R. 15628: Hays motion to lay on table Riegle motion to provide that House conferees be instructed to concur in Senate-passed Cooper-Church amendment on Cambodia. (Passed 237 to 153, "present" 1)	NAY

1970 VOTING RECORD OF HON. DONALD M. FRASER, OF MINNESOTA—Continued

Yea—For No—Against NV—Not voting NVA—Not voting, paired against NVF—Not voting, paired for

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
209	July 9	H.R. 17070: To reorganize the postal system. Dulski motion to table Henderson motion to instruct House conferees to insist on right-to-work provision in House-passed version of the bill. (Failed 153 to 230)	YEA
210	July 9	H.R. 17070: Henderson motion to instruct conferees. (Passed 227 to 159)	NAY
211	July 9	H.R. 16968: To provide for adjustment in Government contribution with respect to the health benefits coverage of Federal employees. Gross recommittal motion with instructions to reduce the contribition from 50 percent to 38 percent. (Failed 146 to 200)	NV
212	July 9	H.R. 16968: On passage. (Passed 284 to 57)	NV
213	July 13	S. 3215: To authorize appropriations through fiscal 1973 for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 237 to 69)	YEA
216	July 15	S. 2601: D.C. Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 332 to 64)	NAY
217	July 15	H.R. 16595: To authorize $537,730,000 for activities of the National Science Foundation plus $2,000,000 in excess foreign currencies for fiscal 1971. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 311 to 76)	YEA
219	July 16	H.R. 14685: To amend the International Travel Act of 1961 to expand U.S. Government efforts to attract foreign tourists. Adoption of conference report. (Failed 174 to 207)	YEA
220	July 16	H.R. 16916: To make appropriations of $4,420,145,000 for the Office of Education for fiscal 1971. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 357 to 30)	YEA
221	July 20	H.R. 18253: To increase availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 326 to 0; 2/3 vote required)	YEA
222	July 20	H.R. 14114: To improve administration of the national park system. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 325 to 0; 2/3 vote required)	YEA
228	July 22	H.R. 17619: To make appropriations of $2,028,524,700 for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal 1971. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 387 to 3)	YEA
231	July 23	H.R. 14705: To extend and alter the Federal-State unemployment compensation program. O'Hara motion to recommit the conference report with instructions to agree to Senate amendment extending coverage to certain agriculture workers. (Failed 170 to 219)	YEA
232	July 23	H.R. 14705: Adoption of conference report. (Passed 388 to 3, "present" 1)	YEA
233	July 23	H.R. 18515: To make appropriations of $18,824,663,000 for the Departments of Labor, and HEW, OEO and related agencies for fiscal 1971. On passage. (Passed 362 to 14)	YEA
238	July 29	H.R. 17548: To make appropriations of $18 billion for Independent Offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for fiscal 1971. Motion to recommit conference report. (Failed 156 to 227)	NAY
242	July 30	H.R. 15733: To provide a temporary 15-percent increase in railroad retirement annuities. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 344 to 0)	YEA
243	July 30	H.R. 13100: To extend for three years programs of assistance for training in the allied health professions. On passage. (Passed 343 to 1)	YEA
244	July 30	H.R. 14237: To amend the Mental Retardation Facility and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. On passage. (Passed 339 to 0)	NV
247	July 31	H.R. 17880: To amend the Defense Production Act of 1950. Blackburn recommittal motion with instructions to report back with a provision requiring the President to freeze prices, rant, wages, salaries and interest at their May 25, 1970 level and authorizing a ceiling of no more than $2 billion to carry out provisions of the freeze. (Failed 11 to 270)	YEA
248	July 31	H.R. 17880: On passage. (Passed 257 to 19)	YEA
250	Aug. 3	H.R. 18260: To authorize $45 million through fiscal 1973 to establish programs on environmental education. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 289 to 28; 2/3 vote required)	NV
251	Aug. 3	H.R. 11032: To prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 322 to 4; 2/3 vote required)	NV
252	Aug. 3	H.R. 2076: To provide for the withholding from the salaries of Federal employees income taxes imposed by certain cities. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed 145 to 184; 2/3 vote required)	NV
255	Aug. 5	H. Res. 1117: Relating to compensation of two positions providing for staff created by H. Res. 543, 89th Congress, providing for a staff member for both House Democratic Committee and House Republican Conference. On passage. (Failed 90 to 284)	YEA
256	Aug. 5	H.R. 18546: Agricultural Act of 1970. Teague recommittal motion with instructions to delete titles dealing with payment limitations and wheat, feed grains, cotton and land-retirement programs. (Failed 167 to 218)	NAY
257	Aug. 5	H.R. 18546: On passage. (Passed 212 to 171)	YEA
259	Aug. 6	H.R. 17070: To reorganize the postal system. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 338 to 29, "present" 1)	YEA
260	Aug. 6	S. 1933: To establish uniform Federal rail safety standards and guidelines for transporting hazardous materials. On passage. (Passed 359 to 0)	YEA
262	Aug. 10	H. J. Res. 264: To propose a constitutional amendment banning discrimination on account of sex. Motion to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration. (Passed 332 to 22)	YEA
263	Aug. 10	H. J. Res. 264: McCulloch recommittal motion with instructions to hold hearings thereon. (Failed 26 to 344)	NAY
264	Aug. 10	H. J. Res. 264: On passage. (Passed 350 to 15)	YEA
265	Aug. 10	H.R. 18619: To establish a nonvoting delegate from the District of Columbia in both the House and Senate. On passage. (Passed 338 to 23)	YEA
266	Aug. 10	H.R. 18725: To establish a Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia and to provide for a nonvoting delegate in the House from the District. On passage. (Passed 300 to 57)	YEA
269	Aug. 11	H.R. 18110: To amend the Public Health Services Act to extend assistance programs to states and localities for comprehensive health planning. On passage. (Passed 275 to 1)	YEA
271	Aug. 11	H.R. 18434: To amend the Communications Act of 1934 to exempt major party candidates for the Presidency from equal-time provisions of the Act and to establish limitations on campaign spending for political broadcasting. On passage. (Passed 273 to 98)	YEA
274	Aug. 12	H.R. 8298: To amend the Interstate Commerce Act to alter certain restrictions upon the application and scope of the exemption provided therein. Nelsen amendment in the form of a substitute for the Committee amendment. (Failed 181 to 194)	YEA
275	Aug. 12	H.R. 8298: Nelsen recommittal motion. (Failed 141 to 230)	NAY
276	Aug. 12	H.R. 17570: To amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and alter the existing program relating to education, research and training in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diesases. On passage. (Passed 365 to 0)	YEA
278	Aug. 13	H.R. 16916: To make appropriations of $4,420,145,000 for the Office of Education for fiscal 1971. On passage to override veto. (Passed 289 to 114; 2/3 vote required)	YEA
279	Aug. 13	H.R. 17548: To make appropriations of $18 billion for Independent Offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for fiscal 1971. On passage to override veto. (Failed 204 to 195; 2/3 vote required)	YEA
280	Aug. 13	S. 3302: To amend the Defense Production Act of 1950. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 216 to 153)	NV
281	Aug. 13	S. 3547: To authorize the Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Narrows Unit, Missouri River Basin Project, Colorado. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 337 to 4)	NV
283	Aug. 13	H. Res. 1182: To provide for two hours debate on H.R. 17809, to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government. Previous question. (Passed 235 to 86)	NV
287	Sept. 9	H.R. 17809: On passage. (Passed 231 to 90)	NV
288	Sept. 9	H.R. 16542: To provide for the regulation of the mailing of unsolicited credit cards. On passage. (Passed 301 to 0)	NV
290	Sept. 10	H.R. 17795: To amend Title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. On passage. (Passed 282 to 32)	NV
291	Sept. 10	H.R. 11913: To amend the Public Health Service Act to provide authorization for grants for communicable disease control. On passage. (Passed 312 to 1)	NV
293	Sept. 10	H.R. 9306: To provide for the establishment of Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in Wisconsin. Kyl recommittal motion with instructions. 1)	NV
295	Sept. 14	H.R. 18306: To authorize United States participation in certain international financial institutions. On passage. (Passed 177 to 140)	YEA
299	Sept. 16	H.R. 16900: To make appropriations of $3,004,711,000 for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office and certain independent agencies for fiscal 1971. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 342 to 8)	NV
300	Sept. 16	S. 3637: To amend the Communications Act of 1934 to exempt major party candidates for the Presidency from equal-time provisions of the Act and to establish limitations on campaign spending for political broadcasting. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 247 to 112, "present" 2)	YEA.
304	Sept. 17	H.R. 17654: Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. Schwengel amendment to provide that no vote may be cast by proxy. (Failed 156 to 187)	NAY
305	Sept. 17	H.R. 17654: On passage. (Passed 326 to 19)	YEA
307	Sept. 21	S. 2763: To provide for purchase of systems and equipment for passenger motor vehicles over statutory price limitations. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 264 to 42; 2/3 vote required)	NV

1970 VOTING RECORD OF HON. DONALD M. FRASER, OF MINNESOTA—Continued

Yes—For No—Against NV—Not voting NVA—Not voting, paired against NVF—Not voting, paired for

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
308	Sept. 21	H.R. 14678: To alter provisions for penalties for illegal fishing in territorial waters and contiguous fishing zone of the U.S. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 315 to 0; 2/3 vote required)	NV
309	Sept. 21	H.R. 15911: To provide for an increase in rates of pension and dependency and indemnity compensation. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 316 to 0, "present" 1; 2/3 vote required)	NV
310	Sept. 21	H.R. 16710: To authorize loans for mobile homes for veterans. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 297 to 0; 2/3 vote required)	NV
311	Sept. 22	H.R. 18127: To make appropriations for Public Works and the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1971. Evins motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment reported by conferees providing $807,000 in planning funds for the Dickey-Lincoln power project in Maine. (Failed 131 to 230)	YEA
312	Sept. 23	H. Res. 1220: A resolution citing Arnold S. Johnson for contempt of Congress. On passage. (Passed 337 to 14)	NV
315	Sept. 24	H.R. 18583: To alter existing drug abuse education programs, prevention, treatment and rehabilitation programs, revising the Federal narcotics laws and penalty structure, and providing additional law enforcement methods. On passage. (Passed 341 to 6, "present" 1)	YEA
317	Sept. 28	S. 2264: To provide authorization for grants for communicable disease control and vaccination assistance. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 292 to 2)	YEA
318	Sept. 28	S. 1933: To alter existing standards for railroad safety and hazardous material control. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 311 to 0)	YEA
320	Sept. 29	H.R. 17123: To authorize $19,929,089,000 for defense procurement research and Safeguard antiballistic missile construction for fiscal 1971. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 341 to 11)	YEA
321	Sept. 29	H.R. 18185: To provide long-term financing for expanded urban mass transportation programs. Boland amendment to reduce aggregate authority to $3.1 billion from $5 billion for grants and loans. (Passed 200 to 145)	NAY
322	Sept. 29	H.R. 18185: On passage. (Passed 328 to 16)	YEA
324	Sept. 30	H.R. 18679: To amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to eliminate the requirement for a finding of practical value. On passage. (Passed 346 to 0)	YEA
325	Sept. 30	H.R. 19444: To provide for guards to accompany aircraft operated by U.S. air carriers in order to prevent hijackings and to raise revenue for that purpose. On passage. (Passed 323 to 17)	YEA

A PENNSYLVANIA PROGRAM OFFERS NEW HOPE FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, the general public has for a long time held a sterotyped view about institutions for the mentally retarded. We assume that once a person enters one of these institutions, he or she has reached "the end of the line" and will probably never leave the institution during his or her lifetime. We stop considering these mentally handicapped people as potentially useful members of the community. In short, we simply have no more hope for them.

Fortunately this image of the mentally retarded patient is beginning to change. We are finding that many of these patients can be trained with marketable job skills and eventually released from the institution they are in, either completely or on a work-out, live-in basis. This is an encouraging development and one which might hold even greater potential if it could be expanded.

One such program has been operating for the last 4 years at one of Pennsylvania's largest institutions for the mentally retarded, Pennhurst State School and Hospital at Spring City, on the Schuylkill River 25 miles northwest of Philadelphia. In this particular program 16 women patients have been trained as industrial sewing machine operators and have been released from Pennhurst. Many others, while not able to move out of the institution entirely, have been able to perform useful work during regular working hours, either at a nearby knitting factory or at a special knitting production unit set up by the factory on the grounds of Pennhurst.

The industrial firm that has made this training program possible is the Spring City Knitting Co., which has its home office and one of its plants just two miles from Pennhurst. Edward L. Gruber now heads this firm which his father Ira founded in 1907. It is the largest manufacturer of knitted men's and boys' underwear in the United States, and since 1968 has been a subsidiary of Cluett Peabody & Co. Despite the fact that the Spring City Knitting Co. now employs over 4,000 persons at plants around the United States, Edward Gruber retains a vital interest in the community life in Spring City and in various humanitarian concerns, such as the care of the mentally retarded.

This program at Pennhurst for the training of mentally-retarded women as sewing machine operators is remarkable, both as a human venture in rehabilitation and as a cooperative effort between a State hospital and a private firm.

How this program actually works is described in an article entitled "Joint Effort Opens the Door," written by Martha H. Freedman, and contained in the September-October 1970 edition of The Challenge, a publication of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

JOINT EFFORT OPENS THE DOOR

(By Martha H. Freedman)

The whirr of countless sewing machines echoed throughout the vast factory room. At the machines, women deftly match material edges, guiding them to be seamed beneath the high-speed needles. There is a continuous flow of productive motion.

Steadily keeping pace, Myrtle Bowham, a slight, reddish-blonde woman who appears younger than her 61 years, fits aptly into the picture of efficient workmanship. To a casual observer, little differentiates her from her co-workers.

But the remarkable fact is that for almost the span of a lifetime—55 years—Myrtle was a resident at Pennhurst State School and Hospital.

On Dec. 16, 1915, shortly before her seventh birthday, Myrtle was placed in Pennhurst by the York County Court. Her mother had died several years before, and her father was unable to care for his little daughter who couldn't comprehend in normal fashion.

Throughout the years, Myrtle adapted well to situations and was never a behavioral problem. As a result of a psychological examination done in 1963, she was rated as having borderline intelligence. Her adjustment potential was recognized at that time.

The key that finally opened the door to independent, meaningful living for Myrtle was a Training and Work-Activity Program initiated at Pennhurst three-and-a-half years ago in conjunction with the Spring City Knitting Company.

The largest manufacturer of knit underwear for men and boys in the United States, Spring City Knitting Company's original plant is located near Pennhurst. In 1966 the company's new director of training, Richard Tyler, whose background includes work in remedial education, suggested the possibility of training qualified Pennhurst residents for industrial sewing.

With the approval and endorsement of the school-hospital's superintendent and his staff, a joint effort pilot project was undertaken by Pennhurst and the knitting company to train residents at the school sewing room in specific machine operation skills which would ultimately lead to their employment at Spring City Knitting Company, and subsequently to their release from the institution. Machinery, materials and supplies were contributed and installed by the knitting company at Pennhurst.

Myrtle was well-suited for participation in this pilot program. She had always had a natural initiative for work.

"I used to help feed the kids and things and then I made nightgowns and dresses," Myrtle recalls. "But, now, this is the best job I ever had in my life. It couldn't be any better than this!" she ends with a sunburst smile lighting her face.

After careful screening, along with a limited number of other Pennhurst residents, Myrtle was evaluated as having trainable po-

tential and chosen to participate in the training for industrial sewing machine operation. Patients in the program are trained to operate the machinery by company instructors; however, supervision is supplied by the school-hospital.

When Myrtle reached a predetermined level of learning and efficiency, she was transferred from Pennhurst to the vestibule training center at the Spring City Sewing Plant. (Vestibule training is conducted by the company as a separate unit for new employes so that they are not disconcerted or discouraged by working next to experienced, more highly skilled operators.)

Upon completion of the training period, she was transferred to the sewing floor where she capably took her place next to the regular workers.

At this point, Myrtle was considered eligible for discharge from Pennhurst.

She now is paid at the same rate as regular employees. She has moved to Pottstown, where she shares a double bedroom and sitting room in a private home with another woman who is a live-out placement from Pennhurst. The home is close to all transportation and Myrtle comes and goes as she wishes.

She occasionally visits her two sisters and their families who live in York, and maintains a correspondence with them. Along with the delight and pride she takes in the television set she purchased from her earnings, she enjoys sending little gifts to her nieces and nephews.

A vocational screening test administered this past summer revealed that Myrtle, who has an overall mental age of about 9 years, has developed good factual knowledge, follows directions well and shows regard for the possible consequences of her actions. She is working well and has had no trouble with the accompanying adjustments she has had to make.

As a matter of fact, she couldn't be happier, and is deeply grateful to the company that made it all possible.

PIONEER EFFORT

The development of a Spring City production unit at Pennhurst pioneered the first industry-sponsored work-for-wages situation at the school. The project opened new horizons for a number of the patients. For many of them, it was the first time since their admission that they were able to work and be paid for their production. Their earnings frequently meant that they were able to travel outside the institution. It meant an opportunity to go to town and purchase non-institutional clothing of their own. For some of the girls their earning experience was the motivation needed to prepare themselves in other areas to leave the institution.

At the present time, Pennhurst patients participating in the program fall into one of three categories: first, the patients who have been trained at Pennhurst, are working at Spring City and either have been or will be discharged from the institution; second, the patients who are in training preparing for live-in work-out situations, and, third, the patients who are working in the production unit that has been set up at the school-hospital, but who are incapable of living on their own in the outside world and are, therefore not being considered for discharge.

Of the first category, Myrtle Bowham and 15 other women completed the program and are employed at Spring City. These women have successfully made the transition from a sheltered workshop-type setting to competitive industry where they keep up with competent workers. They have proved their ability to function well in a model of industrial management employing the finest and most efficient machines, advanced techniques and a highly developed use of manpower.

Not only has the program brought these former residents new, independent constructive lives, but it is realizing considerable savings to the Commonwealth. Based on an estimated average patient cost per year of $6,000, an annual savings of $96,000 is currently likely. The potential is even greater for the sewing room facilities at Pennhurst are adequate to accommodate considerably more trainees. Additional Pennhurst patients and perhaps patients of other State institutions who have the manual dexterity and interest factors, could be transferred into the program.

Thus, this pioneer cooperative effort between an industry and an institution has blazed a promising trail for any number of retardates who, like Myrtle Bowham, can advance from isolated dependent existences to live fulfilling lives as active, productive members of society.

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING THE FAA IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM FOR THE 1970'S

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, according to news reports, a brush with treetops on a high ridge rising in front of a rainy airport runway appears to be the immediate cause of the crash of a Southern Airways DC–9 at Tri-State Airport in Huntington, W. Va., killing all 75 persons aboard including the Marshall University football team.

During the next several months, trained investigators of the National Transportation Safety Board will carefully examine all facets of the accident in an effort to determine authoritatively the probable cause. In this instance, it may never be possible to determine with exactitude the reason the pilot of the aircraft came in so low as to collide with the ridge. However, logic suggests with absolute certainty that if adequate air traffic control equipment had been installed and in use at this airport so as to allow for air operations under conditions of optimum safety, the accident may well have been avoided.

Unfortunately, as in the case of many other airports throughout the Nation, the Tri-State Airport had inadequate instrument landing facilities, and no radar.

Landing a modern jet airliner at night in adverse weather conditions is a tricky and delicate business. Fortunately, over a period of many years, this Nation's air transport system has developed instrument landing devices and radar which sharply curb the danger involved in such operations and, in a practical sense, make them routine. Unfortunately, the lifesaving characteristics of these technical breakthroughs require the actual installation of the equipment at the Nation's airports, an effort which the Federal Aviation Administration has not pursued with significant success.

In the United States today, there are thousands of airports, varying in size from the giant facilities in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, to those that are little more than cow pastures. Of these thousands of airports, 584 serve regularly scheduled commercial air traffic. In addition, a dozen or so serve a high volume of general aviation traffic exclusively. Yet, of these 600 airports, only 330 have control towers; only 121 have air surveillance radars; and only 250 have instrument landing systems.

Under current FAA criteria based upon traffic volume, 435 of these 600 airports are slated to have control towers by 1976; 214 will have air surveillance radar systems, and 469 are scheduled to have instrument landing systems.

Yet, Americans who rely upon the air traffic control system to get them safely to their destinations might logically and reasonably ask why all 600 of these airports with a high volume of general aviation traffic or scheduled commercial traffic are not equipped with these rudimentary devices at this time. Or, at least, if these crucial airports are not equipped for the optimum safety of operations at this time, then, why are not plans under way to provide this equipment that is absolutely essential to optimum safety?

An in-depth investigation of the Nation's air traffic control system by the Government Activities Subcommittee, which I serve as chairman, culminating in a report submitted to the House last July, indicated that air traffic control development was running some 4 to 6 years behind schedule.

This investigation also revealed that critical problems involving personnel and operations within the FAA and the Department of Transportation continue to compromise implementation of an effective air traffic control system for the 1970's. Of crucial importance is the failure of the FAA to develop an authoritative statement of requirements for such items as towers, instrument landing systems, and radars.

The report also reveals that officials in the executive branch of the Government have failed to request adequate funds from the Congress for the implementation of an air traffic control system that would provide optimum air safety for the Nation's air travelers.

Tragically, I must advise the House that, in the months since the submission of our report, little progress is being made to remedy these problems, and that in my opinion the Nation's air traffic control system is on a collision course with disaster.

In fairness to officials of the FAA, the solution to many of the problems outlined in our report involving the recruitment of more adequate personnel and the development of more effective contract and research and development techniques take considerable time. However, there is no excuse for the failure of officials in the executive branch—and I am referring in particular to those in the Department of Transportation and the Office of Budget and Management—to request adequate funds from Congress to

install lifesaving air traffic control equipment at the Nation's airports that has already been developed and perfected and need only to be purchased and installed to avoid the needless and tragic loss of lives such as occurred at Huntington, W. Va.

As a followup to our report of July, I addressed a letter to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration on October 23 in which I stated:

I cannot let this opportunity pass without expressing my very deep anxiety and concern over the failure of the FAA to obtain the funds necessary to implement the national airspace [Air Traffic Control] system as it was described and in the time limitations discussed during our hearings last January.

In this letter to the FAA Administrator, I emphasized that Congress stated as a policy, in recent legislation providing user charges to support air traffic control and airport development, that air traffic control would be funded at not less than $250 million annually. This $250 million annual funding level is consistent with FAA's 10-year air traffic control facilities and equipment procurement plan referred to in the hearings before my subcommittee. Yet, the budget request submitted by the President to the Congress for fiscal year 1971 was for only $190 million. The insufficiency of this sum is made even more pronounced by the fact that even the $250 million figure, by the FAA's own admission, falls far short of providing adequate funding for an air traffic control system providing optimum safety.

As a further indication of the very desperate plight confronting the Department of Transportation and that irresponsible approach toward the funding of air traffic control development, the House and Senate Appropriations Committees only recently had to allow for an emergency reallocation of appropriated funds to allow the FAA to exercise an option on desperately needed modern terminal air traffic control equipment for which no funds had been requested.

Even more unbelievable is the failure of the Department of Transportation to request funds in the supplemental appropriation bill now before the Congress for the exercise of the third option on this equipment that comes up in May 1971.

But, these are only specific examples of a general problem which finds overstringent and overzealous budgeteers hacking and cutting at FAA expenditures in an area vital to the lives of literally thousands of American travelers. In my letter to the FAA Administrator of October 23, I pointed out that the work of the subcommittee in the air traffic control investigation was guided by a very simple concept—that while we could not do anything for those unfortunate individuals who had been killed or injured in air crashes in the past, we could do something for those who might be involved in tragedies of this type in the future.

The tragedy at Huntington, W. Va., was bad enough. The death or injury of even a single person is proper cause for concern to any responsible budget official. But, as tragic as this occurrence might be, it could have been worse in the sense that the aircraft could have been a Boeing 747 and the crash might have occurred in a large city rather than a relatively rural area. With giant jumbo aircraft a fact of life in the future and with the number of air operations climbing every day, these tragedies will take the lives of larger and larger numbers of people, both in the aircraft and on the ground. If a large jet transport should crash in downtown Chicago, New York, or any other large American city, thousands and thousands of people could be killed. The time to prevent these accidents is before they occur.

The finest memorial the executive branch of the Government could give to the fine young men, their friends and supporters, and the crew on board the DC–9 at Huntington, would be to dedicate itself to preventing accidents of this type in the future. Sorrowfully, I must say that I see no signs of such an affirmative and responsible reaction.

I am afraid that, with time, the anxiety and the sorrow of this tragedy will pass from the minds of those officials in the Federal Government who must act to prevent such accidents in the future. Gradually, they will probably return to a day-by-day routine. In their minds they will try to justify to some degree the deficiencies of the past on the basis of some economic evaluation of how much money we can logically allocate to air traffic control under the tight restraints of the present budget.

At this time of tragedy, let us make one fundamental point crystal clear. Those officials in the executive branch of the Government with responsibility for air safety must plan an air traffic control system based upon providing all of the Nation's airports with regularly scheduled commercial or high levels of general aviation traffic with the essential air traffic control equipment needed for optimum safety. If for any reason these officials fail to act, the Congress must react, and in the most forceful manner.

I place in the RECORD Appendix C of the 29th report by the Committee on Government Operations entitled "Problems Confronting the Federal Aviation Administration in the Development of an Air Traffic Control System for the 1970's."

This appendix contains a résumé and list of terminal air traffic control facilities installed at the Nation's airports. If an airport is not listed, it means that no federally owned equipment is installed or operated at that particular facility. I urge all members to examine this list to determine the extent to which the airport facilities in their districts are equipped wth radar, instrument landing, and other lifesaving air traffic control equipment. I believe that, as you scan this list, it will be evident that many airports in the Nation share with the Tri-State airport near Huntington, W. Va., deficiencies in air traffic control equipment that, if installed and in operation, might well have avoided this tragedy.

HOUSE REPORT 91–1308

APPENDIX C.—RÉSUMÉ AND LIST OF TERMINAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITIES

The following résumé of air traffic control terminal facilities and accompanying list of airports with air traffic control facilities and equipment are reprinted from the FAA Air Traffic Service "Fact Book." The airports listed are those which have air traffic control facilities or equipment *of any kind* that are provided by either the FAA or the military. If an airport is not on this list, it has no air traffic control facilities or equipment unless privately owned and operated.

This summary is the best available. However, the "Fact Book" is maintained for the use of those who are familiar with the air traffic control system. This means that certain of the acronyms and some of the data the summary contains will prove troublesome to others.

The explanations that follow should be helpful:

When a star follows the name of an airport, this means that a Flight Service System (FSS), an FAA informational facility used predominantly by pilots flying under visual flight rules, is also located in the vicinity of the airport.

Some towers are delegated authority to provide radar separation for instrument flight rule traffic approaching or departing that airport. Other towers are not. Towers are therefore either designated "AC" (for Approach Control), or "NA" (Non-Approach Control) to advise pilots of this difference in responsibility.

Towers are also combined with Flight Service Stations at some airports as one facility. When such a combination exists, the facility is designated "CS/T" standing for Combined Service Station/Tower. Therefore, if there is a notation under any of the four columns appearing under either "Tower" or "CS/T", the airport has a tower facility.

Any designation under "Radar" means that the airport has a terminal radar system. The varying designations in this column distinguish between the ownership and operation of FAA and military radar. In the next column, headed "BCN" for Beacon, are listed those airports that have terminal radar systems with transponder capacity. Note that most airport surveillance radar systems also have the capacity to provide terminal controllers with coded identification data from aircraft equipped with transponders.

The next column, headed "PAR" for Precision Approach Radar, is the less popular of the two instrument approach landing systems presently in operation by the FAA and the military.

In the following column, "ATIS" stands for Automatic Terminal Information Service. The list indicates those airports equipped with radio transmission equipment that, through the use of recordings, continuously transmits operational data relative to that particular airport.

In the next column, entitled "ILS/LDA/Rnwy," are listed those airports having either ILS systems or Localizer Directional Aids. The latter are essentially rudimentary ILS systems. The designations in the column provide the pilot with the runway numbers on which these landing aids are installed. Note that in some instances two or more runways at the same airport will be equipped with instrument landing facilities.

The next five columns contain data describing runway lighting systems. "RVV" stands for Runway Visual Value; "RVR" for Runway Visual Range; "REIL" for Run-

way End Identification Lights; "VASI" for Visual Approach Slope Indicator, and finally, "DF" for Direction Finder Equipment.

Certain of these lighting systems are used in conjunction with instrument landing procedures and, in this sense, fall within the air traffic control category. The committee, however, considers that they are more closely related to airports and runways and, therefore, fall outside the scope of this report.

Additional explanatory material appears at the end of the table.

Résumé of terminal facilities (for the 50 States and territories)

	Amount
Towers (includes 8 military; 25 non-Federal	314
Approach control (AC) includes 3 military	155
Nonapproach control (NA) includes 6 military; 25 non-Federal	159
Combined station/tower (CS/T)	48
Approach control	37
Nonapproach control	11
Radar approach control facilities (serving 415 civil airports)	157
Airport surveillance radar (including 37 military)	124
Military airport surveillance radars operated by FAA	31
Combined terminal and air traffic control centers on Wake Island and Guam)	2
Radar beacons (transponder receivers) includes 1 military	114
Precision approach radar (PAR) (includes 14 military)	27
Automatic terminal information services (ATIS)	76
Direction finder (DF) (includes 11 dopplers)	115
Instrument landing systems, approach lights and runway visibility equipment: Instrument landing system (ILS)	288
Approach light systems	288
Visual approach slope indicator (VASI) (includes 15 military: 23 non-Federal)	116
Runway end identification lights (REIL) (includes 152 non-Federal; 14 military)	251
Runway visual range (RVR)	168
Runway visual value (RVV)	89

TERMINAL FACILITIES AT MAJOR AIRPORTS

Location and airport	Hours of OPN	Tower		CS/T		Radar	BCN	PAR	ATIS	ILS/LDA runway	Approach light systems runway	RVV runway	RVR runway	REIL runway	VASI runway	DF	Remarks
ALABAMA																	
Birmingham—Municipal [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	5	5		5		23		
Dothan—Municipal	16		F														
Fort Rucker—Cairns AAF						ASR(M)											
Huntsville—Huntsville-Madison.		F								18R	18R	18R					
Mobile:																	
Bates Field [2]	18		F							14	14		14			V, U	
Brookley Field	10		N			RAPCON	X										
Montgomery—Dannelly Field. [2]	17		F							9	9		9			V, U	
Maxwell AFB						RAPCON										U	
ALASKA																	
Amchitka—Amchitka	10		F														
Anchorage:																	
Elmendorf AFB						RAPCON	X	F									
International			F							6	6		6		13		
Lake Hood	8		F														
Merrill [2]			F														
Annette—Annette [3]	10		F							12	12						
Bethel—Municipal [2]											18 [4]				36		
Cold Bay—Cold Bay										14	14				32		
Cordova—Mile 13 Field [2]												27		9	9(4)		
Fairbanks:																	
Eielson AFB						RAPCON	X	F									Military owned/ FAA operated.
International			F							19	19	19				V, U	
Galena—Galena [2]											25				25, 7 (M)		
Juneau—Municipal					F						8 [5]				8(4)		
Sing Salmon—King Salmon		F				RAPCON	X	M		11	11	11			29, 11 (M)		AC 8 hrs. daily Mon-Fri.
Kotzebue—Nome															8, 26(4)		
Nome—Wein Mem											27 [5]			9(N)	9		
St. Paul Is.—Municipal														36(M)			
Unalakleet—Unalakleet														14	14		
Sitka—Sitka										11				11	11		
ARIZONA																	
Goodyear—Phoenix-Litchfield Muni.	16		N														
Phoenix—Sky Harbor Muni. [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X			8R		8L, 26(R) (N)	8(R)N		
Tucson:																	
International [2]			F														
Davis-Monthan						RAPCON	X										
Yuma—MCAS/Int'l [3]		M [3]														V, U	
ARKANSAS																	
Fort Smith—Municipal [2]				F						25	25	25					
Hot Springs—Memorial	16	F [3]															
Little Rock—Adams Field		F				ASR(F)	X			4	4		4				
Morrilton—Petit Jean														2, 20(N)			
Pine Bluff—Grider Field [2]														17			
CALIFORNIA																	
Arcata-Eureka—Arcata [2]										31	31		31		13		
Bakersfield—Meadows Field. [2]	17	F [3]								30R	30R	30R					
Burbank—Hollywood-Burbank.		F				ASR(F)	X		X	7	7	7		15		V	
Concord—Buchanan Field	16		F														
Crescent City—Jack McNamara Field. [2]														17			
Culver City—Hughes	10		N											23N			
Edwards—Edwards AFB						RAPCON	X										
Fairfield—Travis AFB						ASR(M)	X										
Fresno:																	
Air Terminal [2]			F							29R	29R	11L	29R				
Fresno-Chandler Muni.	16		F														
Fullerton—Municipal	16		F						X					24			
Hawthorne—Municipal	16		F											25			

Footnotes at end of table.

TERMINAL FACILITIES AT MAJOR AIRPORTS—Continued

Location and airport	Hours of OPN [1]	Tower AC	Tower NA	CS/T AC	CS/T NA	Radar	BCN	PAR	ATIS	ILS/LDA runway	Approach light systems runway	RVV runway	RVR runway	REIL runway	VASI runway	DF	Remarks
California—Con.																	
Hayward—Air Terminal	18		F														
LaVerne—Brackett Field	16		F														
Lemoore—Lemoore NAS						RATCC	X										Military owned/ FAA operated. LRR used for lcl ctl.
Lompoc—Vandenberg AFB						ASR(M)	X								12,30(M)		
Long Beach—Long Beach-Daughtery.		F				ASR(F)	X		X	30	30 [5]		30			V	
Los Angeles: [3]																	
Interna ional [3]		F				ASR(F)	X	F	X	25L 24L	24L [5] 25L 25R		25L, 25R 7L, 7R	6R 7R(N),7L	7R	V	
Van Nuys	16		F						X	24R				16R			
Merced—Castle AFB						ASR(M)	X										
Miramar—Miramar NAS						RATCC	X										Military owned/ FAA operated.
Modesto—City-County	16		F								29R [6]						
Montague—Siskiyou County. [2]			M														Radar for Mil. only.
Monterey—Monterey Peninsula.		F				ASR(M)		M		10	10						
Mountain View—Moffett NAS.						ASR(F)	X										Military owned/ FAA operated.
Napa—Napa County	16		F														
Oakland—International		F				ASR(F)	X		X	29, 27R	29, 27R	27R	29, 11			V	
Ontario—International			F		F				X	25	25		25			V, U	
Oxnard—Ventura County	16	F												25			
Palo Alto—Santa Clara	16		F														
Palmdale—AF Plant No. 42			F														
Palm Springs—Municipal	16		F														
Riverside:																	
Municipal	16		F											27			
March AFB						RAPCON	X										ASR located at Ontario Int'l.
Sacramento:																	
Metropolitan			F							16	16	2	16				
Executive [2]			F						X	2	2						
McClellan AFB						ASR(M)	X										
Salinas—Municipal	16		F														
San Bernardino—Norton AFB.														23(N)			
San Carlos—San Carlos	16		F														
San Diego:																	
S.D. County-Gillespie Field.	16		F														
Int'l.-Lindbergh Fld. [2]			F						X	9	9			27			DME co located with glide slope.
Montgomery Field	16		F														
San Francisco—International.		F							X	19L, 28L	19L, [5] 28L		28L	28R(N)			ASDE on Standby.
San Jose:																	
Municipal			F						X	30L	30L		30L				
Reid-Hillview	16		F														
San Rafael—Hamilton AFB						ASR(M)											
Santa Ana:																	
Orange County	17		F						X	19R	19R [7]		19R				
El Toro NAS						RATCC	X										Military owned/ FAA operated. LRR used for lcl ctl.
Santa Barbara—Municipal [2]		F [3]							X	7	7		7				
Santa Maria—Santa Maria Public.											12 [8]			12(N)			
Santa Monica—Municipal	16		F						X					21	21		
Santa Rosa—Sonoma County.	16		F														
Stockton—Metropolitan [2]		F [3]								29R	29R [5]	29 [7]					
South Tahoe Valley—Lake Tahoe	16		F														
Torrence—Municipal	16		F						X								
COLORADO																	
Aspen—Aspen-Pitkin Co	10		F														
Broomfield—Jefferson Co	16		F														
Colorado Springs—Peterson Field		F				ASR(F)		F		35	35		35		35		
Denver—Stapleton Int'l. [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	26L, 35	26L, 35		26L, 17, 35	17(N)	8R, 17	V	
Grand Junction—Walker Field [3]	16	F [3]								11		11		11(N), 29			
Pueblo—Memorial				F [3]						7L	7L	7L			25R	V	
CONNECTICUT																	
Bridgeport—Municipal			F														
East Hartford—Rentschler Field	16		N											7(N) 18(N) 36(N) 22(N) 32(N)			
New Haven—Tweed-New Haven	16		F											1(N)			
Windsor Locks—Bradley Int'l. [2]		F				ASR(F)			X	6	6		6, 24	33, 24(N)	33		
DELAWARE																	
Dover—Dover AFB						ASR (M)	X										
Wilmington—Greater Wilmington		F								1	1		1			V	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA																	
Washington—Washington Nat'l. [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	18 [9], 36	18, 36	15, 18	36	3, 15, 18, 21, 33	3(4), 15, 18, 21(4)	V	ASDE on Standby.

Footnotes at end of table.

TERMINAL FACILITIES AT MAJOR AIRPORTS—Continued

Location and airport	Hours of OPN [1]	Tower AC	Tower NA	CS/T AC	CS/T NA	Radar	BCN	PAR	ATIS	ILS/LDA runway	Approach light systems runway	RVV runway	RVR runway	REIL runway	VASI runway	DF	Remarks
Dulles International		F				ASR(F)	X			01R, 19R	01R,[10] 19R		01R, 19R, 19L		12 *01 (Stol) *19 (Stol) 10, 28		*STOL Runway.
FLORIDA																	
Clewiston—Airglades	10		N														
Cocoa—Patrick AFB						ASR(M)	X										
Crestview—Bob Sikes	6		N														
Daytona Beach—Municipal		F [3]							X	6	6		6				
Fort Lauderdale:																	
Ft. Lau.-Hollywood International		F [3]							X								
Executive	12		N														
Fort Myers—Page Field	16		F												5(2)(N)		
Hollywood—North Perry	16		F														
Jacksonville—International [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	7	7		7			V, U	
Key West:																	
International [2]	16		F														
NAS, Boca Chica Fld						ASR(M)	X										
Marianna—Municipal	11		N														Open Mon-Fri.
Melbourne—Cape Kennedy Regnl. [2]	17		F														
Miami:																	
International [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	9L, 27L	27L, 9L		9L, 27L		12	V	
New Tamiami	16		F														
Opa Locka	16		F														
Orlando—Herndon [2]		F				ASR(F)			X	7	7	7					
Panama City:																	
Bay County	16	F															
Tyndall AFB						ASR(M)	X										
Pensacola:																	
Municipal [2]		F								16	16	16					
NAS						RATCC	X									V, U	FAA owned and operated.
St. Augustine—Fairchild-St. Aug.	9		N														
St. Petersburg:																	
Whitted	16		F									17					
St. P.-Clearwater Int'l. [2]	16		F							17	17						
Sarasota—Sarasota-Bradenton.	18		F												13		
Tallahassee—Municipal [2]		F [3]								36	36	36					
Titusville—Ti-Co	16		N														
Tampa—International		F				ASR(F)	X		X	36L, 18L	18L		18L				
West Palm Beach—Palm Beach Int'l.		F							X	9	9	9					
GEORGIA																	
Albany—Municipal	8		N														
Atlanta:																	
Fulton County [2]	16		F													V, U	
Airport		F				ASR(F)	X		X	9L, 9R 33	9L, 9R 33			3	27L 27R		PAR on Standby.
DeKalb-Peachtree	16		F														Mon-Fri 1300-2130Z.
Augusta—Bush Field		F [3]								35	35	35				V, U	
Brunswick—Glynco NAS						ASR(M)	X										
Columbus—Metropolitan		F [3]								5		23					
Macon:																	
Lewis B. Wilson [2]	16		F							5	5		5				
Robins AFB [2]						RAPCON	X										Reimbursable. (RAPCON)
Savannah:																	
Sav. Muni-Travis Fld		F								9	9						
Hunter AFB						RAPCON	X										FAA owned and operated. LRR shared with ARTOCC.
Valdosta—Moody AFB						RAPCON	X									V, U	
HAWAII																	
Hilo—Gen. Lyman Field				F [3]						26					26	V, U	
Honolulu—International [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	8	8		8	26	4L	D	
Kahului, Maui—Kahului				F [3]						2			2			V, U	
Kailua—Kona	16				F												
IDAHO																	
Boise—Air Terminal [2]		F [3]								10L	10L	28R	10L				
Idaho Falls—Fanning Field. [2]	16	F												20			
Pocatello—Municipal [2]				F						21	21 [3]	2					
ILLINOIS																	
Alton—Civic Memorial	16		F														
Belleville—Scott AFB						ASR(M)	X										
Champaign—Univ. of Ill.-Willard.		F [3]							X	31		31					
Chicago:																	
DuPage	16		F											10			
Merrill C. Meigs	18		F											18	36		
Midway			F			ASR(F)	X		X	31L, [5] 13R	13R		13R	31L(N), 22L		V	ASR for DC only.
O'Hare Int'l		F				ASR(F)	X	F(2)	X	4, 14R, 14L, 27R 32L, 27L [10] 32R	14R, 4, [5] 14L 27R, 32L, 32, 4		14L, 14R 27R 32L 32R		9R, 27L 22 *18	V	PAR on Standby.
Pal-Waukee	18		F								16(N) [9]			16(N) [9]			

Footnotes at end of table.

TERMINAL FACILITIES AT MAJOR AIRPORTS—Continued

Location and airport	Hours of OPN	Tower AC	Tower NA	CS/T AC	CS/T NA	Radar	BCN	PAR	ATIS	ILS/LDA runway	Approach light systems runway	RVV runway	RVR runway	REIL runway	VASI runway	DF	Remarks
Illinois—Continued																	
Danville—Vermilion														21(N)			
Decatur—Muncipal		F [3]												18(N), 36(N)			
Mattoon-Charleston—Cole County Memorial.														24(N)			
Moline—Quad City				F [3]						9	9		9				
Peoria—Greater Peoria				F [3]						30	30		30			D	
Quincy—Muni-Baldwin Fld. [2]										3		3					
Rockford—Greater Rockford. [2]		F								36	36		36	18			
Springfield—Capital		F [3]								4	4		4			U	
West Chicago—(See Chicago DuPage).																	
INDIANA																	
Evansville—Dress Memorial.		F [3]								21	21					V	
Fort Wayne—Baer Field [2]		F				ASR(F)	X			31	31 [5]		31	22(N)			
Gary—Gary	16		N														
Indianapolis—Muni. Weir Cook. [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	4, 31	4, 31, 22 [5]		31	13R	22		
Lafayette—Purdue Univ. [2]										10 [9]				10(N)			
Muncie—Delaware County (Johnson Field).	16		F														
Peru—Bunker Hill AFB						ASR(M)											
South Bend—St. Joseph County. [2]		F [3]								27	27		27				DME Collocated with glide slope.
Terre Haute—Hulman Field. [2]		F [3]								5		5					
Valparaiso—Porter County														27(N)			
IOWA																	
Cedar Rapids—Municipal [2]		F [3]								8	8		8	26			
Des Moines—Municipal [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	30	12, [5] 30	12	30	23			
Dubuque—Municipal														31			
Fairfield—Municipal														35(N)			
Mason City—Municipal [2]														35			
Sioux City—Municipal				F [3]						31	31		31	13		V, U	
Waterloo—Municipal				F [3]						12	12		12				
KANSAS																	
Hutchinson—Municipal				F [3]						13	13						
Kansas City—Fairfax Municipal	17		F														
Liberal														17(N)			
Olathe—Johnson Co	11		N														
Salina—Municipal [2]	16	F [3]								35	35						
Topeka—Philip Billard Muni		F								13	13	13					
Wichita:																	
Municipal [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	1	1						
Beech			N														
KENTUCKY																	
Covington—Greater Cincinnati.		F				ASR(F)	X		X	18, 36	18, 36		18, 36	9R(N)	27L(4)(N)	V	
Hopkinsville—Campbell AAF.						ASR(M)											
Lexington—Blue Grass Field.		F [3]								4	4		4				
Louisville:																	
Bowman Field [2]	16		F											24(N)			
Standiford Field		F				ASR(F)				1, 29	1	29	1		19	V, U	
Owensboro—Owensboro-Davies.	16		F											35(N)			
Paducah—Barkley Field [2]														4			
LOUISIANA																	
Baton Rouge—Ryan				F [3]						13				13			
Fort Polk—Polk AAF							X(M)										
Lafayette—Municipal [2]		F [3]								19	19	19		1			
Lake Charles—Municipal [2]		F [3]								15	15	15					
Monroe—Municipal [2]		F [3]								4	4	4					
New Orleans:																	
Intl. Moisant Field		F				ASR(F)	X		X	10	10		10	1		V	
Lakefront [2]			F											35	17		
Shreveport:																	
Greater Shreveport					F					13	13		13				
Barksdale AFB						RAPCON	X									V	
Downtown			F														
MAINE																	
Auburn-Lewiston—Municipal.														4(N)			
Augusta—Augusta-State [2]														17(N)			
Bangor—International		F								15, [4] 33			33	15			
Limestone—Loring AFB						ASR(M)											
Portland—Intl. Jetport				F [3]						11	11	11			29, 23(N)		
Waterville—Robert LaFleur														5(N)	23(N)		
MARYLAND																	
Baltimore—Friendship Int'l		F				ASR(F)			X	10, 15	10, 15		10	4, 22	28	V	
Camp Springs—Andrews AFB.		M/F				ASR(F)	X	F(2)		1L, 19R	1L, 1R (M) 19L, (M) 19R (M)				1L, 1R(M), 19L, 19R (M)		Military traffic only.

Footnotes at end of table.

TERMINAL FACILITIES AT MAJOR AIRPORTS—Continued

Location and airport	Hours of OPN [1]	Tower AC	Tower NA	CS/T AC	CS/T NA	Radar	BCN	PAR	ATIS	ILS/LDA runway	Approach light systems runway	RVV runway	RVR runway	REIL runway	VASI runway	DF	Remarks
Maryland—Con.																	
Hagerstown—Municipal	15		N														Operates Mon-Fri.
MASSACHUSETTS																	
Bedford—Lawrence G. Hanscom Field.			F						X	11	11	11		29(N), 23(N)	11(N) 29(N)	V, U	
Beverly—Municipal														16(N), 34(N)			
Boston—Logan Int'l.[2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	4R, 33L	4R, 33L	22L	4R		22L 15R(4) (N)	V	
Chicopee Falls—Westover AFB.						ASR(M)	X									U	
Falmouth—Otis AFB						RAPCON	X										
Hyannis—Barnstable Muni.	16		F							24	24			6(N)			
Lawrence—Municipal														5(N)			
Martha's Vineyard—Martha's Vineyard.												24 [6]					
Nantucket—Memorial [2]	16				F					24	24	24					
New Bedford—Municipal	16		F							5	5	5					
North Adams—Municipal														29(N)			
Norwood—Memorial											35 [6]	35 [6]					
Pittsfield—Municipal											32 [7]			14(N)	14(N)		
Westfield—Barnes Municipal	16		F											20(N)			
Worcester—Municipal					F					11	33 [11]	33					
MICHIGAN																	
Alpena—Phelps Collins			M											18, 30(N)			
Battle Creek—W. K. Kellogg Regional Airfield				F [3]						22	22					U	
Bellaire—Antrim Co														20(N), 2(N)			
Benton Harbor—Ross Field										27							
Detroit:																	
City [2]		F							X	15R [9]				15R			
Metro-Wayne		F				ASR(F)	X		X	3L, 21R	3L, 21R		21R, 3L	9(N), 3(N)		V	
Willow Run			F							5R	5R			23L(N)		U	
Flint—Bishop				F [3]						9	9		9	18(N), 27(N)			
Fremont—Municipal														27			
Grand Rapids—Kent County		F [3]								26	26		26	8(N) 36(N)			
Gwinn—K. I. Sawyer AFB						ASR(M)											
Jackson—Reynolds Muni.[2]	16		F							23 [9]				23(N)			
Kalamazoo—Municipal	16		F							35	35	35		17(N)			
Lansing—Capital City [2]		F [3]								27	27		27	6(N)		V	
Marquette—Marquette County [2]														8(N) 26(N)			
Mt. Clemens—Selfridge AFB						ASR(M)											
Muskegon—Muskegon County		F [3]								32	32		32			V, U	
Pellston—Emmet County [2]														32(N), 23(N)			
Pontiac—Oakland-Pontiac	16		F								9 [8]			9, 27			
Saginaw—Tri-City [2]	16	F [3]								5	5		5			V, U	
Sault Ste. Marie:																	
Kinchloe AFB						ASR(M)											
Municipal [2]											32 [11]			14(N)			
Traverse City—Municipal [2]														36			
MINNESOTA																	
Duluth—International		F				ASR(M)	X	M		9	9	27	9		9		
Hibbing—Chisholm-Hibbing [2]											31			13(N)			
International Falls—Falls Int'l														13(N), 31(N)			
Minneapolis:																	
Crystal	16		F											9L(N)			
Flying Cloud	16		F						X								
Minn.-St. Paul Int'l		F				ASR(F)	X	F	X	4, 29L	4, 29L		4, 29L	11R(N)	11R,22		DME collocated with glide slope.
Redwood Falls—Municipal														12, 30(N)			
Rochester—Municipal [2]		F [3]								31	31		31				PAR on standby.
St. Paul—Downtown	16		F											30(N)			
Thief River Falls—Municipal														13, 31(N)			
Winona—Muni.-Conrad Fld														11(N) 29(N)			
Worthington—Municipal														17, 35(N)			
MISSISSIPPI																	
Columbus—Columbus AFB						ASR(M)											
Gulfport—Municipal	16	F [3]															
Jackson:																	
Hawkins Field	16		F														
Allen C. Thompson Field [2]		F				ASR(F)	X			15L	15L		15L			V, U	
Meridian:																	
Key Field [2]	16		F				X			1	1		1				
Meridian NAAS						RATCC											Military owned/FAA operated. LRR shared with ARTCC.

Footnotes at end of table.

TERMINAL FACILITIES AT MAJOR AIRPORTS—Continued

Location and airport	Hours of OPN	Tower AC	Tower NA	CS/T AC	CS/T NA	Radar	BCN	PAR	ATIS	ILS/LDA runway	Approach light systems runway	RVV runway	RVR runway	REIL runway	VASI runway	DF	Remarks
MISSOURI																	
Joplin—Municipal [2]										13							
Kansas City:																	
Municipal [2]		F				ASR(F)		F	X	18	18 [5]	18				V	
International			F							9, 36	36		36				
St. Joseph: Rosecrans Memorial		F [3]								35	35						
St. Louis:																	
Lambert-St. Louis [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	24, 12R	24, 6, [5] 12R	35	24, 12R				
Spirit of St. Louis	17		N														
Springfield—Municipal [2]		F [3]								1	1	1					
MONTANA																	
Billings—Logan Field [2]		F [3]								9	9		9				
Great Falls:																	
International [2]			F							34	34	16, 34				U	
Malmstrom AFB						RAPCON		M									
Helena—Helena				F [3]									26	8(N)26(N)			
Missoula—Johnson-Bell	16	F															
NEBRASKA																	
Grand Island—Municipal [2]											35						
Lincoln—Municipal [2]		F [3]								35L	35L	35L		17R(N)			
North Platte—Lee Bird/ Muni. [2]														12(N), 30(N)			
Omaha:																	
Eppley Field [2]	17		F						X	14	14, 32 [5]					U	
Offutt AFB						RAPCON		M								V, U	
Scottsbluff—Municipal [2]														23(N)			
NEVADA																	
Las Vegas—McCarran Field [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X						25		
Reno—Municipal		F				ASR(F)				16	16	16					DME collocated with glide slope.
NEW HAMPSHIRE																	
Berlin—Municipal														36(N)	36(N)		
Concord—Municipal [2]														17(N)	17(N)		
Keene—Dillant-Hopkins											2			2(N)	2, 20(N)		
Laconia—Municipal														8(N)	8(N)		
Lebanon—Lebanon-Regional. [2]														25(N)	25(N)		
Manchester—Grenier Field		F								35				35(N)			
Nashua—Boire Field														32(N)	14(N)		
NEW JERSEY																	
Atlantic City—NAFEC/Atl City/Pomona.		F				ASR(F)	X			13	4, 13		13, 31				
Fairfield—Caldwell-Wright	9		N														Open weekends only.
Linden—Municipal														9(N), 27(N)			
Morristown—Municipal	16		F														
Newark—Municipal		F				ASR(F)	X		X	4, 22	4, 22		4, 22	22	29	V	
Teterboro—Municipal [2]			F							6	6						
Trenton—Mercer County			F							6	6 [5]			6(N)			
NEW MEXICO																	
Albuquerque—Sunport/ Kirtland AFB. [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	35	35		35		8		
Clovis—Cannon AFB						ASR(M)								3(M)	3, 12, 30(M)		
Farmington—Municipal [2]					F												
Hobbs—Lea County	18				F												
Roswell—Industrial Air Ctr. [2]	19	F [3]								21							
Santa Fe—Santa Fe County/Muni.					F												
NEW YORK																	
Albany—Albany County [2]		F				ASR(F)	X			19	19	19					
Bethpage—Grumman-Bethpage.	8		N														
Binghamton—Broom County.				F		ASR(F)	X			34	34 [5]	34					
Buffalo—Greater Buffalo Intl. [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	5, 23	23		5			V	
Calverton—Peconic River	16		N							5							
Elmira—Chemung County [2]		F [2]								24	24	24					
Farmingdale—Republic	17		N														
Glens Falls—Warren County. [2]														1			
Islip—Long Island-MacArthur. [2]			F							6	6 [11]	6					
Ithaca—Tompkins County															14(N)		
Jamestown—Municipal										25 [1]	25 [9]			7(N), 25(N)			
Newburgh—Stewart AFB						ASR(M)	X				9(M)						
New York:																	
JFK Int'l.		F				ASR(F)	X	F	X	4R, 22L 31R	4R, 22L		22L, 31R, 31L, 3R, 4R, 13R	13L [11]	13L, 13R 31L 22R	V	DME collocated with glideslope on R4. PAR on Standby.
La Guardia		F				ASR(F)	X		X	22 [9] 4, 13	4, 22	4		22(N), 31(N), 13(N)	31 13 22	V	
Niagara Falls—Municipal			F							28R	28R		28R			V	
Poughkeepsie—Dutchess County. [2]															24(N)		

Footnotes at end of table.

TERMINAL FACILITIES AT MAJOR AIRPORTS—Continued

Location and airport	Hours of OPN [1]	Tower AC	Tower NA	CS/T AC	CS/T NA	Radar	BCN	PAR	ATIS	ILS/LDA runway	Approach light systems runway	RVV runway	RVR runway	REIL runway	VASI runway	DF	Remarks
New York—Con.																	
Rochester—Rochester-Monroe Cty.				F		ASR(F)	X		X	4, 28	28		28				
Rome—Griffiss AFB						RAPCON	X									U	
Schenectady—Schenectady County.	16		N													V	
Syracuse—Clarence E. Hancock.				F		ASR(F)	X		X	28	28		28				
Utica—Oneida County [2]			F							33	33	33		15(N)			
Watertown—Municipal [2]														6(N)			
White Plains—Westchester County.		F				ASR(F)			X	16	16						
NORTH CAROLINA																	
Asheville—Municipal				F[3]						34	34		34		16		
Charlotte—Douglas Muni		F				ASR(F)	X		X	5	5		5	36(N)			
Fayetteville—Grannis Field				F[3]						3	3		3				
Goldsboro—Seymour Johnson AFB.						ASR(M)											
Greensboro—Greensboro-High Point-Winston-Salem Regnl.		F				ASR(F)	X			14	14		14				
Hendersonville—Henderson-Meyer.															15(N)[8] 33(N)[8]		
Hickory—Municipal														24(N)			
Raleigh—Raleigh-Durham [2]	18	F				ASR(F)				5	5		5				LRR shared with ARTCC.
Wilmington—New Hanover County.				F[3]						34	34		3				
Winston-Salem—Smith-Reynolds	16		F							33	33[5]	33					
NORTH DAKOTA																	
Bismarck—Municipal				F[3]						30	30	30				V	
Fargo—Hector Field		F[3]								35	35	17	35	17(N)			
Grand Forks—Grand Forks AFB.						ASR(M)											
International [2]														35			
Minot—Minot AFB						ASR(M)											
OHIO																	
Akron:																	
Akron-Canton		F				ASR(F)	X			1	1		1	23			
Municipal		F								259				25(M), 7(N)			
Athens—University of Ohio														27(N)			
Cincinnati:																	
Lunken [2]	16		F							20L	20L[7]			2R(N)			
Greater Cincinnati (See Covington Ky.)																	
Cleveland:																	
Hopkins Intl.[2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	5R, 28R	5R, 28R		5R, 28R	36L	23L(4)	V	DME collocated glideslope 5R.
Burke-Laketront	16		F							24R							
Cuyahoga	15		N											23			
Columbus—Ohio State Univ.	16		F											9, 27(N)			
Columbus—Port Columbus Intl.[2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	10L, 28L	10L, 28L		10L, 28L	10L, 28L		V, U	
Dayton:																	
James M. Cox-Dayton Municipal.[2]			F						X	6	6	6		24(N)			
Wright-Patterson AFB						RAPCON	X	M									FAA owned and operated.
Findlay—Hoskins [2]											7, 36			36			
Hamilton—Hamilton Inc														11(N), 29(N)			
Mansfield—Municipal				F[3]						32	32		32				
Middletown—Hook Fld. Muni.										23[9]				5(N), 23(N)			
North Lima—Elser Field														9(N)			
Springfield—Municipal	8		M											5, 23(N)			
Tiffin—Municipal															27(N)		
Toledo—Express		F				ASR(F)	X			7	7		7	34(N)			
Willoughby—Lost Nation	12		N											5(N), 27(N)			
Youngstown—Municipal [2]		F				ASR(F)				32	32		32			V	
OKLAHOMA																	
Ardmore—Municipal [2]	16		F														
Enid—Vance AFB						ASR(M)											
Fort Sill—Fort Sill AAF						ASR(M)											
Lawton—Municipal	16		F														
Oklahoma City:																	
Wiley Post [2]	16		F														
Will Rogers World			F						X	35L	35L		35L	12	17R		
Tinker AFB						RAPCON	X	M								U	
Ponca City—Municipal													17	17, 35(N)			
Tulsa:																	
International [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	17L, 35R	17L, 35R		35R				
Riverside	12		F														
OREGON																	
Eugene—Mahlon-Sweet				F[3]						16	16		16			D	
Hillsboro—Portland-Hillsboro.	16		F														
Klamath Falls—Kingsley Field.				F		ASR(M)	X	M		32	32	14, 32		14		D	
Medford—Jackson County				F[3]						14	14		14			V	
North Bend—Municipal [2]														13		D	

Footnotes at end of table.

TERMINAL FACILITIES AT MAJOR AIRPORTS—Continued

Location and airport	Hours of OPN [1]	Tower AC	Tower NA	CS/T AC	CS/T NA	Radar	BCN	PAR	ATIS	ILS/LDA runway	Approach light systems runway	RVV runway	RVR runway	REIL runway	VASI runway	DF	Remarks
OREGON—Continued.																	
Pendleton—Municipal				F[3]						25R	25R	25R				V, U	
Portland:																	
International [2]		F				ASR(F)		F	X	10R, 28R	10R, 28R		10R, 28R			V	PAR and ASDE on standby.
Portland-Troutdale	16		F														
Salem—McNary Field										31	31[5]	31					
PENNSYLVANIA																	
Allentown—Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton				F[3]						6	6						
Coatesville—Chester County														11(N)			
Erie—International		F[3]								6	6		6	24		D	
Harrisburg—Harrisburg-State [2]		F				ASR(F)	X			8[9]	8[6]	8					
Indiana—Jimmy Stewart														28(N)			
Johnstown—Cambria County														23(N)			
Lancaster—Lancaster	16		F											8			
Latrobe—Westmoreland-Latrobe	16		N							23(N)							
Martinsburg (Altoona—Blair County [2]														20(N)			
Middletown—Olmsted	15	F								13	13[6]			13, 31			
Philadelphia:																	
International		F				ASR(F)	X			9	9		9			V	
North Philadelphia [2]			F														
Pittsburgh:																	
Allegheny County [2]			F							27	27			30(N), 9, 23			
Greater Pittsburgh		F				ASR(F)	X		X	28L, 10L	28L, 10L		28L, 10L, 28R	32	28L	V	
Reading—Gen. Carl A. Spaatz Fld		F[3]								36	3[5]	36				V	
St. Marys—Municipal														27(N)			
Wilkes Barre—Wilkes Barre-Scranton [2]		F				ASR(F)	X			4	4	4					
Williamsport—Lycoming County [2]		F[3]								27	27						
RHODE ISLAND																	
Providence:																	
Theodore F. Greene St				F						5R	5R		5R				
Quonset Point NAS						RATCC	X										Military owned/ FAA operated.
SOUTH CAROLINA																	
Charleston—AFB/Muni. [2]		F				ASR(F)	X	F	X	15	15(M)		15		15(M) 21(M) 33(M)	U	
Columbia:																	
Metropolitan		F[3]								10	10		10				
Owens Field	8		M														
Greenville—Muni-Downtown.	16	F				ASR(F)	X			36							
Greer—Greenville-Spartanburg [2]	17		F							3	3		3				
Myrtle Beach:																	
Myrtle Beach AFB						ASR(M)											
Myrtle Beach Muni. [2]	12																Opers 12 hrs daily.
Spartanburg—Downtown Memorial.	16		F														
Sumter—Shaw AFB						ASR(M)											
SOUTH DAKOTA																	
Brookings—Municipal														12			
Huron—W. W. Howes Muni. [2]										12		12		12(N)			
Mitchell—Municipal														30(N)			
Rapid City:																	
Ellsworth AFB						ASR(M)											
Municipal [2]	16		F							32	[7]32			14(N), 32			
Sioux Falls—Joe Foss Field		F[3]								3	3		3	15(N)		V	
Watertown—Municipal [2]														17			
TENNESSEE																	
Bristol—Tri-City	18	F				ASR(F)	X			22	22		22				
Chattanooga—Lovell Field		F				ASR(F)				20	20		20		2		
Jackson—McKellar Field [2]											2						
Knoxville—McGhee Tyson [2]		F				ASR(F)				4L	4L		4L			V	
Memphis—Metropolitan [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	35, 9	35, 9		35, 9		27	V, U	
Nashville—Metropolitan [2]		F				ASR(F)			X	2L	2L		2L	20R(N)	20R	V	
Shelbyville—Bomar Field											36						
TEXAS																	
Abilene:																	
Municipal [2]	17		F							35	35	35					
Dyess AFB						RAPCON	X	M								U	
Amarillo—AFB/Municipal [2]		F				ASR(F)				3	3	21	3		3(M) 21(N)	U	
Austin:																	
Robt. Mueller Muni. [2]	15		F						X	30L	30L		30L, 12R		12R		
Bergstrom AFB						RAPCON	X	M								U	
Beaumont-Port Arthur—Jefferson County.				F[3]						11	11		11	16			
Big Springs—Webb AFB						ASR(M)											
Brownsville—Rio Grande Valley Int'l.				F[3]						13R	17[11]	17L					
College Station—Easterwood Field [2]	16	F[3]															
Corpus Christi—International.		F				ASF(F)				13	31L, 13		13, 31L				LRR used for lcl ctl.

Footnotes at end of table.

TERMINAL FACILITIES AT MAJOR AIRPORTS—Continued

Location and airport	Hours of OPN [1]	Tower AC	Tower NA	CS/T AC	CS/T NA	Radar	BCN	PAR	ATIS	ILS/LDA runway	Approach light systems runway	RVV runway	RVR runway	REIL runway	VASI runway	DF	Remarks
TEXAS—Continued.																	
Dallas:																	
Addison	16		F														
Dallas-Love Field [2]		F				ASR(F)			X	13L,31L	13L,31L		13L,31L	31R	31R	V	
Red Bird	16		F														
El Paso—International [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	22	22	22		26			
Fort Worth:																	
Greater Southwest Int'l		F				ASR(F)	X			13	13		13			V	
Meacham Field [2]	16		F							17	17 [11]		17				
Greenville—Majors Field	9		N														
Houston—Wm. P. Hobby [2]			F							3	3		3		12		ASR-2 and 6 available.
Houston—Intercontinental		F				ASR(F)	X		X	8	8 [10]		8, 26				
Kingsville—Kingsville NAAS.						ASR(M)											
Laredo—Laredo AFB						ASR(M)											
Longview—Gregg County Muni.				F [3]						13	13	13					
Lubbock—Municipal	16			F		ASR(F)	X			17R	17R	17R					
McAllen—Miller Int'l. [2]	16	F [4]												13			
Midland—Odessa Regn'l. [2]		F [4]								10	10	10				V	
Mineral Wells—Mineral Wells. [2]	18		N														
Plainview—Hale County	16		F														
San Angelo—Mathis Field				F [3]						3	3	3					
San Antonio:																	
International [2]		F				ASR(F)	X			3, 12	3, [11] 12		3, 12			V	
Stinson Muni	16		F														
Sherman—Perrin AFB						RAPCON	X	M			35R(M)						
Tyler—Pounds Field				F						13	13						
Waco—Municipal				F [3]						18	18	18					
Wichita Falls—Sheppard AFB/Wichita Falls Term. [2]		M				ASR(M)	X	M		33L	15R, 35, 33L.		33L		15R(M) 33L(F)		
UTAH																	
Moab—Canyon Lands															5 15, 33(N)		
Ogden:																	
Municipal	16		F											3(N)		V	
Hil. AFB						RAPCON	X										
Salt Lake City—Municpal No. 1. [2]		F				ASR(F)	X			34L	34L		34L		16R		
VERMONT																	
Burlington—International		F				ASR(F)	X			15	15		15, 33	33(M)		V	Long range radar used for terminal.
Morrisville—Stowe-State														1(N), 19(N)			
VIRGINIA																	
Blacksburg—VPI														12, 30(N)			
Charlottesville—Charlottesville-Albemarle. [5]										3 [5]				3(N)			
Dublin—New River Valley																	
Franklin—Rose											27 [6]			9(N)			
Lynchburg—Muni-Presto Glenn Fld.	16	F [3]								3	[6]	3				D	
Manassas—Muni Davis														16, 34(N			
Newport News—Patrick Henry. [2]			F							6	6		6	24(N)			
Norfolk—Municipal		F				ASR(F)	X			4	4	4		13(N), 31(N)		V	
Richmond—Byrd Flying Fld		F				ASR(F)	X			[6]	6						
Roanoke—Municipal		F				ASR(F)	X			33	33	6		23			
WASHINGTON																	
Everett—Snohomish County.	16	F						M		16	16		16, 34		16, 34 (M)		AC by ARTCC.
Moses Lake—Grant County	21	F								32R	32R	14, 32					
Renton—Municipal	16		F														
Seattle:																	
Boeing Field Intl. [2]			F						X	13	13 [5]	13		31			
Tacoma Intl		F				ASR(F)		F	X	16, 34	16, 34		16, 34			V	ASDE on Standby.
Spokane:																	
International			F							21	21	3	21				
Fairchild AFB						RAPCON	X										
Felts Field	16		F														
Tacoma:																	
McChord AFB						RAPCON	X										
Industrial														17(N)			
Walla Walla—City-County [2]			M					M			20						
Yakima—Municipal				F [3]						27	27						
WEST VIRGINIA																	
Charleston—Kanawha County. [2]		F				ASR(F)				23	23 [5]	23		5		V	
Huntington—Tri. State (Walker Long Field) [2]	16	F [4]								11 [9]	11						
Martinsburg—Municipal [2]	8		M											8,26(N)			Radar for military only.
Parkersburg—Wood County. [2]	16		F											21			
Wheeling—Ohio County				F						3	3			21	21		
WISCONSIN																	
Appleton—Outagami										2(N)				11, 29			
Eau Claire—Municipal [2]														22			
Green Bay—Austin Straubel. [2]		F [3]								6	6		6				

Footnotes at end of table.

TERMINAL FACILITIES AT MAJOR AIRPORTS—Continued

Location and airport	Hours of OPN [1]	Tower AC	Tower NA	CS/T AC	CS/T NA	Radar	BCN	PAR	ATIS	ILS/LDA runway	Approach light systems runway	RVV runway	RVR runway	REIL runway	VASI runway	DF	Remarks
Janesville—Rock County	16		F										15L	4(N), 22(N)			
La Crosse—Municipal														13(N)			
Madison—Truax Field		F [3]								36	36	18	36				
Marshfield—Municipal														15			
Milwaukee:																	
Gen. Mitchell Field [2]		F				ASR(F)	X		X	1,7R	1,7R		1,7R			V	
Timmerman Field	16		F														
Oshkosh—Winnebago County.	16		F							9		9		9 [5]			
Racine—Horlick														22(N)			
Sheboygan—County Memorial.														21			
Stevens Point—Stevens Point														3			
Waukesha—Waukesha County.														10(N), 18R(N)			
West Bend—Municipal														13(N), 31(N)			
WYOMING																	
Casper—Air Terminal [2]	16	F [4]								7	7	7					
Cheyenne—Municipal				F [3]						26	26	26		30(N)		D	
Rock Springs—Municipal [2]										25	25 [11]						
OTHER																	
Balboa, C.Z.—Albrook AFB/Howard AFB/ Tucumen Int'l.						CERAP	X										Military owned/ FAA operated.
Guam, Pacific—Anderson AFB.						CERAP	X		F								Military owned/ FAA operated.
Pago Pago, Amer. Samoa—International.															5		
Ponce, P.R.—Mercedita	16	1	F														
San Juan, P.R.:																	
International		F				ASR(F)				7	7						
Isla Grande	15		F						X								
St. Croix, Virgin Islands—Christiansted/Alex Hamilton.	16	F													9	D	
St. Thomas, Virgin Islands—Charlotte Amalie/ Harry S. Truman.	16		F [1]														
Wake Island—Wake		F [3]					X		X	10 [9]					10	V, U	

[1] 24 hrs unless otherwise indicated.
[2] FSS location also.
[3] Nonradar approach control.
[4] SALS without sequential flashers.
[5] Short approach light systems (SALS).
[6] MALS.
[7] MALS/RAILS.
[8] Nonstandard.
[9] Percent LDA (partial ILS).
[10] Category II approach light configurations.
[11] Other approach lighting systems (neon ladder, etc.).

KEY TO SYMBOLS

AC=Approach control.
D=Doppler DF.
DC=Departure control.
DME=Commissioned at glide slope loc.
F=FAA owned and operated.
F/M=FAA owned and Military operated.
LRR=Long range radar.
M=Military owned and operated.
M/F=Military owned and FAA operated.
N=Non-Federally owned.
SS=Simplified short approach light system.
U=UHF (243.0 emergency frequency).
V=VHF (121.5 emergency frequency).

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE RICHARD HOFSTADTER

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following tribute to the late Richard Hofstadter, the eminent historian who died last month, is a well-earned one. It was broadcast over WCBS–TV in New York City on October 29 by Peter Kohler.

RICHARD HOFSTADTER

Richard Hofstadter was a brilliant scholar whose studies of American history won not only Pulitzer prizes and acclaim from colleagues, but places on bestseller lists. He was, in the best sense of that much over-used word, relevant.

The Columbia University historian, who died last week, was not just a student of the past. His great skill was in unraveling the skeins that tie the present to the past, that make history relevant to our time.

What most occupied Professor Hofstadter's interest recently was America's history of violence, a subject much studied in these terrible times of political assassinations, urban rioting, and campus bombings. And to this subject, Dr. Hofstadter was able to bring a perspective that is enlightening, and, in some ways, encouraging.

For one, he argued in a recent essay that, contrary to the rhetoric of the Far Left, violence in American history has often been counterproductive. The Civil War, he noted, led to a century of bitterness and repression. Besides, most social reforms in American history have been brought about without violence.

The present danger with violence from the Far Left, he argued, is not the violence itself, but the backlash it can bring from the conservative majority of Americans who might support a government committed to political repression.

But Professor Hofstadter did not leave us with such a gloomy prophesy. For in the closing words of his essay, he argued optimistically that the strength of our political system can continue to overcome its afflictions.

"The Nation", he concluded, "seems to slouch onward into its uncertain future like some inarticulate beast, too much attainted by wounds and ailments to be robust, but too strong and resourceful to succumb."

These words from a man whose vision of the American experience was so keen are well worth keeping by those of us facing that uncertain future.

WEST VIRGINIANS SADDENED OVER TRAGIC PLANE CRASH

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, during the rainy, foggy night of Saturday, November 14, 1970, at approximately 7:40 p.m., a plane, virtually within seconds of landing at Tri-State Airport in Kenova, W. Va., crashed and burned, claiming the lives of approximately 75 people, including members of the football team, coaching staff, faculty, loyal friends, and supporters of Marshall University in Huntington, W. Va. This tragic event has shocked and deeply saddened the many friends and loved ones of those whose lives were lost.

To the faculty, students, alumni, friends of Marshall University, and to those loved ones left behind as a result of this tragedy, I express my heartfelt sympathy and compassionate understanding in behalf of those residents of southern West Virginia which I am honored and privileged to represent in the U.S. House of Representatives.

U.S. FOREIGN AID ADMINISTRATION FOR THE 1970'S

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a working paper entitled "U.S. Foreign Aid Administration for the 1970's," prepared by the University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of Public and International Affairs.

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

U.S. FOREIGN AID ADMINISTRATION FOR THE 1970's

(GSPIA Faculty Foreign Aid Seminar [1])

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

In the long run U.S. foreign aid is most likely to be supported at home if it is effective abroad. Effectiveness abroad requires: first, that U.S. aid programming be oriented to the needs and performance of each recipient country and second, that aid management and organization be geared to both programming and implementation.

U.S. involvement in Vietnam and the competing demands of high priority domestic needs militate against significant expansion of U.S. foreign aid in the near future. Assuming progress in ameliorating these situations, more resources should again become available for foreign aid. However, adequate financing may not be forthcoming unless the interim period is used to improve the effectiveness of current programs.

The hiatus should, therefore, be used to build a strong basis of Congressional and public understanding about the usefulness of foreign aid in achieving public purposes. Current efforts should focus on strengthening the organizational structure, improving administrative capabilities, and upgrading the effectiveness of management in conducting ongoing programs.

If present U.S. aid programs are to be improved, the most urgent changes required are: a) more comprehensive programming of all U.S. aid to each country including improved coordination with multilateral and other bilateral programs; b) reduction in the number of Washington agencies now administering both U.S. bilateral aid and responsible for U.S. participation in multilateral aid; c) greater decentralization of implementation to strong field missions; d) more effective management of project planning and execution; e) better conditions for career employment to attract and retain qualified professional personnel.

THE GOALS OF U.S. AID

U.S. purposes in providing foreign assistance are diverse and complex. They reflect the responsibilities of the United States as a world power and the variety of altruistic and national interests in its relations with other countries.

They include:

(1) An expression of its own humanitarian ethos and concern for the human condition abroad as well as at home.

(2) Aspirations for peace through a stable but progressive world order and improved modes of international cooperation.

(3) Concern with the material, political and social progress of friendly countries, as well as the safeguarding of their independence.

(4) Specific foreign policy interests in countries whose internal and external stability or security are threatened by unfriendly powers.

(5) Furtherance of economic growth and of an orderly world trade and payments system to promote prosperity at home and a better international environment abroad.

(6) Concern about the private investments, balance of payments deficits and exports of the U.S.

THE MEANS

The foregoing objectives can be furthered only in part through foreign aid programs. They can be related closely to such programs by establishing priorities for the allocation of funds. Allocating scarce funds so as to reflect priorities concerning U.S. goals can only be accomplished meaningfully with respect to particular sovereign countries. The situation and problems of the recipient country should determine the amount and type of assistance required as well as the urgency of the needs. U.S. priorities must, of course, be determined with close reference to whatever internal priorities are established by the government of the recipient country.

The essence of country programming is the allocation of the limited supply of U.S. foreign aid of all types in accordance with a well-considered pattern of U.S. priorities (a) among countries and (b) among the priorities determined by each recipient country taking into account its own resources, capabilities, policies and performance as well as the assistance it may receive from other bilateral and multilateral sources.

Some purposes may best be furthered through bilateral programs, some through regional or global international agencies, some through multilateral arrangements incorporating both bilateral and international institutions. Country programming of U.S. assistance should be sufficiently coordinated and sufficiently adaptable to meet the needs of a particular situation by utilizing the most suitable combination of these instruments. Thus bilateral and multilateral programs should be regarded as complementary rather than conflicting means of managing foreign aid.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

Implementing country programs implies administrative arrangements focussed on individual recipient countries to provide for effective total program coordination. Such arrangements should include the following:

(1) *A professional resident field mission* working day-by-day with the appropriate officials of the recipient country, under the general guidance of the Ambassador. Such a professionally oriented mission is indispensable for broadening the range of policy and procedural choices and for identifying reasonable and practicable alternatives. It can promote more rational development policy formulation and administration in the recipient country and can monitor performances and results. Without such a mission influence on recipient performance is peripheral, at best. Without such influence much of the effectiveness of foreign assistance is lost—however rational and enlightened be the intent of both donors and recipients. The complex variety of detailed technical matters does not lend itself to administration through foreign embassies in Washington and through using occasional visitors, telegrams and letters.

(2) *Decentralization to the field missions* of as much responsibility as possible for implementing programs. Management effectiveness requires that objectives and criteria be clearly delineated for field personnel and that maximum authority then be delegated to such personnel for advancing stipulated program goals and for executing authorized programs.

(3) *A single Washington agency to program U.S. foreign assistance* organized primarily on a country basis. The country desk should be responsible for mediating between the field mission and the complex of executive and legislative branch interests in Washington. Its programming responsibilities should include as much of U.S. foreign aid funds as can be made acceptable to the Congress, including responsibility both for bilateral and U.S. participation in multilateral assistance programs. The aid agency should also be responsible for congressional relations and for presenting authorization and appropriation requests to the Congress.

In carrying out these responsibilities, the aid agency should be required to work within the broad framework of foreign policies set by the President and implemented by the Secretary of State. It should also be given sufficient authority to operate its programs imaginatively and constructively on the basis of first-hand knowledge of the situation. The precedents established during the Marshall Plan period for relations in Washington between ECA and the Department of State provide a useful model for a sound allocation of functions and coordination of responsibilities between the aid agency and the Department of State.

The execution of some programs may be delegated to agencies with special responsibilities such as the Export-Import Bank, the Department of Defense and Agriculture and the Peace Corps. Moreover, priority determinations concerning the use of aid resources should, of course, be subject to interagency review.

(4) *Continuity of organization and personnel systems* is one of the most pressing needs if U.S. programs are to be better managed. More capable personnel will be attracted to the agency only if its authority is broadened, its opportunities for constructive achievement become more exciting, its career development programs are improved and its organizational structure made more stable and enduring. The efficiency of U.S. aid programs has been heavily penalized by repeated efforts to restructure and reorganize and by constant attrition in the authority of the principal aid agency.

(5) *These recommendations are not advanced as justification of the present system of foreign aid administration.* That system now suffers from fragmentation, divided and unclear authority, low morale and loss of many of its best qualified staff. It clearly lacks sufficient Congressional and public support. Rather, the intent of the present recommendations is to point out the need for improving aid administration by giving a single aid agency the authority, the staff and the organization necessary to do the job. The result need not be a larger agency but one which has a clearer mission, is better equipped to perform efficiently, and can reestablish foreign aid as a responsible and effective tool of American foreign policy.

THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES

The growing family of global and regional multilateral organizations provides channels for foreign aid administration that should be used increasingly. The Pearson Commission [2] objective—increasing the multilateral share from 10% to 20% of the aggregate assistance effort of all developed nations—is an appropriate target. However, it should be reached by increasing total assistance efforts, not by reducing bilateral programs.

Particularly in the case of United States aid, substituting contributions to multilateral agencies for bilateral assistance at the present time is likely to diminish effectiveness, reduce the priority of foreign aid claims on U.S. resources, lower the actual volume of U.S. aid, and reduce progress in meeting the goals of both the U.S. and the developing countries. Moreover, a reduction in U.S. bilateral aid may seriously diminish the effectiveness of U.S. leadership in encouraging other developed countries to maintain and expand their own aid programs.

The advantages of the international agencies are important and have been well ad-

Footnotes at end of article.

vertised in recent reports. For example, it is often easier for recipient countries to accept advice from a multilateral organization than from a particular donor country agency. Multilateral agencies, since they include the participation of the recipient countries, help provide the latter with participation in the decision-making and the review and evaluation processes of the aid programs. Multilateral aid also may help avoid the strains inherent in a direct donor-recipient aid relationship. Their limitations, however, need more emphasis, lest some of the very purposes of U.S. foreign assistance be lost. For example, while the advice of international agencies is indeed easier for developing countries to accept it is also easier to reject. The work of multilateral agencies moreover has been hampered thus far because they have failed to establish effective resident missions in developing nations to carry on country programming.

International financial institutions, like other specialized agencies, are not likely to have sufficient influence over the many areas of public policy relevant to the promotion of development. They do not deal with the security and foreign policy concerns of donors or recipients. They also have difficulty in coping with the political and social factors which, increasingly, are recognized as the principal impediments to long-term economic growth. Some are seriously restricted by their charters from considering the non-economic goals which frequently and rightly reflect higher priority objectives of both donor and recipient governments. Their administrative arrangements need drastic revision if they are to deliver to developing countries the kinds of resources that are most urgently needed and with a minimum of delay. As noted by the Jackson Report,[3] their programming and implementation as presently organized exhibit serious deficiencies in both coherence and coordination.

This is not to say that some international agencies are not improving nor that they do not have prospects of overcoming some of the deficiencies. The point is, that for the time being neither global nor regional bodies are equipped to carry the full load of international development. In particular, they are not in a position to fully express the U.S. interests in U.S. foreign assistance.

THE PETERSON COMMISSION PROPOSALS

The recommendations for improving administrative arrangements summarized at the beginning of this report are neither totally new nor dramatic. They have long been urged by experienced administrators and close observers of U.S. and other foreign aid programs. In recent months the Jackson Report [4] offered a similar suggestion to the United Nations family of organizations, as a means of improving the effectiveness of programs administered through its various agencies. Yet a recent U.S. Commission [5] appears to propose that the administration of U.S. programs be further "fractionated", that the authority of U.S. aid field missions be drastically reduced and that country programming be abandoned.[6]

Such proposals stem from a variety of considerations, among which dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of the existing aid program and its organization is a major factor. However, if implemented, they are likely to result in even less efficiency than the existing arrangements. Proliferating the number of U.S. government foreign aid agencies in Washington and returning "principal operating decisions" to Washington can only increase the difficulty of administering aid programs effectively. It is not likely that such measures would serve U.S. influence or U.S. interests in developing countries. In fact, the developing countries themselves are likely to be the principal victims. Their economic, political and social development is bound to suffer. Their external and internal security is unlikely to benefit.

The notion that a small White House staff in Washington and an Ambassador aided by a few Foreign Service Officers in the field can successfully coordinate such an administrative arrangement runs counter to two decades of experience with a variety of organizational structures for U.S. aid programs. Coordinators have never been successful in modifying significantly the allocation of funds by agencies that possess operational control over the obligation and expenditure of appropriations. Coordination at the White House inevitably facilitates maximum attention to *short-term* political considerations reflecting and responding to immediate domestic and foreign policy pressures. These are the very considerations that least reflect fundamental U.S. motives and basic U.S. interests in foreign aid.

It has been suggested that the underlying motive for these proposals was the expectation that splitting appropriations among many agencies and numerous pieces of legislation would make it easier to obtain adequate financing for U.S. aid as a whole. The reaction of Congressional friends and foes of foreign aid suggests that the Congress is unlikely to be affected by such tactics. What will be persuasive is a program so soundly conceived and skillfully administered that it produces results.

FOOTNOTES

[1] This working statement is one of the papers prepared by a group of faculty members and doctoral students who met weekly during the spring term of 1970 to consider the basic issues and problems of foreign aid in relation to a number of published reports on the subject. The group, chaired by Professor Saul Milton Katz, included: Professors Cheever, Creshkoff, Eaton, Flack, Kaplan, Katz, Robinson, Roseman, Solow, Thorn and Walters and Messrs. Ebeling and Wright. Not all members agree with all points in the paper.

[2] L. B. Pearson, *et al., Partners in Development*, for IBRD, Praeger Publishers, 1969.

[3] United Nations: *A Study of the Capacity of the UN Development System*, Vols. I & II, Geneva, 1969. (The "Jackson Report")

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] Peterson, et al, *U.S. Foreign Assistance in the Seventies* etc.

[6] The Peterson Commission's recommendations would seem to result in the following agencies administering U.S. government aid funds:

1. U.S. International Development Bank
2. U.S. Development Institute
3. Overseas Private Investment Corp.
4. Department of Agriculture
5. Export-Import Bank
6. Peace Corps
7. Department of Defense
8. Department of State

Additional funds for international organizations would be supervised by the Treasury Department in the case of international financial institutions, and by the United Nations Bureau of the State Department for other UN agencies. Presumably new organizational entities would be established within the State Department to administer supporting assistance and the Contingency Fund, public safety programs and refugee and emergency relief programs.

MODY BOATRIGHT—A GREAT AMERICAN FOLKLORIST AND EDUCATOR

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of America's finest folklorists and most renowned educators, Mody Boatright, died August 21, 1970. Dr. Boatright, who was University of Texas professor emeritus of English, earned the admiration and affection of his teaching colleagues and students. He came to be known as an outstanding friend of higher education, and was instrumental in bringing about many progressive innovations during his years as a teacher at the University of Texas at Austin where he taught from 1926 until 1969.

In addition to being recognized as a great educator, Dr. Boatright was generally considered to be one of the foremost experts on the folklore of the Southwest. He served as secretary and editor of the Texas Folklore Society from 1934 to 1964.

Dr. Boatright, a prolific writer, was perhaps best known for his articles and books on the history and folklore of the oil fields of Texas, and his studies of the American cowboy as a national folk hero. All of us owe this highly intelligent American an enormous debt of gratitude for his endless efforts to enrich our lives by preserving and reminding us of our heritage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that articles entitled "Heart Attack Claims Life of UT Prof," published in the Friday, August 21, 1970, issue of the Austin American; "Noted UT Folklorist, 73, Dies in Abilene," which appeared in the Friday evening, August 21, 1970, edition of the Fort Worth Star Telegram; "Dr. Boatright Dies; Folklorist, Ex-Teacher," published in the August 21, 1970, issue of the Fort Worth Star Telegram; "UT Prof. Emeritus Dr. Boatright Dies," published in the Friday, August 21, 1970, edition of the Houston Chronicle; "Dr. Mody C. Boatright, Folklore Editor, Dies," published in the Friday, August 21, 1970, issue of the Dallas Morning News; and "Mody C. Boatright, 1896–1970," published in the Dallas News on September 20, 1970, be printed in their entirety at this point in the RECORD.

I also ask that tributes by Wilson Hudson, Michael Crow, Américo Paredes, and Arthur M. Cory which were offered at Dr. Boatright's funeral be printed at this point in their entirety in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD tributes by Clarence L. Cline and Harry H. Ransom, and a response by Dr. Boatright, all of which were delivered at a dinner given in honor of Mody Boatright on April 16, 1965. These speeches appear on pages 7 through 27 in a pamphlet entitled, "Mody Boatright," which was published by the Texas Folklore Society on July 4, 1965.

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

HEART ATTACK CLAIMS LIFE OF UT PROF

Dr. Mody C. Boatright, University of Texas professor emeritus of English, died in Abilene Thursday.

University colleagues said he suffered a heart attack Sunday following an automobile accident which occurred while he and Mrs. Boatright were en route to Abilene to visit relatives.

Boatright had been in the intensive care unit of an Abilene hospital since Sunday, friends reported.

Funeral is pending Cook Funeral Home of Austin.

Boatright, a noted folklorist, taught at UT Austin from 1926 until September 1969. He remained active after his retirement, retaining an office in Parlin Hall. He continued his long association with the Texas Folklore Society, of which he was secretary-editor from 1943 to 1964.

Chancellor Harry Ransom of the UT System, who worked with Boatright for many years, gave an affectionate appraisal of his colleague when the Texas Folklore Society honored Boatright at a dinner in 1965. Among Dr. Ransom's remarks were the following.

"I must restate two well-known facts from the record of three decades. First, no matter how hot the argument, no matttr how perplexed the issue, Mody has never been unkind or unfair to any student or any colleague. Second and conversely, since the founding of the University, there have been few men who have inspired that kind of personal loyalty and those many kinds of personal trust which his integrity and gentle candor have enlisted among those of us who studied and worked with him.

Born Oct. 16, 1896, in Colorado City, Boatright was educated at West Texas State University (B.A., 1922) and the University of Texas (M.A., 1923, and Ph.D., 1932). He was an instructor in the demonstration school at West Texas State and taught English at Sul Ross State University before coming to UT Austin in 1926.

He rose through the academic ranks from instructor to professor and served as chairman of the English Department. In addition to his activities in state and national folklore organizations, he was a member of the American Studies Association and an honorary member of the South Central Modern Language Association.

He is survived by his wife; a daughter, Mrs. Frances Speck of Alpine and a son Mody K. Boatright of Corpus Christi.

NOTED UT FOLKLORIST, 73, DIES IN ABILENE

AUSTIN.—Dr. Mody C. Boatright, a well-known folklorist and English teacher at the University of Texas for 43 years, died yesterday in Abilene, the apparent victim of a heart attack. He was 73.

Funeral arrangements are pending here.

Colleagues said Boatright had a heart attack last Sunday following an automobile accident while he and his wife were driving to Abilene to visit relatives.

His daughter, Mrs. Frances Speck, lives in Abilene and a son, Mody K. Boatright, lives in Corpus Christi.

Boatright had been hospitalized in intensive care at Abilene since Sunday, friends said.

He taught at the university from 1926 to 1969, and, despite his retirement, kept an office on campus. He was a professor emeritus of English.

Boatright was secretary-editor of the Texas Folklore Society from 1943 to 1964.

Chancellor Harry Ransom of the university, a friend for 35 years, once said of Boatright, "No matter how hot the argument, no matter how perplexed the issue, Mody has never been unkind or unfair to any student or any colleague . . . there have been few men who have inspired that kind of personal loyalty and those many kinds of personal trust which his integrity and gentle candor have enlisted among those of us who studied and worked with him."

Boatright's interests ranged from Sir Walter Scott to oil to the American cowboy.

His books include "Folklore of the Oil Industry" and "Tall Tales from Texas Cow Camps."

A forthcoming book, "From the Derrick Floor," was written with Prof. William Owens of Columbia University.

Boatright was born in Colorado City and was educated at West Texas State University and the University of Texas. He taught at West Texas State and Sul Ross State University before coming here.

DR. BOATRIGHT DIES; FOLKLORIST, EX-TEACHER

AUSTIN.—Dr. Mody C. Boatright, 73, a noted folklorist and former English teacher at the University of Texas, died in Abilene Thursday.

Colleagues said Boatright suffered a heart attack Sunday after an auto accident which occurred while he and Mrs. Boatright were en route to Abilene to visit relatives.

He had been in the intensive care unit of an Abilene hospital since Sunday, friends said.

Boatright taught at the university from 1926 until 1969. He still carried the title of professor emeritus of English and had an office on the campus although he was retired.

He was secretary-editor of the Texas Folklore Society from 1943 to 1964.

Boatright established a tape-recorded oral history of oil pioneers at the university, and joined with a Columbia University professor in writing a forthcoming book entitled "From the Derrick Floor."

Other works by Boatright include "Folk Laughter on the American Frontier" and "Tall Tales from Texas Cow Camps."

He was born in Colorado City and educated at West Texas State University and the University of Texas.

Boatright is survived by his wife and two children, Mrs. Frances Speck of Abilene and Mody K. Boatright of Corpus Christi.

UT PROF. EMERITUS DR. BOATRIGHT DIES

(Chronicle Austin Bureau)

AUSTIN.—Dr. Mody C. Boatright, University of Texas English professor emeritus, died in Abilene Thursday of a heart attack suffered following an automobile accident which occurred while he and his wife were en route to Abilene to visit relatives.

Dr. Boatright had been in the intensive care unit of an Abilene hospital since Sunday, friends reported.

Funeral arrangements are pending at Cook Funeral Home in Austin.

A noted folklorist, Dr. Boatright taught at UT-Austin from 1926 until 1969.

He as a close associate of the late J. Frank Dobie, well-known UT professor and author.

Dr. Boatright is survived by his wife and two children, Mrs. Frances Speck of Alpine and Mody K. Boatright of Corpus Christi.

DR. MODY C. BOATRIGHT, FOLKLORE EDITOR, DIES

AUSTIN.—Dr. Mody C. Boatright, 73, a noted folklorist and former English teacher at the University of Texas, died in Abilene Thursday.

Colleagues said Boatright suffered a heart attack Sunday following an automobile accident which occurred while he and Mrs. Boatright were en route to Abilene to visit relatives.

He had been in the intensive care unit of an Abilene hospital since Sunday, friends said.

Boatright taught at the university from 1926 until 1969. He still carried the title of professor emeritus of English and had an office on the campus although he was retired.

He was secretary-editor of the Texas Folklore Society from 1943 to 1964.

Boatright established a tape-recorded oral history of oil pioneers at the university and joined with a Columbia University professor in writing a forth-coming book entitled "From the Derrick Floor."

Other works by Boatright include "Folk Laughter on the American Frontier" and "Tall Tales from Texas Cow Camps."

He was born in Colorado City and educated at West Texas University and the University of Texas. He taught at West Texas State and Sul Ross State University before coming here.

Boatright is survived by his life and two children, Mrs. Frances Speck of Alpine and Mody K. Boatright of Corpus Christi.

Funeral arrangements are pending.

MODY C. BOATRIGHT, 1896–1970

Texas lost one of its most distinguished literary figures when Mody C. Boatright died last month. The University of Texas at Austin knew him as an influential teacher of English there from 1926 to 1969; folklorists of the region, the nation and the world hailed his work in preserving and interpreting native lore. Two of his books, "The Folklore of the Oil Industry" and "Gib Morgan, Minstrel of the Oil Fields" are on the list of the SMU Press, as are 15 volumes edited or co-edited by him for the Texas Folklore Society's annual publication series. Next year the SMU Press will reissue his first book, "Tall Tales from Texas Cow Camps," published in Dallas by the Southwest Press in 1934 and long out of print. He had also before his death completed the manuscript of his study of the American cowboy as folk hero, to be brought out by the Encino Press of Austin.

MODY BOATRIGHT

(By Wilson Hudson)

I first came to know Mody Boatright in a class taught at the University of Texas by Dr. Griffith in the fall of 1928. It was a small class and we all got to know each other. At the end of the term Dr. Griffith showed me Mody's research paper on some aspect of Dryden. As I read it I realized that it was written as a research paper should be. It can be truly said that at this point I began to learn from Mody. In my long friendship with him this process never ceased.

For sixteen years I was out of Austin, but often on my visits I would drop in on Mody in his office. No matter how far apart the intervals, when I walked in it was always as if no time at all had elapsed. On one occasion when we were eating together he placed a few drops of hydrochloric acid in water and drank it. This was medicine for dyspepsia. Whatever the cause or causes, he did not offer an explanation, for it was not his way to talk about himself or say anything that could be taken as a complaint. Mody had fortitude, and this too was an important lesson for me.

When I returned to the Univeristy as an instructor in 1946, Mody was here. He had become editor for the Texas Folklore Society in 1943 after assisting J. Frank Dobie edit five volumes. Mody asked me whether I had anything to contribute to the volume he was currently editing, *Mexican Border Ballads and Other Lore*. I happened to have on hand a folktale which I had heard and written down in Mexico. Though I didn't suppose it was worth publishing, I showed it to Mody and he accepted it.

It was a good story, but at that time I didn't think of folklore as a field for serious activity. I learned otherwise from Mody. Except for the interruption of the war, I was fresh from a graduate English department where there was much talk of Aristotle and literary criticism, and folklore was not presumed to have any value unless it was connected with Arthurian romances or the *Canterbury Tales*. Mody seemed to be oriented to collection, but I soon found out that he was friendly to any kind of folklore investigation that would yield illuminating results.

In the year before my return to Austin, Mody had published his book on Gib Morgan, an oil driller in Pennsylvania who had become legendary. Besides pioneering the study of the folklore of oil, this book showed, more

generally, that folklore and folkways are not limited to agricultural or rural people but also flourish in industrial societies. Mody went on to publish *Folklore of the Oil Industry* in 1963; *Tales from the Derrick Floor*, with William Owens, is ready to appear this fall. Mody and Bill were active in organizing and carrying out the project known as the oral history of the oil industry.

This is only one side of Mody's folklore studies. He has worked on cowboys and frontiersmen, as in *Tall Tales from Texas* (1934) and *Folk Laughter on the American Frontier* (1949). He has won the high honor of being named a fellow of the American Folklore Society. After John A. Lomax, L. W. Payne, and J. Frank Dobie, Mody became a fellow of the Texas Folklore Society.

In the summer of 1951 Mody went to California to teach. He entrusted me with editing the Texas Folklore Society's volume for that year. When he returned he gave me advice on the typographical format of *The Healer of Los Olmos*, but he would not permit his name to appear on the title page, though he was still the elected editor. From 1951 until his resignation as editor in 1964, I helped Mody bring out the Society's annuals. From him I learned, first of all, respect for the material to be edited, and then the technique of editing by making only the necessary changes so as to improve the original without infringing upon the integrity of its writer. Mody respected the indivídual, always.

Though Mody was the editor and I was his assistant, he treated me as an equal partner. We shared in making decisions, and never was there a disagreement. When he gave up the editorship, he passed it on to me, I accepted on the condition that he would advise me freely on all important questions. Another characteristic of Mody's was that he would not give advice unless it was sought for. He was an excellent listener to puzzled people, but they had to ask explicitly for his opinion. Another of his characteristics was that he kept close council.

In the last two years Mody had made paisanos for the Society to sell. (The paisano or roadrunner is the Society's emblem.) These paisanos are made entirely of triangular pieces of wood which when assembled look remarkably like the bird. Mody liked to work with his hands and he had a fine artistic sense. He measured all of the pieces by eye, so that each paisano is unique. And underneath the pedestal he burned his brand. It gave him pleasure, I am sure, to know that members of the Society and his friends far and wide had something of his making that would always be theirs. I have five of Mody's paisanos that I shall always cherish, and I shall cherish forever his friendship and his teaching. I do not mean merely his teaching in the field of folklore; I mean to include what he taught me, by example, about how people should face life and treat others. He was a strong moral force in my life and I am thankful for him.

MODY

(By Michael Crow)

"The evil that men do lives after them;
The good is oft interred with their bones."

So spoke the bard, and this oft quoted, ironic statement may well serve as a final judgment upon the lives of most of us. But a life such as Mody Boatright lived is clearly an exception, albeit the exception that proves the rule.

What are the good qualities, one may ask, that will survive from such a life, a life lived most unselfishly, without any desire whatever for show or pretense, without any desire for glamour, great riches, or worldly fame? Indeed the kind of glory and pseudo-honor connoted by the familiar phrase "the boast of heraldry, the pomp of power" were objectives condemned by Mody throughout his career. What, then, is he to be remembered for primarily? For his wide-ranging scholarship—yes, especially in American literature and American folklore. For his excellent teaching over a span of several decades—yes, he will long be remembered for this by hundreds and hundreds of students, both graduate and undergraduate, whom he guided painstakingly in academic disciplines. For his numerous learned publications—yes, certainly he will long be remembered for these. Also, for his excellent administrative ability, displayed effectively but ever unobtrusively as chairman, for over nine years, of a large and complex department, composed of heterogeneous and often volatile, if not explosive, elements.

Yes, for all these accomplishments Mody will long be remembered. But I have not yet touched upon that significant quality which, in my opinion, made him a truly great and good man. It is hard to define exactly this quality. And one had to live with him and work with him for many years to appreciate, with any sense at all, the magnitude of this quality. Each of us who have known him over the years can truly say with Marc Antony, "He was my friend, faithful and just." All who have worked with him have felt the warm glow of his sincere friendship, his calm sense of fair judgment, his deep understanding of human nature, his breadth of view, and his kindly tolerance. Living himself according to the strictest moral code, he was yet slow to condemn or censure those who did not, or perhaps could not, live up to his standards. Not openly professing adherence to any religious sect, he nevertheless lived by the highest moral principles of religious teachings. To perceive his true nature one had to see him, not only at home surrounded by his devoted family, by his carefully marked volumes of English and American literature, and by the treasured oil paintings and water colors produced by his wife, but also one had to see him, always completely unruffled, presiding at a stormy departmental meeting or session of the budget council, where cross-currents ran strong and sharp disagreements were sharply expressed, and where, with that tempering little smile we all knew so well, he, like the worthy Parson, did not hesitate when the occasion demanded, to "snybben sharply for the nonys" some colleague who too stubbornly defended a perverse point of view. And to perceive his true nature one had to see Mody also as the quiet and sympathetic listener and counselor to a student or to a fellow staff member who had got into real trouble. An understanding of the human heart, a never-failing sympathy for his fellows—these were noteworthy qualities of this man, loved and revered by so many. In the unpretentious simplicity of his way of life, he attained a greatness of soul that inspired us all, and most of all this is the quality, the good, that will *not* be interred with his bones, but will live on and on in the memory of his fellow men. "For he was great of heart."

MODY BOATRIGHT, A TEACHER

(By Américo Paredes)

I did not know Mody Boatright as long as many others of his colleagues. And when our paths first crossed, it was at considerable distance; nor did I recognize him then—as I came to do so later—as a folklorist, undeniably the most distinguished professional folklorist that Texas has produced. This crossing of our paths occurred in the 1940s—when he already was a teacher of long standing at the University of Texas and I was a journalist of sorts in Tokyo, Japan. I took courses by correspondence from him during those years, in literature and short-story writing; and it was as a teacher of these subjects that I first came to know of him and to profit (at long distance) from his wisdom and experience.

Some two or three years later I met him in the flesh, in that .nevitable meeting place for the English Department prior to Parlin Hall—the Tower elevator. I am not really sure he remembered me as one of the dozens of student-correspondents he had worked with during preceding years. But if such was the case, he did nothing to make me aware of it. I might have been the only correspondence student he had ever had. Not long after this folklore became my major field; and it was my privilege to be associated with him—first as student, later as beginning folklorist under his tutelage, and still later as colleague. Many a task of mine was made easier and more productive by his kindly advice and his willing help. But there is nothing remarkable in that; hundreds of others who knew him can surely say the same.

Mody Boatright lived a full life—that is to say, a life in which there are always things still waiting to be done. Among those things was to be a study of the folklife of the southwestern people he knew and loved. This was to be one of those projects he would do justice to—once he was "fully retired." As editor of the *Journal of American Folklore*, I had the privilege of publishing what was probably the last of his works that he would see in print—a note on his brother, Will Boatright, maker of bits and spurs. Other studies would have followed.

We can see this unfinished work of his as cause for sorrow. Or we can feel that he died with the future still unfolding before him, which is certainly the best way to die.

It is as a teacher, however, that I will remember Mody Boatright. And it is as spokesman for his students that I say these words today. It is said that it is easy to speak well of the dead. I would want to bring you, then, a token of the affection his students had for him when he was still among them. Just a year ago, the students of folklore at the University of Texas (the University Folklore Association) published the first number of their *Folklore Annual*. It carried a picture of Mody Boatright and the following dedication: "The University Folklore Association dedicates the first issue of its *Annual* to Mody C. Boatright, distinguished folklorist, first among the founders of the Center for Intercultural Studies in Folklore and Oral History, and a teacher who has inspired generations of students." A teacher who inspired generations of students. It is as a teacher that I would honor him today.

MY FRIEND MODY

(By Arthur M. Cory)

While Dr. Boatright was chairman of the Department of English, I was privileged to serve as his assistant for a period of seven years. During that time I came to know him in a close day-to-day relationship that few others in the department have had the opportunity to share. There were many pleasant times. There were also times of pressure, times of annoyance, times of frustration—times that would have driven a man of lesser stature to explosive anger and harsh words. But Dr. Boatright never lost his perspective, never raised his voice. My most cherished recollection of Mody is that of his kindness in dealing with people.

For he really liked people; he had a great and inexhaustible capacity for friendship. He was a gentle man—gentle in the sense of having deep and sincere consideration and compassion for others. A great deal more than most folk realized, he was concerned about the members of the department—especially the young members—and he had a perceptive awareness of their individual needs, both financial and psychological. He was quick to praise, reluctant to criticize; he found it difficult to be unpleasant with anyone.

Those of us who worked closely with him appreciated his soft spoken, low pressure attitude. To use the kind of homely expression that he himself was fond of, he was "as com-

fortable as an old shoe." Although he had a disarming simplicity, he was a man of many interests, widely read in a host of varied and divergent areas. Yet he wore his scholarship casually, always giving the feeling that he was sharing rather than pontificating.

Mody had a way of going directly to the heart of things. A man of honesty and integrity, he could not abide affectation or pretense. With Tom Paine he could say, "I believe that religious duties consist in doing justice, loving mercy, and endeavouring to make our fellow creatures happy."

What more can we say? We loved this man—loved him for what he was, for what he stood for, for the incalculable influence that he has had upon his students and his friends. Inevitably we think of Hamlet's appraisal of his father:

He was a man, take him all in all;
I shall not look upon his like again.

We think, too, of Emerson's final graveside comment about Thoreau:

"Wherever there is knowledge, wherever there is virtue, wherever there is beauty, he will find a home."

When I was first asked to substitute for Dr. Ransom this evening, my feelings were very much like those of an aging rookie, accustomed to warm the bench, who is suddenly called upon by that eccentric manager Casey Stengel to pinch-hit for Mickey Mantle in the first inning. I quickly recognized, however, that that metaphor was not very good, especially as all my athletic activity is confined to an easy chair. So I came up with another one, which I think better: it was like being called upon, five minutes before curtain time, to substitute for Richard Burton in the role of Hamlet—and being handed a copy of the play. What more could anyone ask? I won't answer that question: all that I promise is that I will read from the authentic text.

I liked the Hamlet analogy because I remembered that when Hamlet staged a play he inserted some dozen or sixteen lines of his own composition into it. Well, I intend to do the same. The play that Hamlet staged in the presence of King Claudius and his court, you will remember, was entitled "The Mouse Trap." If Mody feels that he is being mousetrapped tonight, I would remind him of the saying, "I can protect myself against my enemies, but God preserve me from my friends." Or as the English statesman George Canning expressed it:

Give me the avowed, the erect, the manly foe,
Bold I can meet—and perhaps may turn his blow!
But of all plagues, good Heaven, thy wrath can send,
Save, save, oh save me from the *candid friend!*

In all seriousness, however, there is no one whom I would rather join in honoring than Mody Boatright. In the first place he richly deserves it; in the second I think of no one to whom I am personally so heavily indebted.

The beginning of our friendship goes back to 1928—more years than I like to contemplate. Madison Avenue in our time has coined the phrase "the thinking man." Well, in 1928 I was Number 1 on the list of unthinking men. Badly educated, I was nevertheless filled with deep prejudices, conventional ideas, and dogmatic convictions—primary certitudes, as James Harvey Robinson calls them—all stubbornly held but none of them ever examined. Babbitt would have given me the Boosters' Club handgrip, Barry Goldwater would have called me brother, and I think it even possible that some others unnamed would have spoken of me as "a man of very sound ideas." But one by one, Mody—with occasional assists from others—forced me to examine these "certitudes," and one by one I reluctantly had to abandon most of them as untenable. This, as you can see, places me immeasurably in his debt.

With others of our colleagues I share a professional indebtedness to him as well. Since Dr. Ransom develops this point, I will only say that the structure of the Department of English today owes more to Mody than to any other single person. He was chairman for ten years—longer, I believe, than any other man. The department today has much of the stamp of Mody Boatright on it; and if its shape and structure are goodly in the main, much of the credit must go to him and his wise leadership. As his successor, I inherited a sound, going concern that made my task comparatively easy—most of the time.

For the more than thirty-five years of our association we have been friends—a friendship that my wife and I have shared with his good wife as well—we have been office mates—a real test of friendship—we have been colleagues in an intimate professional relationship. In all those years I have never know him to commit an unworthy act. And in the days of our internal university convulsion, going back almost twenty years now, I still remember that his was the most courageous single act performed by any member of a faculty of perhaps a thousand. I will not embarrass him by reciting the details of how he—and he alone—stood up in public and said what ought to have been said—what the rest of us, with minor exceptions, thought, felt, and did not say. That enlightenment emerged from the dark peril of those days was due, in good part, to his courage and example and that of other faculty members who joined with him.

I am proud to say that there has never been a break in our friendship, not even a hint, I believe I can truthfully say, of suspicion of one another's integrity. I have loved Mody as much as I have ever loved any man. There is no one whom I'd rather join in honoring than Mody Boatright. The Texas Folklore Society could not have made a better choice, and in honoring him I feel that we are really honoring ourselves.

Forgive me if I have exercised my privilege and gone beyond the dozen or sixteen lines of Hamlet. I will now read what Dr. Ransom would have said so much better had he been able to be present. Articulate as he is, this may well have been one of the hardest speeches that he ever had to write; for I am sure that he shared the difficulty that any of us who know Mody would have faced—how to control the strong emotion that is nevertheless evident in what he wrote and how not to embarrass his friend more than he could help.

MR. RANSOM'S SPEECH

These lines on Mody Boatwright were written before I received a summons to a meeting on the East Coast which I had not foreseen and could not ignore.

I am glad that in my absence I am being made audible by Clarence Cline, a teaching colleague of Mody Boatwright. Indeed, for this fact I am doubly grateful because I have tried to talk about Mody mainly as a teacher, as a man, and as a friend. Nothing I have to say about him depends solely upon transient relations in editorship or administrative work. Yet in every official context, my respect for him has grown to equal my personal affection.

Like some of the Southwest's early amateur Indian fighters, more skillful gun-slingers, and hardier grizzly-bear wrestlers, Mody Boatright has lived dangerously. With a difference. It is this difference which defines him.

Mody's folklore has not focused on bears. Yet in the academic bestiary, there are shaggy and shambling creatures. Mody has proved himself a champion in pinning these mindless chimeras to the floor. He carries no gun. He has never been trigger-happy on academic firing lines. But he is fast—very fast—on the draw when it comes to principle. So far as I know, his experience with Indians is all peaceful and artistic, in company with his talented wife. Among the not so noble savages of the academic savannas, however, he has been a civilizing influence by example—especially when we were inclined to revert to our aboriginal impulses.

These roundabout figures are only a cautious means of avoiding the kind of superlatives I know Mody detests. On an unstatistical and unrhetorical basis, I must restate two well-known facts from the record of three decades. First, no matter how hot the argument, no matter how perplexed the issue, Mody has never been unkind or unfair to any student or any colleague. Second and conversely, since the founding of the University, there have been few men who have inspired that kind of personal loyalty and those many kinds of personal trust which his integrity and gentle candor have enlisted among those of us who studied and worked with him.

In the Boatright era, we have seen many swift transitions, new departures, subtle changes. Among all of them Mody has been highly adaptable. Some men adapt by whirling in the manner of an academic wind sock. Not Mody. His changing has come out of qualities in character—lively human interest and deep human sympathies. His altruism is neither polite sentiment nor professional expediency. "He is profoundly interested in other people—what they think, what they are doing, what they hope to do." That sentence is a paraphrase of the opinion of a student in the thirties. In the sixties, it holds true. It is true, and it is worth some emphasis when we consider the scarcity of Mody Boatrights. That scarcity has brought into being the perverted notion that the real profits of the academy are reserved for the self-interested and the self-centered.

I am not saying that Mody has ever chosen empty amiability above honest argument. He does not retreat to vague agreeableness in order to avoid collision of ideas. On the contrary, he knows as well as the professional cynics and better than the self-anointed do-gooders that a certain amount of friction is healthful. One of my earliest conversations with him, in 1935, circled this matter. In that year, I was trying to regain a sense of the state's history and grope toward the sense, if any, by which our English Department in those days conducted its business. From Mody I began to learn that universities get some of their motive power from contradiction, controversy, disunity of opinion, and the general disorder of educational affairs which so bewilders some obtuse outsiders who really want to be the friends of higher education. During the years that followed, I discovered that like Addison's angel, Mody has native talents for riding tempests, directing storms, and harnessing occasional tornadoes to the general good. His genius under such circumstances, by the way, is not so much a function of natural piety as quick access to common sense. He takes the same unvarying common sense to public gatherings, to official desks, and into the private clutterment of his office. It would be impossible to estimate how many pipefuls of attentive concern has gone up in smoke as Mody listened to the unharnessed prejudices and pip-squeak problems which each of us from time to time has visited upon him.

One more closely related generalization. In these three decades, when academic men and women have found new voices and concocted new idioms, nobody has ever doubted that Mody knew when the time came to stand up and be counted. He has never been one of those among us, however, who kept jumping up just to be heard. Hence his

talent for quietness has multiplied the hitting power of his opinions when they were expressed. And hence, on the personal side, the steady inclination of his friends to keep counting on him not only for momentary comfort but also for steady encouragement.

I have been discussing what might be called Mody's contribution to our living as teachers and learners. The Texas Folklore Society is as good a context as any for adding certain observations about his highly professional work, his scholarship. I came to Texas too late to learn how this practical Texan had steered a doctoral raft among the narrows, the depths, the shoals and reefs and shallows of formalized disciplines in Gothic, Old-English infinitives, and eighteenth-century bibliography. I knew that he had landed in a cove where he could examine without any sort of pretentiousness the folklore of Sir Walter Scott. His choice of that topic must have been personal. It was certainly prophetic. He did not make his tome a mere scholarly gimmick. Nor did he cloud it with implications that Scott was spiritually Texan, a chivalric ghost who might have presided over the battlements of the Alamo. On the contrary, he wrote a solid study which is *solidly* fixed among "contributions to Scott scholarship."

Mody's bibliography is lengthy. By his generosity my name is attached to three or four of the volumes which he and Frank Dobie published for this Society. I am proud of that fact. I am prouder of a surprise which illustrates something more than the little ironies of our profession. At an international meeting in London years ago, I discovered by pure accident that "Boatright of Texas" was one section of a symposium on world frontiers. The subject of discussion was not one of Mody's notable books. It was his short, simple article on co-operation among frontiersmen. It was typical Boatright scholarship: quiet counterpoint in real significance among louder, lopsided proclamations about the intrepid loneliness and lonely independence of our pioneers.

Mody's contributions to the history of the oil industry are well known. It will be more widely known later that without much of a budget he directed the foundation of the library of oral accounts concerning that industry. How many of these accounts would have been lost if his imagination had not salvaged them is anybody's guess. I would guess the larger part.

If the Boatright study of the American cowboy brings into focus the kind of insight which his essays now being printed reveal, that work may well be his greatest harvest.. It may even exceed his long and distinguished service to this Society. Both careers have been mixed in him with the constant learner, the teacher, and the man.

As I started out trying to say, there has been enough of Boatright to go around among a host of admirers, friends, and debtors. Our kind of debt is payable only in gratitude. It will outlast this night.

MR. BOATRIGHT'S RESPONSE

I am deeply grateful to my friend Harry Ransom for the kind words he has written about me and to Clarence Cline for his delivery of them, and especially for the dozen or so lines he has added. I shall continue to call him a friend in spite of what he has just said.

Several years ago I delivered a lecture at the University of Illinois. While I was there a local emcee asked me to be a guest on his television show. We exchanged pleasantries, he gave a generous plug for my lecture, and then said he would like to ask me a few questions. First, how did I come to be interested in folklore? I replied with what was meant to be an introductory sentence, but at that moment the signal came on that it was time for the commercial. I have been frustrated ever since and tonight I propose to relieve myself of my frustrations and become a well-adjusted personality.

As I now look back it is clear to me that my interest in folklore is related to the culture in which I spent my boyhood. This was basically a cattle culture out on the sources of the Colorado River of Texas in an era of fenced pastures and individually owned land. The ranches were typically moderate in size and family-owned and family-operated. There were a few farmers among us, many of whom had acquired their 640 acres under the Texas Homestead Act. They kept a few cattle, and raised feed for their livestock and cotton for sale. There was no conflict between them and those whose incomes were derived primarily from cattle. (Incidentally I believe that writers of popular Western stories and even some historians have greatly exaggerated the farmer-rancher conflict, certainly as far as Texas is concerned.) There were Yankees among us and even some Hudson River Dutch, but we were predominantly of Southern extraction. If I had to characterize our prevailing mental bent, I should say that it was pragmatic and skeptical. Whenever Doc Hightower saw a land terrapin crawling down a cowtrail in the daytime, he would bet five dollars that it would rain in three days. He expected, however, to win on averages, for he knew that it did not rain every time he saw a terrapin crawling down a cowtrail in the daytime. Mr. Stonham did not believe that the weather of the first twelve days of the year indicated the weather of the twelve months to follow. He said that he had noticed it a hundred times and there was nothing to it. We used to say that all signs fail in Texas and that the only sure sign of rain was cloudy all around and pouring down in the middle. This skepticism extended to things other than the weather.

We were not all singers but there were singers among us, from whom I heard many of the cowboy songs John Lomax was later to collect. Strangely, in spite of our Southern heritage, I heard very few Child ballads.

We were not all liars but there were liars among us who told some of the tales I was later to put in a book. There was Mr. New, a great hunter. Once he drew a bead on an antelope a half mile away, but so powerful was that 30–30 Winchester and so accurate was his aim that even at that great distance he hit the antelope and killed him tol'able dead.

And there was Mr. Powell, who liked to fish as well as Mr. New liked to hunt. Once he thought that he had discovered a new species of catfish. He was fishing in the Clear Fork of the Brazos when he hooked a great fish which he eventually tired down, and as he was pulling him in he noticed what looked like a long white beard, but when he landed the fish he saw that what looked like a beard was not a beard at all. It was a dozen or more fishing lines of less successful fishermen.

We were not all fiddlers, but there were fiddlers among us, and when they cut down on "Cotton-Eyed Joe" or "Hell Among the Yearlings," they could make them fiddles talk. Most celebrated among them were James K. Polk Harris, a ranchman of considerable substance, in whose house we couldn't find a drop of liquor on the day his wife was bitten a rattlesnake and my mother and I stopped to give first aid;—and there was Paul Hamilton, who before prohibition put him out of business ran a saloon in Sweetwater. They took turns winning the championship in the district Old Fiddlers' contest. And there was Clyde Jones, who could read notes and who played the violin as well as the fiddle.

There were no real Negroes in our country, but the Negro was nevertheless in a cultural sense present. I heard "Run, Nigger, Run," "Possum up a 'Simmon Tree," and "Roll, Jordan, Roll" long before I saw them in print. I heard Negro jokes and rhymes too, some sympathetic, but mostly derogatory. I could sense the injustice implied in the rhyme,

A nigger and a white man
  Playing seven-up;
The nigger beat;
  The white man picked the money up.

I knew a Negro man who shined shoes in Sweetwater, but since he was a deaf mute, it was difficult to communicate with him. He used to prophesy the weather. If he held up one hand with fingers down and moving, and the other hand up with three fingers erect, he was saying it would rain in three days, but I never learned what his prognostications were based on.

I learned about segregation when at the age of seven I spent a summer in deep East Texas. I found that I could play with Sweet Child, a Negro boy of my own age, without loss of caste among my peers. But when I used the wash basin reserved for the colored help, Ella May Connally ran up and down the street chanting,

Mody Boatright, washed his face in the nigger wash pan,
Mody Boatright, washed his face in the nigger wash pan.

A few years after this visit to East Texas the railroad came to our immediate West Texas community. Frank Williams sold a section of land for a townsite. He sold off other land in blocks of 160 and 300 acres, and Jim Aldredge sold a part of his. Some of the purchasers were from the Piney Woods of Texas. Some of them knew how to remove warts by the moon. Some of them said that if you were sick a-bed and anybody swept under the bed while you were in it, you would never get up. They told stories about sawmills and alligators and they knew strange riddles like, "A horn ate a horn in a high oak tree." Even a fifteen-year-old boy was aware of cultural differences and found them interesting.

This interest was further stimulated by my experience at West Texas State College. There I had two history teachers who enlarged my concept of history. One was Lester F. Sheffey, who was recently honored at the Texas Writers' Roundup, and the other was Hattie Anderson, a young woman just out of graduate school, news of whose death reached me last week. They organized the Panhandle Plains Historical Society and, as they were without funds, during my senior year they asked me to serve temporarily as unpaid secretary. I gave what time I could spare, a good part of which was spent in signing letters that Hattie Anderson had written. I had had courses in history from grade school through college. In Texas in those days all pupils in the public schools had to have a course in the history of the state, but I had never considered the settling of the Panhandle of Texas as history. I had not before realized that the founding of the Western Windmill Company in Colorado City, for example, was an event of some historical importance.

When I came to the University of Texas, Mr. Sheffey, who had been a student with Bertha and Frank Dobie at Southwestern University, told me to be sure and look Dobie up. I did, but little came from our meeting. It was my fault. I was trying to get a master's degree before my money gave out. My real friendship with Dobie began later, after I had gone to teach at Sul Ross College. One day Victor Smith telephoned me that Frank Dobie was in town and he was to meet him at the college in the evening. Would I like to come? Dobie had just come out of Mexico. As we sat on the steps in the moonlight, he told the story of the *mezcla* man, the adobe man who concealed a hoard of gold in his belly. I told a story then current in the Big Bend about how in the early days a priest had pursued the Devil down a valley and locked him up in a cave near Ojinaga. He asked me to write it for the Texas Folklore Society publication.

I did, and thus began what for me was a long, pleasant, and gratifying association.

John Lomax was not at the University of Texas when I came. He and James Ferguson had had a disagreement and both were out of office. One of my teachers had given me a copy of *Cowboy Songs;* I was pleased to see songs I had known in print, and I was impressed by Theodore Roosevelt's letter of endorsement. Lomax did come to the campus to lecture and I heard him. What struck me most was his singing. When he wished to illustrate a point with a song he said, "I make no apologies for my singing. I can sing as well as the average cowboy." And indeed he could. I was almost persuaded to sing in public.

I came to know John Lomax quite well. The most vivid memory I have of him concerns a visit to his home in Dallas. He had invited Frank Dobie and me to spend the night with him. Miss Ruby was away from home, and he had plenty of room to put us up. He had also invited a capitalist who he hoped might give some money to support our work in folklore. He had bought the best steaks and the best liquor the Dallas market afforded. After the meal we talked far into the night. Lomax kept bringing the subject back to folklore—how important it was, and implying that it was worthy of generous support. Finally about midnight he asked the capitalist directly whether he would like to give some money to the cause. The capitalist replied, "You know, I believe I'm under the influence. Yes, I am under the influence, and I make it a rule never to make a commitment while under the influence." If he made a commitment after he became sober, I never heard of it.

I did come to know during my first year in the University Lomax's associate and cofounder with him of the Texas Folklore Society, L. W. Payne, who before coming to Texas had done field work in dialectology in rural Alabama, where he found a folk culture more Elizabethan than Victorian. In time a ritual was established as a part of the annual meeting. After the papers and speeches at the dinner, Professor Payne would get up and explain how in Alabama during his boyhood the minister would at the close of the sermon "open the doors of the church" by inviting any who felt disposed to enter by letter, the promise of a letter, or by "profession of faith." He would then announce that the doors of the society were open to any who might wish to enter by paying the membership dues. Once when the Society met in El Paso Dr. Payne could not go and asked me to perform for him. I said his speech as nearly verbatim as I could and was promptly dubbed Brother Boatright.

I should not fail to mention my indebtedness to Morgan Callaway, Jr. After I returned to the University for the Ph.D. and as the time approached for me to decide upon a subject for a dissertation, I was inclined toward folklore. I did not know then that Professor Callaway had told John Lomax that the cowboy ballad was an unsuitable subject because there was no way to connect it with any major writer or movement in literature. This would have been the typical Johns Hopkins answer at the time and I was not surprised to learn of it later. I asked Professor Callaway if he would supervise a dissertation on the use of the supernatural in the fiction of Sir Walter Scott. He readily agreed and took a keen interest in the work, which became essentially a study of the literary use of folklore. He left me largely to my own devices, confining his suggestions to minor matters of form and style. He did require a longer bibliography than I would have otherwise had. While I was writing the dissertation I wrote some sketches which afterwards appeared in *Tall Tales from Texas.* When the first of these came out in a magazine, I took it to him with some misgivings, thinking he might reprove me for using time that had better be given to the dissertation. But he was pleased. He praised me especially for my attempt to render in writing the speech I had heard from cowboys like Bill Bishop and Red Padget. And I learned that he was an admirer of Longstreet's *Georgia Scenes.* When the dissertation was finished, however, he advised me not to abandon Scott, at least for a while. In a few years, he said, I could become the world authority on Sir Walter. He never said so, but I think he was disappointed that I did not follow his advice.

In 1937 Frank Dobie asked me to serve as associate editor of the Texas Folklore Society publications, and soon afterward he asked Harry Ransom to join us. And we worked together until Harry was drafted by Dean of the Graduate School. I think we made a good team. In those days we received more unsolicited manuscripts than later came our way. Dobie would keep them in a tin box until a number had accumulated and then we would meet and discuss them. Some of them didn't detain us long. A woman has written a poetic tribute to her grandfather, who exemplified all those pioneer virtues that made Texas great, and has offered it to us for publication. A man is writing an epic poem the hero of which is to be the jackrabbit, the most appropriate symbol of America. He has completed a hundred or so lines and perhaps we would like to publish them. But if an unsolicited paper from a layman seemed authentic, we would put it in publishable form. For some reason, perhaps because Dobie had edited for publication an excellent series of tales published under the title of *Juneteenth,* subsequent papers by J. Mason Brewer fell to me. Brewer knew that the farm Negroes in the Brazos bottom did not speak standard American English and he would have felt dishonest if he had put standard American English in their mouths. He knew their language and could talk it and when he told their tales orally he used it effectively. But when he sat down to write he had little regard for consistency. He might write *Gawd* in one line and *God* in the next line without a change of speaker. But his contribution to folklore was a significant one and I do not regret the time that I spent on his manuscripts.

We had no rigid definitions, no unchangeable preconceptions about what folklore ought to be. If one complained that the recollections of a mustanger did not fit any of the traditional categories of folklore, Dobie would reply, "We make our own categories." Yet over the years there was a discernible trend in the publications of the Society, as has been pointed out by a number of scholars including Gene Bluestein and more recently Roger Abrahams. We are a regional Society and our special province has been Texas and the Southwest and our neighboring republic. Generally we have attempted not to abstract the lore from its context but to present it within its cultural matrix. We believe that there is something distinctive in the overall conformation of this lore, but we have not claimed unqueness for any single item. Even such an indigenous-sounding expression as "Texas is a fine place for men and dogs but hell on women and horses" had its analogue in the England of Thomas Deloney.

We have not, however, excluded general or comparative studies, recent examples of which are Frank Dobie's article on madstones, McEdward Leach's on the folk ballad as a literary form, and Wilson Hudson's on "Freud's Myth of the Primal Horde." The proportion of these studies has been increasing in our annual volumes.

I value the years that I spent as an associate editor and as editor for the Society. I think I learned something about editing. I think I learned something about writing. But most rewarding to me have been the associations I have formed, particularly with men like Frank Dobie and Harry Ransom.

A CENTURY IS MARKED BY BETHEL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I place into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article that appeared in the November 5th edition of the West Orange Chronicle.

This story concerns the 100th anniversary celebration of Bethel Presbyterian Church of East Orange, N.J. Moreover, its pastor, Rev. Nicholas J. Burggraaff, is concurrently marking his 20th anniversary with Bethel. I congratulate Reverend Burggraaff, both for his splendid service to his parishioners and his imaginative handling of Bethel's centennial celebration.

The article follows:

ONE-HUNDRED YEAR HISTORY IS CELEBRATED AT BETHEL, E.O.

A display of memorabilia relevant to the 100 year history of Bethel Presbyterian Church, corner of Dodd street and Midland avenue, East Orange, is currently being assembled in preparation for the Homecoming celebration on Anniversary Sunday. Among the display items is a small organ which was used over a half cenutry ago to provide accompaniment for the Sunday School class of six Chinese boys. All members of one family, the class was held in the minister's study under the tutelage of Mrs. Floyd Bennett, according to Mrs. William Riedel, Bethel church secretary.

Old photographs, wedding announcements and church bulletins marking highlights of the past 100 years are on view on a special display shelf which was designed and constructed by Elder George A. Waters around the perimeter of the Junior High Room to allow maximum flow of visitors to have the opportunity to study the rare items.

Former Bethel members from as far away as Ohio are expected for the centennial celebration, November 8 which also marks the same Sunday when the present building was dedicated in 1891.

The last of three celebration events, including an organ recital in March and a Strawberry Festival in June, the Homecoming Sunday will be marked with a special worship service. Rev. Nicholas J. Burggraaff, whose 20th anniversary as pastor of Bethel is also being observed, will preach the anniversary sermon entitled, "The Forward Moving Church."

The chancel choir, under the direction of Edwin Skalak, A.A.G.O., will sing "Achieved is the Glorious Work" from Haydn's "Creation" among its offerings. All of the choral responses were composed by Skalak, two of them especially for this occasion. Former soloists who have sung at Bethel over the years will join the choir in honor of this occasion.

Rev. K. Blaine Cragg, moderator of the Newark Presbytery, Rev. Hamilton Reeve, former Bethel member, and Rev. Ulysses B. Blakeley, executive of the Presbytery of Newark will also participate in the service. Presentation of a portrait of Rev. Burggraaff and re-naming of Fellowship Hall in his honor will commemorate both anniversaries.

A film program for children from 4 to 8 years will be shown in the Junior room and a nursery for younger children will be provided during the church service, according to Miss Helen Rhodes, who with Miss Margaret Auld and Mrs. Roy Sjogren, is co-chairman for the day's activities.

Following the service, a dinner will be

served under the direction of Mrs. George A. Freeman and Mrs. George A. Waters, hospitality co-chairmen. Three hundred reservations have been received. Mayor William S. Hart of East Orange will extend greetings.

A souvenior centennial booklet of the church's history will be presented to all who attend.

UNITED STATES WILL NOT RECOGNIZE ODER LINE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News last Friday carried a very disturbing report by its Daily News foreign service correspondent, Donald R. Shanor.

Mr. Shanor reports that the United States does not intend to follow West Germany in recognizing Poland's Oder-Neisse frontier.

Over the weekend, West Germany's Chancellor Willy Brandt announced that West Germany has signed an agreement with Poland setting up the West Germany-Poland boundaries.

If the Chicago Daily News report is correct, it appears incredible that the United States would not recognize the agreement reached between West Germany and Poland.

President Nixon has made a lot of promises to the Polish-American people, but if Mr. Shanor's report is correct, the President has a forked tongue; he is talking out of both sides of his mouth and has no intention of keeping his promises.

Mr. Shanor's article follows:

UNITED STATES WON'T RECOGNIZE ODER LINE

(By Donald R. Shanor)

WARSAW.—The United States does not intend to follow West Germany in recognizing Poland's Oder-Neisse frontier, although it is under considerable pressure from Warsaw and Polish-Americans to do so.

When the German-Polish treaty talks are concluded and a formula for recognizing the border is agreed to, the United States will issue a statement welcoming the pact and expressing its satisfaction that another step toward East-West detente has been accomplished.

But there will be no change in the U.S. position that final placement of the Polish-German border must await a peace treaty, and until then the territories the Germans have renounced are still considered to be under only temporary Polish administration.

The British are expected to go along with this stand. The French, although they have made no formal changes in their policy on the Polish borders, made it known 11 years ago through the late President Charles de Gaulle that they considered the Oder-Neisse line to be final. The fourth World War II allied power, the Soviet Union, has that more than Poland's borders is at stake.

If the unchanged U.S. position seems to put the United States out of step with almost everyone, including both German states, the reasoning is that more than Poland's borders is at stake.

The United States does not want to risk any further erosion of four-power responsibility for settling the problems of postwar Germany.

Thus, the United States welcomes interim solutions between the German states and their neighbors, and for this reason the Americans support the talks between the two German governments.

But a U.S. abrogation of any of the four-power agreements, such as the one on the Polish border, would imperil four-power responsibilities on the entire complex of post-war issues, the most important of which is Berlin.

U.S. officials feel that the security of 2.2 million West Berliners is more important than satisfying Poland's wish for further border guarantees.

POLICY STATEMENT OF MIDDLE STATES TAXPAYER CONFERENCE

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, last July the representatives of the Middle States Taxpayers Associations representing Texas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, Tennessee, and Louisiana, adopted an important resolution concerning the growing need for fiscal responsibilty by government.

I believe it is pertinent to this moment as we take up a number of money bills in the remaining sessions of the 91st Congress that we Members of Congress be aware of the feeling of the majority of the taxpayers of the Nation. I am, therefore, including as a part of these remarks, the resolution passed by the 13th Annual Middle States Taxpayers Conference on July 29, 1970.

The resolution follows:

POLICY STATEMENT OF 13TH ANNUAL MIDDLE STATES TAXPAYER CONFERENCE

The executives of the ten statewide taxpayer research organizations in attendance at the Middle States Taxpayer Conference view with continuing and growing concern the mounting expenditures at all levels of government and the increasingly heavy tax burdens required to finance these expenditures.

We recognize that serious problems confront our communities, states, and nation. However, officials and citizens alike must somehow be brought to the realization that (1) the only, or the best, solution to these problems does not automatically involve increased government spending, and (2) where such expenditures are found to be of high priority they will attract greater citizen support if they are based upon sound fiscal policies and decisions.

We continue to insist upon the fundamental principle of sound governmental fiscal policy, that the authority to spend tax dollars must be closely associated with the responsibility for raising them. We cannot have more and more services and lower taxes at the same time.

We view with particular concern the obvious deterioration in the federal budgetary situation. After a brief respite, it appears a return to runaway budget deficits of alarming proportions is imminent. Both the Executive Branch and the Congress share responsibility for seeing that this does not happen. The Administration should not back away from its balanced budget objective, and should firmly resist unrealistic and unwise spending increases. The Congress *must* act responsibly. The mere adoption of a token legislative spending limitation which provides neither a ceiling on spending nor an effective deterrent to unwise increases on individual spending bills is insufficient and threatens federal tax increases and/or further erosion of the dollar through inflation. We therefore urge that:

1. Efforts to control and reduce expenditures at all levels be supported in every possible way, to the end that further tax increases may be avoided and prospects for eventual tax relief may be enhanced.

2. Our elected representatives at all levels and in Washington, in particular, take note of the widening opposition to state-local bond issue and tax increase proposals, recognizing that such attitudes reflect deep-seated taxpayer concerns.

The representatives of the Middle States taxpayer research organizations thus return to their respective states more convinced than ever of the essential role of our organizations in continuing to urge resistance to unsound and unwise fiscal actions and policies at all governmental levels.

WHAT DID IT PROVE?

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, everyone has his own evaluation of the recent elections and the following editorial from the Salisbury Press-Spectator of November 12, 1970, has some interesting comments:

WHAT DID IT PROVE?

Last week's election demanded so much time and energy from the candidates and their supporters and staffs; it intruded so extensively on the average citizen by way of the campaigning; it cost so much money; and in the end it really changed so little that one is forced to ask, "What did it all prove?"

Since elections at regular intervals are such a part of American life, it may be well to look back and consider this particular election and see if it really did prove anything. It is my feeling that it indicated, if not actually proved, several things.

Probably the foremost result of this election was the startling realization by a lot of candidates and political leaders that, when they take the notion, the voters are quite capable of deciding what the real issues are. And no amount of spouting by such orators as the President and Spiro "The Mouth" Agnew can disguise the problems or divert the voters from the things that are really worrying them. The Republican party spent millions to change the line-up in the Congress and to help G.O.P. candidates for governor and other offices. The net result was practically nil.

Speaking as a newspaper publisher, the election proved something else—that the broadcast media, especially television, are simply not very effective when it comes to selling candidates to the people. On election night, the TV people themselves said very frankly that it was obvious that the millions spent on television advertising had gone down the drain. This, of course, is very satisfying to the newspaper people who have had to be content with a few crumbs from the political advertising budgets in recent years while the broadcasters gobbled up the bulk of the money.

Candidate Jack Danforth told a group of newspaper publishers at a press meeting in October that he thought editorial endorse-

ments by newspapers were of little value and that most of his advertising money would go to television. As a matter of fact his opponent was editorially endorsed by many Missouri newspapers, including papers in Kansas City and St. Louis. And as he promised, Mr. Danforth spent most of his money (or somebody's money) on television—climbing steps and running around in his shorts. And Mr. Symington won. Still listening, Mr. Danforth.

These are a few of the things the election proved to me. Maybe it proved other things to you. At any rate, it's over and we're all going to have to live with the results until the chance comes to vote again.

OEO—MODEL AGENCY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, some who have infiltrated the ranks of taxpayer subsidized poverty programs appear to have adopted the status of untouchables—a new breed of poverty supremacists.

Last month, in our capital city of Baton Rouge, La., the OEO organization was lauded as a model antipoverty operation by the OEO regional supervisor of Austin, Tex. Just what criterion was used in judging poverty programs is not certain.

However, the Community Advancement-OEO organization in Baton Rouge has been used as a public opinion front to promote support for men accused of plotting to murder the mayor-president. And, more recently, one of its local VISTA directors came under fire for persistent revolutionary attacks against the evangelist, Billy Graham.

If this is the subterfuge for a poverty program which is accorded recognition as a model agency, the American people should shudder at the thought of the poverty programs which receive a sub-excellence rating.

Soon the poor people will tire of being exploited.

An article from the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate of October 30, 1970, and an article from the Baton Rouge State-Times of October 22, 1970, follows:

DIRECTOR OF VISTA BEING PROBED AFTER GRAHAM COMPLAINT

The Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington has ordered an investigation into activities of Edward Deevy, local VISTA director, after a complaint from evangelist Billy Graham that Deevy harassed him.

Officials at Community Advancement, Inc. (CAI), confirmed Thursday the investigation into the activities of Deevy.

The investigation, which began Tuesday, stems from Deevy's activities during Graham's crusade in Baton Rouge last week. Deevy, other employes of CAI and various other local persons organized a group to protest racial attitudes in local churches after an integrated group was refused admission at four churches Oct. 18.

Local officials of the crusade met with Deevy three times during the crusade and received a printed copy of the protest but Graham said he refused to hear the group because of a heavy schedule.

"We rather felt Graham was using his connections with the (Nixon) administration . . . to try to get back at us," Deevy said last week.

Graham is a personal friend of President Nixon.

Deevy said his task is marshaling resources to solve community problems and called the spirit generated by the crusade "one of the finest resources of our community. There was no intention of being against the crusade."

OFFICIAL CAME HERE

CAI officials said they learned of the investigation from Fred Mosley, an investigator assigned to the Atlanta office of OEO, who spent Tuesday and Wednesday in Baton Rouge. The investigation was ordered Monday by Donald Runsfeld, director of OEO in Washington.

"He (Mosley) said Runsfeld himself had ordered that an investigator be sent into Baton Rouge," said Charles Tapp, CAI director. Tapp said the investigation was touched off by a complaint from Graham or one of his associates to Runsfeld that Deevy harassed them during the five day crusade.

CAI officials were also contacted about the investigation by Bill Staton, VISTA program director in Austin, Tex., and by Ron Dietrich, a VISTA attorney in Washington.

The investigation is apparently aimed at determining whether duplicating equipment, paper and materials belonging to CAI were used by Deevy's protest group and also whether federal man hours were used in the protest by other VISTA workers.

Tapp said the CAI would take full responsibility for Deevy's actions and that it supports his efforts to bring attention to racial attitudes in some local churches.

"We're not going to fire Ed Deevy. We're not going to discipline anybody or do anything," said Tapp. "We support him."

The first open sign of the protest by Deevy and the citizen's group came at an Oct. 20 news conference when Deevy asked Graham if he would permit a reading of the protest.

Graham refused and quickly shut off Deevy by saying no one but newsmen could ask questions. However, neither Graham nor his aides attempted to shut off questions from others who were not newsmen.

CHECKED WITH POLICE

As part of the investigation, Mosley contacted local police to assist in locating tapes by newsmen at the news conference. Police contacted two newsmen but both refused to give up their tapes.

Rolfe McCollister, an attorney who headed local arrangements for the crusade, said Thursday he had been contacted by Mosley also. He said the complaint about Deevy did not come from the local group.

"I have no knowledge of anybody asking for an investigation and I can assure you it did not come from the executive committee," said McCollister.

The conflict between Deevy's group and the Graham crusade began with a breakfast Tuesday morning and continued through the evangelist's stay. An attempt by Deevy to press the protest at the breakfast meeting with crusade officials and local ministers brought complaints to the police department.

One of the complaints came directly from Graham, according to authorities. Others came from other crusade officials.

"To the best of my knowledge, one of my officers called me and said Mr. Graham himself was pretty upset about it," Capt. Leroy Watson, head of the city police intelligence division, said.

"I don't recall any other names who complained, but there were several. They just all seemed to be pretty upset," Watson said.

This is the second time Deevy has come to the attention of VISTA officials in Washington.

The first time was when he urged OEO support in the case of Frank Stewart, a VISTA worker and one of three young Negro men accused of plotting to murder Mayor-President Dumas.

Stewart was in the parish jail at that time under a $100,000 bond. U.S. Dist. Judge E. Gordon West ordered Stewart released on his own recognizance when the case reached him.

Deevy is an Irish-born Catholic priest who came to Baton Rouge about two years ago after Bishop Charles P. Greco gave him permission to leave his official church duties in the Diocese of Alexandria.

OEO OFFICIAL CALLS CAI MODEL AGENCY

Baton Rouge's Community Advancement Inc. program is often used as a model of how an anti-poverty operation should be handled in this region, an Office of Economic Opportunity official from Austin, Tex., said here today.

Hamah King, regional metro supervisor for the OEO, made the statement during a brief meeting of about 20 individuals with Mayor-President Dumas today to discuss the local anti-poverty program here.

Dumas was complimentary of Community Advancement Inc. (CAI), saying that the group has opened communications in areas where the local government had no communications before.

There have been some local problems which could have developed into something worse without the line of communications established by the CAI, Dumas said.

The mayor-president said an effort has been made locally to keep politics out of CAI functions and to give the anti-poverty group a free hand in operating.

The relationship between the local government and the CAI has been good so far, Dumas added.

King said that the regional officer in Austin has not had the difficulties with the Baton Rouge agency which have occurred at other anti-poverty agencies in this region.

Charles Tapp, director of the local CAI, said Dumas "has never failed to respond" when the CAI needed political support.

MEET ON POVERTY

Officials of poverty agencies met here today to discuss new directions planned by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). Seen at the meeting were, left to right, Daniel Vincent, New Orleans, executive director of Total Community Action; Jerry Arceneaux, Jennings, president of the Louisiana Association of Community Action Agencies; James W. Griffith, Austin, Tex., regional director of the OEO, and Charles W. Tapp, Baton Rouge, executive director of the Community Advancement, Inc.

PETITION TO NORTH VIETNAM EMBASSY IN PARIS

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the board of selectmen of Chelmsford, Mass., recently signed a formal proclamation setting aside Veterans' Day as a time for Chelmsford residents to contact the North Vietnam Embassy in behalf of American prisoners of war.

An official message was also sent by the board in behalf of the town of Chelmsford, and I am honored and pleased to include this in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

BOARD OF SELECTMEN,
Chelmsford, Mass., November 11, 1970.
The NORTH VIETNAM EMBASSY,
Paris, France
To Whom It May Concern:

The Selectmen of the Town of Chelmsford, Chelmsford, Massachusetts, United States of America, on the second day of November 1970 proclaimed that Veterans' Day, November 11th, 1970, he set aside in this community for its citizens to act in behalf of the Prisoners of War held in North Vietnam.

We, therefore, do earnestly request that all American Prisoners of War be completely identified, that all sick and injured prisoners be immediately released and that Prisoner of War camps be impartially inspected and that the Prisoners of War be allowed to send messages to their families; all of which are provisions of the Geneva Convention which North Vietnam has signed.

Prisoners of War are guaranteed basic human rights by International Law. We deplore this treatment of our Prisoners of War, and this departure from the agreements of the Geneva Convention.

HOWARD E. HUMPHREY
Chairman.
GERALD J. LANNAN.
EUGENE J. DOODY.

HOLY TRINITY LUTHERAN CHURCH

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 11, I had the 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, Rev. Paul Baranek, has prepared an inspiring prayer to mark the dedication. I include below for the edification of my colleagues the text of Pastor Baranek's 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 stones 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 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 of 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.

ENVIRONMENTALISTS SUPPORT H.R. 16785

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, at a news conference here November 14, a group of leading environmentalists headed by consumer advocate Ralph Nader announced their support of H.R. 16785 and S. 2193, the Occupational Safety and Health Act, soon to come before the House of Representatives and the Senate. I am including the entire text of the conference as reported by the New York Times of November 15, 1970.

To illustrate the urgent need for a job safety and health bill, the environmentalists revealed the tragic results of a recent study of causes of death of 400 asbestos workers in the New York-New Jersey area. Dr. William J. Nicholson, assistant professor of community medicine at the Mount Sinai School of Medicine who conducted the study, said that these asbestos workers were dying from cancer at a much higher rate than the general population. According to Dr. Nicholson, the majority of these deaths could have been prevented with proper safety and health regulations.

H.R. 16785 would permit the Secretary of Labor, upon consultation with advisory committees and public hearings, to set Federal occupational safety and health standards in order to prevent the carnage in our worksites. Positive Federal leadership is required immediately if the statistics of on-the-job death and disability are to be lowered. Efforts to dilute the provisions of H.R. 16785 and substitute a weaker version would only indicate a lack of concern and commitment on the part of the Federal Government to end this slaughter in our factories and on our farms.

I urge my colleagues to act in the bipartisan spirit which such important and vital legislation deserves. Loss of life and limb must cease being a concomitant of the modern industrial process in this, the most advanced Nation in the history of mankind.

The New York Times article follows:

NADER UNIT BACKS JOB SAFETY BILLS

WASHINGTON.—Asserting that "elk and deer are better protected than working men and women," a group of environmentalists led by Ralph Nader threw their support today behind two job health and safety bills now before Congress.

They called the bills the minimum legislation Congress should approve. They denounced industry and Administration efforts to change the measures, which are supported by organized labor and the Democrats.

The Senate bill, sponsored by Harrison A. Williams Jr., Democrat of New Jersey, is among the pending business when that body reconvenes Monday. A similar House bill, sponsored by Representative Dominick V. Daniels, Democrat of New Jersey, is scheduled for early action.

Both bills place broad rulemaking, inspection and enforcement powers in the Secretary of Labor and grant expanded employe rights. Segments of industry, led by the Chamber of Commerce, and the Nixon administration want rule-making and enforcement to be done by independent panels. Industry sources have also complained about the expanded workers' rights.

At a news conference called by the environmentalists, a New York City physicist said that New York and New Jersey asbestos workers were dying of cancer at much higher rates than the general population, according to a study he had conducted.

"The majority of them will die from asbestosis, from inhalation of the fibers, and it is completely preventable," said Dr. William J. Nicholson, assistant professor of community medicine at the Mount Sinai School of Medicine.

FOUR HUNDRED DEATHS STUDIED

Dr. Nicholson said his study of asbestos workers in New York Local 12 and New Jersey Local 32 showed that since 1943, more than 400 had died. Accidents were the dominant cause of death in the early years, he said, but now 10 per cent were dying of asbestosis, over 20 per cent were dying of lung cancer, 10 per cent of cancer of the digestive tract, 10 per cent of nasal mesothelioma (a cancer) and 10 per cent of miscellaneous cancers.

An interrelationship between consumer problems and occupational hazards was pointed out by Glenn Paulson of Rockefeller University, who said workers packaging enzyme detergents were beginning to contact chronic respitory diseases.

And a Boston cancer specialist said reports were "beginning to trickle in" that housewives were suffering from skin problems because of the enzymes.

BIRTH DEFECT WARNING

Dr. Samuel S. Epstein, of the Children's Cancer Research Foundation in Boston, issued a warning about increased dangers of birth defects and damages to "the genetic pool."

He said the sources of danger to workers came from accidents, noise, dust, irradiation and toxic chemicals.

Absent from the news conference but listed as signers of a statement of support for the health and safety legislation were a number of men prominent in science such as Barry Commoner of Washington University, Paul Erlich of Stanford and George Wald of Harvard.

CHILE, CUBA, AND THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the editorial columns of the New York Times are the best arguments for the existence of a new logic which up to the present time, I have come into contact. A daily dose of opinion from the people who write these gems have convinced me that while there are those of us still hopelessly enmeshed in the Aristotelian framework the editors of this newspaper are not. They seem to have moved progressively ahead to some new realm of thought as of yet untouched by those of us to the right of Norman Mailer.

A recent editorial is a case in point. In the last month or so Cuba has been in the news several times. The Defense Department revealed that the Soviets are building a nuclear submarine base on that island. A female employee of the South African Embassy has been expelled from the United States for spying for Castro. Two members of the Cuban delegation to the United Nations, the First Secretary and a counselor have been asked to leave our shores for "engaging in activities outside the scope of their duties," State Department talk meaning espionage. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has released a report prepared by the Illinois Crime Investigating Committee containing ironclad evidence that Cuba is serving as a base for the training of Americans in terrorist tactics. The McClellan Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations released a section of its continuing investigation into riots, civil and criminal disorders in which the deputy director of the tactical command of the Puerto Rico Police Department states unequivocally that the bombings in Puerto Rico are being supported by the Castro government.

What does the New York Times make out of all this? The United States "cannot afford to cling stubbornly to a policy of isolating Cuba. Why is this? Because the new Communist-Socialist government of Chile in violation of the OAS embargo has restored relations with the Cuban dictator.

The editorial follows:

CHILE, CUBA, AND THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

It was inevitable that President Allende would restore Chile's relations with Cuba sooner rather than later. He had promised throughout his campaign that he would reestablish formal ties with Havana and his prompt action will please many Chileans.

The move will also be popular in other Latin American countries where some momentum has been gathering behind the idea that fresh efforts should be made to bring Cuba back to the inter-American family. Long before the election victory of Dr. Allende's Marxist-led coalition, Chile's Christian Democratic Government had breached the economic boycott and received a Cuban trade mission.

On that occasion, Chile's Foreign Minister Valdes had branded as "illegal, useless and counterproductive" the embargo against Cuba adopted by the Organization of American States in 1964. Mexico never observed the boycott, the military regimes in Peru and Bolivia have voiced the desire to normalize relations with Cuba, and other Latin Governments may speak up now that Chile has broken the ice.

What is disturbing is that Dr. Allende announced his decision without consulting or even informing the O.A.S. Though opposed to parts of the 1964 resolution, Chile had declared its adherence. That document said the suspension of diplomatic and trade relations with Cuba would continue until the O.A.S. Council determined by a two-thirds vote that the Castro regime "no longer posed a threat to the peace and security of the Hemisphere."

Even Mr. Valdes, no friend of the O.A.S., had conceded last July that because the 1964 boycott had been a collective decision "it should be revised collectively." There had been hope that whatever its direction at home, Chile under Dr. Allende would continue an active and constructive role in the O.A.S.

While the United States was justified in deploring the fact that Chile acted outside the O.A.S. framework in restoring ties with Cuba, it is unfortunate that this point was not raised first by a concerned Latin government. Washington cannot afford to cling stubbornly to a policy of isolating Cuba that seems likely to command decreasing Latin support; but it is right to insist on the wisdom of dealing collectively with the question through established O.A.S. machinery.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the Disabled American Veterans. On November 24 a special commemorative stamp will be issued.

Service to disabled veterans by disabled veterans, who fully understand the problems of those who have experienced the same suffering and hardships of war service, prompted the founding of the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV was born because the disabled veteran needed a champion.

Its early objectives have remained its objectives today:

To advance the interest and work for the betterment of all wounded, injured and disabled veterans, their widows and dependents . . . to cooperate with all federal and private agencies devoted to the cause of improving and advancing the conditions, health and interest of wounded, injured or disabled veterans.

The founders of the DAV also resolved that the organization shall stimulate a feeling of mutual devotion, happiness, and comradeship among all disabled veterans.

In the months immediately following World War I, approximately 4 million American men discarded their Government-issue uniforms and returned to civilian life. Of this number, about 300,000 were wounded, disabled, handicapped, or ill. These men caught the country by surprise and presented a multitude of problems—medical care, rehabilitation, job training, and employment—with which the Government was not prepared to cope.

Hastily set up Government bureaus tried to handle some of the problems along with the existing ones. Chaos was the result. The disabled veterans were in the midst of the many bureaus working at cross purposes and without getting any real or beneficial help. Many men entitled to compensation were getting nothing at all and those who were, received unequal and inadequate ratings.

The Government evolved a plan to institute vocational training courses for disabled veterans in an attempt to give each man a trade or profession to compensate for his handicap. These were poorly organized and run. Many disabled veterans enrolled in these courses. They formed clubs—mostly for fraternal reasons to be in a position to help each other. Many began to feel that an organization composed of disabled veterans should be formed. From the ranks of those disabled veterans in the various clubs across the country came the men who conceived and brought into being the Disabled American Veterans. At a Christmas Day party in 1919, the first step toward a national organization was taken. Judge Robert S. Marx invited 100 fellow disabled veterans to his Christmas party. From this meeting came the inspiration to form a permanent organization to help the wounded and disabled veteran.

Inspired by their spirit and enthusiasm, Marx called another meeting with 200 vocational trainees at the Ohio Mechanical Institute. These veterans took a long look at the situation as it then existed: the Government vocational training program was working poorly; exploitation of the disabled veteran was alarming; medical and hospital care were at substandard levels—insufficient hospital beds and doctors to meet the needs of disabled veterans; and, the compensation program had virtually collapsed due to inequities in disability awards. The biggest hurdle was Government redtape because of the many Federal bureaus working at cross purposes shifting the veteran from one agency to another.

In view of the situation, disabled veterans attending the gathering resolved that a single-purpose organization should be formed immediately, dedicated to the cause of the wartime wounded, sick, and disabled.

In May 1920, a committee was named to draw up the necessary constitution and bylaws for a national organization as well as for local chapters—the first of which was formed in Cincinnati. It was not long before other similar units banded together throughout the country.

In 1921, the DAV had gained sufficient size and strength to hold its initial convention. Delegates assembled at the Hotel Tuller in Detroit, elected Judge Marx, the father of the DAV, as first national commander. This was the nucleus of the DAV as it exists today. By the time the second DAV national convention was held in San Francisco the following year action had already been taken toward the correction of mismanagement in the administration of veterans' affairs.

At the 1922 convention, the DAV Women's Auxiliary was formed by the wives and daughters of the disabled veterans. Mothers of the war dead were also invited to join the auxiliary.

The publishing of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War Weekly newspaper was authorized at the second convention. To cover the cost of publication and mailing, each member was assessed an additional 50 cents a year.

An early and serious problem was securing funds to run the national headquarters. A percentage of the money raised by local chapters went to the national headquarters as did gifts from other organized groups.

Madame Schumann-Heink, an opera star who had lost sons on both sides of World War I, gave many benefit performances for the DAV.

In 1928, the National Service Fund Foundation was formed to raise money to ensure the ongoing of the service program. In 1929, the DAV and the International Historical Society agreed that the DAV would receive a percentage of the sale of the book "Progress of Nations" by the society.

This decade, 1922–32, saw the DAV become increasingly influential throughout the Nation as the official spokesman for the wartime disabled veteran—the only group devoted exclusively to the cause of our war-disabled men and women. Because of the DAV's outstanding accomplishments, the organization was awarded a charter by Congress in 1932 as a Federal, nonprofit corporation, recognized by the U.S. Government as the official voice of the disabled veteran.

In 1939, the life membership fund was begun which has now grown to 112,820 life members and a fund of over $5,000,000.

In 1941, the DAV issued their first idento-tags, the miniature license plates. Since that time nearly a billion tags have been mailed and the donations from those who received them have become the financial base for the DAV. In 1945, the DAV bought much of the equipment and all rights to the exclusive manufacture and issuance of the idento-tag. This made it possible for the DAV to obtain more money from the program.

The DAV charter was amended in 1942 to admit members of World War II and members of any future wars. In DAV ranks are the 240,000 veterans of America's two major wars, disabled Korean veterans, and veterans of Vietnam and other cold war conflicts. Nurses of both World Wars and Korea, as well as members of the women's armed forces who suffered service-connected disabilities, also are members.

National DAV headquarters is located in Cold Spring, Ky., across the river from Cincinnati, Ohio. The DAV operates an influential and active legislative headquarters in Washington, D.C. and DAV national service officers are stationed in all regional offices of the VA. They represent, without charge, the disabled veteran and his family in claims for benefits. More than 2,000 DAV chapters are located throughout the United States. Every President of the United States since World War I and every director of the Veterans' Administration has commended and endorsed the many services rendered by the DAV.

Nearly all beneficial legislation affecting disabled veterans that has passed Congress since 1920 was sponsored by the DAV. Down through the years, DAV has been in the forefront as a "single purpose" organization. Members of Congress, recognizing the legislative efforts of the DAV on behalf of disabled veterans, frequently seek advice from DAV officials concerning proposed laws.

Among the most widely known DAV-sponsored legislation is Public Law 16, the "disabled veterans section" of the famous GI bill of rights, which provided extensive educational training and rehabilitation programs for thousands of the combat wounded.

DAV continues to spearhead the fight for enactment of long-overdue disability compensation increases for the more than 2 million of the Nation's wartime service connected disabled veterans. Other disabled veterans compensation increases, widow and dependent benefits, and various insurance programs, have been pushed through Congress with the help of DAV.

By maintaining liaison between disabled veterans and business and industry, the DAV has insured the widest possible employment of handicapped exservicemen. This program is a major item of the organization's national service work.

DAV has pledged a major effort against any further consolidation or closing of VA facilities, or efforts to fragment present service programs administered by the VA for disabled veterans. In addition, DAV believes that disability compensation should at least match cost-of-living increases, and that no wartime disabled veteran should be forced to live at poverty level.

The history of the DAV has been complicated and tumultuous. Nothing as important as the objectives of this organization is ever easy. The DAV has had its hours of trial—its moments of hopelessness—its time of glory—its periods of riding the crest of the wave. But the important thing to the organization itself, and to the American public in general, is that through all this it has determinedly stuck to its single purpose—that of aiding the wartime service connected disabled veteran return to civilian life in a competitive position with his peers. That he and his family can face the future with confidence knowing that his medical, rehabilitation, and employment requirements will be met.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY'S WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PROJECT

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the first annual report of the President's Council on Environmental Quality provides us with useful action guidelines by assigning priorities to specific problems within the totality of the so-called environmental crisis.

This report, issued in August, identified eutrophication—the premature aging of our freshwater lakes because of overfertilization—as "perhaps the single most difficult water pollution control problem." It cited this problem as one on which "a concerted and comprehensive attack should be made—particularly in the Great Lakes."

A group of Michigan ecologists and engineers are ready to attack the problem of the aging of the Great Lakes in a meaningful way. This multidisciplinary team at Michigan State University is about to implement a plan calling for the tertiary treatment of the East Lansing municipal sewage treatment plant's secondary effluent to eliminate this effluent's excess nutrients. This will be done through the use of a series of lakes, plus spray irrigation, to produce aquatic plant livestock, food, recreation, agricultural crops, and replenishment of the area's ground water supply.

Called the water quality management project, it will be constructed on Michigan State University's spacious main campus and landscaped to become the university's attractive "front door" along Interstate 96. A unique demonstration and research scheme, it has won the financial support of several private foundations and the State of Michigan. Federal participation in the funding of the construction phase of the project also is anticipated. Construction of the first stage of this project is expected to be accomplished in 1971.

To provide my colleagues with an example of the kind of Great Lakes water quality demonstration project that should be funded under Section 15 of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970, I include a series of articles of Michigan State University's water quality management project, which have appeared recently in Lansing area newspapers, with these remarks.

The articles follow:

[From the (Lansing-East Lansing) State Journal, Feb. 26, 1970]

PRICE MUST BE PAID ON WATER POLLUTION

The ugly pollution story of Lake Erie and the potential of what this could mean for other big lakes and water resources is now a familiar one to all Americans.

The end result of decades of pollution is finally making an impact. But it will be a long, difficult road back before the damage can be undone. As grim as the picture appears, however, steps of progress are being made.

At Michigan State University a proposed experiment by the Institute of Water Resources holds promise of helping to reverse the tide. With the cooperation of East Lansing officials, the MSU institute plans to pipe waste water from that city to a 430-acre site on the south side of the campus where it will be channeled through a series of small lakes.

In this process it is expected that the waste water will be purified to an extent that it can be returned to the natural water cycle. If successful, similar experimental stations can be set up in many locations to help to curtail water pollution in many rivers and streams of Michigan as well as the big lakes.

Experiments at a water reclamation plant at South Lake Tahoe, Calif., have also indicated that a vastly increased sewage treatment processes can result in clear, odorless waste water suitable for irrigation or fishing.

Undoubtedly, the new and intensified methods of treating wastes and sewage to purify water will be more costly. But a price must be paid if this priceless natural asset is to be saved.

Some experts have warned that Lake Michigan could become another Lake Erie within 10 years unless drastic methods are found to reduce pollution. Some good starts have been made in finding solutions and they will need full support of government at all levels as well as citizens in all communities.

[From Mucc's Michigan Out-of-Doors, December 1969]

MAY CONVERT POLLUTION INTO FISHING AND CATTLE FEED

Can city sewage be converted into cattle feed?

That is a question which may be answered by Michigan State University. A $450,000 grant by the Ford Foundation will be a major help.

The funds will help finance construction of a $1.35 million "tertiary" treatment plant to process wastewater from the city of East Lansing. The project will involve 450 acres of MSU's campus at Hagadorn Road and I–96, where five new lakes will be created from the city's waste water.

The lakes will range from 5 to 26 acres. They will be dug, a pump station built and a distribution system installed to feed secondary effluent to the lake system. Up to five million gallons per day of treated waste water from the East Lansing sewage treatment plant will flow through the lakes.

It is hoped the water can become so clean in the lakes that the waters will furnish fishing and recreational sports.

The new project was initiated by Dr. Howard A. Tanner, MSU Director of Natural Resources, and Dr. Robert C. Ball, director of MSU's Institute for Water Research. Dr. Ball will direct the project.

Waste water from East Lansing will first go through secondary treatment facilities. In this step, solids are screened off and the effluent is put through a biological process that breaks down organic compounds into their inorganic components. These nutrients are usually dumped into a river or other body of water.

Secondary treatment is not enough, however, to stop deterioration of United States rivers and lakes. Nitrogen and phosphorus, main components of fertilizer, are released by the process. The effluent waters tend to choke with weeds and algae. These, in turn, rob the waters of oxygen, killing off fish and other aquatic animals.

MSU's plan calls for each lake, except the last one in the chain, to be planted with selected plants that have a high requirement for the phosphates and nitrates. As water moves from one lake to another, more and more nutrients will be removed by the growing plants. By the time the water reaches the last lake, the water will supposedly be so pure the area can be used for water sports and the production of a good crop of fish.

The lakes will be engineered to assure a continuous flow of water from one lake to another, with each lake having enough volume to give the plants plenty of time to work on the water and remove nutrients.

MSU scientists will be making continuous studies of the water and the plant growth. The plants will be removed as often as necessary with the thought that they can be converted into potential cattle forage. The excess water will be studied to see how its quality can be improved, with some possibly used for irrigation.

Recreational benefits of the lakes will also be examined to determine final costs and benefits of such a water management program.

Should the ambitious program work as planned, it could well revolutionize water management throughout the world and turn a liability (pollution) into a definite asset (recreation).

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, Feb. 18, 1970]

NEW WASTE TREATMENT PLAN MAY HELP REDUCE POLLUTION

(By Pat Murphy)

A proposed experiment by the Institute for Water Research at Michigan State University may help East Lansing curtail pollution of the Red Cedar River and could be instrumental in helping keep Lake Michigan from becoming a "dead lake."

The East Lansing City Council has given tentative approval to the project, which calls for piping millions of gallons of waste water, which has been treated at the city's sewage treatment plant, to a campus location.

There, in a series of small lakes, aquatic plant life will feed on the nitrogen and phosphorous which are a main source of the pollution that threatens to turn Lake Michigan into a dead lake, according to Robert C. Ball, director of the institute.

OPTIMISTIC ABOUT FUNDS

The project will cost an estimated $2 million and is expected to be operating within a year, Ball said. Although the federal government hasn't made any commitment, Ball and others close to the project are "optimistic" about getting federal funds.

East Lansing will pay nothing toward the expense of the experiment, according to City Manager John M. Patriarche. He said MSU will pay for installing and maintaining the new pipes.

Ball explained that the city's waste water (or sewage) treatment plant removes some of the nitrogen and phosphorus—as well as the solid waste—from the water which now flows into the Red Cedar.

However those remaining nitrogen and phosphorus are eventually carried to Lake Michigan where they stimulate the growth of plant life, Ball said.

PLANT LIFE DIES

This plant life eventually dies, settles to the bottom of the lake and causes pollution, he continued.

"Experts say we have about 10 years to do something drastic about this cycle," Ball emphasized, "or else Lake Michigan will die like Lake Erie."

Ball said his experiment calls for piping waste water from the treatment plant to a 430-acre site on the south side of the campus where the water will be channeled through four small lakes.

"The water will go from lake to lake with plants in each removing some of the pollutants," he said.

When the water comes out of the last lake, Ball said, it will be sprayed on crops, which will absorb the remaining nitrogen and phosphorous and the pure water will be returned to the natural water cycle.

Ball pointed out that one side benefit that will help make this system financially attractive is that the water plants which absorb the nitrogen and phosphorous can be harvested and eventually used as cattle feed.

Obviously, the one experimental station at MSU will not end the threat to Lake Michigan. However, Ball said the information obtained in this project will hopefully be useful in curtailing pollution in the thousands of streams and rivers which empty into Lake Michigan.

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, June 19, 1970]

MSU TRUSTEES ACCEPT 3 WATER RESEARCH GRANTS

Three grants totaling $1.2 million for a major water research program were accepted today by Michigan State University's Board of Trustees.

The funds will be used for an experimental program in water quality management on the MSU campus, under the direction of the university's Institute of Water Research.

The grants from the three foundations include: Kresge, $500,000; Ford, $450,000; and Rockefeller, $250,000.

Dr. Milton E. Muelder, vice president for research development, said:

"It may now be possible for MSU to establish what could be the nation's outstanding teaching-research-demonstration facility in the area of wastewater recycling.

WASTE WATER

The MSU facility will receive waste water from the East Lansing Municipal Treatment Plant and apply it to aquatic plants, via a series of small lakes, and to terrestrial plants by spray irrigation.

[From the Lansing-East Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, June 19, 1970]

TANNER TO HEAD MSU PLAN

Dr. Howard A. Tanner, director of Natural Resources in Michigan State University's College of Agriculture and Natural Resources has been named to head MSU's Campus Water Plan, a new multi-disciplinary research-teaching and demonstration program in waste water recycling.

The new assignment was approved today by MSU's Board of Trustees.

Tanner will continue as director of Natural Resources and, in conjunction with his new role, will become the assistant director of the Institute of Water Research.

Tanner and Dr. Robert C. Ball, director of the Institute of Water Research, have shared the planning and promotion of the project in waste water renovation and recycling. Tanner's new assignment reflects the imminent emergence of the project from the planning to the construction phases.

ENCOURAGED PLAN

MSU's Board of Trustees encouraged the project with planning funds, renovation of existing facilities and by allocating approximately 500 acres of the main campus for the project.

The researchers point out that traditional municipal treatments are inefficient in removing phosphorus and nitrogen. The addition of these nutrients contributes to the rapid aging of surface waters, including the Great Lakes. This aging process is characterized by increasing amounts of algae, slimes and unwanted plant growth.

The new MSU facility will receive waste water from East Lansing Municipal Treatment Plant and provide for removal of much of the phosphorus and nitrogen. MSU's project will apply these nutrient rich waters to aquatic plants, through a series of small lakes, and to terrestrial plants by spray irrigation.

RESEARCH FACILITY

Experiments to utilize the plants grown will range from livestock nutritional studies to farm crops and Christmas tree production. The project will be designed to provide a productive research facility where scientists of many disciplines, social, physical and biological, can work jointly towards the solution of some urban waste problems.

In conjuction with the research aspects, the site will be landscaped and in other ways developed to provide an attractive recreational facility of 150 acres around the lakes.

The project will provide a valuable teach-

ing and demonstration area where students and the public can view and study the principles of waste recycling through new applications of many sciences, officials said.

[From the East Lansing (Mich.) State News, June 26, 1970]

RECREATION-RESEARCH: WATER PROJECT MAPPED

(By John Borger)

The new Campus Water Plan, a multidisciplinary research-teaching and demonstration program in waste water recycling, will provide recreational as well as research facilities, Howard Tanner, asst. director of the Institute of Water Research, said Thursday.

"If we can create a situation that not only improves the water but also enhances recreational facilities, then the project would be of more benefit," he said.

The extent of public access to the facility and the date of completion have not yet been determined, Tanner said. Alternatives include granting the public free access (which might complicate research work) and conducting groups through the facility, Tanner said.

"Certainly, students are going to get the first consideration, whatever is done," he said.

Tanner said the project, which will remove waste by recycling water through a series of small lakes, is more expensive and occupies more land than traditional water treatment facilities, so that additional factors, such as recreational facilities, must be employed to make the project feasible.

Once the project has been established, it will serve as a working model for city officials planning similar water treatment facilities.

"The University is not an atypical community in this regard," Tanner said. "We have the same problems with waste disposal that any community of 40,000 to 50,000 people has. If we can do it, it will show other communities that they can too."

The project is aimed at removing phosphorus and nitrogen waste from water, something which traditional treatments do only inefficiently. Phosphorus and nitrogen contribute to the aging of surface waters by increasing the amounts of algae, slimes and other unwanted plant growth.

The new facility will receive waste water from the East Lansing Municipal Treatment Plant. Phosphorus and nitrogen will be removed by applying the nutrient-rich water to aquatic plants in the lakes and to terrestrial plants by spray irrigation.

The facility is located on the extreme south end of campus and is bounded by Jolly, College, Sandhill and Pierce roads. Interstate 96 divides the project into two areas.

The project is being financed by grants from private foundations and a $500,000 capital outlay appropriation from the legislature. The grants include $500,000 from the Kresge Foundation, $450,000 from the Ford Foundation and $250,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation.

[From Mucc's Michigan Out-of-Doors, October 1970]

RECYCLING: OUR FUTURE MAY DEPEND ON IT

(By H. A. Tanner, Director, natural resources, MSU)

Americans have recently awakened to the decline in the quality of our environment.

We are belatedly aware of the seriousness of water and air pollution.

Michigan's citizens, with much greater water resources than citizens in any other state, are now acutely aware of our water pollution problems.

We acknowledge our share of guilt in the demise of Lake Erie and our role in reducing the quality of water in the upper three lakes. Recent monitoring studies by Michigan State University have shown that our contribution, in lake killing nutrients to Lake Michigan, exceeds five million pounds of phosphates and more than twenty-nine million pounds of nitrates per year. Even at a time when we are bonding ourselves to build primary and secondary sewage treatment plants for every Michigan city we are aware that these plants are only a partial answer. Their effluent will contain most of the nutrients discharged into our Great Lakes tributaries. Plans for better removal of nutrients have been developed.

The State Water Resources Commission has set standards that require 80% of the phosphates to be removed by municipal treatment plants in the Lake Michigan drainage by 1972 and the same for Lake Huron a few years later. Present technology shows that we can approach this level of removal by a precipitation process. However, eighty percent phosphorus removal may not be good enough to reverse the declining quality of Lake Michigan. The material precipitated in this process just adds to our solid waste problem.

We must soon look ahead to taking out nitrates, six times more abundant than phosphates. Today it is fair to say that we lack the technology to precipate nitrates. If we learn how to precipitate nitrates we will end up with a bigger solid waste problem. Too often in our search for better waste removal we have eliminated one problem only by substituting another in its place.

If we make a careful assessment of the problem of how to really solve water pollution problems we will come logically and inevitably to the principal of recycling waste. Nutrients and organic matter are important forms of waste. These move through biological systems, through plant growth, animal consumption, excretion, decay, and back to plant growths. This is recycling.

If we put these wastes into our lakes and streams they are recycled within these waters-usually to the detriment of our values-through algae and slime development, unwanted aquatic plants, alewives, etc. We should conclude that the solution to our problems of organic wastes and nutrients is not to discharge them into the water where unscheduled, haphazard and detrimental recycling will occur, but rather to retain them in carefully designed biological systems.

These systems can be designed to produce valuable plant and animal growths made up of preferred species, produced on schedule, and yielding substantial dollar values. These systems we usually call farms. This is what Michigan State University's Campus Water Plan really is. It is an alternative to discharging wastes into our streams. It is several interlocking biological recycling systems.

Let me tell you how this plan will work. We will take a portion of the effluent from the East Lansing Sewage Plant. This is a typical primary, secondary plant. It receives about eleven million gallons of waste water per day, treating it and discharging the effluent into the Red Cedar. Of this, about three million gallons comes from the Michigan State University campus. This effluent still contains substantial amounts of phosphates and nitrates but meets current standards from standpoints of health and nuisance values.

Again, this effluent is typical of most municipal plants. We will take about three million gallons of this effluent before it goes into the river. It will be pumped and piped to 500 acres near the southeast corner of the campus. Here the water will move through a series of lakes (to be constructed) with a surface area of about sixty acres.

Many interesting things will occur here. Before I describe the system, I want to remind you that our basic strategy will be to make the waste water nutrients available for incorporation into plant systems. Plants will take-up the nutrients from the water and build them into the valuable forms of plant tissue.

The water will move from pond to pond by gravity taking approximately thirty days to move from the first through the last pond. Each of these ponds will be of depths most favorable for the development of rooted aquatic plants. These rooted aquatic plants are expected to grow vigorously in the bath of nutrients provided.

They will have a long growing season, from April through October. Some aquatic plant growth can be anticpated in winter and beneath the ice. These aquatic plants will be harvested with a sickle bar three to four times a year and will provide the first route for recycling. This plant material, experimentally fed elsewhere, has the approximate nutritive values of alfalfa, and will be run through alfalfa driers and/or pelletized for incorporation into various livestock diets. Fed to livestock it will provide the bases for additional meat production. Again, this is recycling.

In addition to producing aquatic plants we will have two kinds of fish populations growing in these ponds. One a bass and bluegill combination will be available for recreational fishing which will be permitted as part of the over-all recreational development to be described soon. Accompanying the bass-bluegill population will be a channel catfish population. This population will essentially be for production of protein. Channel catfish have a high market value at the moment. Fish production potential is conservatively estimated at between 800 and 1600 pounds of fish annually per acre. This is a second avenue of recycling.

I have already mentioned the development of recreation facilities which is one of the more exciting aspects of the project. In the one hundred fifty acres north of the highway and including the sixty acres of ponds, will be developed a total recreational complex. Here our Park and Recreation Resources Department faculty will design, develop, and operate facilities for picnicking, canoeing, sailboating and fishing.

Eventually we will develop a swimming pool which will be filled with water from the last pond in the series after additional water treatment. The whole one hundred fifty acres will be landscaped to be esthetically pleasing and especially to provide an attractive view of the campus from the Interstate highway.

When the water has completed its thirty days of movement from the beginning of the pond series to the end, we will have water of very high quality. The nutrients will be substantially reduced and the water will be available for a variety of uses. Highest value will determine which use will be made of the water.

Again, we will have designed for recycling and reuse. Some of the possible uses are spray irrigation of a variety of terrestrial plant system on the project site, water for cooling in the campus power plant system, or for irrigating the golf course. We may also choose to return it as high quality water to the Red Cedar River for other downstream water use. Some clean water will be returned to the ground water system by percolation or by dry well injection.

Throughout the experiment water quality will constantly be measured. We must be able to assure public health officials that the system is effective in eliminating any residual viral or bacterial problems; that we are not providing exposure of man or his animals to disease organisms. We must assure all concerned that nitrate levels and phosphate levels have been reduced to a minimum.

The second half of our water treatment project is the terrestrial system. This lies on the south of I-96 and contains about 350

acres. Here we will have many types of terrestrial plants, including woodlots, Christmas tree plantations, sod, old fields, and row crops. We will have available to us the alternatives of taking irrigation water from any of the five ponds in the system.

We may choose water still heavily laden with nutrients from the first pond or we may choose water from the last pond after nearly all nutrients have been removed. Here we will determine such questions as what additional growth and values do we attain, how often and how heavily may we irrigate these systems for the incorporation of water without damage to either plants or to the porosity and texture of soils.

Again, we have provided productive avenues for recycling. Some additional water of high quality can be used again or returned to segments of the hydrologic cycle. Still more recycling.

With this project what will we have really accomplished? We will have set up biological systems for recycling. We will have done it in the context of the appropriate University roles; that is, to do research and train students and faculty. More important, this will be an extremely valuable demonstration area where state legislators, county supervisors, and other segments of local government faced with waste water problems may come, visit, and be shown a working alternative to the discharge of waste nutrient laden effluents into our surface waters.

In principal, it is a comparatively unsophisticated system. It will be applicable to many communities that cannot afford the growing level of treatment cost that will be required in the traditional approaches to waste water treatment.

The question may be asked what cities can afford to acquisition of five hundred acres to treat the wastes of 50,000 people. The answer lies in multiple use of the area. The site will do much more than treat waste water. A city may use such biological systems as part of its recreational areas, picnic areas, parks, green belts, golf course and other esthetic areas essential to the well-being of cities and suburbs.

Were do we stand at this moment? It is true that we know in principle how to proceed along these lines of recycling just described. We simply must provide good detailed answers to such questions as how much area is needed for handling the waste water of how many people. What are the problems of functioning with this system in the winter time? We must demonstrate to the public health official that virus, parasites, and bacteria are not recycled into human populations. We must demonstrate the biological treatment is a good neighbor, that it can be inserted into the urban scene without creating a nuisance of any kind.

We must answer questions as to how much value can be harvested from these various plant systems. How many inches of water can safely be applied to which soils? What plant arrays are most effective in stripping phosphates and nitrates out of the water? What percentage of aquatic foods can be incorporated into the diets of what domestic animals? What fish populations provide the most satisfactory recreation and the most pounds of protein? How is the best way to handle the recreation?

The answer, of course, is with a functioning, attractive "show me" project.

We have the mix of scientists to answer these questions. We are one of the few universities capable of bringing a productive team of economists, recreationists, biologists, fish biologists, foresters, chemists, engineers, agricultural scientists, nutritional scientists and phyiologists together to work on the total complex of the problems involved in the recycling of waste.

On a long range basis, we see this as a demonstration of waste recycling demonstration that can be used conceptually to talk about other kinds of waste recycling; the recycling of steel, paper, and containers of all kinds. As we begin to provide examples of how recycling can occur and what benefits can be derived from recycling, we will begin to provide a total concept of recycling as a way of life that the people and the government of the state and our nation must espouse as the total system which will provide for more people, more generations yet unborn.

Finally, let me describe the current status of the project. Michigan State University has contributed five hundred acres and substantial faculty and staff time to the development of the project. It carries the endorsement of the Michigan Natural Resources Commission and the Michigan Water Resources Commission. It has been developed in consultation with the staffs of the two commissions mentioned, with the Michigan Public Health Department and with the City of East Lansing.

For the purposes of construction we have raised 1.7 million dollars; $450,000 from The Ford Foundation, $500,000 from The Kresge Foundation, $250,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation, and a $500,000 legislative appropriation have been received. For the purposes of additional equipment and for maintenance and operation, our current budget for the first three years of the project totals 2.4 million dollars.

We have made several visitations to the Federal Water Quality Administration and are encouraged to believe that some additional funds will be forthcoming from this federal agency. We expect a definitive reply from this agency soon. Other foundations have been approached and additional funding seems forthcoming. The University has accepted the funds from the various sources to date.

A consulting engineering firm, Johnson and Anderson of Pontiac, Michigan, has been employed and we are now entering into the design stages of the project. We anticipate completion of the project by September, 1971.

It is important to all of us that we continue to work for broad recognition amongst people and leaders in Michigan as to what precisely this project is designed to do, why it is being done, and most of all, what it will do to protect Michigan waters. It is for this reason we welcome this opportunity, and any opportunity, to describe our project verbally or for publication.

Remember, the word is Recycle.

REGIONAL MEDICAL PROGRAM: FOR HOME RULE IN HEALTH CARE

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, by strange coincidence, in my hometown of Roseville, Calif., there is another Harold F. Johnson, a young man who is no relation to me, but one with whom I am proud to share a namesake. He is a progressive and hardworking, very dedicated, physician who conceived and developed an outstanding project under the regional medical program which was established through congressional action in 1965 and expanded in 1968.

As one who was proud to have supported this regional medical program legislation when it was brought before the Congress, I am indeed pleased that one of the most outstanding examples of its success is located in my own hometown.

The work being done by Dr. Harold F. Johnson and the Roseville Community Hospital of which I have long been a supporter is outlined in a recent issue of System Development Corp. in an article which was recently brought to my attention.

Accordingly, I would like to share this article with my colleagues:

RMP: FOR HOME RULE IN HEALTH CARE

Hal Johnson lives in Roseville, California. To get there you drive north from Sacramento along U.S. interstate Highway 80. Usually the trip takes about 20 minutes. There's a lot more traffic now than there used to be, and the once vacant grasslands along the way are sprouting tract houses as Sacramento reaches out for more bedroom space. Roseville, an historic Old West railhead, is being sucked into the metropolis.

Since Hal Johnson began practicing medicine for a living nine years ago, he has come to know quite a few of Roseville's 20,000 citizens. He sees patients every day in his office on Oak Ridge Drive or at the Roseville Community Hospital where he's a member of the staff. Johnson and his five partners in group practice are members of a fast disappearing physician minority—the general practitioners.

This doesn't seem to bother Johnson. He takes pride in what he's doing. There's no trace of the defensiveness you sometimes sense amoung GPs in this age of increasing medical specialization. But if you're getting some mellow notion that he's a storybook country doctor, you're in the wrong town. The word for Hal Johnson is Mod.

He swings in a medical and scientific sence because he works at it. He reads the right journals regularly—and learns from them. He makes the time to get to two or three continuing education seminars every year to keep up-to-date. You'll usually find him draped across a chair at classes offered by the local hospital.

As a member of the Roseville City Council and the local school board, he also swings in the community involvement sense. He's the councilman with the crewcut gray hair who makes it to all the meetings and has a reputation for being well up on issues that concern the community. Watching him hold up his end during a clash of views on local taxes, you'd have to concede that for a stripling (39) he's politically hip. This applies in medical politics, too, where Johnson has been a president of his county medical society.

In medicine, as in city government, Johnson likes to describe himself as a progressive conservative. He says he welcomes changes so long as it carries along the positive achievements of the past and is based on politically workable and economically sound assumptions.

Like many of his colleagues in organized medicine, Hal Johnson has harbored deep suspicions about government medical programs, especially those that have emanated from the federal level. He was been apprehensive that they might eventually destroy the personal doctor-patient relationship or undermine the private practice of medicine. Private medicine, he is convinced, is both a wellspring of medical excellence and a powerful witness to individual freedom.

Knowing how Hal Johnson feels on this score makes what he has been doing the past 15 months all the more remarkable. Since July 1968, he has been helping set up a federally sponsored health program in Roseville. He believes it will benefit his own patients and those of other Roseville physicians. He fought to get it. It is being paid for under Public Law 89–239, passed in 1965 and amended last year by P.L. 90–574. Johnson, and thousands of other physicians who have had their thinking changed by this law, call

it Regional Medical Programs, or simply, RMP.

To capture the support of doctors like Hal Johnson, RMP has to be a special program. It is. It is the first federal health program to insist on grass-roots leadership in the decisionmaking process. Regional advisory councils call the shots, and the law is explicit that the councils be representative of all elements of the health community, including consumers. There's a great deal more about RMP that is different from past government efforts, but first let's talk about how the law came into being.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSE

Looked at historically, RMP is dollars-and-cents Congressional recognition that there is much more than shortages of physicians, other health specialists and hospital beds to what Presidents Johnson and Nixon have called the health crisis. Shortages may grab the most space in our news media, but leaders in the health sciences are beginning to talk more and more about *a breakdown in our system for delivery health care.*

This was essentially the message of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke when it submitted its report in December 1964. Chaired by famed Houston heart surgeon, Dr. Michael E. De Bakey, the Commission pointed with pride to the great strides made in medical research and then viewed with alarm the slowness with which the results of this research were being made available to patients throughout the nation.

The following summer, Congress acted to improve the delivery of medical knowledge by passing the Heart, Cancer and Stroke Amendments to the Public Health Service Act. This created Regional Medical Programs "to afford the medical profession and the medical institutions of the nation, through . . . cooperative arrangements, the opportunity of making available to their patients the latest advances in the diagnosis of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and related illnesses." The diseases selected were appropriate targets. As a group, they are our most lethal killers, accounting for 71 of every 100 deaths in America.

The Commission study, now known as the De Bakey Report, had called for the establishment of "centers of excellence" for the dissemination and demonstration of new knowledge. This concept smacked of too much centralism for the medical profession to swallow and was finally scrapped by Congress in favor of "cooperative arrangements" among medical schools, hospitals, medical associations and related elements of the health care system. Such cooperative arrangements are one of the most unusual RMP features.

Congress went even further toward allaying the fears of many physicians when it declared that RMP was to accomplish its ends "without interfering with the patterns, or the methods of financing, of patient care or professional practice, or with the administration of hospitals. . . ." This guarantee, along with the local autonomy delegated to individual regional advisory councils, in large measure explains why practicing physicians like Hal Johnson have greeted RMP so warmly.

DOWN TO THE GRASS ROOTS

Physicians have been joined in their enthusiasm by nurses, hospital administrators, medical educators and representatives of voluntary health organizations, to name the most prominent professionals whose membership is required, along with that of physicians, on the advisory councils. Congress also made it clear that it expected to see some average citizens among the council members.

In drafting P.L. 89–239, the legislators recognized two distinct but related phases in getting RMP into business—planning and operation. In the first, the regional advisory council draws on all the resuorces in its area to identify what is needed to deal with the problems related to heart disease, cancer and stroke as they exist in its own region.

Once needs are known, the council must get down to the task of setting priorities among competing needs and hammering out the cooperative arrangements required to develop remedial measures. This effort is supported by planning funds granted under the Law after approval of the National Advisory Council of the Division of Regional Medical Programs. DRMP is the capping agency that administers the RMP program for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Planning grant approval hinges on acceptance of the region's organizational plan and method for proceeding.

At this point, the region is ready to enter the operational phase, which is another way of saying it is ready to send in an initial grant proposal to the Division of Regional Medical Programs. As required by the Law, DRMP won't give out money for patient treatment except where such funds are to be used for "demonstration" purposes only, and not to set up permanent care and treatment programs. There is also no provision in the Law for money for construction.

Neither Congress nor the division has laid down any hard-and-fast timetable for moving from planning to operation. It hasn't been unusual for the two to proceed concurrently. A few RMP grantees—North Carolina, Kansas and Missouri, for example—had a long history of regional cooperation and planning and were able to move quickly to full operational status. Others have found it necessary to move more slowly.

The real decision on the timeliness and acceptability of operational activities lies with the division as expressed by the recommendations of the Review Committee and the National Advisory Council on RMP. The latter is a body of distinguished medical practitioners and administrators who review and make recommendations on all regional proposals, again as required by law.

Dr. Alfred M. Popma, a Boise, Idaho, radiologist for more than a quarter-century before turning his full time attention to RMP, knows all the angles in the review process. He is one of the 16 members of the National Advisory Council, has served on the Review Committee and keeps his local perspective sharpened as program director of the Mountain States RMP.

"At council review sessions, we are insisting more than ever on excellence," Popma says. "The successful operational grant must reflect the kind of solid region-wide planning that will enhance and improve patient care in heart disease, cancer and stroke. The council makes its recommendations to the Surgeon General who authorizes DRMP to fund approved proposals. So far, none of our findings has been reversed, but recently some have been deferred because of a lack of funds."

Perhaps the most important factor in council deliberations is the quality and durability of the voluntary cooperative arrangements. Says Paul Ward, coordinator of the California RMP, "All operational proposals are based on voluntary cooperative arrangements. It's the term we're stuck with. What does it mean? Simply plain old verbal agreements between given people to do given things, provided they can get the resources from one place or another." Once plugged into a grant proposal and approved, however, these verbal agreements take on all the legal force of a formal contract.

In form, then, RMP goes well beyond encouraging local participation. It demands it. Moreover, the tactic of local control has been strengthened through the philosophies of Drs. Robert Q. Marston and Stanley W. Olson, the two physicians who have served as directors of DRMP. [Marston moved up in 1968 to become the first administrator of the newly created Health Services and Mental Health Administration and subsequently become director of the National Institutes of Health.] Both have employed the division more along the lines of a flexible staff resource than as a heavy-handed federal director and enforcer. In keeping with this attitude, the *Guidelines* put out by DRMP run but 32 pages.

Refuting the notion held by some RMP is the beginning of a national blueprint for dictating standards of medical care. Dr. Olson has said, "Even if we knew enough to draw such blueprints—which we do not—this method of procedure is so foreign to the American tradition that it would fail if for no other reason than lack of acceptance.

"What in fact is intended is that planning shall be accomplished community by community, neighborhood by neighborhood, hospital by hospital, and doctor by doctor, not for the consumer but with him. . . . Regional Medical Programs, though federally supported, are intended to strengthen voluntary institutions and organizations of our country in their effort to develop local resources to meet local needs." Olson learned this lesson on the firing line. Before coming to Washington, he was coordinator of the Tennessee/Mid-South RMP.

A LEARNING PROGRESS

The idea that local communities should guide their own destinies has caught hold in a number of recently enacted federal programs. Says Irving Lewis, deputy director of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, within which DRMP now operates, "We have tried to move more and more decision making out into the field, recognizing that coordination of federal action cannot be accomplished in Washington alone. . . . Moving the point of decision to the community, we find there is no one best way of doing things."

Lewis must have been listening in at some of the meetings in the 55 RMP regions funded since passage of P.L. 89–239. Observers have been struck by the innovation and differentiation of approach that have distinguished the groups as they moved to solve their own health problems. Originality in this case is no accident. It is as integral a part of the RMP fabric as local initiative.

Listen once more to Dr. Olson: "A Regional Medical Program requires a wholeness that cannot be achieved by an aggregation of loosely related projects. If fosters innovation and change. Change is constantly taking place, and we can no longer accept at any stage in our development the belief that we have arrived."

Physicians, hospitals, nurses, laymen and the rest have found it anything but simple to live up to this kind of demand. To begin with, they aren't used to sitting down together to resolve their differences and plan a medical future for an entire geographic region.

In this vein, RMP signals a new departure in the way decisions are made in medicine and the health sciences. Dr. Marc J. Musser, executive coordinator of the North Carolina RMP, says, "For the first time in the history of our country, the health professionals and health interests are joining together to make our health care system more cohesive and effective, not by legislation or with large sums of money, but by involvement of the right people, communications, good judgment and a challenge to local initiative."

California's Paul Ward goes even further: "This is a new role for the majority of our institutions and one that is not fully understood or accepted. Involving outside community forces in planning is difficult enough let alone entering into operational projects that give responsibility to those outside the institution."

Adjusting prerogatives, adjudicating local

differences and coming up with projects that embody both medical excellence and regional benefit have caused the planning process to move deliberately in most of the regions. Consequently, there has been some impatience both within the programs and in Congress. The latter, always strongly in support of RMP, has had difficulty understanding why the regions as a whole haven't spent all the money that has been appropriated.

RMP has had carry-overs of $22 million from Fiscal Year 1966, $38 million from FY 1967, $36 million from FY 1968 and $20 million from FY 1969. From 1966 to 1968, the fact was that there was an insistence on quality and compliance with the Law, an insistence that left some funds unobligated as indicated by the carry-overs. However, the most recent carry-over of $20 million from 1969 to 1970 was an administrative decision of HEW and not the result of a shortage of worthwhile projects. The fact remains that at the end of FY 1969 (June 30) there were some $25 million worth of approved but unfunded projects.

In a March 1968 appearance before the House Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare, Dr. Michael DeBakey anticipated this development. "There have been times when I have been guilty of impatience," he admitted, "but the fact is that this program has developed, I think, at a normal pace and in a very sound way."

He pointed out that the planning phase of RMP had stressed the design, not the implementation, of health programs. This resulted in smaller expenditures than were projected in the beginning, but De Bakey emphasized that regional planning efforts were about to pay off in more expensive operational programs that would require close to $300 million by 1971. He further suggested that Congress "contemplate authorization levels of some $500 million" by 1973 to maintain standards and momentum in the program.

AN EMERGING PATTERN

Through Fiscal Year 1969, the 55 regions had received some $145 million in both planning and operational grants. In part, this paid the freight for the nearly 2500 paid staff members (47 percent physicians) in the programs. It did not reflect the enormous volunteer efforts of the nearly 10,000 private individuals, professional and lay, who man the regional and national advisory councils and serve on various subcommittees, task forces and local action groups.

Active RMPs now blanket the Continental United States and reach beyond to take in Alaska, Puerto Rico and Hawaii, the latter grant including Guam, American Samoa and Micronesia. In land area, the regions range from Washington-Alaska to Washington, D.C. California leads in population with nearly 20 million; Northern New England, headquartered in Vermont, has but 425,000. All Americans now live within at least one RMP area. Because of regional overlapping, some live in as many as three.

Some states, like New York with five and Ohio with four, have set up multiple regions within their boundaries. The opposite has happened in the wide open spaces of the West where the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education administers a program that takes in four states and overlaps portions of four others that have their own RMP activities. California, in turn, is a single region but has organized itself into "areas" defined by the medical service areas of the state's eight medical schools.

Of the 55 organizations that have fiscal responsibility for the programs, 25 are medical colleges or university medical centers. Seven others are universities, while the remaining grants are split among 17 specially chartered foundations, commissions and associations, four state medical societies, one advisory council and one state agency.

Medical school involvement in RMP is written into the Act, since the medical colleges are at once a prime locus of new knowledge through research and because of their tradition as a vehicle for disseminating such knowledge through established extension teaching activities in their own medical service areas. From the outset Congress intended that RMP have heavy educational emphasis, and it is something of an understatement to say that the most popular and well supported thrust of RMP among doctors and allied health personnel has been in the direction of continuing education courses.

In fact, Dr. Dwight Wilbur, immediate past president of the American Medical Association and a staunch RMP supporter, has said: "These [RMP] programs should be primarily educational, for the better educated physicians are, the higher the quality of medical care they can render. . . . Facilities and financing are important, but of prime importance is the widespread availability of high quality medical care. The key to this is more and better education of practicing physicians." Small wonder the regions maintain close relations with medical colleges in their jurisdictions. or that operational grants to date have been notable for their innovative approaches to providing educational programs across a wide range of medical and health specialties.

Few, if any, would disagree altogether with Dr. Wilbur's support of continuing education, but there are many who question that such programs should be the dominant theme in RMP. Dr. H. Jack Geiger speaks for many of these when he argues that RMP should devote much greater attention to the *total* health problems of the urban and rural poor.

Now acting chairman of the department of preventive medicine at Tufts University School of Medicine, Dr. Geiger holds that the categorical RMP emphasis on heart disease, cancer and stroke is too narrow and should be broadened to include not only *all* disease problems that confront the poor, but also such pressing extramedical issues as poverty, discrimination, lack of education and unsanitary inner city and rural housing.

Differences of opinion like these don't intimidate Dr. Olson and his staff at DRMP. They call theirs a living program in the sense that they expect to see it change and grow as conditions change and new health priorities emerge. They've already seen the categorical emphasis expanded somewhat through greater attention to kidney, respiratory, diabetic and other diseases that fall under the "related illnesses" portion of P.L. 90–574, and they fought successfully to have dentistry included within the RMP rubric.

Moreover, they have established close liaison with social action agencies both in HEW (Office of Economic Opportunity) and HUD (Model Cities) and have encouraged individual regions to forge cooperative arrangements with these and other programs wherever possible. (A subsequent section in this issue touches on such interagency cooperation in Nashville, Tennessee.)

For all this, the program has experienced some disappointments. One of the most persistent has been the slowness with which RMP has moved in some of our largest and most problem ridden urban areas. This has been accentuated by the speed and success realized in rural and alpine regions. Much of the problem traces to hangups in getting RMP organized in the core cities where, among other problems, there is a plethora of health institutions, people and activities, all of which are essentially autonomous.

The division has made no effort to soft-pedal these difficulties in its testimony before Congress or in its public statements. Olson has said: "The complex problems of our cities pose a national crisis of the gravest order. . . . We recognize that the complexities involved in developing regionalization in urban areas have delayed the development of regions in the very areas where their services may be most needed. This is a matter to which I have already given a great deal of my time and to which I am prepared to devote more of my personal efforts."

Dr. Olson's "complexities" are the same bugaboos that plague most public programs in the cities—inadequate funds, social fragmention, the difficulty of bringing together all the culturally diverse groups that must be included in the planning process, immovable bureaucracies, indifference. By and large, the rural regions have had to deal with a far less numerous but more homogenous population, a circumstance that goes far toward accounting for their rapid progress in getting into operational status. Comparative operational grant histories tell the story about as well as anything else.

Let's consider the Kansas RMP and the Intermountain Program based at Salt Lake City, Utah. These regions, both largely rural, have received grant funds totaling some $3 million and $7.3 million, respectively. Another fast-starting group, the Albany RMP in upstate New York, has received almost $2.8 million. Together, these regions represent about eight million people.

On the other side of the coin, the latest DRMP directory of operational grants lists none for Chicago, Cleveland, New York City or Pittsburgh. The New York Metropolitan RMP alone has more people than Albany, Kansas and Intermountain combined. While awards have been made for projects in Los Angeles, Philadelphia, St. Louis and Baltimore, they have been on a far less ambitious scale than those for some of the more thinly populated regions.

Not that there aren't some encouraging urban programs. Watts-Willowbrook, a project to develop a post-graduate medical center to serve the people of Central Los Angeles, is widely regarded as a possible prototype of future community health centers in ghetto areas. The Tennessee/Mid-South RMP, combining the activities of predominantly black Meharry Medical School with those of traditionally white Vanderbilt University Medical School, is embarked on a preventive medicine program that links multiphasic screening and OEO-sponsored Neighborhood Health Center in a deteriorating section of North Nashville. Similar programs are on the drawing boards in such regions as Illinois, New Jersey, Detroit, Washington and New York City.

A GLIMPSE AT WHAT'S GOING ON

The working draft of a directory prepared by DRMP at the end of Fiscal Year 1969 required nearly 240 pages to furnish biographical data on the 55 regions and capsule descriptions of the projects in the 41 regions that had achieved operational status. Most of the space was devoted to the latter task.

Predictably, the individual projects differ as markedly in design as the regions themselves differ in topography, demography, and health manpower and facilities. Just as predictably, there are pronounced similarities, for gaps in the armamentarium for attacking heart disease, cancer and stroke have some characteristics that transcend regional boundaries.

For example, the best equipped and trained personnel are found in the major hospitals and university medical centers, whether these are in rural or urban regions. Logically, then, these institutions find themselves involved in some way in nearly all educational, training or demonstration projects that have won approval for operational funding.

Commonly, RMP strategy has been two-fold—to build on existing strengths wherever there is a strong local program and to extend knowledge outward from the medical centers to the smaller community hospitals where

specialists and sophisticated equipment are often nonexistent. Nowhere is this strategy better illustrated than in the emphasis on coronary care programs, an emphasis that threads its way through RMP activities from Hawaii to Florida, from sparsely peopled Idaho to crowded New Jersey.

In the Memphis region, the University of Tennessee Medical Center plans to install a 12-bed "showcase" coronary care unit (CCU) that the medical staff will use to give training and demonstrations to health professionals from throughout the area. The Metropolitan Washington, D.C., RMP is literally putting its coronary care program on wheels by designing a mobile CCU that will rotate among three hospitals in the area. The hospitals will provide their own nurses, who will be specially trained, and physicians will be drawn from the Heart Disease Control Program of HEW.

Joint action by the Central Ohio Heart Association and the Ohio State University College of Medicine characterizes coronary care training in the Ohio State RMP, a 61-county region in the central and southern portions of the state. Nurses from hospitals in 10 core cities come to Columbus for two weeks' intensive training that prepares them to return to their own institutions as "nurse educators." Physicians, in turn, are eligible for coronary care seminars right in their own local hospitals.

These projects give some idea of the style, if not the scope, of RMP coronary care activities. There are still other innovations. Some of the regions have installed 24-hour telephone hookups that allow small hospitals to dial regional medical centers directly for electrocardiogram analysis and professional consultation. Another twist has been the development of coronary care training programs in hospitals other than teaching hospitals, an approach that is especially relevant to those medical personnel who live great distances from the large training institutions. Whatever the approach, the separate regional efforts share a common bond of helping the practicing physician, the nurse and others to improve their skills in behalf of coronary patients.

To Marc Musser, it is this recognition of the needs of patients, as much as the recognition of the educational needs of health professionals, that accounts for the RMP emphasis on coronary care units. He says, "Coronary care units represent increased awareness of the acute problems of patients. RMP picked up the CCU program at the right time, since it combined our initial emphasis on continuing education and the means to effectively meet needs in patient care."

What holds for coronary care is no less true of programs in cancer and stroke. Most of the regions have moved solidly into these areas with tumor registries, tumor boards, stroke management programs, and cancer and stroke screening projects. Without exception, the regional plans demonstrate conscious attempts to mount a balanced attack against all the diseases identified in the legislation. (The final segment of this issue includes discussion of a cancer program being developed in Boise, Idaho.)

TOWARD THE FUTURE

Of the many issues that will face RMP in the 1970s, none is likely to remain more visible than the health needs of the urban poor. Dr. Olson believes, "Regional Medical Programs can assist in the improvement of health service activities through projects that supplement elements of both old and new systems aimed specifically at the urban poor.

"True, we suffer from several constraints as we attempt to deal with these problems. Facilities are needed, but we have no authority to use funds for construction of facilities. Neither may grant funds be used to pay for the cost of medical services or hospitalization. Nevertheless, there are major contributions which Regional Medical Programs can make. . . .

"Regional Medical Programs are functioning organizations specifically designed to link the providers of care together for the purpose of collectively improving services to patients. . . . To do this, RMP must enter into cooperative arrangements with the many local and federal programs already addressing themselves to health problems of the urban poor.

"The [RMP] programs can and should contribute significantly in planning general health services for these populations, because it is only in this fashion that we can come to grips specifically with the problems of heart disease, cancer and stroke." Clearly, the DRMP staff doesn't intend to dodge its responsibilities in the cities.

Nor, if Dr. Olson is to be believed, will RMP diminish its emphasis on continuing education. He is on record as being convinced that continuing education is one of the most significant single components of RMP activity. In years to come, however, the division expects to promote more comprehensive and innovative approaches designed to make health professional active participants rather than passive receptacles in the educational process.

In Olson's view there is no conflict between the requirement for continuing education and the need to do something in the cities. In fact, he believes that RMP is flexible enough to accommodate the problems of the rural poor as well. Education and social action can coexist comfortably in Olson's philosophy, because he regards them as essential to each other.

He sees continuing education in urban areas as one sure way to achieve better care and treatment for disadvantaged patients. In the same vein, he believes that cooperative health arrangements worked out by agencies in the cities can be copied elsewhere to benefit the rural poor. This outlook again reflects the importance DRMP attaches to balanced programs.

This emphasis is certain to grow even stronger throughout the 55 regions in coming years. The division—through its own staff, the National Advisory Council, outside consultants and the Review Committee—has traditionally insisted on excellence in the operational proposals that come before it for review.

In recent months, Dr. Olson has strengthened this policy and called on the regions to work harder than ever to improve the quality and regional significance of their requests. Perhaps the most effective means toward this end will be the encouragement of more rigorous standards of review and criticism among the regional advisory councils when they evaluate their own operational proposals.

The quest for excellence doesn't stop there. Today there is also more attention than ever to the problem of project evaluation. All proposals must include formal mechanisms for periodic evaluation, and the division has invested a great deal of effort in developing sensitive tools for this task. The object is to help the regions identify weaknesses and eliminate unproductive programs. It turns out to be a continuing responsibility.

GETTING TO KNOW THE PUBLIC AND EACH OTHER

Programs like RMP recognize that their success is almost totally dependent on timely and accurate communications to a wide and heterogeneous set of audiences. There's Congress, the mass media, the general public, the medical schools, the professional organizations, local governments, state health agencies, voluntary associations, and on and on and on.

At another but equally important level, there is the requirement for open communications between the division and the regions and among the regions themselves. Under DRMP Assistant Director, Edward M. Friedlander, the division has worked out a program to produce maximum reciprocal feedback. Within the separate regions, most core staffs now include a professional public information officer.

It's important that he do a good job, for as Marc Musser has said: "Most of the problems in RMP result from failure to communicate at the right time. Leave someone out and things can get sticky. You might think that busy doctors could care less, but that has been far from the rule so far in RMP. Overlook them and they let you know about it in a hurry.

"Frankly, getting the commitment of local people is only the beginning. Communications exchange must be reciprocal. It must be continuous. A lesson all of us around the country have learned is that good communications in a region don't just happen. You must do a lot of work to make them happen. A good core staff is essential."

This basic lesson hasn't been lost on Ed Friedlander and his group at the division. Early in the game they set in motion a systematic program of interregional meetings designed to draw together RMP staffs from the same geographical parts of the country. Such gatherings serve several purposes. They allow for briefings on what is going on at the federal level in regard to budget and legislative policy. They also serve as a platform for interpreting divisional guidelines and giving the regions a chance to air their gripes about what the division is doing. That way everybody has a chance to learn some of the basic facts together.

If the meetings accomplished no more than this, chances are both Dr. Olson and Friedlander would consider them worthwhile. There's another angle, however, that may prove even more useful to the regions in the long run. Friedlander and his people are using their get-togethers with the regions to encourage permanent channels by which the regions can communicate regularly with each other, separately and as groups.

DRMP is convinced—as are many of the regions—that there is a manyfold pay-off in this kind of activity. For one thing, a frank exchange of data on operational program successes and failures can help the respective regions avoid expensive false starts. For another, it can provide late-starting regions with helpful tips on how to secure the enthusiasm of their own people and how to initiate the planning process. Of increasing importance, it can also help iron out jurisdictional problems or stimulate cooperative arrangements among regions whose programs overlap each other.

At a February 1969 meeting in Tampa, Florida, the coordinators and other staff of the 15 regions that make up the Southeastern Region furnished proof that interregional cooperation and exchange are gaining in appreciation. Spurred by Marc Musser and Dr. J. Gordon Barrow who directs the Georgia RMP, the Southeastern group voted to share the cost of an interregional coordinator whose task would be to "ride circuit" among the regions and keep everyone apprised of what his neighbors are doing. The new man has already been on the job for several months.

BUDGET OUTLOOK

The fact that the regions are now ready to look beyond their own immediate interests is an indication that the four-year-old RMP is coming of age. Further proof—if any is ready needed—lies in the rate at which programs are moving out to planning into operational status. It is at this point that RMP requires much higher levels of financial support. The program is already feeling a pinch.

Says Dr. Olson: "Clearly, we are moving from a circumstance where there has been a surplus of funds—at times an embarrassing surplus of funds—to one in which the reverse will be the case. Looking at applications already in hand, we can predict that the ag-

gregate demand for grant funds will exceed our appropriations in the Fiscal Year 1970. Beyond that, the amounts that the Review Committee and the National Advisory Council will likely recommend for approval from yet-to-be-received applications will also exceed available funds."

Because RMP didn't spend all the money Congress made available to it in the first four years, some of the lawmakers have been dubious about whether program requests do in fact represent a reasonable estimate of need. Although final Congressional appropriations for RMP grants are yet to be voted, this dubiousness, combined with Administrative and Congressional belt-tightening, resulted in a House Appropriations Committee recommendation of $50 million in grants for FY 1970. This is $24 million less than the Administration asked for and $70 million below what was authorized by legislation.

Many in RMP regard this as a body blow to the future health of the program. Both Marc Musser and Paul Ward serve on the Coordinators' Steering Committee, a group of 10 coordinators elected by their fellows to advise DRMP on national policy and programs. Ward and Musser think present funding projections are far from adequate.

Musser calls the budget outlook unpromising. He warns that some programs may have to cut back and that the fiscal situation will almost certainly discourage new starts. "On the whole," he says, "this is occurring with the worst possible timing, since so many new localities and communities are clamoring to get into RMP."

Speaking to the same point, California's Ward said, "I suppose that at the present time you can say that the program is at its most critical stage. Years of planning are coming to a head, and the projects are rolling in. Now if you don't get the money in a reasonable time, the people who made the cooperative arrangements move away or change their minds, and you have to try to put it all together again. Well, that's very wasteful.

"Understand me, it's not hard to sell Congress on RMP. They were always willing to authorize just about as much as the program could use, because their opinion of us was always high. The only thing Congress has had against us is that in the beginning we asked for too much—more than we could realistically use. That is the problem."

Ward feels much the same as Dr. De Bakey did when he testified last year before the House—that the program must continue to grow and expand. Characterizing RMP as a means for distributing medical knowledge, Ward draws an analogy from the business world: "You know, General Motors would never think of developing a new automobile and then not spend some of their resources on campaigns to get it in the hands of customers. The same is true today in medicine. You might just as well forget the research unless you are willing to devote some money to distribution.

"That's what RMP is all about, and if we are talking $100 million as a plateau for all time, we are engaged in the wrong kind of planning. You've got to preserve your momentum and the faith that people have manifested in the future of the program. Otherwise the voluntary contributions and local participation will largely be lost. That is what would really hurt."

ALTERNATIVES TO "THE BASTILLE OF MEDICAL SCIENCE"

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Benjamin Rush said:

The Constitution of the Republic should make provision for medical freedom as well as religious freedom. To restrict the art of healing to one class of men and deny equal privilege to others will constitute the Bastille of medical science.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Joseph T. English, president of the New York City Health and Hospital Corp., is a public servant whose youthfulness has not prevented the attainment, before the age of 40, of a distinguished record of accomplishment and perception in the medical delivery field.

A psychiatrist who served at the Peace Corps, at the Office of Economic Opportunity, and as administrator of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration of HEW before assuming his enormous responsibilities in New York earlier this year, Dr. English is now responsible for administering the new health and hospital corporation which recently took over responsibilities for a major part of the city's medical facilities.

Dr. English spoke recently to the American Association of Medical Colleges in Los Angeles on the desperate need—so far unrecognized by the administration—for new approaches to better health care delivery. He also discussed the responsibilities which Congress has undertaken for these improvements and the serious gaps which still exist. His talk follows:

REMARKS BY JOSEPH T. ENGLISH, M.D.

In a time of great crisis for all of us concerned and committed to the health needs of the American people, perhaps no group is in a more strategic position to help than those of you who are members of this Association. I take it as a great privilege to have this opportunity to review with the leadership of American medical education some of these problems, the urgency with which they confront us, and the critical role of the medical center in their solution.

Nearly a year and a half ago, Robert Finch, then Secretary of HEW, and his newly appointed Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, Dr. Roger Egeberg presented to President Nixon their assessment of the health care crisis in America. I quote:

"This nation is faced with a breakdown in the delivery of health care unless immediate and concerted action is taken by Government and the private sector. Expansion of public and private financing for health services created a demand for health services far in excess of the capacity of our health system to respond. The result is a crippling inflation in medical costs causing vast increases in government health expenditures with little return, raising private health insurance premiums and reducing the purchasing power of the health dollar of our citizens."

Disturbingly, this description of a basic imbalance between the financing of health care services and the capacity of the health care system to respond is no less accurate today than it was a year and a half ago. How have we come to this point? What is being done about it today? What must be done in the future?

The lessons of recent years have sharpened our focus and perspective. Our nation has come to recognize two important myths—myths which impede our efforts toward progress in meeting the health needs of our people.

The first myth held that a major investment of money and talent in biomedical research would result in advances that would be automatically transmitted throughout the health care system to the benefit of all. The investment was made. Dramatic advances were the result. We saw progress in every field of medical science and technology, making our nation's centers of medical excellence second to none in the world.

But the translation of these advances into the day-to-day practice of medicine did not occur. Rather, the gap widened between the best which medicine could offer and what was available to vast numbers of our people. Committed to the important work of advancing medical knowledge, our medical schools became over-dependent upon Federal research support for other important activities, such as education and community service.

The second myth held that a mainstream of American medical care existed, and that the only barrier between this mainstream and millions of our people was the lack of money to pay for these services. It was assumed that if these citizens were provided a money ticket into the system, they would then be able to partake of quality medical care. This assumption was seldom questioned, and the great national debate centered on whether the money ticket was to be from public or private resources.

The result of the economic and ideological dialogue which ensued was the enactment of the Social Security amendments of 1965, creating Medicaid and Medicare. A significant step forward was taken in the development of a financial structure to support health services. But only recently have we begun to understand how incomplete a strategy this legislation was.

What have been the consequences of an incomplete strategy based, to some extent, on a series of myths? First, the demand for health services has reached an unprecedented scale. Medical progress in the past 30 years has increased realization of what the physician can offer. Health services are perceived as related to the right to life itself. Provided with real purchasing power, the American health consumer has placed enormous stress on the capacity of the American health enterprise to respond.

This strain has been compounded by the maldistribution of health manpower, particularly physicians, who are moving away from the rural areas of our country, away from the urban core, and into the suburban communities surrounding our great cities. In 1943, the doctor-patient ratio in the inner cities was one to 500, and in the surrounding surburban communities was one to 2,000. By 1968, it had become one to 10,000 in the urban core and one to 500 in the suburbs. So much for the myth of the mainstream.

It has been in the cities of our nation, where the majority of Medicaid beneficiaries reside, that increased demand for health services has been most pronounced. It is in the cities where our capacity is most severly strained. In one 55-block area of Harlem recently studied, 50 physicians served 25,000 residents 25 years ago. Today, five physicians struggle to serve a population grown to 50,000. A physician in a situation such as this often bears double and triple the load he carried before, and inevitably finds difficulty in providing every patient with the highest quality care. The sheer number of patients seeking his attention forces him to put those who are really ill into hospitals. Many of these patients might have been otherwise cared for outside of the hospital. This strains our already over-taxed hospital resource. This is further aggravated by financing mechanisms which support hospital care far better than out-patient care.

In the South Bronx of New York, the 346-bed Lincoln Hospital now serves as primary health resource to some 350,000 of New York's most medically needy citizens. In its tiny emergency room, now the third busiest in the nation, some 500 patients a day are seen in a facility and by a staff never intended to bear such a load. In these situations we risk dilution of the quality of care. Further, we find increasing inequities and indignities in the human relationships involved in health services. The personal and human attention

so basic to the healing process becomes progressively more difficult to assure.

In the rural areas of the country, the problem is no less acute. In rural counties physicians lost through death and retirement are not being replaced. Over 412,000 people in 115 counties scattered through 23 states do not have any physicians providing patient care in their counties. There is no place at all to cash in the money ticket.

Faced with an increased demand, and dilution in the quality of services for a major portion of our population, inflation in health costs has increasingly attracted the attention of Americans and their congressional officials. Last year public-private expenditures for health services in this country exceeded $63 billion. Inflation in this massive segment of the economy has exceeded that in any other. The nation's medical bill has increased 500% during the past twenty years. Health insurance premiums have been increasing at the rate of 10% a year. Hospital costs have increased 82% in the past five years. In the last fiscal year the federal contribution to the $63 billion enterprise was $18 billion—a figure larger than the national budget of all but five countries in the world. Of this $18 billion, $14 billion was devoted to the financing of health care—to the issuing of money tickets.

These are the elements of the health care crisis we face today. The growing reaction of an aroused public is the major new factor. In the halls of Congress and in the headlines of our national press we see the stirrings of a public now questioning those in whom they had placed their trust for the assurance of accessible, high-quality health services. The health professions, and medicine in particular, are receiving increasing public scrutiny. I would suggest that, unless we respond by effective action in the public interest, the reaction of an increasingly concerned public will eventually impose drastic changes which will work neither to the benefit of the patient nor the provider.

There are several major issues which must be confronted.

First, the national shortage of health manpower and institutions is real. But beyond the training of larger numbers of health professionals, the means must be developed to deal with the serious maldistribution of health manpower and resources.

Second, pouring resources into payment for health services without comparable investment in our capacity to respond to increased demand produces staggering inflation. A qualitative balance in the Federal health investment must be struck. This has not been done.

Third, important advances in medical research and technology still have not reached the public at large. Effective incorporation of new discoveries into the daily delivery of health services *must* be assured.

Fourth, medical schools are vulnerable today because of their over-dependence for many functions on federal research dollars. Realistic financing for the educational and service responsibilities of medical schools must be guaranteed.

Finally, the system through which health services are organized and delivered has serious inadequacies requiring effort on many fronts. New organizational models for health care delivery must be supported, studied and compared. Incentives both for consumers and providers of health services must be developed and tested. In order to be sure that the vast talent of the nation's medical schools contributes to these efforts, departments of social and community medicine must be supported. It is here that the vital union of education, service, and research can be directly focused on solving some of our most severe problems.

At a time when the health professions are entering what could be the most critical decade of the century for the future of our nation's health effort, at a time when public unrest is moving us toward new approaches to the problem which would have been unthinkable ten years ago, what kind of leadership and response are we getting from Washington?

This is the saddest fact of all. The evident lack of attention to the health needs of the American people is a matter of public record:

(1) The nation's number one health official has had to publicly lament his exclusion from the decision-making process in the White House.

(2) The new secretary of HEW was not consulted by the White House staff before the Presidential veto of a major piece of health legislation: the Hill Burton Program.

(3) At this very moment, it is still impossible to identify anyone on the largest White House staff in history who has responsibility or competence in this major segment of our economy and national life.

(4) In a year which the Administration itself defined as one of major crisis, there was no Presidential Health Message.

Meanwhile, the Federal Government will quantitatively increase its expenditures for health next year by $2 billion in a way which contributes to the present inflationary spiral. But it has developed no strategy for making this increase produce the qualitative impact so needed if the public interest is to be served.

Despite the urgent need for investment in increasing our capacity to respond to new demand, it is in this area where the administration seeks false economy.

It has been the Congress this year which pressed for an increase of $411 million over the administration's budget for support of bio-medical research, medical education, comprehensive health planning and health services research and development.

It has been the Congress which pressed for increases in expenditures for medical facilities construction, the Regional Medical Programs, mental health, and communicable diseases control.

Despite drastic inequities in our medical educational system in which 40% of the nation's medical students come from families in the top 5% income bracket, the Administration cut back financial aid programs for medical students last year. It has been the Congress, with the encouragement of this Association and the Student American Medical Association, which pressed the Administration for an additional $18 million for student assistance this year.

When a score of our medical schools are on the verge of financial collapse, it is again the Congress that takes the initiative in pressing an Administration, deaf to its own health officials, for an additional $16 million for institutional support and an additional $24 million for health research and education facilities.

I would contend that this not so benign neglect of a $63 billion segment of our economy can do nothing but further cripple our capacity to provide services important to life itself, and to aggravate the reaction of a frustrated public.

But perhaps the most insidious aspect of the current situation is the fostering of a climate which could divide into meaningless competition the three inseparable parts of our health effort: research, education and service. When resources are scarce, individuals and institutions whose primary commitment has been to one of these areas may fall into the easy trap of attempting to protect their interests at the expense of other equally vital areas. In the face of famine, there is a temptation towards cannibalism. Only the most simplistic analysis of the current crisis would allow such a course.

Research has led and will continue to lead to heightened medical capability without which the whole medical enterprise will wither and die. All our efforts will be futile if our capacity to produce increased numbers of physicians and other health professionals is not assured. Without financing mechanisms which at once remove monetary barriers for those who need health services and provide incentives for the more rational organization and delivery of health care, we can never meet our responsibility to the American public.

I would suggest that the callous indifference at the highest levels of our government to the health crisis in America exposes above all our own inability to organize effectively and to argue persuasively for the rational support of the American health enterprise. This indifference requires that we rise above our more parochial concerns to organize an effort in the public interest which combines our forces more effectively.

In the past there has been ample evidence of the leading role that medical educators and schools of medicine can play in such an effort.

Tufts University School of Medicine moved to sponsor two of the pilot Neighborhood Health Centers in cooperation with the Office of Economic Opportunity. These centers, established in the Columbia Point section of Boston and in Mound Bayou, Mississippi, served as early models of the effective social involvement of medical educational institutions in the health problems of the poor.

When government confronted the problems of the Watts community here in Los Angeles, the University of Southern California School of Medicine, then under the direction of Dr. Roger Egeberg, took the initiative to accept major responsibility for the medical aspects of that task. Today over half the nation's medical schools are involved in the operation of Neighborhood Health Center programs.

Early in the '60's the municipal hospitals of the City of New York were faced with the serious consequences of a failure to attract enough house staff and attending physicians. The City's commitment to provide health services to the medically indigent was in danger of breach. Under the brilliant leadership of Dr. Ray Trussell, then Commissioner of Hospitals, the affiliation plan was born. Through this plan, the City contracted with medical schools and voluntary hospitals for the provision of professional services. Since 1961, the medical schools of New York have helped to provide quality care to millions of New Yorkers while leading in the development of some of the nation's finest physician training programs. We are now involved, through the newly created New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation, in efforts intended to further develop this public-private partnership. But this example reminds us that in a time of great need, the medical schools of the City responded with energy and responsibility in helping with *that* health care crisis.

Today the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, an institution natonally known for its high standards of academic excellence and its contributions to basic bio-medical research, has begun to rise to the new challenge. At the Lincoln Hospital which I mentioned earlier, the school is developing training programs for students and house officers which will assure medical excellence but which will also deal realistically with the needs of a hospital and a community where health conditions are in a state of near disaster. Beyond its concern with the South Bronx, the College is moving toward an holistic approach to health problems and is taking a leadership role in the development of a more rational planning of health services for the entire Bronx. The College's response to the basic needs for new models of physician and health professional training, and to the need for participatory planning involving the community, is most encouraging. Albert Einstein is but one example of many such initiatives uderway by

major medical centers in our city and throughout the country.

The major challenge of this decade will be to stabilize the support of our institutions of bio-medical excellence while we create the new institutions of equity. The task is to share the fruits of our achievements with 200 million people, to share our excellence with equity, efficiency and respect for human dignity.

This will take institutional development as did the challenge of the last two decades. And the development of the new institutions of equity will require the leadership of medical research and education in the same way that the development of our institutions of bio-medical excellence did in the past. If we do not forge this partnership in the '70's, then all of the American health enterprise will suffer, but especially the consumer.

With this partnership, the Administration will not be able to ignore our Federal health leadership. If those of us committed to new knowledge, new manpower and better service join forces in the coalition whch the times demand, we shall be heard. It must be a coalition of teacher and student, of provider and researcher. It must include those interested in the old as well as the young; of those interested in the treatment of disease as well as the protection of health. It must be a public-private partnership, and most importantly, it must include the consumer.

The time is late. The public need is great. Let us get on with the work.

CONTINUING INTEREST IN USE OF SDR MECHANISM TO INCREASE DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in August 1969, the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee issued a report urging serious study of a link between the creation of special drawing rights and financial assistance for economic development. The objective of any such linkage would be to use the International Monetary Fund's multilateral authority to distribute SDR's as a vehicle for transferring additional resources to poor nations. A number of different techniques for achieving this end result have been suggested, and the relative merits and disadvantages of these various approaches need to be examined in detail.

A little less than a year ago I commented here on the widespread interest—particularly among developing countries—in using the multilateral authority of the IMF to create international money for beneficial purposes. I then submitted for the record excerpts on this subject from the comments of various officials at the 1969 annual meetings of the IMF and the World Bank. Since that time, interest in a possible linkage arrangement has grown. In his concluding remarks at the 1970 meetings, held last month, World Bank President McNamara said:

I think no other subject was referred to as frequently during the week's discussions as such a possible link between special drawing rights and development finance.

At the conclusion of a preliminary conference to prepare for the Fund-Bank meetings, the British Commonwealth finance ministers urged serious study of this subject. In his final remarks, Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, managing director of the IMF, asserted he was sure that:

The executive directors will want to give careful consideration to the Fund's program of work in this field.

I would like to underline the recommendations of the Subcommittee of International Exchange and Payments to the effect that the potential benefits of a linkage arrangement are sufficient to warrant careful consideration. I submit a series of excerpted remarks by various IMF governors at the recently concluded meetings on this subject and more complete statements by President McNamara and Managing Director Schweitzer.

Admittedly, the first concern of the IMF must be to secure universal acceptance of the SDR facility. But we should not be satisfied that the potential benefits of international monetary creation under multilateral supervision are being fully exploited.

Extracts from remarks at the 1970 annual meetings of the IMF and World Bank: linking reserve creation and development assistance follows:

LINK

MALAWI—GOVERNOR BANDA

In particular, there was a general consensus of opinion at the recent meeting of the Commonwealth Finance Ministers that a study should examine the possibilities of a future link between SDR's and aid.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY—GOVERNOR SCHILLER

SDR's cannot be a medium to finance capital aid. The normal needs of developing countries for international liquidity must, of course, be met. Germany has been and continues to be in favor of a fair participation of developing countries in the creation of liquidity through the IMF.

INDONESIA—GOVERNOR WARDHANA

[I know that a linkage of special drawing rights with development financing] is not provided for in the Articles of Agreement of the IMF. But legislation is a reflection of need and if that need is recognized, legal provisions can and should be adopted for it.

NETHERLANDS—GOVERNOR WITTEVEEN

There is a fundamental difference between development aid and liquidity creation. Real resources are necessary for development. These real resources can only be made available by taxes or savings. . . . I cannot see any logical link between aid and the creation of liquidity.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC—GOVERNOR FERNANDEZ

It is of special interest to Latin America that the International Monetary Fund study the form in which special drawing rights might possibly be used, as the system develops, to promote the financial and economic integration of our continent.

KENYA—GOVERNOR KIBAKI

I am aware of the arguments that have been put forward in the past against such proposals, rhetorically described as confusing liquidity with aid. There are strong arguments for using this new form of international liquidity as a form of development finance, either directly through the allocation of SDR's to developing countries or indirectly by channelling them through lending institutions such as IDA.

AUSTRALIA—GOVERNOR BURY

. . . I would not argue against [a study] of the link. But I do think we should remember that the Fund is in the balance of payments business and the Bank is in the development finance business and we may weaken both if we get their functions confused. And I sincerely trust that the examination of this question will not be carried beyond the point where it may prejudice any future allocation of SDR's. That would be a great price to pay.

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO—GOVERNOR NDELE

The industrial countries cannot obtain the expected surplus unless they are prepared to finance the deficit of the less developed countries without thereby excessively aggravating those countries' burden of debt, either by transferring existing savings to the developing countries or by creating new instruments of payment for their use.

AFGHANISTAN—GOVERNOR AMAN

Recognizing that there is no specific link between the SDR system and developing countries' needs for economic resources, we request that the Fund's monetary experts study alternative methods for reallocating the special drawing rights. One possibility would be to continue the present system of computation based on quotas but to provide for double allocations of SDR's to developing countries.

ISRAEL—GOVERNOR HOROWITZ

The use of SDR's, indeed, might have less inflationary effects when allocated to developing countries which possess considerable amounts of unused resources, than when allocated to developed countries with relatively full employment. Thus, by using SDR's for development finance purposes, a new development strategy of utilizing spare capacity could evolve.

YUGOSLAVIA—GOVERNOR SMOLE

If an adequate approach is found to the establishment of a link; between the creation and activiation of SDR's, on the one hand, and the financing of development, on the other, an important contribution would be made to the search for a new and supplementary source of development financing, without compromising in the process, the very ideas and objectives for which the SDR's were introduced.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO—GOVERNOR PREVATT

The SDR scheme is operating satisfactorily; now we should re-examine it in the interests of equity. We cannot divorce international liquidity and development finance. A link between the two is feasible and the Fund should study the problems involved. This study should be completed before the beginning of the next basic allocation period.

NEW ZEALAND—GOVERNOR MULDOON

There have been proposals to study the possibility of linking the special drawing rights in the Fund to development finance. While New Zealand sees the value of a study, we would only support the activation of such a scheme if it was shown to be clearly compatible with the aims and objects of the Fund.

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC—GOVERNOR HAMID

The link I have in mind is that which can be effected by direct contribution of SDR's by developed countries to IDA out of their allocation, followed immediately by an exchange of these rights into the national currencies of the respective donor countries, or through contributions in national currencies by developed countries to IDA in proportion to their annual allocation of SDR's.

Already the Expert Group on International Monetary Issues, in its report on "International Monetary Reform," prepared at the request of the UNCTAD Trade and Development Board, has recommended a link be-

tween reserve creation and the provision of development finance. Then no less a body than the General Assembly passed Resolution No. 2565 (XXIV) last December, inviting IMF member governments to consider at an early date the possibility of establishing such a link after the activation of the SDR's.

NIGERIA—GOVERNOR ISONG

But we must nonetheless stress the need for such a study on the grounds that any way of ensuring increased development finance to developing countries is both desirable and healthy for the rich as well as for the poor countries. [SRD's] must form a part of the cure for the serious ailment and malaise of the developing nations. Some of the objections to this link do not take into account the long-term political and economic stability of the developing nations.

From the concluding remarks by Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, managing director of the Fund:

Many Governors have expressed their satisfaction with the operation of the special drawing rights facility in its first months. Our overriding concern is to establish the SDR firmly as an effective and valued reserve asset. Even though we are only in the early phase of the first basic period, a number of suggestions have been made for the study by the Fund of modifications of the facility. These range from some of a more technical character to fundamental changes such as would be involved in establishing a link of some kind between the issuance of special drawing rights and the financing of economic development. I am sure that the Executive Directors will want to give careful consideration to the Fund's program of work in this field.

From the concluding remarks by Robert S. McNamara, President of the World Bank, IFC, and IDA:

And secondly, I would like to comment upon the possible link of special drawing rights to development finance. I think no other subject was referred to as frequently during the week's discussions as such a possible link between special drawing rights and development finance. Sharply conflicting views are, I know, held with respect to the desirability of such a link, but I think the great majority of those who spoke urged that the subject be given careful study. Mr. Schweitzer referred to it a moment ago. Because the availability of more concessional finance is of such vital importance to the development process, the Bank is prepared to give assistance in any study of this matter undertaken by the Fund.

Extract from communique of Commonwealth Finance Ministers, September 21, 1970:

LINK BETWEEN SPECIAL DRAWING RIGHTS AND DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

Ministers discussed the possibility of linking special drawing rights to development finance. They were encouraged by the first six months' experience of the working of SDRS which indicated satisfactory progress towards the establishment of SDRS as a reserve asset on an equal basis with other assets. They agreed, however, that the special drawing rights system would need to be firmly established before there would be any link with development finance. Ministers also agreed that the next occasion when the International community ought seriously to consider the link will be in 1972 when consideration is to be given within the IMF to the next round of SDR allocations. They accepted that the IMF members ought to be adequately prepared for this consideration and that to this end the executive board of the fund should be requested to undertake a study of the question in good time so that the results are available well before the time when decisions must be taken.

NATIONAL SERVICE ACT SUPPORT CITED

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 11, 1970, a syndicated article by Alan Emory was carried by the Muncie Star in Muncie, Ind., on the subject of the National Service Act of 1970—H.R. 18025 and 18578. I would like to insert this article in the RECORD at this time:

SUPPORTERS IN MAJORITY: BINGHAM DRAFT ALTERNATE MEASURE COULD UNITE THE COUNTRY WITH ITS YOUTH

(By Alan Emory)

WASHINGTON.—"This bill will do wonders in averting the revolt of our youth and in getting united once more behind the country of which they can be proud," said a mother in Juneau, Alaska.

A woman in Chicago was happy that a public official felt "something besides war can be an honorable activity."

"I believe even women should be made to face that type of "draft,'" wrote a resident of Arlington, Tex.

"That type of draft" is the plan for some kind of national service for all young Americans proposed by Rep. Jonathan B. Bingham, D-Bronx.

It has fired the imagination of people across the country.

The idea is not brand-new. One of its early advocates was former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, but the response then was limited.

Recently, with rising opposition to American participation to the Vietnam war and vigorous campus dissent, the proposal has struck a more responsive chord.

Bingham, the lanky, prematurely-gray New Yorker, says mail from Massachusetts to Alaska has been running about 10 to 1 in favor of his proposal.

Supporters include a university chief psychologist, a mother of draft-age youths and a 23-year-old policeman. A July 4 survey showed 70 per cent of the voting-age public approved a national service plan.

"These are thoughtful letters by people who are genuinely concerned about the draft's destructive effect on American society," says Bingham.

A cancer researcher for a leading pharmaceutical firm in Michigan thinks the plan would provide a solution to "a variety of urgent problems."

The policeman, Bennett W. Dickmann, of Edwardsville, Ill., said the only way the "poor image of policemen will be corrected is if we encourage young-open-minded people to seek careers in this field."

"As a teacher and the mother of two sons, I am aware of the deep and genuine moral aversion many young people feel toward military service," says a woman in Baltimore, Md., so the Bingham Plan offers a "useful alternative."

Now everyone agrees. A correspondent from Brooklyn resents Bingham's idea of having the young give "involuntary service" in any way not required of other segments of the population. "So far as justice is concerned," this minority view goes, "no benefits will be derived from your bill. It is worthless."

The secretary of the Examining Chaplains' Board of the Episcopal Diocese of New York told Bingham that the "double-standard" posed by placing ministerial students in a special selective service category served as a "constant embarrassment" for those appearing to take refuge from national service.

Some individuals appear to have "little sense of the vocation of the ministry," he said, and, as a result, "the ministry is the loser."

A writer from Hillsborough, Calif., said the Bingham Plan would end "forced" pacifists to avoid the hassle of having to obtain a co (conscientious objector) status."

"I have brought up my sons to believe that they can and must serve their country and mankind in peaceful and constructive pursuits," said one letter.

The chief psychologist of the University of Massachusetts Mental Health Service observed that in his work he and his colleagues saw many young men "deeply troubled by the prospects of military service."

The University plans a course this coming year dealing with the impacts of military conscription on young men in general and college students in particular.

The Bingham Plan has the support of such leaders as Rev. Theodore Hesburgh of Notre Dame University.

Rev. Daniel Burke, president of LaSalle College in Philadelphia, who has expressed an interest in the idea, recently wrote to Dr. George A. Hetard, asking whether, between now and the 200th anniversary of "our noble experiment" in 1976, some way might not be found to "allow each man's obligation to this country to be fulfilled and each man's honor to be kept intact."

"It seems a more fitting method of realizing the American Dream," Rev. Father Burke said.

Heard just completed a special survey of student unrest and its causes for President Nixon, but the president's reception of the report and its recommendations has been less than enthusiastic.

The Bingham Plan may be one answer.

Wrote a youth in Wayne, Pa., "Millions of kids, myself included, have recently seen their birthdays pulled out of a drum and placed on a board. This game of chance is ruling our lives."

"We want a choice," he pleaded.

A STUNNING CHARTER VICTORY FOR JACKSON COUNTY

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in the Kansas City Star of November 4, concerns the victory for home rule in Jackson County, Mo., in the November 3 election.

The editorial follows:

A STUNNING CHARTER VICTORY FOR JACKSON COUNTY

The people of Jackson County won control of their own destiny at the polls yesterday. Thus draws to a close an era of dominance by the Missouri Legislature which began almost 150 years ago when this county was a remote outpost on the frontier of American civilization.

The charter not only carried but it carried big. The margin of victory leaves no doubt that the voters want permanent reform at the courthouse. There will be no turning back to the old system of spoils politics that permitted a few faction bosses to manipulate an archaic system.

Home rule means that local decisions can be made locally after the charter takes effect on January 1, 1973. Full responsibility for the affairs of this urban county will fall on the shoulders of Jackson County officials who must answer to their constituents every four years at the polls. After 1973, the buck will

stop at the courthouse, not in Jefferson City. The voters will be able to assess credit or blame for what happens in their own county.

The charter victory is the capstone of the administration of Charles E. Curry, the retiring presiding judge. After eight years filled with impressive achievements, Curry's final goal at the courthouse was to bring lasting reform to Jackson County through a home-rule charter. When others turned down the job, Curry personally raised almost $100,000 to finance an educational campaign to explain the charter to the people.

No individual was more responsible for the successful signature campaign which initiated the charter movement than George Lehr, who will be the county's last presiding judge. On January 1, 1973, he will automatically become the first chief executive officer under the new form of government. Lehr and his two colleagues, Harry Wiggins, judge-elect of the western district and Joe Bolger, jr., judge-elect of the eastern district, will play a vital role in the transition from the old to the new.

The 14-member bipartisan commission which wrote the document not only did a thorough job, but also found a winning formula. From the start Harold Fridkin, the chairman, was determined to blend reform with the political realities of the county. The results at the polls yesterday are the highest tribute that can be paid Fridkin and the commission.

Many problems lie ahead. But none should be as formidable as the task of winning home rule at the polls. That effort began shortly after World War II and survived two earlier defeats. Yesterday's victory lays the groundwork for a new era of achievement in this urban county.

IMPORT QUOTA AND TARIFFS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of nonsense is being peddled today about the restrictive efforts of import quotas. Much of what is said is not in keeping with the facts.

In order to put into focus the differences between import quotas and the tariff, I offer for the RECORD a short account of these differences. The paper was prepared by O. R. Strackbein, president of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy.

Mr. Speaker, we are on the eve of voting on the very important Mills bill on trade. I commend the article below to all Members for their close attention. The article by Mr. Strackbein follows:

IMPORT QUOTAS AND TARIFFS—A COMPARISON

(By O. R. Strackbein, president, the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, November 12, 1970)

Import quotas are often compared with tariffs as means of regulating imports. Until recent years this country relied almost wholly on the tariff as a protective device. Other countries, particularly since 1930, have used nontariff barriers rather extensively for this purpose. Import quotas have been prominent among these nontariff barriers.

With the exception of import quotas on a few agricultural products, such as wheat, wheat flour, sugar, dairy products, raw cotton and peanuts, we have had virtually no quotas. Those that we do have on farm products were imposed during the past thirty or thirty-five years, principally to sustain governmental price support programs. It was not until the last ten or twelve years that we established a few quotas on nonagricultural products, such as petroleum and petroleum products, lead and zinc (removed in 1965), and cotton textiles.

The latter is in the form of international agreements under which other countries agree to restrict their cotton textiles exports to this country. In 1964 we placed a statutory ceiling on the imports of bovine meats but no actual quota. In 1968 an international arrangement was made with the principal iron and steel exporters to limit their exports of those products to this country. The effects are somewhat the same as limitation of imports by quotas.

As our tariffs were increasingly dismantled (some 80% since 1934 on the average), import quotas began to draw more attention from our industries. When the tariff was no longer available while the problems to which it was addressed again loomed large instead of disappearing, a substitute for the tariff was brought.

Those of the freer-trade persuasion now condemn quotas as less desirable than tariffs; indeed brand them as more restrictive and inflexible than the tariff. Now that the tariff is dead, in other words, it finds itself suddenly vested with previously invisible virtues, while the quota draws heavy fire.

THE IMPORT QUOTA

Perhaps one of the principal characteristics of the import quota is precisely its flexibility and malleability. It could be absolute, restrictive and inflexible. On the other hand, it could be liberal, only lightly restrictive and flexible.

Short of an embargo an import quota could indeed place a severe limit on imports. For example, in place of a petroleum quota that permits about 12% of domestic consumption to be imported, it might be 5% or even less, as in some other instances. Such a quota might, moreover, be made inflexible. In that event it might admittedly be more deadly than even a high tariff.

On the other hand, an import quota might be set at a level that would permit a liberal inflow of imports. It could also be devised that in succeeding years imports might be permitted to expand, either in the same proportions as domestic consumption of the product in question, or more or less rapidly, as might be deemed desirable.

The quota would then bear no resemblance to a straitjacket. To describe it as such would represent an effort to discredit it without justification.

THE TARIFF

The tariff represents a tax on imports either on the basis of value (ad valorem) or by physical specification (lbs., sq. ft., tons, or the like and is then called "specific").

Our tariff is the same toward all nations with the exception of the Communist-controlled countries. This uniformity of the tariff results from the Most-Favored-Nations Clause in our treaties with other countries.

It is oddly enough this very uniformity that represents one of the tariff's principal weaknesses. Competitive levels vary rather widely throughout the world and as a result a uniform tariff is an awkward instrument for regulating the inward flow of trade.

EXPLANATION

Recently TIME magazine carried an article on the international contest for low-cost labor.

While this country has the highest wages in the world there are tiers of lower levels over the whole globe, from the highest to the lowest. Canada, although about 20% below our level, is the nearest to us in point of wages per hour. Europe, although not uniform, is generally higher than Japan in turn is higher than Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong or South Korea. Even in Europe significant differentials prevail. The TIME article says that the Finnish workers have a wage only about half that of the Swedish. German wages are well above those paid in Yugoslavia. To compete with Japan a German manufacturer is reported to be investing in production facilities in Singapore. Even Japan is seeking low-wage havens in India, Taiwan, etc. Italy supplies many items to the German, French and Dutch markets where higher wages prevail. In these many instances it is not the degree of relative efficiency or natural advantage of soil, climate or the like that determines the competitive advantage but simply lower wages.

An equal tariff rate such as we have, applicable to goods coming from all these countries, is no more sensible than having only one size of shoes for all feet. If a tariff were designed against goods from the higher-cost countries, at a level of, say, 15%, the lower-cost areas would enjoy a competitive windfall because such a rate would fall far short of bridging their cost gap. A tariff rate high enough to have a braking effect on the goods coming from the low-cost countries, possibly as high as 100% or 200%, would exclude the higher-cost countries from our market.

The import quota avoids this competitive discouragement of the higher-wage-paying countries. The quota prevents the use of the wage-advantage of low-wage countries as a highly effective international trade weapon. It can act as a preventive against the downward pull on wages exerted by the lowest-wage countries against their higher wage competitors.

Quotas can prevent the competitive advantage attributable to low wages from becoming a drag on all efforts to raise wage levels in the low-wage areas.

QUOTAS AND PRICES

The notion that import quotas are designed to raise prices is not supported by the trend of prices or products that are subject to import quotas in this country. If anything, there is a negative correlation. In most instances the prices on these products have lagged behind the general price level. (See Import Quotas and Prices—A Review, by O. R. Strackbein.)

This result is traceable to the simple fact that quotas are seldom used, if at all, to raise prices, but to prevent their falling to such ruinously low levels that they would bankrupt our industries while in many instances still returning a profit to lowcost foreign exporters to this country. It is then a defensive rather than an offensive instrument.

This is, to repeat, not to say that the quota could not be used for raising prices. It is to say that it has not demonstrably been so used in this country. The effect of quotas on prices depends on the ground rules under which the quotas are established and the degree of restriction imposed by them. A liberal quota, which is to say, one that permits imports to grow in proportion to the domestic market while cutting back current levels of imports little or none at all, will have very little if any effect on prices.

To maintain that quotas raise consumer prices, as a generalization, represents a falsification of historical facts, and is not a service to public understanding of the function of import quotas.

The fact is that import quotas offer the best basis for liberal trade legislation, hand in hand with nondiscrimination, which is a cardinal principle of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

FOR MORAL LEADERSHIP

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the weekend edition of the Christian Science Monitor for October 3–5, 1970, carried a column by Mr. Erwin D. Canham entitled "For Moral Leadership" in which Mr. Canham makes some forthright observations about the reaction to the report of President Nixon's Commission on Campus Unrest.

I found Mr. Canham's comments to be most incisive and include them at this point in the RECORD:

FOR MORAL LEADERSHIP

(By Erwin D. Canham)

It is terribly unfortunate that the problem of campus unrest has been made a political issue. This is precisely what President Nixon's commission (on which I served—and hence of course cannot claim detachment) tried to prevent.

The commission's report is couched in very carefully balanced terms. It urges reconciliation within a divided nation, and especially calls upon the President to give this moral leadership. It does not blame him for the long-standing development of campus unrest.

Unhappily, Vice-President Agnew has chosen to make the report itself a kind of political issue. He describes the earnest and sincere appeal to the President as "scapegoatism"—a most extraordinary accusation—and otherwise has misrepresented what the commission concluded.

WHAT WAS SAID

The New York Times devoted its lead editorial on Oct. 1 to parallel quotations from Mr. Agnew and the commission, showing very vividly how badly the Vice-President had been informed about the report's contents.

For example, Mr. Agnew said the commission "assumes a posture of neutrality as between the fireman and the arsonist." He also said. "It [the report] is sure to be taken as more pablum for the permissivists."

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

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

Of course not. What the commission actually said was: "We have deep sympathy for peace officers—local and state police, national guardsmen and campus security officers—who must deal with all types of campus disorder. . . . We therefore urge that peace officers be trained and equipped to deal with campus disorder firmly, justly and humanely."

It is very much to be hoped that President Nixon will not be tempted to take the line chosen by his Vice-President. When we presented the report to him last Saturday he received it graciously and promised to read it all.

DIVISIONS LARGE

The commission's recommendations, we truly believe, give President Nixon a great opportunity and indeed a great political position. That is the position he initially chose upon his inauguration, a desire to unite the country.

The present divisions and misunderstandings are very large. The problem of an unpopular war, still dragging on, divides the country.

Black people believe they are still the victims of racist discrimination. The facts speak for themselves, in such terms as the scant public financial support given to black colleges and universities compared with the tax money given to white institutions.

The facts speak for themselves in such things as the tiny number of black court officers throughout the country, especially in areas where a big majority of the individuals called before the court are black. So it goes, across the wide range of American society.

YOUTH HAS CHANGED

The cleavage between the "conventional" and the "youth" culture is also great. It is largely a crisis of understanding, as the commission emphasizes. Many young people, including many of their leaders, have learned high ideals from their parents but believe society is not living up to them. Their life styles have changed spectacularly. It is very easy to misunderstand them, to hate and fear them. And there is no excuse for the violence to which some have descended.

"Middle America" is particularly and understandably resentful at the "youth" culture. It is already taking revenge at the polls, voting down educational bond issues and cutting university appropriations. It is receptive to the "hard line." Now, a hard line against crime is one thing. Against the whole structure of education and a generation of youth, it would be tragedy. The President can lead the nation out of this potential inferno. But the tinder must not be fed by irresponsibility and misrepresentation.

MARINE CORPS COL. DONALD NEFF

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Station—AFEES—in Pittsburgh, recently was named the winner of the U.S. Army's Recruiting Command "AFEES of the Quarter" award for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1970. The award was presented to station commander, Marine Corps Col. Donald Neff, by the Recruiting Command's deputy commander, Col. P. F. Bermingham, in special ceremonies held at the Federal Building in Pittsburgh.

Colonel Neff's unit, which was selected over four other nominees from 74 AFEES groups in the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, is staffed by five officers, 30 enlisted personnel, and 28 civilian employees. It serves 66 Selective Service Boards and 101 Armed Forces recruiting stations in Western Pennsylvania and West Virginia. The station has the capability of processing 200 men per day and the average number of people processed each day is 181. During the month of May, 4,676 physical examinations were conducted, an average of 233.8 per day.

I am sure much of this group's outstanding record can be traced to the leadership of Colonel Neff. My administrative assistant in the Pittsburgh district, Joseph Zajicek, had had many occasions to work with the colonel's staff on various military matters and has found Colonel Neff and the personnel under his command to be most efficient and cooperative.

Colonel Neff enlisted in the Marine Corps on January 29, 1943, and, during World War II, participated in four major campaigns. He holds the Silver Star for gallantry in action during the fighting at Tinian. After the war, he returned to teaching and obtained a masters degree in administration from Albany State University. However, he also organized and commanded a Marine Corps Volunteer Training Unit in New York. Upon moving to Pittsburgh, he was accepted as a member of the Marine Corps Selective Service Training Unit and commanded that group from 1963 until 1966 when he was recalled to active duty as the commanding officer of the Pittsburgh AFEES unit.

Colonel Neff is married to the former Shirley Doughty of Bedford, N.Y., and they are the parents of three children. He also is greatly interested in athletics and has officiated collegiate basketball in various conferences and national tournaments. In 1968 he was selected as the outstanding collegiate basketball official in Western Pennsylvania by area sports writers.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Colonel Neff and the personnel of the Pittsburgh AFEES unit for the outstanding record they have compiled in examining inductee for military service.

GREEN THUMB PROGRAM

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the manpower bill clarified in debate concerning the programs for older people.

Although the bill presented to the House is called the Comprehensive Manpower Act, it used language that might have eliminated the very programs which were used to develop and test the "public service employment concept." Furthermore, it seemed originally to overlook the special problems of the older workers who comprise a large percentage of the unemployed and poor.

There are 6¼ million persons over 55 years old and living in poverty. Most of them can and want to work. The Green Thumb and Senior Aides programs which have focused on helping this age group are too valuable to be endangered. The parks they have built, historical sites they have restored, their highway beautification and conservation efforts have transformed many communities, and also brought more income to the workers. The Senior Aides and Green Lighters have brought joy to the poor, the sick, the homebound, the isolated and handicapped by their work as community aides.

I am glad that the floor discussion clarifies the bill, and that they can be funded under this act.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GAME, FISH, AND CONSERVATION COMMISSIONERS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, at its 60th annual meeting in New York City on September 18, 1970, the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners adopted numerous resolutions relating to environmental and natural resource matters. So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to be aware of the association's position on these various matters, I insert the text of the resolutions at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION NO. 1—PUBLIC LAW LAND REVIEW COMMISSION REPORT

Whereas, the Public Land Law Review Commission has recently published its recommendations for developing a new public land ethic for America; and

Whereas, Congress will soon consider the implementation of these recommendations:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners takes the following position on these major national resource management and public land issues contained in the Public Land Law Review Commission Report:

1. The total acreage of public land currently held in trust for the benefit and use of the people shall not be diminished;

2. Public domain and national forest lands should not be dedicated for any "dominant" commodity use;

3. The management of public lands should not be unduly weighted toward "maximum economic efficiency";

4. A basic organic act for the management of public domain (B.L.M.) lands should be enacted immediately based upon the multiple use doctrine;

5. All exploration and extraction of mineral resources must be accomplished under a mineral leasing system replacing the mining law of 1872;

6. National forest and public domain lands must be managed under the multiple use-sustained yield concept of forest and range management. There should be no special funding from timber sales and separate corporation procedures to finance timber production on public lands;

7. No public lands should be sold for grazing purposes. Public lands must not be classified for dominant use by domestic livestock and the single purpose Taylor Grazing Act should be repealed. Grazing permittees on public land should pay a fair market value for grazing privileges and federal authorities should return immediately to the increased fee schedule designed to obtain this goal;

8. Reasonable fees for the use of special facilities developed at federal expense on public lands are acceptable, but there should be no federal fee for recreational use of undeveloped areas;

9. The Wilderness Act of 1964 and the terms of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act should be amended to apply to the public domain (B.L.M.) lands;

10. The intense development of the resources of Alaska should begin only after the state and federal governments have produced a well coordinated land management and zoning plan which gives full consideration to environmental protection and the preservation of public aesthetic and recreational values.

RESOLUTION NO. 2—PREVENTION OF POLLUTION IN THE ARCTIC

Whereas, there is increasing emphasis on the search for and development of arctic resources; and

Whereas, the very nature of this exploration and development poses a threat to the delicate ecology of the Arctic from long lasting and possible permanent damage by pollution; and

Whereas, international maritime law has not kept pace with technological advances associated with exploration, transportation and development of natural resources, and does not provide for the prevention of pollution of the seas or shorelines of the coastal states or the world, the Arctic areas are in extreme danger from Alaskan oil field development and shipping:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners hereby urges strong action to prevent the pollution of the Arctic environment, and commends the Government of Canada for its initiative in this field; and

Be it further resolved, that the President and the Congress of the United States be urged to adopt legislation for the immediate protection of Arctic and Sub-Arctic environment of the United States from pollution and to lend their influence to the early achievement of international agreement and modification of laws to provide for protection from the dangers of pollution of all oceanic and coastline zones of the world.

RESOLUTION NO. 4—LEGISLATION MODERNIZING THE P–R AND D–J ACTS

Whereas, the state fish and game agencies recognize the value of clarifying and modernizing the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act; and

Whereas, the provisions of S. 3860 and similar bills will delete the engineering, maintenance and management limitations and effect other housekeeping changes which are desirable; and

Whereas, the bill's provisions would add the revenue of the federal excise tax of pistols and revolvers to the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Program; and

Whereas, one-half of these revenues would be apportioned among the states to, in part, support the cost of hunter safety programs; and

Whereas, the bill provides the option of documenting state-federal aid programs on the basis of comprehensive fish and wildlife resources plans which will encourage long-range, worthwhile planning and reduce the red tape in annual documentation:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners endorses the principle of S. 3860 (and similar bills such as H.R. 12475, S. 3927, and S. 3962) and urges its early enactment by the Congress.

RESOLUTION NO. 5—FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AND CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

Whereas, existing funding authority needed to continue vital programs of Federal-State-Local cooperation in improving the quality of water, one of our basic natural resources, will expire on June 30, 1971:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners urges that the provisions of Section 7, "Grants to States for Water Pollution Control Programs", and Section 8, "Grants for Construction", of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Public Law 84–660, as amended, be extended to June 30, 1975, by appropriate and prompt action by the Congress of the United States; and

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to the President, Secretary of Interior, and House and Senate Committees on Public Works.

RESOLUTION NO. 6—INCREASE MIGRATORY BIRD HUNTING STAMP FEE

Whereas, there is a current and critical need to accelerate the acquisition of critical wetlands for waterfowl; and

Whereas, the present fee of $3.00 for a migratory bird hunting stamp has been in effect for many years; and

Whereas, due to increased acquisition costs additional funds are necessary to complete the wetlands acquisition program:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners favors legislation to increase the migratory bird hunting stamp fee from $3.00 to $4.00 with the understanding that Congress will annually appropriate an additional amount from the General Fund equal to the revenue generated by this increase and to be used for continuation of the federal wetlands acquisition program, and none of these funds be rebated to the states.

RESOLUTION NO. 7—HEAVY METAL CONTAMINATION OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Whereas, there recently have been recognized incidents of environmental contamination by mercury and other heavy metals which have had disastrous effects on fish, wildlife, public health and recreation, and food stocks; and

Whereas, incidents of such environmental contamination have been recognized in Japan and Sweden for many years, yet the significance of this information was not generally known to or recognized by environmental protection officials of the North American nations; and

Whereas, there is a great need to gather information on pollution problems throughout the world and to disseminate such information as may be pertinent, to alert federal, state, and provincial pollution control agencies to similar problems on this continent; and

Whereas, there still remain many unanswered questions as to the full impact of heavy metal contamination, its threat to human health, fish and wildlife, and its persistence once it has been introduced to the environment:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners urges the Council on Environmental Quality of the United States and its Canadian counterpart to take necessary steps to assure that (a) information on environmental pollution developed throughout the world be gathered and analyzed, (b) that analytical methods become standardized, (c) that funds for such work be made adequate; and

Be it further resolved, that the federal governments of both the United States and Canada be urged to conduct research on mercury and other heavy metals to fully ascertain their effect on the environment and to explore ways that such effect can be reduced or eliminated.

RESOLUTION NO. 8—LOSS OF WETLANDS AND SPORT FISHERIES CAUSED BY STREAM CHANNELIZATION UNDER THE SMALL WATERSHEDS ACT, P.L. 83–566

Whereas, implementation of the Small Watersheds Act, P.L. 83–566 has involved considerable channelization of natural streams; and

Whereas, such channelization destroys the natural ecology of streams and floodplains and results in wetland drainage and loss of existing sport fisheries and wildlife resources:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners urges Congress

to enact H.R. 15850, or similar legislation, to amend the Wildlife Coordination Act to include all small watershed projects under P.L. 83-566.

RESOLUTION NO. 9—FEDERAL BUDGET CONTROLS ON MILITARY EXPENDITURES FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAMS

Whereas, Public Law 86-797 (Sikes Act) was enacted by Congress to promote fish and wildlife programs on military lands; and

Whereas, beneficial fish and wildlife programs have been carried on by the military using special fees collected from the sale of hunting and fishing permits as provided in P.L. 86-797; and

Whereas, the programs have provided substantial recreational use for civilian and military personnel; and

Whereas, the Bureau of the Budget is making program decisions by restricting expenditures of funds collected and thereby seriously curtailing fish and wildlife conservation programs; and

Whereas, the Act directs the Secretary of Defense to expend such funds in furtherance of the puropses of the Act and for no other purpose; and

Whereas, the Act exempts the Department of Defense from paying into the U.S. Treasury funds that are collected pursuant to the Act:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners urges the Administration to direct the Bureau of the Budget to rescind its restrictions and budget controls over funds collected by the military for fishing and hunting permits, under Public Law 86-797, and that these funds be appropriated for the purposes for which they were intended.

RESOLUTION NO. 10—FEDERAL-STATE LEGAL RELATIONSHIPS

Whereas, for a number of years the question of authority for the management of wildlife, particularly resident wildlife and fish, on federally owned and managed lands, has been a divisive issue between the states, as represented by this Association, and the federal government; and

Whereas, this Association has spent much time discussing this highly controversial question and has sought federal legislation to settle it once and for all so that conservationists in all agencies could get on with more important business; and

Whereas, Walter J. Hickel, Secretary of the Interior, on September 9, 1970, issued an official Regulation to give force and relative permanency to a policy statement of his Department which quiets the reasonable concern of the states for their right to manage fish and resident wildlife within their borders:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners commends Secretary Hickel for his definitive action in implementing his recognition of the states' authority in the management, regulation, and control of fish and resident wildlife.

RESOLUTION NO. 11—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4—U.S. GOVERNMENT

Whereas, Reorganization Plan No. 4 would transfer the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Marine Game-Fish Research program of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to another agency not necessarily resource management oriented; and

Whereas, the proposed reorganization will have the effect of dividing rather than unifying the Nation's fisheries conservation efforts; and

Whereas, the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners believes this division would result in less effective professional management of the commercial and sport fisheries:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners opposes Reorganizational Plan No. 4 and strongly urges the Congress to reject this reorganization proposal; and

Be it further resolved, that the President be urged to establish a Department of Natural Resources, which would include the Department of Interior, U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Soil Conservation Service, and the civil functions of the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

RESOLUTION NO. 12—NATIONAL TIMBER RESOURCES

Whereas, the National Timber Supply Bill which called for substantial increases in the timber yield from the national forests and their development for optimum timber production as soon as possible was introduced in the 91st Congress; and

Whereas, the greatest danger of this Bill is its policy declaration that national forests are to be dedicated primarily for timber production in direct opposition to the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960 that gives equal consideration to fish, wildlife, range management, outdoor recreation, and watershed protection as well as timber management; and

Whereas, this Association by resolution dated September 9, 1969, requested the Congress to withhold passage of the Bill; and

Whereas, after numerous protests by conservationists and statements submitted at public hearings the Congress refused to consider the Bill; and

Whereas, the President of the United States has directed that timber harvest be liberalized on the national forests in direct opposition to the Congress and this Association with regard to multiple use management on the national forests;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners urges the President of the United States to rescind his directive to liberalize timber harvesting on the national forests and to support the continuation of the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960.

RESOLUTION NO 13—REGULATION ON SHIPMENT OF DISEASED FISH

Whereas, unregulated shipment of diseased fish among the states as well as the provinces of Canada can jeopardize natural fish populations and public and private fish cultural operations; and

Whereas, existing legislation regulating shipment of diseased fish is not comparable with the legislation which effectively regulates shipment of diseased livestock; and

Whereas, Senate Bill 1151, which is now before the Congress of the United States, would provide for effective control of shipments of diseased fish; and

Whereas, this Association has proposed amending language which would improve the acceptability of this legislation:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners continues to support the passage of S. 1151 and H.R. 9417 with the proposed International Association amendments which are now before the Congress of the United States; and

Be it further resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners urges each of the states of the Union and the provinces of Canada to enact companion legislation to provide for effective fish disease control.

RESOLUTION NO. 14—PERPETUATION OF GRIZZLY BEAR

Whereas, the grizzly bear population in the northern Rocky Mountains represent the best potential for perpetuating this species; and

Whereas, there is widespread concern over the welfare of the grizzly bear, now classified as a rare species; and

Whereas, research efforts on grizzly bear ecology outside the national parks have been inadequate or lacking in the past; and

Whereas, there is a need for the development of a grizzly bear management plan encompassing all grizzly bear habitat; and

Whereas, the various agencies having responsibilities related to grizzly bear management are in general accord concerning the need for improved management of this species:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners urges that Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana establish a technical committee to formulate research and management objectives concerning grizzly bears, to be pursued both inside and outside of the national parks, and that all relevant agencies having responsibilities for wildlife or for land management coordinate their efforts with these states in the development of a comprehensive management plan which will include all presently occupied or potential grizzly bear habitat, and which shall have as its major objective the perpetuation of the grizzly bear.

RESOLUTION NO. 15—PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT OF PEREGRINE FALCONS

Whereas the peregrine falcons have suffered an unprecedented population decline throughout much of their worldwide range; and

Whereas, they no longer breed east of the Mississippi River and recent surveys showed that breeding pairs at long-known nesting sites have continued to disappear westward and northward on the continent; and

Whereas, scientific evidence strongly indicates that DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbons are adversely affecting reproduction and survival of these falcons; and

Whereas, falconers, pet-keepers, egg collectors, wildlife photographers, and research biologists have all taken a toll that threatens to continue at an increasing rate:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners respectfully urges the governments of Canada, Mexico and the United States and their respective political subdivisions to establish and/or strengthen their regulation over activities that affect peregrine populations and to encourage multilateral management on a continental basis.

RESOLUTION NO. 16—WILDLIFE HABITAT MANAGEMENT ON NATIONAL FOREST LANDS

Whereas, the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, is obligated by Public Law 86-517 to manage the national forests ". . . under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services and for other purposes . . ."; and

Whereas, national forest lands contain some of our best forest game habitat, especially for big game, rare and endangered species, and forest nongame important for a variety of recreational, aesthetic, and ecological purposes; and

Whereas, wildlife funds provided the Forest Service by the Congress are not adequate to support joint state-federal habitat programs on the national forests, making it necessary to limit or curtail desirable programs to improve the forest environment for wildlife; and

Whereas, although the Forest Service does employ competent wildlife biologists to fully coordinate wildlife with other resources management activities to meet multiple use objectives:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and

Conservation Commissioners favors a realistic program of wildlife habitat improvement on national forest lands, and hereby requests the Forest Service to develop the necessary plans and programs to achieve adequate recognition of the wildlife resource under multiple use; and

Be it further resolved, that the Association urges the Congress to provide the necessary funds to carry out wildlife management responsibilities of the Forest Service under multiple use, and to support cooperative state-federal programs on national forest lands.

RESOLUTION NO. 17—USE OF NONTOXIC SHOT FOR MIGRATORY WATERFOWL HUNTING

Whereas, spent lead shot has contributed to the mortality of waterfowl for at least two decades; and

Whereas, a great deal of time, effort and expense has gone into researching this problem; and

Whereas, the continued failure to solve this and other serious forms of contamination has become intolerable:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners recommends to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife that immediate steps be taken to bring about an orderly transition from the use of toxic to nontoxic shot for all hunting of migratory birds; and

Be it further resolved, that in the absence of a compelling reason by the industry, before the 1973 waterfowl hunting season the Bureau adopt a regulation prohibiting the use of toxic shot for hunting of migratory waterfowl.

RESOLUTION NO. 18—ADMINISTRATION OF GRAZING AND CROPPING LEASES ON U.S. CORPS OF ENGINEERS LAND

Whereas, certain federal lands surrounding water development projects administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers are licensed to State fish and game agencies for wildlife refuges or public huntinig areas while the administration of grazing on lands so licensed is retained by the Corps; and

Whereas, properly regulated farming and/or grazing on most of these areas is desirable as a game management tool while over-grazing, intensive cropping, absence of grazing or absence of cropping is poor wildlife management; and

Whereas, the environment for wildlife and man on Crops land is being destroyed by widespread overgrazing and by allowing priority leases to overuse or otherwise abuse Corps lands from the time they are purchased by the Corps until they are licensed for public recreation, including fishing and hunting; and by permitting individuals to construct private access roads across lands licensed to fish and game agencies; and

Whereas, present Corps policy does not permit state agencies to retain receipts from grazing leases, agricultural leases and sale of surplus grains, even with the stipulation that all such receipts be used for development and management of the areas producing the income:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners requests the Corps of Engineers to convey to the state fish and game agencies full authority and responsibility for the administration of agricultural and grazing contracts and granting of road easements on lands licensed to them, with receipts from agricultural leases, grazing leases, and sale of surplus crops on licensed lands retained by the fish and game agencies for defraying the expense of developing and managing such areas; and

Be it further resolved, that the Association requests that lands zoned for wildlife be licensed to the state management agencies as soon after purchase as possible to preclude environmental degradation which results from overgrazing or improper cropping now practiced by some lessees.

RESOLUTION NO. 19—COMMERCIAL FISHING BY FOREIGN FISHING FLEETS IN THE COASTAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas, foreign fishing fleets have become active in the near coastal waters of the United States; and

Whereas, some of these operations are being carried out as near shore as the 12 mile fishing boundary line; and

Whereas, some foreign activities have penetrated deep into the Gulf of Mexico to fish important near-shore areas off the Mississippi River Delta and the coast of Texas; and

Whereas, some indication is that long line fishing for sailfish and tuna by fleets is having a detrimental effect upon billfish population which supports important recreation fishing for saltwater big game species; and

Whereas, all such foreign fishing is indirectly competing with U.S. commercial and recreation fishing interests; and

Whereas, the United States Government has no system of regulating the fisheries on our continental shelf beyond 12 miles;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the United States Government, through Congress, develop a system for regulation and protection of all U.S. fisheries interests in the continental shelf either by means of statutes which extend the present boundaries of the U.S. fishing interests and regulatory powers, or by means of treaties and agreements with foreign governments.

RESOLUTION NO. 20—APPRECIATION FOR NEW YORK'S HOSPITALITY AND EXCELLENT PROGRAM

Whereas, the 60th Annual Conference of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners in New York City has been an outstanding and memorable event; and

Whereas, the New York Department of Environmental Conservation has arranged a well organized meeting and an excellent program, and has been a most gracious host; and

Whereas, the delegates and guests have thoroughly enjoyed this opportunity to share in a joint celebration with the American Fisheries Society of their first 100 years of service to the people of North America and the world:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners extend its appreciation to Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, to Mayor John V. Lindsay, to the fine City of New York, and to the many cooperating organizations and individuals who have made this a memorable "week at the Waldorf".

RESOLUTION NO. 21—ACTION ON LEGISLATION AND RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

Whereas, the Legislation Committee has prepared a detailed report favoring certain bills pending in the United States Congress; and

Whereas, the Resolutions Committee has made a number of recommendations in connection with pending legislation, projects and programs on conservation and natural resources subject which also received approval; and

Whereas, prompt action is needed to publicize these resolutions and positions on pending measures:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners requests the Secretary-elect to follow through on distribution of copies of all resolutions as indicated therein or as may be deemed advisable to secure maximum effect and value from them, and that the Chairman of the Legislation Committee, both this year and the next, use these committee reports in preparation of position statements as necessary and desirable in expressing the Association's stand on pending bills in the United States Congress.

TO FIND HIMSELF, MAN MUST FIRST KNOW HIS BACKGROUND

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, Luis G. Juarez is a man who consistently writes of his people in a lucid and convincing manner. One's understanding is enhanced by listening to a man who is an eloquent member of a very large and significant minority group in the United States.

Herewith are Mr. Juarez' remarks as they appeared in the San Jose Mercury-News Sunday, September 27, 1970:

TO FIND HIMSELF, MAN MUST FIRST KNOW HIS BACKGROUND

(By Luis G. Juarez)

Ignorance of his cultural heritage has been perhaps the greatest cause for the slow socio-economic growth of the Mexican-American in this valley.

Second and third generation Mexican-Americans still make up the bulk of the unemployed, low-income, and unskilled part of our county population.

The Mexican-American born and raised in this country, who has had little or no exposure to the history and culture of Mexico, has a difficult time knowing himself and his role in this society.

As is frequently the case, the Mexican-American child of a nomadic family who traveled the Southwest following the agricultural crops had little opportunity to feel a sense of belonging to any community. He lived in tents and makeshift huts and saw his father humiliated and often mistreated by the grower.

He could see the children of the grower living in a nice house, well dressed, riding in a good car and going off to school.

The image this child of a campesino family had of himself was that he was mentally and socially inferior and that he could never aspire to anything much better than that of his father.

In school, this feeling of inferiority prevented this child from raising his level of aspiration and soon he would join the ranks of the high school dropout.

In the adult world, even in menial jobs, he would be afraid to compete for a better job in the company. He would accept the inferior status he thought he was destined to have.

It is significant to note that the common denominator for most Mexican-Americans found in the professions and in successful business in this area is that of having lived in Mexico or near the Mexican border during their formative years.

A Mexican-American who received his education in Mexico, at least through the elementary level, had an opportunity to develop pride in his country's history and culture the Mexican schools stress so well.

When that child migrated to this country in later years, there was no doubt in his mind that he was just as capable as the next man to compete in school and on the job.

He was proud of his ancestry and in the

achievements of the great men in the history of ancient and contemporary Mexico. He knew who he was and where he came from.

The present effort by the Chicano to find an identity is of extreme importance to the future of this country. To be a good American, you first have to know who you are. The Chicano must first be proud of his heritage and succeed in his own emancipation struggle before he is ready to listen to the rest of society.

When the Chicano is ready to join the rest, it will not be to Anglo-Saxon conformity, but rather in a direction that will ultimately blend and merge into a way of living that is distinctly American, and unlike the way of life that people of Mexican origin came from.

Our school system must place stronger emphasis in providing the student of Mexican origin with access to books and courses that speak of his culture.

The Mexican-American child must also see himself in American history books. The contributions made by Mexicans in the development of this country have been omitted in the history textbooks of our schools.

According to the 1960 census, there are 11 million persons of Mexican origin in this country; and it is estimated this number will grow to 15 million in the 1970 census. This puts the Mexican-American as the second largest minority in the United States.

A WORKABLE DEFINITION OF OBSCENITY

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have often observed that the most important good the newly comprised Supreme Court can do for the Nation is to establish some sensible restraints on the outright permissiveness of the multitude of Warren Court decisions that have resulted in chaos on the domestic scene in the United States. One of the first line efforts in this regard is a decision redefining "obscenity" in a way to enable the several States as well as the Federal Government to stop the disgusting filth now available on the news stands and in the back rooms of filth houses of the land.

The following article in the New York Times by Anthony Lewis is significant in this regard. I do not agree with Mr. Lewis in his conclusion that Americans have "made it clear that they do not believe there is a vital social interest in suppressing obscenity." On the contrary I believe most Americans want true obscenity stopped in this country and that they are looking to Chief Justice Burger and his Associate Justices to do just this. Certainly a meaningful, reasonable interpretation of "obscenity" is within the capability of the Highest Court in this land.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 16, 1970]

FOR THE COURT TO DECIDE

LONDON, November 15.—In approaching the subject of obscenity the sane man should avoid indignation, pious or libertarian. One possibility is the mocking tone taken by Benn Levy, the playwright and former member of Parliament, in a letter to The Times of London the other day.

Studies in several countries, Mr. Levy said, have found that criminal laws against obscenity do nothing to prevent depravity and corruption, their stated original purpose. But many people still feel deeply that we must have such laws, so we had better find another reason for them: "We must look for a crime to fit the punishment."

Mr. Levy was in fact making a more serious point than he intended. Public attitudes are changing; the old justifications for suppressing books and films and the like will not stand up. But there still are social interests to be protected. The problem is to identify them—to bring legal order into an area where disorder is rolling society unnecessarily and making the law seem ludicrous.

As it happens, the Supreme Court of the United States has a rare opportunity right now to introduce some civilized clarity into the legal treatment of obscenity. It is hearing a number of significant obscenity cases, and they coincide with other developments that point toward possible accommodation of the conflicting interests.

The recent report of the Commission on Obscenity has particular relevance. Politicians rushed to denounce the majority's conclusion: "There is no warrant for continued governmental interference with the full freedom of adults to read, obtain or view whatever such material they wish." But the Supreme Court cannot brush the report aside, for it represents the first serious American effort to investigate the significance of obscenity instead of theorizing about it.

The Commission's reseach points inescapably to the finding that obscenity does not cause anti-social conduct. It is not scientificially conclusive evidence; no one claims it is. But it is the best available so far, much better than political fulminations, and it must carry weight in a court that demands compelling reasons for any restriction on freedom of expression.

The Constitution, after all, commands freedom of speech. That is not a self-executing rule, but at the least it requires the state to show some impressive social interest in suppression. The burden is on the authorities to justify control, not on the individual to justify freedom. And the Commission report is bound to make the justification of criminal laws against alleged obscenity more difficult.

When the Supreme Court first addressed itself to the problem, in 1957, it struck what was then an informed and sensitive balance. On the one hand, it held that obscenity was outside the Constitution's protections. On the other, it defined the obscene so narrowly—as utterly without redeeming social importance—that much would still be protected.

But that formula turned out to have an operating difficulty: It focused everything on definition, on judging each disputed work in terms of art and sex—a task that befuddled judges and confused everyone else.

Over the years, also, the framework of public consciousness in which the Court functions has drastically changed on this issue. Whatever moralizing may go on, the majority of ordinary Americans has made clear by what it pays to read and see that it does not believe there is a vital social interest in suppressing obscenity.

In a way the Commission itself signifies that change in attitude. When appointed, it was not expected by anyone to favor an end to restriction. Its chairman, Dean William B. Lockhart of the Minnesota Law School, had proposed a sophisticated theory for deciding what should be prohibited. But he and the majority abandoned the quest for definition and came out for a rule of freedom.

The Court has already begun to move away from the emphasis on judging individual works. It has allowed blanket protection of children and of those adults who do not want sexually explicit material through the mail. Eighteen months ago—without dissent among the Justices who reached this issue—it held that a man's possession of an obscene film for his own private use could not be criminally punished.

The trend of all these shifts in law and public attitudes is to give fresh emphasis to one social interest—privacy. That is the individual's freedom to see and read what he will—so long as he does not exploit it or invade the sensibilities of others.

Such a view would meet the real contemporary concerns about sexual portrayal. It would take the criminal law out of the wasteful and degrading task of snooping into private taste. But it would also allow a community to prevent public displays of the sort that now sully the Times Square area—displays that really assault the privacy of sensitive citizens.

To make such an accommodation is to ask a great deal of the Supreme Court, but in our system it alone can really do so. The Court's duty—and opportunity—is to cut through hypocrisy, weigh the various interests in constitutional terms and reach a balance justified in reason.

IRS RIGHTS A WRONG

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly pleased to note last week's announcement by the Internal Revenue Service Commissioner, Randolph W. Thrower, that the tax deduction status of "public interest law firms" has been restored.

Commissioner Thrower's announcement is a victory for all citizens who care about the poor and the environment. As I said on the floor of this House last October 14, the IRS ruling depriving the public interest law firms of their tax exempt status could not have come at a more unpropitious moment in our histoory. At a time when many of or brightest young people feel alienated from our society, depriving them of a peaceful means to protest and change what they consider the injustices of our society is wrong and dangerous. The reversal of this unfortunate ruling surely must hearten the many young lawyers and law students who have worked long hours to fight in the courts, instead of in the streets, in support of consumer interests and the protection of the public from pollution and corporate fraud.

These public interest law firms, as well as other charitable organizations threatened by the IRS ruling, have already made a valuable contribution to American society and their full impact is yet to be felt. I welcome their growing influence. To deny them tax exempt status, and thus deny them, in effect, of any possible funding, is to say to them that the little people of America do not count.

It is particularly heartening that the great public outcry occasioned by the IRS ruling has been reversed in only 30 days, not the 60 days originally set aside for a study. The unusual speed of this review is clear evidence of the beneficial influence an enraged citizenry can have upon an often unresponsive bureaucracy.

CONGRESSMAN CELLER ON COPYRIGHT LAW REVISION

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, during the period in which Congress was in recess, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, the distinguished dean of our House and chairman of the Judiciary Committee delivered an address before the Copyright Luncheon Circle in New York City that was published in full in the New York Law Journal on Monday, October 26, 1970.

I want to call the attention of our colleagues to the perceptive comments of Congressman CELLER to the urgent need for revising our copyright laws and to his analysis of considerations that have thus far blocked action for over 5 years. I particularly want to alert our colleagues to the importance of our action on Senate Joint Resolution 230, before the work of the 91st Congress becomes a matter of history. This resolution would continue to protect from expiration, until December 31, 1971, copyrights whose renewal terms are nearing their end.

As Congressman CELLER points out in the full text of his statement, this will be the sixth time that we have had to adopt such an extension Resolution. As a result of past extension, more than 79,000 copyright expirations have been postponed and remain suspended pending final action by Congress on copyright law revision. Adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 230, would add 7,000 copyrights to that number.

For more than 5 years, Congressman CELLER and his colleague on the Judiciary Committee have worked with diligence and dedication in hammering out an acceptable measure. I trust those efforts will bear fruit at the next session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker. Following is the full text of Congressman CELLER'S statement as published in the New York Law Journal:

WHITHER COPYRIGHT?

(By EMANUAL CELLER)

A little over five years have passed since I last publicly addressed myself to the issues and problems involved in the copyright law revision project. As I recall, it was on Sept. 2, 1965, the last of some twenty-one days of subcommittee hearings on H.R. 4347 of the Eighty-ninth Congress, that I presented a statement of comment on the progress of the revision project and the condition of the bill as it emerged from the hearings.

In my remarks I noted that since the legislative reorganization of 1946 the House Judiciary Committee has had legislative responsibility of all measures affecting copyrights and for guarding the intellectual property of authors and composers, and that it was universally recognized that the Copyright Act of 1909 is in many respects obsolete and inadequate and sorely in need of being brought up to date.

Also—perhaps recklessly—I made a number of predictions as to what resolution the subcommittee might make of a number of the salient issues presented by the revision bill. I said that I believed that the proposal of a single national system of copyright for unpublished as well as published works would be accepted together with a copyright term of the life of the author plus fifty years. As respects the often-criticized manufacturing clause, it was my thought that the subcommittee should and would include liberalizing changes, without totally eliminating this provision. With respect to the compulsory license for manufacture of phonograph records, I supposed that the subcommittee would retain this device, possibly with some increase in the cost of the license.

I exhorted publishers and educators to find an acceptable middle ground and predicted, with respect to the challenge created by the development of the newly emerging cable television techniques, that the subcommittee would not end up recommending an outright exemption from copyright liability in this area.

Finally, I reiterated my well-known concern over the outright and unfair exemption under existing law of jukebox performances of copyrighted music.

PREDICTION FAILS

Although most, if not all, of my prognostications were realized in committee, it would hardly do for me to rest my claims to clairvoyance on that day's soothsaying, for I also predicted that by Dec. 31, 1967, the expiration date of the then pending copyright extension statute, a copyright revision measure would, and I quote, "surely have been enacted." Had that prediction come true we would not be meeting here today.

We now know that no revision measure was enacted in 1967 or in 1968 or 1969 and that none will have been enacted in 1970. I guess we are here, or let us say I am here to speculate about the reasons why progress in copyright law revision has slowed down to the point where some assert that it is negative.

On April 12, 1967, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 2512, the copyright law revision bill introduced by me in the Ninetieth Congress. The measure failed of enactment in the Senate. The Ninety-first Congress saw its re-introduction as S. 543. A committee print of S. 543, dated Dec. 10, 1969, contains the text of the measure that has been reported by the Senate Copyright Subcommittee to the full Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

When one examines the legislative status of copyright revision today and compares it with the legislative situation in April, 1967, when the House passed H.R. 2512, it is possible to conclude that we have made no progress or that indeed we have lost some ground. When one examines the situation in an effort to determine why this should be so, one is immediately impressed by the appearance of a number of new and complex provisions, reflecting in part newly activated and complex issues.

IN THREE TITLES

At the outset it is noted that H.R. 2512, which was processed and passed by the House as exclusively a copyright law revision bill, has become, in the Senate, S. 543, a measure comprising three separate titles. The Dec. 10, 1969, version of S. 543 set out in the Committee Print reported to the full Senate Committee on the Judiciary, contains a Title I which continues to deal with copyright law revision. In addition, however, Title II of the bill proposes the creation of a National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works, and Title III, in turn, consists of legislation that has been introduced and reintroduced in the last several Congresses and that would provide new statutory protection against the piracy of ornamental designs of useful articles.

Nothing in my remarks about these titles is intended either to endorse or to oppose the legislative proposals involved. Their presentation for enactment is entirely appropriate, I call attention to them solely in order to raise the question whether their inclusion in the same bill with the copyright law revision title serves to help or to hinder dispositive consideration of the revision bill.

Apart from Titles II and III the Committee Print of S. 543 also contains a number of new provisions relevant to the revision project, some of which inevitably add complexity to the realization of copyright law revision. One of these, found in section 114, provides a performing right in sound recordings. This provision has been criticized on the ground that the performances in question do not qualify as "writings" under the constitution; that recognition of performing rights should remain a matter of private bargaining; that the question of a performing right in sound recordings should be the subject of separate legislation; and that some provisions involve difficult administrative problems. A significant view expressed is that the inclusion of a performing right in the legislation would be disruptive of, or jeopardize the possibility of copyright law revision.

Another new and unusual provision of S. 543 is found in sections 801 through 807 which would create a Copyright Royalty Tribunal whose function apparently would be to establish fair fees applicable to cable television systems, performance royalties on sound recordings, the mechanical royalty, and jukeboxes; in short, the areas in which the revision would impose compulsory licenses. The tribunal would make determinations concerning the adjustment of statutory rates and, in some cases, concerning the distribution of royalty fees deposited with the Register. Evidently the proposed tribunal is a concept that is new to American copyright law and involves further close scrutiny and study, which require time and effort.

COPYRIGHT PROTECTION

Also finding their way into S. 543, as reported to the Senate Judiciary Committee, are provisions such as those dealing with the protection of owners of copyright in works used in conjunction with computers (sec. 117), and provisions relaxing the responsibility of libraries for photocopying (sec. 108). Most of these and other innovations, whether or not their independent adoption would be substantively desirable, necessarily have had the effect of burdening the revision bill and of tending to render its ultimate enactment more distant.

By far the most complex and controversial provisions of the Senate bill are those governing copyright liability of so-called cable television installations for their use of copyrighted material. It should be recalled that the 90th Congress House bill, H.R. 2512, also contained complex provisions for governing the copyright responsibilities of cable television systems. On the floor of the House these provisions ran into serious difficulty and they were stricken in order to save the remainder of the bill. One of the difficulties of the CATV issue is that it involves both the regulation of communications and compensation of copyright owners. So far the issue has not been resolved; the Federal Communications Commission, the Senate Judiciary Committee, and possibly the Senate Commerce Committeee, are all involved in its solution, as are the interested parties, and resolution seems as far away as ever.

The question quite seriously arises for me whether the bill that passed the House, even without any provisions bearing on cable television, could not appropriately have been allowed to become law, leaving the unresolved CATV and other issues for a later time.

Proposals to disembarrass copyright law revision from the incubus of the CATV problem by enacting a so-called "bare-bones" bill has not met with Senate approval. Such a measure might, for example, embody the life plus fifty term, a single federal system of copyright, and the liberalization of the

manufacturing clause. Its enactment would go far in improving our international copyright relationships and bargaining power.

The chairman of the Senate Copyright Subcommittee has announced that in his opinion no constructive purpose would be served by seeking further action in the Senate on the copyright bill during this session. He has indicated that he intends to introduce a successor to the committee print of S. 543 in the next Congress and hopes that it can be promptly processed by the subcommittee. He states that consideration can thus resume in the Committee on the Judiciary at the point at which proceedings are now being suspended.

The situation in which the proponents of revision find themselves leaves them with little choice other than to close their ranks and continue in the coming year to hammer out the terms of an overall copyright law revision. This is so because the "bare-bones" proposal has been rejected and because it is too soon to fall back to a situation in which individual issues are offered for piecemeal adoption. Meanwhile, they would do well to discover and discourage any self-styled friends of revision who would add to the already unmanageable list of differences that must be resolved. For, with such friends the revision project needs no enemies.

CONTINUED PROTECTION

I want to indicate that my own confidence in the ultimate outcome has not been impaired. I believe that the coalition of interests that have been cooperating to produce a viable revision can and will succeed. As a token of my confidence I expect, early after our return from the present recess of Congress, to press for the enactment of S.J. Res. 230, the pending copyright extension bill, which would continue to protect from expiration (until Dec. 31, 1971) copyrights whose renewal terms are nearing their end.

Enactment of this measure will mark the sixth occasion of this sort since 1962. Since the initial extension, up to and including the present, it is estimated that more than 79,000 copyright expirations have been postponed and remain suspended as a result of the interim legislation. The current bill would add another 7,000 copyrights to this figure.

In the absence of a further extension more than 56,000 musical compositions and 22,000 books, periodicals, and dramatic works will fall into the public domain at year's end. This will work a serious and unwarranted injury to the authors and their families.

The point of the extension, of course, is that it will prevent a situation in which some copyright owners lose their protection while owners of copyrights whose expirations come later may benefit from the nineteen-year extension contemplated in the revision bill.

For these reasons and because the extension of copyright term has become a central symbol of the entire copyright law revision project, I have concluded that another extension is imperative.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 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?

THE EDUCATION OF A CORPORATE PRESIDENT

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD today a delightful Halloween eve speech given to graduate business school students at Stanford University by Herbert Patterson, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank. In the tradition of G. Northcote Parkinson, Lawrence J. Peter, and Avis' Robert Townsend, Mr. Patterson has set forth several basic precepts with reference to institutional leadership in today's world, precepts which may well be applicable to the government of the world's largest nation as well as to the world's largest bank.

Consider these samples:

(1) "If anything can go wrong, it probably already has . . . For example, in a long range move, we established a one-bank holding company . . ."

(2) "Only in recent years, however, have we come to the realization that highly motivated employees are the greatest asset any company has."

(3) "A President must resist the solicitous urgings of his staff, who seek to conserve his time and energy by putting him into the traditional ivory tower. Once there, safely isolated from the functioning every day realities that shape the lives of his employees and the general public, he is well on his way to being neutralized."

(4) "If you think you're on top of the job resign!"

The humor and capacity for recognition of error with which Mr. Patterson addressed Stanford's business students might well serve as an example to all of us charged with the Nation's $200 billion annual budget—at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue.

The speech follows:

THE EDUCATION OF A CORPORATE PRESIDENT

Having just survived my Freshman year as the President of Chase Manhattan Bank and being fully mindful that I may be speaking to more than a few future Presidents in this gathering, I thought it might be appropriate to give you some advance warning of what may possibly lie ahead.

As I explained to Dean Miller and Charlie Magowan, my only excuse for the apparent immodesty of talking about myself is that there is no one else with whom I am better acquainted. And since the first rule of all public speaking is—Know Your Subject—I feel that I am on reasonably safe ground.

Some of my colleagues in New York warned me that in this autumn of discontent, communication between businessmen and college students is impossible. But after learning that a chimpanzee named "Sarah" has recently succeeded in establishing direct communication with some of your academic colleagues at Santa Barbara, I am encouraged to press ahead! If "Sarah" can do it, I hope I can!

I have deliberately entitled my remarks "The Education of a Corporate President." I have done so to put you on notice that however thorough your college training and early business experience may be, your learning experience will escalate once you get behind that desk where the buck stops.

In trying to select from my own experience some helpful lessons to pass along, I have skipped over those resulting from personal idiosyncrasy or unique circumstance and have settled on four lessons that seem to me broad enough to be relevant to business in general.

I don't pretend to have discovered these factors. But since Parkinson and Peter have established the precedent, I will draw upon my alliterative kinship with them and call my observations "Patterson's Precepts."

The first Precept is "If anything can go go wrong, it probably already has." I remember our Comptroller saying that the hardest part of his job was living daily with the knowledge that somewhere, somehow, something in the bank was going wrong—and not knowing what it was! The most careful corporate planning can go astray due to factors entirely beyond your control—and occasionally even beyond your wildest executive nightmares. The success, indeed the survival, of a chief administrative officer is determined not so much by the infallibility of his decisions as by his ability to live with the ones that turn sour. For example, in a long-range move, we established a one-bank holding company. With the approval of our stockholders, the new corporation became the owner of the bank and was free thereafter to acquire other companies. We assigned a group of our brightest young men to examine the possibilities for new acquisitions under the holding company. They returned with a carefully thought out and comprehensive plan of action and we had even started negotiations with several companies in the financial service business. We were confident that the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives would report out a bill that would not try to put the banking industry in a straightjacket. And we were right—it did!

When the bill reached the floor of the House, however, in 45 minutes it was rewritten into a highly restrictive piece of legislation, which threatened to stymie the future growth not only of one-bank holding companies but of banking per se. Undoubtedly these restrictions and the strategy to get them had long been in the mind of Congressman Wright Patman, illustrating my precept, again, that "If anything can go wrong, it probably already has."

This one development alone would have convinced me of the importance of making personal trips to Washington to visit Senators and Representatives and tell our story. So, I have set aside at least one day every month to spend on Capitol Hill, talking with Congressmen, trying to understand their problems and telling them something about our own. Hopefully, these face-to-face meetings can help eventually to dispel the impression that bank Presidents are hiding horns under their hats. You might say this is my way of working within "the system"—in this case, the political system—to bring about what I consider constructive changes through persuasion and the free exchange of viewpoints. I don't expect to prevail on every point, but neither do I want to concede any by default!

On a recent flight to Europe I read a magazine article about an executive who was asked how he felt about the honor of having just been elected President of his company. Recalling the press reception, the warm congratulations of his colleagues and the genial letters and telegrams, he responded, "The first 22 minutes were just great!" Then he was asked for his first executive decision and the glow vanished! From my own experience I would go a step further and say that making a difficult decision is only half the agony. The other half is trying to get someone to pay attention to it. As Clarence Randall, former Chairman of Inland Steel, sagely observed: "The common idea that all top management's wishes become self-executing orders is, of course, fiction." He suspected deliberate foot-dragging but much of the delay, it seems to me, is a matter of logistics and procedures.

This brings me to my second Precept: "The

time-lapse between the moment of decision on a policy change and its actual implementation expands in direct proportion to the size and complexity of the company involved."

At Chase it is sometimes like trying to make a centipede into a broken-field runner or a Jim Plunkett. Each part of the organization must get the right word at the right time and complete coordination is essential. It takes infinite attention to detail and infinite patience. Like many of you, I often find myself in the position of trying to make radical changes and, like you, I have learned that changing things around is not always something that can be done as quickly as one would hope. I am persuaded that change is slow not just because innovations are deliberately sabotaged by those who resist change but rather because no one has enough power to change things overnight or, in some awful cases, as quickly as necessary.

As a corporate President, I know only too well that you can issue orders all day long but until people understand the reasons behind them and agree with them, nothing much is likely to happen. And even when they do agree, it is not going to happen immediately!

One of the first broad changes I instituted as President was a new budgetary and accounting system, which would relate our revenues and expenses directly to our specific bankwide objectives in a measurable way. As you know, many industrial companies have been doing this for some time but it was a new undertaking for a major bank, and for one the size of Chase, it was an enormous task. To assure that our new accountability budgeting is carried out effectively, time has to be allotted for review and follow-up at each successive level of management. It is often a frustrating process of two steps forward and one step back, but we do make progress because we are beginning to win over the doubters as to the value of more effective controls. But again, my Precept—"that the time-lapse between the moment of decision on a policy change and its actual implementation expands in direct proportion to the size and complexity of the company involved."

In truly progressive institutions change cannot merely be imposed from on top. It is imperative to create an atmosphere where new ideas will well up throughout the organization. It is also true that every subordinate who presents a new proposal assumes implicitly that his is the most important matter under consideration and that his solution alone will make or break the bank.

Self-confidence is an essential ingredient of any good bank officer, businessman or student and should be nourished even when it is occasionally misplaced. From this conviction I formulated my Third Precept—"Enthusiasm for your innovative subordinates should increase in direct proportion to the likelihood of the rejection of their proposals." Yes, I said in direct proportion to the likelihood of the rejection of their proposals. Let me hasten to add that I do not mean that cynically! To accept an idea is to pay it the highest possible compliment but you must decline an unacceptable one with a high degree of respect for the individual involved, his good intentions and the genuine effort he has expended. Otherwise you will jeopardize the spontaneity and imagination of future proposals upon which your own and the company's success clearly depend. It is always that "next idea" which a colleague will come up with that you hope will give you a competitive edge.

Skill in asset management has long been a traditional test of the good executive. Only in recent years, however, have we come to the full realization that highly motivated employees are the greatest asset any company has. In banking, we know that unless we make a prudent investment of the development and training of our own personnel, it will scarcely matter what financial investments we make because we won't be around at maturity. Traditional thinking in employee development used to concentrate exclusively on how to fit individuals into the company, but today there is a determined effort to adjust the company to accommodate individuals.

At Chase, for instance, a recent employee attitude survey done by an outside firm helped us to isolate areas in which people wanted changes. The results were eye-opening. Many areas in which we thought we were particularly strong were singled out for especially strong criticism. The message of "likes" and "dislikes" came through so loud and clear that we started to make changes. I established what we call a Manpower Resources Working Group, composed of senior officers from various areas of the bank, to study the results of the survey and recommend viable changes. The first thing we did was to eliminate some features of our MTM system, which had drawn very heavy fire. In fact, everybody was cheating! Next, we worked out a more effective transfer system, making it easier for staff members to move from one job to another more suitable and therefore more appealing, thereby reducing our turnover. We are sincerely trying to create in our bank an atmosphere wherein anyone feels free to approach senior management with a new idea. To show you the extent to which we have been successful, only last week one of my colleagues suggested to me that, given Con Ed's problems, we could solve the Chase's power needs if we were to buy the Queen Elizabeth, dock her near Wall Street Pier No. 5 and hitch her power system up to our new operations center. (I've still not rejected the idea!)

As a corollary, I would add that one must not lose those direct, sensitive and trusting personal relationships, which are the essentials of managing human beings. A President must resist the solicitous urgings of his staff, who seek to conserve his time and energy by putting him into the traditional ivory tower. Once there, safely isolated from the functioning everyday realities that shape the lives of his employees and the general public, he is well on the way to being neutralized. With the best will in the world, his staff will commandeer his appointment calendar and condense all adversity into easily swallowed capsules that won't upset his stomach. But without continuous exposure to the challenge and the stimulation of contrary views, an executive will be ill-equipped to guide his company with strength and intelligence.

And now, a fourth and final Patterson Precept: "If you think you're finally on top of the job, resign!" I say this because the job of a Corporate President evolves so rapidly that it literally defies mastery. If the requirements of the executive's task appear to stabilize, you are simply not meeting them responsibly.

To illustrate this evolution in executive responsibilities, you need only contrast the duties of a bank President a generation ago with those of his 1970 counterpart. Twenty years ago the President concentrated on the bank's investments, approved all loans over $50,000 and spent a great deal of his time seeing customers. Today these functions have largely been delegated to others, with only broad policy questions coming to the President's office.

Today's multinational banker is occupied with matters unheard of then, such as bank credit cards, computerized customer services and fluctuations in the Eurodollar market. A generation ago our own bank was offering no more than three dozen basic financial services. Today we offer close to 300. From my vantagepoint the technological advances seem endless.

And, if anyone thinks that business and banking are complacently rolling along on the theory of "business-as-usual," totally unaffected by the social currents now running in our country, let me tell you about a day I had recently—to be exact—this past September 29th.

At 8:45 A.M. I had my weekly briefing on the status of legislation in Congress. At 9 A.M. I and a group of senior officers met with our Urban Affairs Task Force—a group of officers, none of whom has been out of college more than five years—to discuss pioneering approaches for our community improvement programs. In the course of the discussion, we authorized more high-risk loans to small businessmen in depressed areas of the city and assigned another bank officer to work full-time as a job developer for the New York Urban Coalition.

At 10 A.M. I left the bank and went uptown for a meeting at the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, of which I am a Trustee. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss what position, if any, the Council should take on the legalization of marijuana. By 11:30 A.M. I was back at my desk to be briefed by our Loan Review Officer on the latest developments on some of our stickier loans. Then lunch with one of our customers—a large Wall Street investment firm.

At an afternoon meeting of the Chase Manhattan Bank Foundation, various grants to urban groups were approved, including one for a mobile information center to distribute bilingual consumer guidance to disadvantaged communities. Before leaving that day, I spoke briefly at graduation ceremonies for one of our manpower training classes—composed mostly of high school drop-outs.

I submit this day as evidence that the so-called Business Establishment can be, and is being, reshaped by those who are willing to work creatively within the system. Change is inevitable and it is necessary but—as a practicing pragmatist—I firmly believe we all must have the courage and stamina to come inside the system and accept what Peter Drucker has called "the great challenge for this generation—how to make institutions perform, not how to tear them down."

Presumably most of you in this room to some extent have already made your decision to take up this great challenge. But I suspect that as you move into positions of executive influence in business or government, many of you will continue to feel the pressure from enthusiasts, who will believe, in all sincerity, that solutions to deep and abiding social problems can be willed or wished into existence. You will be obliged, as I am from time to time, to point out that there are no instant crusades and that when practical solutions to problems are figured out at last, resources must still be allocated to them in some rational order of priority.

It will fall to you to seek ways of breaking down the "us and them" syndrome. Until more of us in business, in Congress and in the universities begin to conceive solutions not in terms of what "they" ought to do but what "we" can do together, the hard realities of racial inequity, poverty, a deteriorating environment, political opportunism and all the rest will still be around.

I began by discussing some of the difficulties I have experienced with executive decision-making. I would like to close by telling you of the most difficult one of all. I had to decide whether to evacuate our Head Office building in Manhattan when a bomb threat was phoned in. According to the anonymous caller, the bomb was due to explode within fifteen minutes. Having once before walked through the rubble of our bombed out sixteenth floor in the middle of the night, I had some idea of what was at stake. But I

also weighed the possible disastrous effects of a sudden panicky evacuation of the thousands of people in the building and the dangerous impact of falling glass, as they milled around outside on the street. I sensed that it was probably just one more of literally hundreds of crank calls we have had but except for the extreme shortness of the warning the call had a similar M.O. to the actual bombing. Finally, I decided not to evacuate. But I can tell you, gentlemen, that in those next few minutes I learned more about executive education than is contained in anybody's Precepts! Fortunately I was right and maybe a little lucky, because no bomb went off!

I earnestly hope that by the time your generation has moved into the controls of business, you will be facing more enlightening and productive decisions than whether to evacuate your office building.

I choose to believe that the social commitments that business is making today will bring us to that day of enlightment even sooner—and, I also choose to believe that working together we can help create a world in which, hopefully, none of you will ever have to include such decisions in your education as a corporate President.

THE MIRACULOUS FIELD GOAL

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, everyone loves the underdog. It seems to be a tradition in American sports circles. New Orleans loves Tom Dempsey, the place kicker for its National Football League team the Saints.

Dempsey has only a half a right foot and no right hand. Yet he had overcome these handicaps to become of all things, a professional football kicker.

He was doing a good job for the Saints, but on Sunday, November 8, he did the impossible. That is when he put his crippled right foot into a field goal attempt that covered 63 yards—and it was good.

This, in itself, was a miraculous feat, but when it brought a stunning 19–17 victory over the Detroit Lions, the 66,000-plus fans at Tulane Stadium went wild.

As a former sportswriter, a Saints fan, and an American, I am proud of Tom Dempsey's accomplishment. I want to insert in the RECORD an account of this sports first written by my good friend Bob Roesler, sports editor of the Times-Picayune in New Orleans. His front-page story from the November 9 Times-Picayune tells the story:

LIONS AND RECORD TOPPLE AS HE KICKS IT 63 YARDS—NEVER WAS THERE SUCH A MIGHTY FIELD GOAL

(By Bob Roesler)

Never in the annals of professional football has anyone kicked such a mighty field goal.

Not until Tom Dempsey put his crippled right foot into the ball and sent it soaring 63 yards through the uprights to give New Orleans an unbelievable 19-17 victory over the Detroit Lions Sunday.

When Jackie Burkett snapped the ball into the steady hands of holder Joe Scarpati there were just two seconds left on the clock.

The crowd of 66,910 patrons watched in stunned silence as Dempsey's boot soared toward the north end zone. Did it have the distance? Was it in between the slingshot goal posts?

An official behind the goal raised his arms skyward.

The ball reportedly cleared the crossbar by a foot and a half, hit the turf three yards behind the uprights and bounced back onto the playing field.

The stadium exploded with a roar. The Saints, playing their first game under rookie coach J. D. Roberts, had registered their most stunning triumph ever.

SINCE 1953

A victory had been snatched from the grasp of the Lions who just 17 seconds before had wrested the lead from New Orleans on an 18-yard Errol Mann field goal.

Dempsey's 63-yarder erased a 17-year National Football League record held by Bert Rechichar who had kicked one 56 yards. Rechichar, playing for Baltimore, booted his on Sept. 27, 1953 against Chicago.

After being carried off the field on teammates' shoulders, Dempsey accepted congratulations with an amazing calm.

"I knew I could do it," Dempsey explained. "There's so much involved in kicking one that long but I knew I could do it. The only question was if this was going to be the time and if it would be straight enough.

"I got a perfect snap (by Jackie Burkett) and a perfect hold (from Joe Scarpati) and without it you could have kissed this one good-bye.

When Scarpati was asked what Dempsey's reaction was out there on the hard, brown playing surface, the little defensive back replied, "I don't know. I couldn't see him because he was engulfed by the players."

Danny Abramowicz, the All Pro wide receiver, told of one man's reaction. "Wayne Walker (a Lion linebacker) told me, 'Danny, Dempsey didn't kick that football. God did.'"

Roberts, who just Tuesday replaced the suddenly-fired Tom Fears, was almost as calm as Dempsey. When asked what he was planning for an encore, the former All America guard from Oklahoma replied, "I'll worry about that later. Right now I'd like to talk to Tom. It's been so hectic in the locker room I haven't been able to see him yet."

Two hours after the monumental kick several thousand fans remained outside the Saint locker room waiting to catch a glimpse of the Saint who will be long remembered for the miracle on Willow Street.

SP4C. ALEX D. PYSZ

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce the death of another of our brave fightingmen, Sp4c. Alex D. Pysz, of Elizabeth, Pa., who was killed in Vietnam.

We owe a profound debt of gratitude and appreciation to our dedicated servicemen who sacrificed their lives for this great country. In tribute to Private Pysz for his heroic actions, I wish to honor his memory and commend his courage and valor, by inserting in the RECORD the following article:

TRIBUTE TO PRIVATE PYSZ

Specialist Four Alex D. Pysz, 20, of 113 Ross Street, Elizabeth, is the latest area victim of the Vietnam conflict. The serviceman was killed in action Tuesday, according to word received by his family. Specialist Pysz entered the Army in August, 1969, and arrived in Vietnam last February 20. He was a 1968 graduate of Elizabeth Forward High School and is survived by his widow, Mary McBride Pysz; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alex Pysz, and a sister and brother.

GOVERNMENT AND THE BUSINESSMAN—SEMINAR IN JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional recess I sponsored in the Third Congressional District of Florida, in Jacksonville, Fla., a "Government and the Businessman" Seminar on Friday, November 6, 1970.

This half-day conference, cosponsored by the Jacksonville Area Chamber of Commerce and the U.S. Department of Commerce's Jacksonville Field Office, was attended by several hundred Jacksonville businessmen and other interested citizens.

Two prominent members of the administration made speeches at the meeting—Assistant Secretary for Administration in the Department of Defense, Robert F. Froehlke, and Nils A. Boe, director, Office of Intergovernmental Relations—along with four Federal agency heads in Jacksonville, and two prominent businessmen.

The purpose of the "Government and the Businessman" Seminar was to bring the Federal Government closer to the people and to explain how Government can better help businessmen. I believe this was accomplished through the efforts of the participants in the seminar, and I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the program and copies of the remarks made at the meeting:

GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESSMAN—SEMINAR: A CONFERENCE ON HOW GOVERNMENT CAN BETTER HELP BUSINESSMEN PROGRAM

9:15 a.m., Opening Prayer, Dr. Homer G. Lindsay, Sr., Senior Pastor, First Baptist Church, Jacksonville.

Welcoming Address, Hon. Hans G. Tanzler, Jr., Mayor, City of Jacksonville.

Remarks, Hon. Charles E. Bennett, Member of Congress, Third District of Florida, Jacksonville.

9:30 a.m., Keynote Address, Hon. Nils A. Boe, Director, Office of Intergovernmental Relations, Office of the Vice President, Washington, D.C.

9:45 a.m., "Federal Aid to Small Business," Hon. Douglas E. McAllister, District Director, Small Business Administration, Jacksonville.

10:00 a.m., "Housing and Urban Development," Hon. Forrest W. Howell, Director, Jacksonville Insuring Office, Federal Housing Administration.

10:15 a.m., "Business and Ecology," Col. Avery S. Fullerton, District Engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Jacksonville.

10:30 a.m., Discussion.

10:45 a.m., Coffee Break.

11:00 a.m., "Commerce Services for Business," Hon. Wm. Bruce Curry, Director, Jacksonville Field Office, U.S. Department of Commerce.

11:15 a.m., "The SBA and the Small Businessman," Mr. John L. Stephens, Downtown Shell Auto Service, Jacksonville.

11:30 a.m., "Jacksonville, Florida and Business," Mr. Gert H. W. Schmidt, President, Jacksonville Area Chamber of Commerce and President, Florida Tractor Corporation.

12:15 p.m., Break for Luncheon.

12:30 p.m., Invocation, Rev. A. J. Reddick, Pastor, Grant Memorial A.M.E. Chufrch.

Luncheon Speaker, "Government and the Businessman," Hon. Robert F. Froehlke, Assistant Secertary, Administration, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES E. BENNETT

In America, government does not generally produce wealth and jobs, and does not function for that purpose. The government does rely on taxes from business and job holders to create a proper and good atmosphere for the development and growth of all its citizens.

This system can be contrasted with that of Russia's. The United States has 85.6 million in its labor force, supporting a population of over 205 million. Eighty-five percent of those working are employed by business, in what we refer to as our "free enterprise" system. While Russia has a work force of almost 120 million persons—half the population—76 percent of them work for the government, the state. Fifteen percent are collective farmers and another 11 percent live on the farms and have private employment.

In a free society, employment cannot usually be created by government, as in the Soviet Union. Business makes jobs. Government can, of course, help, but business must provide the primary opportunities.

It was the ancient Doctor Galen, who said: "Employment is nature's physician and is essential to human happiness."

Government should only step in when the general population and the free enterprise system cannot do the job.

This is the American concept, and it has worked excellently through the years.

The purpose of the "Government and the Businessman" Seminar is to indicate where the federal government has stepped in to help business and what it can mean for business in these instances. We want to probe the possible places where the free enterprise system can gain from the federal programs so business can meet new challenges or determine where new channels of federal assistance seem to be required.

For many years in our history, making money and producing materials were the prime considerations of business.

Dr. Samuel Johnson wrote 200 years ago: "A merchant's desire is not of glory, but of gain; not of public wealth, but of private emolument; he is therefore rarely to be consulted on questions of war or peace, or any designs of wide extent and distant consequence."

And more recently, Charles E. Wilson, head of the world's largest business, told a Congressional hearing:

"What's good for General Motors is good for the country."

But in 1970—more than at any other time in America's history—we have free enterprise taking a major role in solving our nation's great problems.

Business is meeting our challenges for job opportunities; improving race relations; with knowledge breakthroughs and forwarding the brotherhood of man.

Here in Jacksonville, the over 3,500 members of the Jacksonville Area Chamber of Commerce are in the forefront of this effort to make America a better place in which to live.

As your United States Representative, I salute each of you. I am proud of the large and small businesses in our area that tackle the seemingly overwhelming problems facing all of us today. If we can continue to have good communications and work together for the good of all, then our free enterprise system will always be with us to build for an even greater America tomorrow. I hope we will all gain something from the discussion today. I thank you all for coming, and I am particularly grateful to all of our participants.

REMARKS OF NILS A. BOE, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

I feel privileged to have the opportunity to participate in the Government and the Businessman Seminar, sponsored by your distinguished Congressman, Charles E. Bennett, the Jacksonville area Chamber of Commerce, and the Jacksonville field office of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Congressman Bennett, indeed, has been a leader in developing conferences of this character. Previous seminars which he has conducted on subjects of law and order, environment, problems of youth, and community and urban affairs have not only been highly successful but have served as models for similar meetings throughout the nation. To be sure, the citizens of the Jacksonville area are fortunate to have a man with such dedication, sincerity and understanding representing them in the Congress of the United States. I am aware of your respect and admiration for him; I assure you that his colleagues and associates in government in Washington share your respect and admiration to no lesser degree.

I would be remiss if I were not to mention one additional resident of your city and area, who has contributed so greatly to his community, state and nation—your former Governor, Farris Bryant. At the time he was Director of the Office of Emergency Planning I was serving as Governor of South Dakota. The excellent relationship which he was able to develop and forge between the governors and the Executive Branch of the Federal Government served as an incentive and influenced me greatly in accepting the challenge inherent in the position which I presently hold.

My previous reference indicating pleasure in having the opportunity to participate in this particular seminar is not a mere platitude. The thesis of this conference is of the greatest importance. It would be my hope that the results derived would benefit not only the businessman in his relationship with government, but also the institution of government itself—at the federal, state and local levels.

Business has been one of the most constructive forces in the development of our country. History has clearly documented the achievements of business in the fields of sicence, technology, transportation as well as in the attainment of the highest standard of living in any nation of the world. During the past several decades, however, it might be said that business and industry in a sense were relegated to the "rear balcony" in the continued development of our country and in the administration of its problems and affairs. The role of the Federal government with its myriad of departments, agencies and bureaus came to be invisioned as an "omnipotent father" from whom all benefits flowed and by whom all problems were supposedly to be solved. One writer has referred to the relationship which for a time existed between the citizen and the Federal government as "the most torrid love affair of the twentieth century."

Fortunately, however, in very recent years the pendulum has commenced to swing in the opposite direction. The people as well as government itself appear to have realized that in order to meet the mounting challenges and problems of today, the efforts of every citizen is vitally needed and required. Probably the most hopeful sign of our times might be found in the admission on the part of many that government, whether at the federal, state or local levels, has become static and inflexible and accordingly, as entities, are unable to cope with the problems surrounding us today.

In response to this self-analysis, we find more frequently not only a willingness to accept aid and assistance from business and the private sector, but in many instances the urgent request for such help. For no longer can the needs of our country, our states or communities be satisfied through an archaic system which might have been designed to administer the affairs and problems of our people in the nineteenth century. Today government at every level needs the counsel, advice and the expertise of business and industry in streamlining and modernizing its administrative and, yes, its legislative processes. With the problems relating to education, pollution, crime, transportation, inflation, core cities, which in large measure still remain unsolved, we cannot continue to place further and further reliance on existing bureaucracy.

Many of you are familiar with the slogan which has been used over the course of many years—"The business of America is business." Today this slogan has been changed. It must read—"The business of business is America."

Nor does the contribution to the efficient operation of government need be restricted only to the large corporation. In the United States today there are an estimated 5,400,000 individual businesses. Ninety-five percent of these businesses by standards of the Small Business Administration may be considered small. Ninety-seven percent of our nation's firms employ fewer than 100 full-time employees. The small business sector of our economy contributes approximately 37% of the Gross National Product, and is responsible for over 40% of employment throughout the United States.

It is to all businessmen, therefore, whether large or small, that a challenge must be extended to share and aid in the responsibilities and obligations of government.

The present Administration has recognized the need of your talents by including in the Cabinet a former banker, three contractors, a certified public accountant, a former aerospace company executive, and an automobile industry executive. Similarly, the present Administration has recognized that in order to secure the participation of business and industry in the operation of government it must decentralize its own administrative activities and return in large measure the functions of government to state and local levels. The President has succeeded in causing our country to be divided into ten regions in which one city in each of said regions serves as the site for the regional office of five principal departments and agencies of the Federal government. In so doing, every effort will be made to more directly respond to the needs of every local area and at the same time enlist the assistance and cooperation of the private sector, and particularly business and industry.

While we are in the course of discussing the necessity for a more active and direct participation on the part of business in the administration of government, may I digress to the extent of directing your attention to a correlative need—a need for the development of a comprehensive and coordinated structure which will permit the effective and economical delivery of governmental services to the people in every area of our country and perfect the inter-relation of all governmental units to the fullest degree. Why does such a need exist?

The demands upon state and local governments are steadily increasing. The need for Federal assistance accordingly is becoming greater. The cost of Federal grant-in-aid programs is continuing to mount. No longer, therefore, can we afford the luxury of each state and each local governmental unit to fund its individual program with little or no thought given to duplication, coordination of effort, or the development of an integrated plan affecting multiple units of local government, the state as an entire entity, or a region comprising several states.

You in the Jacksonville area have recog-

nized this fact and have taken affirmative action in the reorganization of your local governments. Of this you may be justifiably proud.

To turn our attention in this direction is not to disavow belief in the individual sovereignty of states or in the limited autonomy of local governmental units. Nor will the thoughtful development of such a concept ipso facto cause the creation of another layer of government—as envisioned by some who wish no change. Rather, it is only in so doing that a firm foundation for "New Federalism" truly can be laid.

Instead of a patchwork, "band-aid" procedure which will result from an uncoordinated consideration, it is necessary that a broad comprehensive structure be created by Congressional act, which will lend itself to complete flexibility and will serve the multi-purpose needs of the respective governmental units throughout the United States.

Such a structure should provide as its basic premise that the determination of needs, policies and programs originate within and from a state and its local units of government and the private sector composing the same. The inclusion of cities and counties should not only be permitted but encouraged and even required in such planning and program determinations. In so doing, coordinated planning may be developed for each state with the active aid and assistance of local units of government—a procedure which is distinctly contrary to the requirements of conformity to a static pattern generally found in present Federal assistance programs.

Nor in the adoption of such a structure is it necessary that its genesis must provide immediately for implementation throughout every area and throughout every state in the country. As experience and need dictate, regions may be delineated and added from time to time. In like manner, no total price tag in its inception should be placed thereon. The need, desirability and practicality should be fully demonstrated before funding is made with respect to any programs planned or contemplated within a state or within a region comprising several states.

The opportunity for an imaginative and exciting evolution of our present federal system truly exists. To permit this system, however, to meet the challenges of tomorrow, we must allow our eyes to be raised above the paper boundaries which have heretofore isolated local units of government and the respective states. And at the same time we must cast aside the jealous jurisdictional prerogatives which all too often have caused our federal departments and agencies to fail to recognize the necessity for greater cooperation and coordination in responding to the needs of the American people and the component governmental units of our federal system.

I only hope that my comments may have provoked some thought on the part of the participants of this seminar and that further consideration might be given thereto throughout the balance of this program as well as in the months and years ahead.

Our country and the philosophy and ideals upon which it was founded will survive if we, the present beneficiaries, individually recognize and actively assume the full duty and obligation of participation which is ours as citizens.

REMARKS BY HONORABLE ROBERT F. FROEHLKE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (ADMINISTRATION)

When Congressman Bennett asked me to speak on the subject, "Government and the Businessman", I was not quite sure whether I should speak on government from the businessman's point of view or business from the point of view of the government official. You see, I have been in government approximately 21 months and I believe I'm right in the middle of the metamorphosis to government official.

When considering how I could make this talk interesting and helpful to you I thought back to those days 21 months ago when I was a "businessman". I decided that I would have liked to hear about some of the techniques and problems of managing the Pentagon. After I have concluded you will be able to judge whether I still think like a businessman, and whether I have guessed what is of interest to you.

One of the first decisions Mel Laird made when he became Secretary of Defense 21 months ago was to decide the style of management he would use as the top manager of the nation's largest Executive Department. This entailed a number of fringe decisions:

1. The style of management would not be the end, but the means to achieve the end. The end would always be the goals of the Administration. (How often have you managers offered constructive criticism to a subordinate who has not achieved his goals and have the reply come back, "I didn't achieve what I set out to do but my style of management was superb"?)

2. The style of management Secretary Laird "hoped" to use during his term as Secretary of Defense would be announced before he ever began to manage. At the time this appeared to be a rather daring decision. Mel Laird had never managed prior to taking over as Secretary of Defense. Could he manage? Would the style he thought he would use actually be the style that he could use?

Nevertheless, it was determined that he should announce the style because in that way his associates could know of it and adapt to it. It would also have the good effect of allowing his associates to keep their objectives in view on occasions when he varied from this style of management.

3. There would be no attempt to have everyone manage the same way. A style must be comfortable for the manager. There is nothing worse than to have a style which is artificial. Therefore, it was resolved that at no time would there be pressure for all to manage the same way. There would always be pressure to have all achieve their management goals in the way they thought best.

The management style chosen was the participative style. Textbooks have been written and month-long seminars conducted on this style of management. I think two words best describe it. Involvement. Teamwork. We wanted to involve as many as possible in the total management process. To put it another way—whenever possible, we wanted the views of those who were going to implement the objectives and plans involved in the seting of the objectives and plans.

This involvement should have two important results:

1. The objectives and plans should be better because the day-to-day operators would contribute practical considerations known only to them.

2. The day-to-day operators would be much more inclined to enthusiastically carry out the plans because they were involved in the setting of the goals and plans.

The second key word is teamwork. When you get many people involved in the management process on solely an individual basis you have chaos. Involvement must be accomplished through the various individual working as a team. Loners have their place. However, they don't belong on a team practicing participative management.

In order to practice a participative style, three prerequisites are a must. All three had to be built when we took over.

The first and most important is a feeling of mutual trust among the members of the team. (Until I respect your intelligence and integrity it is useless for me to attempt to pretend I'm interested in listening to your point of view.)

Secondly, you must have an attitude towards communication. It is impossible to involve people as a team without wanting to communicate in depth. The first step in this communication is not the written or spoken word. Rather, it was best described by Emerson when he said "What you are thunders so I don't hear what you say to the contrary."

We had to build a desire to communicate and an awareness that the members of the team would judge the leaders by the actions they took. The leaders' actions—not their words—determines whether their subordinates believe them.

Thirdly, we had to build an attitude toward organization. We found a very rigid organization with almost a slavish obedience to working through the organization. We have tried to play down the importance of the organization and play up the importance of people.

When there is a job to be done we are attempting to have our managers first ask what person has the ability to best get the job done. In the past there has been a tendency to look at the organization chart to determine what position is responsible for getting the job done.

From the viewpoint of a businessman, I see in government these inherent characteristics which make it more difficult to manage.

The businessman uses objectives as the guideline for his every action. Everyone in the business aims his activities towards the total objectives of the business. These objectives can vary as you go down through the organization but generally include sales, growth, expenses, turnover, and, of course, profit. All of these objectives are identifiable and measurable. Everyone in the organization can key his activities towards achieving one or more of the objectives.

What are the identifiable and measurable goals of government? As a manager, I must confess that I have been unable to come up with tangible, measurable objectives.

In the Defense Department our goals are surely peace, strength, restraint and efficiency. All very desirable. All highly intangible and unmeasurable.

Without identifiable and measurable goals it is very difficult to build a team and to get direct job satisfaction for the attaining of the satisfactory goals.

A second problem in government is the relationship between the employees and the board of directors. In business I served on my company's board. Most of the board members were not connected with the company and met only four times a year. When they met there normally was total agreement. They set corporate goals and determined whether the goals of the previous quarter had been met. Then they went home for three more months. This is the way I think a corporate board should manage.

In government our board is called Congress. It meets about 300 days out of the year and only one mile from the Pentagon. The board has never agreed unanimously on a major policy in the past 21 months. The board is constantly involved in our daily operations. From a business standpoint this kind of an operation is not conducive to the application of sound management principles.

I do not recommend changing the relationship between the DoD and Congress. I do point out, however, that there is difference between business and government. This difference, I believe, inherently affects the efficiency of the governmental process.

Finally, I see in government a great tendency to force the top officials to make day-to-day operating decisions. It is easier and more satisfactory to achieve the tangible goals of operation than the vague goals of policy setting. Nevertheless, top managers must set policy. I think I see in the Department of Defense steps being taken in this direction.

From both a managerial and constitutional

standpoint civilians should control the Department of Defense. To the extent that we become involved in day-to-day operating decisions, I think that control is diminished. The only way for the relatively few civilians to control the Department of Defense is to have them restrict their activities to policy-making. This is really what the Blue Ribbon Defense Panel was saying in its final recommendation—"The top officials of the DoD must withdraw from operations and devote the time to setting policy."

REMARKS BY DOUGLAS E. MCALLISTER, DISTRICT DIRECTOR, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Congressman Bennett, conference speakers, distinguished public officials, ladies and gentlemen.

My subject "Federal Aid to Small Business" will actually consist of informing you of the Small Business Administration and its programs. There are other Federal programs which deal with business and commerce; however, they are represented on the program.

The Small Business Administration was established by Congress to serve the public interest by encouraging the growth and preservation of small business throughout the Nation. Our agency has had a comparatively short life; it was authorized in 1953 and was made a permanent independent agency in 1958. From the very beginning, the agency's main reason for existence has been to provide the means whereby the small businessman could lessen the competitive impact imposed on him by the industrial giants in the marketplace.

As evidence of its performance and effectiveness, it now has a portfolio of outstanding loans totalling $2.2 billion. This volume puts SBA on a par with the top 15 major banks of the country.

The entire thrust of SBA's many flexible programs is aimed at helping the little guy stand on his own feet.

Some of these programs are:

Regular business loans:

The purpose of this program is to make sound loans with high economic returns, that meet certain national or local objectives—small manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, service concerns and other businesses may borrow to construct, expand or convert facilities, purchase buildings, equipment or materials, or obtain working capital.

By law we can't make a loan if a business can obtain funds from a bank or other private source on reasonable terms.

It should be pointed out here, I think, that the agency is not a rescue or "bailout" source, is not willing to finance poorly managed or unsoundly situated companies nor to engage in purely speculative investment in new ventures.

We provide a source of term loan assistance to small firms and supplement credit available from commercial sources. Up until the last 4 or 5 years, most of our loans were made directly by us—in recent years most of our loans, 75–80%, have been made in participation with banks and other financial institutions.

I am not going over our loan program regulations, policy and credit criteria in detail since it is set forth in our pamphlets and other literature.

Loan approval is based on sound credit factors and considerations and the decisions are made in the district office here in Jacksonville.

When the financing is not otherwise available on reasonable terms, SBA will guarantee up to 90 percent or $350,000.00, whichever is less, of a bank loan to a small firm.

If the financing in the entirety from a private lender or an SBA guaranteed loan is not available, SBA will then consider advancing funds on an immediate participation basis with a financial institution to make the loan. SBA cannot make a direct loan at the present time because of budget cutbacks and resulting limitations.

The agency's share of a participation loan may not at the present time exceed $150,00.00, if funds are available.

The maximum maturity of 15 years is available only when 35% or more of the proceeds are for new construction. Loans for other purposes may be for as long as 10 years. However, working capital loans are usually limited to 6 years.

Interest: Interest rates on SBA's portion of immediate participations, as well as direct loans, may not exceed 5½%. The bank charges its own interest rate (as long as it isn't excessive) on guaranteed loans and may charge up to 8% on its portion of immediate participation loans.

Collateral: Security for a loan may consist of one or more of these: A mortgage on land, a building and/or equipment under the uniform commercial code, assignment or warehouse receipts for marketable merchandise; a mortgage on chattels; guarantees or personal endorsements and assignment of current receivables.

What is a small business? For business loan purposes, SBA defines a small business as one that is independently owned and operated, nondominant in its field, and meets employment or sales standards developed by the agency. These standards cover approximately 95% of existing eligible businesses in the country. Briefly some of the standards are:

Manufacturing—Small if employment including affiliated companies does not exceed 250.

Retailing and service—Generally, if yearly sales not over 1 million dollars.

Wholesaling—generally, if yearly sales are not over $5 million. In some instances higher standards apply, particularly in manufacturing, and you should check with our office if you have a question regarding size.

Because we are a public agency, using taxpayers funds, SBA has an unusual responsibility as a lender. We are, therefore, unable to make loans to certain businesses or for certain purposes such as gambling or other speculative activities, newspapers, T.V., and radio stations and real estate investments, etc.

For your information, all of our loan literature spells out the ineligible applications or purposes as well as other details concerning our policies and size standards.

Economic opportunity loans (EOL): Economic opportunity loans make it possible for the disadvantaged who have the capability and the desire to own their own businesses to become part of the economic life of our Nation. Both prospective and established small businessmen may receive assistance under this program.

The economic opportunity loan program provides both financial and management assistance. The maximum amount of an EOL is $25,000 for up to 15 years.

Any resident of the United States may apply for an EOL loan if:

1. His total family income from all sources (other than welfare) is not sufficient for the basic needs of that family; or

2. Due to social or economic disadvantage he has been denied the opportunity to acquire adequate business financing through normal lending channels on reasonable terms.

Every applicant must demonstrate the ability to operate a business successfully. There must be reasonable assurance that the loan can be repaid from the earnings of the business.

While character is of more importance than collateral, every applicant is expected to have some of his own money or other assets invested in the business.

Minority enterprise program: In 1968, SBA combined its efforts with those of private industry, banks, local communities and the Federal Government to substantially increase the number of minority-owned, operated and managed businesses. For the first time in SBA history the minority enterprise program, (ME) through "operation business mainstream" brings all the agency's services together in a coordinated thrust to make more sound business opportunities available to minority individuals.

Since minorities comprise 15 percent of the Nation's population, yet own only 3¼ percent of the country's more than 5 million small businesses, the main objective of the minority enterprise program is to help close the gap in business ownership between minority individuals and other Americans.

SBA tries to match minority individuals who indicate a desire for business ownership and have some management aptitude with sound business opportunities. We try to accomplish this with the cooperation and assistance of civic groups, trade associations, volunteers, and other groups who have goals compatible with ours. Volunteer groups help to prepare financial statements, business projections, and other related materials. Assistance is also given, if needed, in preparing a formal application.

This is indicative of the extent and type of management or technical assistance available to the applicant to help assure his business can be operated successfully. This phase of the program is emphasized because private surveys have shown consistently that faulty or inadequate management is responsive for more than 90 percent of new business failures.

ME loans are processed under relaxed eligibility criteria, with emphasis on the applicant's character and his ability to repay the loan and other obligations from the profits of the business.

The average ME loan is for approximately $20,000 and the average term of these loans is five to six years.

Most business opportunities for minorities—both new or established enterprises—are in the retailing, distributing, franchising and service industries. Opportunities in these categories are not only greater in numbers, but usually require less equity capital on the part of the would-be owner.

Minority-owned or managed firms interested in performing government contracts are helped through section "8.a" of the Small Business Act, under which SBA is authorized to act as prime contractor for certain types of goods and services, and subcontract orders to individual small firms.

SBA also helps small firms to acquire or construct facilities, expand, or modernize through loans to local development companies for use in financing a small business. We make loans to local development companies for use in financing specific small firms and we may lend up to $350,000 for each small business to be assisted. Loan proceeds are used solely for plant construction, expansion, modernization or conversion, including the purchase of lands, buildings, equipment and machinery. The SBA may participate with banks in these loans or may make direct loans for as long as 25 years. The agency participates with banks, insurance companies, and other financial institutions, when making loans to local development companies. Constant efforts are made to stimulate participation in local development company loans by the private sector through utilization of an innovative first mortgage plan and loan guarantees. We find that lenders are attracted to the first mortgage program because this plan permits a lender to participate in the financing of a project and to secure his exposure with a first mortgage on all project assets. A minimum of government red tape is involved and the loan can be consummated substantially on the lender's terms.

Another little-known vehicle of SBA assistance is the lease guarantee program. SBA, usually in cooperation with a participating insurance carrier, will guarantee the payment of rental by small business tenants to their landlords, in effect turning the small concern

into a triple-A tenant for credit purposes. This enables him to obtain possession of a facility where otherwise he might be excluded. The resulting strong lease, incidentally, may also assist the landlord to obtain financing for construction of the leased premises.

Premiums are based on actuarial studies and are payable in advance with no refunds. The minimum term of lease guarantee is 5 years, the maximum 20 years. Applicants for lease guarantee policies are evaluated under a risk analysis system devised specifically for this program, which analyzes the applicant's management skills, his financial position, the location he wishes to rent, and his business.

A word about some of our non-lending programs. SBA helps small businessmen obtain a share of Federal business by providing several forms of assistance to small firms that want to obtain government prime contracts and related subcontracts. The major government purchasing agencies voluntarily set aside contracts for small businesses. SBA periodically checks contracting awards to make sure that small business is getting its fair share. SBA representatives are particularly watchful for purchases on which few small firms have bid in the past. If our representatives believe small firms can perform the contracts, SBA officers locate small firms that might be interested in bidding. Contracting officials are then asked to solicit small firms for bids.

Management assistance: Another major SBA service to small businessmen is to strengthen and improve their management thru training and counseling. We feel this is our most important program because our studies show that lack of know-how causes more business failures than lack of capital. Specialists in SBA field offices counsel small businessmen on problems of marketing, accounting, product analysis, production methods, research and development, etc. They also advise and assist prospective small businessmen who want information on management or on specific types of business enterprises. In some instances guidance is given by retired business executives, many of whom have volunteered their services to SBA as small business advisors thru SCORE "the Service Corps of Retired Executives". SBA sponsors one-day workshops where prospective small business owners can learn important factors they should consider before entering business. We also co-sponsor administrative management courses with public and private educational institutions and business associations. These are generally evening courses and are specifically designed for the owners and managers of small firms. Complementing the management courses we also co-sponsor one-day conferences for small businessmen dealing with important management subjects. The conferences feature outstanding speakers, panel discussions and workshop sessions. Our procurement and management assistance specialists are available for advice and assistance on production and marketing problems and on production problems which do not require the service of engineering firms. They can also, in many instances, offer marketing advice and information.

In summary, I think that if SBA has one hallmark, it is cooperation. I hope to see SBA stand out still more strongly on this point. We are constantly cultivating it in our programs. We see it paying off in the participation of more and more banks in SBA loans and increasing interest in our management assistance programs. Of course, the real measure of our success lies in what we can do for the small business community, and what we together can do for the economy.

Our latest studies, tracing the progress of 22,000 SBA business loans for a seven-year period, show our borrowers are ringing up annual profit increases that are more than twice as large as those of all U.S. corporations. For SBA borrowers, the gain runs an average of 14 percent a year, whereas for all U.S. corporations, it runs 6½ percent.

This is not a sample based on our more successful cases. It is a cross-section of good loans and bad ones. It points up the impact of SBA programs across the board.

Just as important as the loan itself, or more important, is the intensive counseling and other management services SBA provides.

We live in an age of complexity—an age of accelerating change. We live in a truly golden age of science and technology, with all the boundless promise and opportunity that such an age could bring. In the face of such a combination of forces, initiative, planning, and cooperation have to be the keys that will unlock opportunity's door.

They are the only keys.

They are in your hands.

Use them. And don't hesitate to ask SBA's support.

REMARKS BY FORREST W. HOWELL, REGIONAL DIRECTOR, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Once asked what he considered most important in industry—Labor, Capital or Brains—Andrew Carnegie reflected for a moment then responded, "Which is the most important leg of a three legged stool?"

This is the government's position exactly. The Congress has provided the programs, but without your expertise and participation in them nothing worthwhile happens.

There are more than 200 million Americans in the United States today and by the year 2000, there will be 360 million, with 10–12 million of us living in Florida.

We must nearly double our housing and other supporting facilities which means that we have just 30 years to build another brand new America.

75 million new housing units will be needed. This is 10 million more than we have now and a tenth of the ones we do have are defective and inadequate.

Four million of the nearly six million substandard housing units in which 20 million Americans now live are in the rural areas of our country. With the formation of new families and the demolition of existing unsafe and dilapidated structures we must build 26 million new housing units this decade.

This is the national picture. What about Florida? How do we compare? In our state there are approximately 2,588,000 housing units, 20% of which should be torn down or rehabilitated.

Of an estimated 55,000 inadequate housing units in Duval County, more than 10,000 of them are so dilapidated they should be torn down, and probably will be. Since October 1969, 980 such abandoned and unsafe structures have been razed and more are being demolished at the rate of 100 per month.

Probably at no other time in our history have the opportunities for service to others and personal success been so great. New towns will sprout up! More than 75 large-scale communities have been started in the United States since World War II, and it is estimated that another 272 will be needed by the year 2000. 17 of these large-scale communities will be located in Peninsular Florida.

One giant city, sprawling over 1,200–1,700 square miles, is predicted for southeast Florida and just last week, on October 29th, the ITT Levitt Development Corporation announced the development of its new city—Palm Coast—on A1A near Flagler Beach 24 miles north of Daytona Beach and 28 miles south of St. Augustine. Also just 6 miles south of St. Augustine is a new Mackle Bros. Development named St. Augustine Shores. 600–700 modular homes are to be erected here in the next 2 years and thousands more thereafter. New communities are being started in Minn., Md., and Ill.

In the past few years apartments and mobile homes and mobile home parks have mushroomed. And these will continue to increase in number, changing the face of America.

A generation ago when couples got married, or as soon thereafter as possible, they purchased and lived in a single-family home, which was the hallmark of middle class America. Many would still like to do this but don't. Why? Because they can't afford to buy what is available.

HUD Secretary George Romney has said that more than half the people in this nation cannot afford to buy a home without a subsidy and, I might add, many can't even with a subsidy. It is not just the poor and the black who are caught in the housing crisis squeeze, but even white middle class America!

We must realize and bring all America to realize that there is a housing crisis and that unless something is done about it today our very society is in danger.

Columnist Sidney J. Harris wrote recently: "We unite only in the face of a common enemy . . . out of fear or anger or despair. As soon as the danger has passed . . . we resume our narrow, selfish and shortsighted behavior.

"In a flood or a fire or a war, we behave superbly, doing what has to be done for the good of all, subordinating personal comfort for the needs of the community. It takes the worst to bring out the best in us.

"Our species has not yet learned, however, to be positively motivated. Love, justice, mercy, generosity—all the positive drives—are paid extravagant lip service, but rarely practiced except under the pressure of external circumstance."

FHA Asst. Sec'y Eugene Gulledge has made the observation that about 90% of us live in "fairly decent houses in fairly decent locations . . . that 90% of us are comfortable and 10% uncomfortable and it is hard to get the 90% to do something about the 10%."

There are no set solutions, no easy formulas, no panaceas for our housing problems, but FHA will be involved in whatever the plans and solutions for a better tomorrow.

Now a part of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, FHA administers about half of the nearly 80 HUD programs. As one of the few major self-supporting government agencies, FHA's accumulated reserves are in excess of $1 billion dollars and over the 36 years of its life FHA's responsibilities have been expanded from Home Mortgage Insurance to:

Mortgage Insurance for Housing for the Elderly and Lower Income Families . . . Disaster Victims. . . . Nursing Homes . . . Nonprofit Hospitals . . . Group Medical Practice Facilities . . . Experimental Housing Projects . . . Urban Renewal Projects . . . Condominiums and Co-ops . . . Land Development . . . Major Home Improvements . . . Mobile Homes and Mobile Home Parks.

These are a few of the FHA programs. If you would like to know more about these, and others, please take some of the literature we have available here today and then visit us in the Federal Building any time at your convenience.

Problems? Yes, we have them, but we can solve them—and will—by working together. Problems and challenges are responsible for our growth, for our progress. And we are too young a nation to stop growing, to stop progressing.

We put men on the moon twice last year and are about to send more. Accomplishing this was our goal and the fact we achieved it points up what we can do when there is a national commitment and unity.

If, in the same way, we can engage our national concern and commit our national resources to meeting the housing goal of 26 million housing units in this decade we will succeed. Let's remember that the world never hears from those who look for a place to sit

down. One must get up and go if he expects to achieve anything worthwhile.

Do you recall the fable about the two frogs who fell into a pail of cream? They jumped and they jumped and they jumped but they couldn't leap out. After a while one frog decided there was no use trying, so he stopped kicking and jumping, extended his legs, and sank to the bottom and drowned. The other frog was made of somewhat sterner stuff. He wasn't inclined to take the easy way out. He resolved that as long as there was a breath of life he was going to try to escape. So he kept jumping and jumping and eventually something happened. The cream turned to butter and he jumped out.

REMARKS BY COL. A. S. FULLERTON OF U.S. CORPS OF ENGINEERS

BUSINESS AND ECOLOGY

It seems rather strange that a representative of the Corps of Engineers should appear before you today speaking on the subject of Business and Ecology.

These may seem to be dissimilar things.

While we have recently learned words such as ecology and biodynamics, maybe we should learn another word—SYMBIOSIS. The dictionary defines symbiosis as "the living together in more or less intimate association . . . of two dissimilar organisms." The term is ordinarily used in cases where it is advantageous or necessary for two seemingly dissimilar things to relate.

An example is the relationship between bees and flowers—the bees pollinate the flowers and the flowers give nectar to the bees.

Some people seem to refer to people and to the natural environment as if they were different and even hostile things. I think we will be closer to the right track if we think of the relationship of man and his environment as a symbiotic relationship, advantageous and indeed necessary to both.

The first things to note about engineering for the environment is that whatever it is or leads to, it will be done by people, and hence for people. For better or worse, people have the means of mastery over nature, which they inevitably will use to fulfill their human needs and aspirations. All kinds of harm, and little if any good, can result if the necessary work of adapting natural resources to meet human needs is conceived of as inherently hostile or evil. It is wiser and better, I think, if instead we conceive of man's resource use as his legitimate benefit from the symbiotic relationship between man and his environment, for which, in return, he has a responsibility to see that nature also receives commensurate benefits.

We will want to protect the wilderness from fire, using our technology judiciously for that purpose. We will want, if we can, to apply science and machines to halt the ravages of disease of man, wildlife, and fishery resources. We will want to protect and manage and replenish the wilderness wildlife, as we do trout and salmon, or even the American bison now fostered at an Army Engineer project up in Montana. We will want to police the wilderness against thoughtless desecration. In short, we will want to interpose our environmental engineering—which is a human function, a human interference, if you will—to insure the environment's benefit from our symbiotic relationship, just as we do to insure the human benefit.

The truth is, man MUST take from nature to stay alive.

The ability to maintain an acceptable environment, however, can be hindered by failure of man to recognize fundamental earth processes. Environmental change is a natural procedure and man contributes to that change, according to Dr. William T. Pecora, director of the U.S. Geological Survey. But Dr. Pecora points out that "not all modifications to our environment are degrading."

In other words, man has begun to develop an awareness that better housekeeping of the earth must be practiced as man continues to take from the earth the things he needs and uses.

For instance, the United States, with 200 million people, now consumes from the earth each year:

6½ quadrillion gallons of water.

7½ billion tons of iron ore.

100 million tons of copper, and so forth.

In just 40 years our U.S. population will double. Just think of the added requirements of pollution control for the next generation:

For instance, in just 30 years—by the year 2000—water usage in the U.S. will triple; energy requirements will triple, and within that 30-year period we will have to construct as many houses and facilities as now exist in the U.S.

These are tremendous demands on Mother Nature. To insure that Nature continues to renew its bounty to us, it is time that Government agencies and business took a long, hard look at our role in business and ecology.

The Japanese have begun to experiment with using compressed trash and debris to make building blocks for home construction.

In England, they are using the heat by-product of trash incinerators to generate electricity.

In Jacksonville, the city has a $100-million-dollar water and sewer bond program cranked up to reduce pollution in the St. Johns River by January 1973.

Jacksonville industries are beginning to clean up their pollution.

St. Regis Paper Co. has announced plans for a multimillion-dollar water pollution control system. Alton Box, U.S. Gypsum, Glidden Company, Reichhold Chemical Co., and others have not only expressed an interest, but are spending additional money to clean up their own waste treatment—both air and water. The Navy has let a contract for sewage disposal facilities.

And the Corps of Engineers, as the nation's biggest construction agency, is given greater emphasis to environmental effects of public works projects than has ever been known in the world.

New federal laws, enacted by Congress in 1969 and in 1970, coupled with the old 1899 Refuse Act, give the Corps of Engineers responsibility and authority to insist on greater emphasis on environmental matters as they relate to navigable waterways. Dredging and filling permits and waterway construction approvals will be scrutinized with increasing care by the Corps of Engineers in the future.

For instance, a brand new permit will be required from all industries that are discharging any type of fluids or solids into navigable waterways and tributaries. Our revised standards, which conform to the Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and Water Quality Act of 1970, will require that an applicant for a federal permit be certified as safe by the State Air and Water Pollution Control Authority before the Corps of Engineers can consider the application for a permit. We will require extensive information on the type of effluent being dumped into a waterway or its tributary, including chemical content, water temperature differentials, toxins, sewage, type and quantity of suspended solids along with proposed methods of instrumentation.

Enforcement of the laws is already being stepped up. In early September, I filed charges for an injunction and asked for payment of damages up to $1 million against a land developer in Hernando County who made unauthorized excavations in the Weeki Wachee River as a part of real estate development. If the court rules in our behalf, as we believe it will, cost of restoring the half mile segment of the river may cost the developer up to $1 million—a pretty costly price.

Earlier this year, a federal District Court of Appeals upheld the Corps of Engineers' authority to deny a permit for dredging and filling on grounds that it would have an adverse effect on fish and wildlife and was not in the general public interest. Up until this time, the contention had been that the Corps could consider only the effect of the proposed work on navigation. We contended our authority was much broader, and the courts have now upheld this position, so you can see it's a whole new ballgame.

Our stepped-up environmental enforcement is not designed to put industries out of business. But it can have that effect if we find businesses that refuse to accept the fact that environmental concern is here to stay.

Pollution control is going to be costly and will certainly bring on more taxes, a higher cost of doing business, possibly tax incentives to businessmen to encourage them to take a greater interest in pollution control. But it also offers an excellent opportunity and incentive for businessmen in pollution control, new devices and constructing and installing equipment which reduce the pollution load.

It also gives the businessman, who is sincerely interested in the long-range goals of pollution control, opportunity to make significant contributions to the community in which he does business, and to insure his survival in that community.

In tomorrow's world we cannot count on meeting our various environmental desires by splitting up the body public and dispersing the farmer to his field, the hunter to the hills, and the worker and merchant to their cities. More and more the hunter and farmer must find ways of sharing the same countryside, cities, and fish and wildlife must be sustained by the same river. Tomorrow virtually every resource use will have to be purchased at the sacrifice of some other value which is equally desired by a substantial number of people. An agreement to compromise our demands and apply our skills so that we develop and share those resources together can work wonders. Environmental management thus becomes not simply a matter of scientific ecology, but one of achieving balance between many equally legitimate community claims.

The lessons we have been learning from the broadened concept of the environment that has been sweeping the country will leave an enduring mark on national policies, on engineering thinking, and on business practice. But at the same time, the enhanced concern for the environment is creating new demands which, though many people may not yet realize it, will require engineering and construction solutions. Ours is a technological society; engineering provides the dynamics of a technological society; and it is an essential means of meeting the objectives of such a society.

In our business we seek so much more work, for instance, from our rivers these days than our fathers did. We ask them to carry our commerce, turn water-wheels for power, maintain the health and domestic water needs of myriads of people, irrigate our farms and gardens, and cool the heat produced by the energy used in our vast production processes; we ask them to amuse and delight us, inspire us, bathe us, float our pleasure craft; we expect them to sustain the kind of fish that each fisherman prefers, in an abundance never dreamed of before and in reaches of river where no such fish ever grew in nature. And every one of these demands requires the application of human environmental management programs—of skill and technology.

Clearly, wise resource management calls for a thorough understanding of the mechanics of our 20th century society.

Today the environmental movement, which opened so promisingly, is becoming increasingly fragmented, to the point where it aproaches something like chaos. We have allowed ourselves to become engaged in a

tug-of-war in which various interests compete for priority in the total national resource-management endeavor—each one seeking to emphasize its particular concern while disparaging the others.

And the way out, it seems to me, must be a recognition of the futility of fragmentation, of isolated narrow objectives, and of conflict. Instead, we must have a concerted search for a broader philosophy that can embrace all of our society and the whole of our environment—the whole big symbiosis between man and nature.

I reject the view, as you must, that man and nature are enemies. We have the skill, intelligence and technology to look wisely at our natural resources and protect them, while still insisting that they serve man's needs. This is the age of environment and gross national product and through your efforts and ours we can insure that business and ecology become more compatible and work together. Thank you.

REMARKS BY WM. BRUCE CURRY, DIRECTOR, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FIELD OFFICE

COMMERCE SERVICES FOR BUSINESS

The basic mission of the U.S. Department of Commerce is to "foster, serve and promote the Nation's economic development and technological advancement." To carry out this function, the Department offers a wide range of services to the business community—some of which I would like to review with you today.

But, first let it be noted that these programs and services are effective only to the extent that we can bring them to the attention of the business community and assist in putting them to use. Accordingly, we welcome such opportunities as this seminar affords to meet with you and perhaps serve as the beginning of a pleasant working relationship.

Now as to some of the services and programs which are yours essentially for the asking, let us first review the vast array of tools and aids available to the businessman who wishes to develop overseas markets for his goods or services.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

We especially enjoy providing our international trade programs and services because we feel that selling overseas should almost be second nature to Jacksonville producers as a source of new markets and increased profits. We should take full advantage of the excellent nearby markets in the Caribbean, Central America, the developing nations of Africa, along with our fine deep water port, which provides excellent cargo service to many of the countries in these areas.

Through the small, informal export meetings we hold in our office each month and the slightly more elaborate export seminars—such as the one we are currently cosponsoring with the Jacksonville Area Chamber of Commerce—we attempt to provide the basic fundamentals relative to selling overseas to the prospective exporter and, equally important, acquaint him with local sources of personalized and professional assistance for each step of the export transaction.

For our part we can help the local exporter in several ways, but perhaps most importantly we can help him find the foreign customer through the use of our trade lists, overesas agency/distributor finding service, trade contact surveys, foreign travel facilitation service, foreign trade opportunities, piggyback program, exhibiting in our U.S. trade center shows located around the world, or perhaps arranging for him to go on locally-sponsored U.S. Government approved trade missions—such as the one that will be leaving for Panama and Costa Rica next week with seven or eight Jacksonville businessmen. These programs plus others are more fully described in the leaflets, booklets, and brochures laid out on the tables for you to pick up at the end of the program.

I would like to emphasize that our international trade services are particularly geared to helping the small businessman who is more likely to need our help than the big firms. In this connection, it is reported that one-fifth of all U.S. exporters have less than twenty employees and, in fact, approximately 60% have less than 100 employees on their payrolls. So this is our target group. Besides, these figures belie the old "wives tale" that you have to be big to be an exporter. It might be nearer the truth to say you can become big, or bigger, by exporting.

SELLING TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Moving on to another commerce service for the businessman, I am sure most of you in this audience realize that Uncle Sam—in the form of various Federal agencies—is the largest purchaser of every kind of conceivable commodity and service year in and year out. Selling your services and commodities to these Federal agencies can be an excellent source of business as many Jacksonville firms already know which have the nearby Naval installations as customers. To help you know exactly what these agencies are going to buy, our department publishes each work day the *Commerce Business Daily* which not only lists U.S. Government procurement invitations but also serves as a source of information on subcontracting leads, contract awards, surplus property sales, and foreign business opportunities under the foreign aid program. So there are several ways the *Daily* can be helpful in developing new business and its a good buy at $25. for an annual subscription. Sample copies are available on the display table along with an order blank for ordering it through our office.

STATISTICAL DATA FOR VARIOUS USERS

In its Census Bureau, the Department of Commerce has the biggest collection and producer of statistical information of any agency in the Federal estabilshment and probably in the world.

The average citizen usually only thinks of the bureau every 10 years when we are filling out population census forms and oftentimes this is not in a very friendly manner. But the published reports that flow from the census of population can provide the businessman with priceless market research information—all for the cost of 25¢ or 35¢ per report—which can show him how many people, by age, sex, income, education, marital status, live in a defined geographical area down to the city block level. These reports along with similar statistical information available from the census of manufacturers, census of retail establishments, census of wholesalers, and census of selected service firms are invaluable in providing not only market research data but in making such important business decisions as distribution channels, warehouse and plant locations, sources of supply and many other items of vital information that a good businessman needs to know from time to time.

Going back to the subject of marketing data, the Bureau of Domestic Commerce of our department publishes a very helpful series of booklets which serve as sources of information on various markets, such as the Negro market, marketing new products, export opportunities, the youth market, and direct mail advertising—copies of which we have on the table for you to see and pick up.

TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY FROM GOVERNMENT TO INDUSTRY

If I should ask this audience what is the nation's greatest storehouse of wealth or treasure, many probably would think of the 12 or 14 billion dollars of gold stored in Ft. Knox. However, in my opinion, a greater source of wealth is the vast reservoir of new technological information that flows constantly into Washington from the various government research and development programs. The government is anxious to get this information—paid for with tax dollars—into the hands of private businessmen who can put it to good commercial use. Many of the consumer products we now enjoy are the result of this information having been put to use by businessmen having imagination and initiative. As custodian of this new technical information produced by the R.&D. programs of NASA, Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense, Department of Interior, and other government agencies, the Commerce Department has developed several devices to channel this wealth of information into the hands of potential users. One of the means I like best, because of its simplicity, is the FAS Announcement Service whereby a businessman can be put on a mailing list to receive announcements of new technical developments in any of some 57 fields he selects as most related to his interests.

From these announcements, he may order the complete technical report which contains information that serves as the basis for a new product or an improvement in the manufacturing process of an existing product.

Another simple means to tap in on the vast gold mine of information is through subscribing to the department's CAST service—CAST being an acronym for clearinghouse announcements in science and technology. From this service, you will not only receive announcements relative to purely technical data but also announcements of the results of advanced studies in the fields of management, administration, and economics which also can be of direct value in enhancing a firm's operation.

Descriptive material on both of these services are on the table along with enrollment forms for your use to stay abreast of new technological developments in your industry field or business.

OFFICE OF MINORITY ENTERPRISE

One of the newest offices in the Department was established at the direction of President Nixon to serve as the focal point for coordinating all Federal programs concerned with the establishment of minority owned business enterprises. In carrying out this function, the Office of Minority Enterprise—as it is known—has become a national clearinghouse for information on minority business enterprises, information which until recently was extremely difficult to collect and correlate. As an example, it recently published the Directory of Private Programs Assisting Minority Business. A few copies of this item are available to those interested in this type of information. A similar publication describing Federal programs for assisting minority business has also been published by that office. This agency's main function, however, has been to serve as a catalyst toward providing a new avenue of opportunity to members of the minority element in establishing their own business and taking their place in the economic mainstream of the Nation's business community.

INVEST IN THE U.S.A. PROGRAM

The U.S. Department of Commerce gives high priority to assisting American businessmen who are interested in attracting foreign investment to this country. This can mean new jobs in the local community, new products, new technology, and more profits for the U.S. firm. Last year we were successful in helping over 4,000 American companies find foreign partners who were also anxious to enter into a joint venture or licensing arrangement in this country.

We refer to this as the "Invest in the U.S.A." program and we will be most happy to discuss this in more detail with any interested businessman at his convenience.

In closing, I must admit that within the short time available I have limited my remarks mostly to those services and programs with which we in the field of-

fice are deeply involved each day. I should emphasize, however, that this by no means represents a complete rundown or review of all the services and programs available from various other bureaus and offices of the Department—such as the Patent Office, the Maritime Administration, U.S. Travel Service, Economic Development Administration, & National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration (which includes our friends in the Weather Bureau). Nor have I really given you a good insight into the help and assistance available to the Jacksonville businessman from our industry and commodity specialist in the Bureau of Domestic Commerce or the country desk officers in the Bureau of International Commerce in Washington. Nor have I mentioned the tremendous in-depth service that is offered to you by our commercial attaches in the American embassies and consulates around the world. These are all members of the Commerce team and regardless of how diversified our functions may be, and how spread out we may be geographically, there is one thing we all have in common and that is our desire to be of service to you—the American businessman.

Thank you and come to see us. (Room 526, Federal Office Building)

REMARKS BY JOHN L. STEPHENS, DOWNTOWN SHELL AUTO SERVICE

S.B.A. AND THE SMALL BUSINESSMAN

The other day I ran into a friend whom I had known was trying to start a business. We started talking and the first thing he said was, "I went down to the SBA and they wouldn't give me any money!"

The point of this little story is that the SBA is one of the most misunderstood agencies of the Federal Government.

What is the SBA and does it do? The SBA was created by Congress in 1953 as a permanent, independent government agency to help small businesses grow and prosper. Most people don't realize small businesses make up more than 95 percent of America's business population and provide work for more than 35 million people.

The SBA "helps" small business in a wide variety of ways, including financial assistance, lease guarantees, management assistance, counseling covering successful practices in every small business field.

My friend was under the misconception that the SBA gave away money. In actuality the SBA can render financial assistance by either participation in or guaranteeing up to 90 percent of a bank loan; or by making a direct loan.

The second misconception that my friend was under is that to receive a loan all you have to do is walk in and say I want so much money. The first step towards a loan is sitting down with yourself, and preparing a resume. A resume is a written portrait of you It tells the person reading it: *Who are you*—your name, age, whether you're married. *What you are doing now*—where you're working. *What you have done*—previous job experience, education. Secondly, write a brief description of your business or your idea for a business. It should cover such things as:

Type—The kind of business this will be (manufacturing, a retail store . . .).

Name—What is the name of the business. (Often called the "dba" or "doing business as" name.)

Owner—Who will be the owner of the business. You alone? Or do you plan a partnership or corporation?

Product— Description of the product or service you plan to make or sell.

Location—Where will your business be? In what location?

Competition—How much competition will you have?

Customers—Who will be your customers; the kind of market you think exists for your product?

Employees—How many employees do you plan to hire? Immediately? In six months?

Plans—Your future plans for growth.

Now you are ready to approach the Small Business Administration. An officer will sit down with you and talk about your plans. As a lender the SBA will want to know the following things about the money you need:

How much?—How much money or other assets do you have to put into the business? (This is called your "equity" in the business.) How much money will you need to borrow to make the total amount you think you'll need to get started?

What for?—What do you plan to spend this money on?

How long—What kind of "terms" do you want the money for? (For how long do you want to borrow the money? How long do you think it will take before you will be making enough profit to begin paying the money back?)

Collateral.—What "collateral" do you plan to offer as security on the loan? (This can be anything of loan value that can be pledged to the lender should your company go out of business before the loan is repaid.)

Other loans—Do you have any other loans which you are still paying off? Have you made an application for a loan elsewhere which is pending or was refused?

If the proposition is sound the SBA will want you to file a formal application including a *Personal Financial* Statement which is:

A listing of all the things you own of value, and how much you owe to other people. The things you own—like your car, a bank account—are listed. These are your "Assets". The amounts that you owe—like charge accounts—are listed. These are your "Liabilities". When you subtract your Total Liabilities from your Total Assets, you get your Net Worth. The Personal Financial Statement should be no older than 90 days.

A projected operating statement

This is sometimes called a Projected "Profit & Loss" Statement since it shows the profit—or loss—that you think your business will make. It shows what you estimate your monthly sales will be. (If you can provide evidence of how you arrived at the monthly sales figure—based on actual orders, letters of intent to buy, or suppliers' estimates—so much the better.) It lists all your business expenses, including the interest on your loan. When you subtract your total monthly expenses from sales, you can see how much Net Profit is left.

With a new business, sales may be low and your business may show a Net Loss for a few months. After a year, your sales will probably increase to where they will cover your operating costs and leave a reasonable Net Profit.

The lender will expect you to have an idea of your sales and expenses—rent, wages and so on—by month. He will also want to be able to project how your Profit and Loss Statement will look at the end of your first year in business.

When you start a new business, you have to estimate these figures as accurately as you can. When figuring your profit expectations, your estimates for sales projections should be on the conservative—or low—side. Expense projections, however, should attempt to cover every possible item and should include some margin for error.

If you have been in business a while, you will have actual operating statements on which to base projections for the future. And the lender will expect these estimated projections to see what kind of profit the loan will enable you to make. He will also want operating statements for the past two or three years. (The Operating Statement often used by small businessmen is the one included in their income tax returns.)

A balance sheet

Only an existing business will have a Balance Sheet to show the lender. And usually it is prepared by an accountant. It is more complicated than the Personal Financial Statement, but the end result is essentially the same. It shows a picture of the net worth or value of your business on a certain date.

If you do not have an accountant—a lender or counselor can often assist you in preparing a Balance Sheet if you provide him with the information.

Your completed application and accompanying material can either be taken to a bank for their participation or filed directly with the Small Business Administration in the case of a direct loan. If you require aid in preparing these forms assistance is available through the SBA. After your application has been filed and investigated the decision will be made whether or not your loan will be granted.

The processing is very long and complicated, but each step is a necessary part of appraising your particular proposition, but it sure would be nice to have a lot less forms.

Here are ten tips which may aid you in getting a loan:

1. *Put All Your Cards on the Table*—Take the lender into your confidence. Give him all the facts about you and your business, even if they're bad.

2. *Present Your Plans in An Organized Way*—Too much information is better than too little. But make sure you have included all the basic facts the lender needs to know.

3. *Remember That It Takes Time To Get Everything Together*—People often are impatient to get started if they've been planning the business for some time.

4. *Make Sure Your Business Idea Will Work*—The lender must be sure that you have considered all the angles—where you plan to locate, who you will employ, who will buy your product or service and whether it can be sold at a profit.

5. *Be Realistic About the Amount of Money You Need*—The lender wants you to suceed. If you borrow too much, your loan payments will be more than you can manage; if you borrow too little, you may go under before your business has a chance to make a profit.

6. *Keep Personal Spending Within Limits*—If you give the lender the impression that you're careless with money, he will be reluctant to grant your loan request.

7. *Ask For Help When You Need It*—No one can possibly know everything, and everyone needs good advice at some time. If there are things you need help with, don't waste any time before seeking assistance.

8. *You Must Know Something About Managing Money*—The continuing good health of your business depends largely on your ability to control costs, to plan both business and personal expenditures wisely.

9. *Respect The Limits of The Loan Agreement*—You'll find that the lender will be involved with your efforts and will work with you to make the going easier. Keep your lender informed of your progress. Going off entirely on your own can endanger the loan and damage your lending relationship.

10. *If You Don't Succeed At First . . .*—Don't give up. If your loan request has been refused, try to find out why and do something about it. One bank or lending organization may have to turn down your proposal because of their own lending requirements while another may be able to handle it. Don't be discouraged if you have to investigate several lending sources.

The Small Business Administration can be a valuable tool for the small businessman or the entrepreneur. It is up to the individual to take advantage of the opportunities available—the SBA cannot do it for you!

REMARKS BY GERT H. W. SCHMIDT, PRESIDENT JACKSONVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., AND BUSINESS

Distinguished Guests—Ladies and Gentleman: My good friend Congressman Charles

Bennett has assigned me to the cleanup batter slot of the morning session. With so many good presentations before me, it will be hard to come up with a home run but let's take a swing at it anyway. I'll try to give you a synopsis of three important areas of business as it affects our general Jacksonville economy.

First, although our local economy is not recession proof, the normal peaks and valleys are never as pronounced in our town when compared to national or other community trends. We are most fortunate in that we have a very diversified commercial and industrial mix which is amply fortified by large, steady governmental activities and their corresponding payrolls. We seem to have some of everything and our economy is so diversified that we are not dependent on any one industry, service or manufacturing activity. We have some basic manufacturing and a thriving distribution industry because of our strategic location on the sea lanes of the world; north, south and west airways; and excellent rail, auto and truck routes in all directions but east. We are Floridas financial capitol with large banking organizations and major insurance companies, all making their headquarters here. We are a trading center for a substantial hinterland and service organizations cater to a steadily increasing population.

Our people have many skills because of the diversity of our economy and even the most sophisticated New York advertising, radio and television agencies readily point to Jacksonville with its four season climate and other geographical, social and economic factors as an ideal test market for new products and a steady market for products filling proven needs.

With this short description of Jacksonville, U.S.A.—the Bold New City of the South—let me review for you a few highly important statistics. In 1965 our Chamber launched our first meaningful research department that has since then kept an accurate record of our economic activity, completed many specialized business and industry studies and is an amazing source for all sorts of facts and figures. Anyone contemplating entering the Jacksonville market can get worthwhile and valuable information from this department which can help determine the degree of success or possible failure of a new venture.

Our Jacksonville business index is based on the 1962–64 average and covers employment, labor force, residential electric meters, taxable sales, value of building permits issued and bank debits. Since 1965, when the index stood at 113, it has risen steadily each year to 115 in '66, 119 in '67, 138 in '68, 149 in '69 and at the end of the present quarter, it is 154.6. Let's take a quick look at significant figures of some of the factors that go into our index and perhaps get out the crystal ball to see what it looks like for 1971. As for employment in September, which is a short month away, we had only 2% of our labor force idle compared to a national unemployment rate of slightly over 5½%. In addition, we have 3% more people gainfully employed this year over last.

Building activity is 3.1% greater than last year's record and at the present time there is over 102 million dollars worth of construction in process which is led by a whopping 17% increase in residential construction over last year, mostly in much needed and attractive apartment complexes. Retail sales have climbed rather sharply this year compared to dips in other areas of our country and department store sales are up 16% for the first 9 months of this year over last year. Bank debits are up 6.2% over last year, although we have had a slight dip in time and demand deposits of less than 3% when compared to 1969.

It is generally conceded that the national business slowdown has bottomed out and that businesss generally will be brisker in 1971. For Jacksonville this is generally good news since we can just continue on growing and having a good healthy increase in our business index, possibly at a little greater rate than we have had in the past year. Optimism in the future economy and a positive faith that it will be better was certainly one factor in the unusually fine achievement of our recently completed United Fund drive which generated over $300,000 more this year than last year. The third area I want to touch on is the Chamber's activity in sponsoring workshops, seminars and trade missions, it's continued involvement and cooperation with various government activities programs, and our deep-seated philosophy that we must be ever mindful of the total problems and challenges of the community in order to serve its needs. The Chamber is sort of a civilian government that must stand ready to do for a community what government cannot do and furthermore, we must be a partner with government in what we can achieve together and finally, occasionally wear a third hat as the community watchdog so that a government created by the people truly serves them as effectively and efficiently as it possibly can.

In the latter area, the leaders of the Chamber were most instrumental in bringing about our modern, effective consolidated government. Although consolidation was purposely never recognized as a Chamber project, credit must be given to former President Yates, who, in his term of office, called together the first citizens ad hoc committee which prepared and signed what is now known as the Yates Manifesto, creating the Government Study Commission. This Commission was predominently composed of Chamber members and all our resources were made available during the many months of studying and creating a new form of government for our community.

Our interest in better government has never waned and daily our Chamber members and its staff are actively and vitally involved in the affairs of our political structure. We attend most meetings of our Legislative Council and serve on mayor and council appointed committees, boards and commissions. We have generated a most harmonious climate for working together on our common community problems but that is not to say that the Chamber is not at times at odds with our government and its proposed Legislation. We plead our viewpoint as energetically as possible and I can't give you an accurate statistic on our batting average because we lose some and also win some, sometimes by relatively close votes.

Many people still believe that a Chamber's only interest is trade, attracting more industries and chasing the all-mighty dollar. Those days, I presume, had their demise many years ago, since it has long been recognized that a Chamber must concern itself with the totality of life in a community. Education in all its forms, deepening harbors, enhancing the environment through air, water and land pollution programs, eliminating urban blight through urban renewal, lobbying for more highways, planning trade missions for export and import, encouraging good racial relations and surveying existing industries, to name just a few, are all part and parcel of the awesome responsibilities of an involved Chamber and its interested and dedicated members.

Because government, local, state and national, is also an active participant in the same community problems and challenges, it's a natural evolvement for both government and business to look to each other for help, support and active cooperation. Legion are the projects and problems that are part Chamber and part government. Here are just a few of a rather current nature that illustrate this government-business partnership.

1. We are deeply involved with a comprehensive plan to completely modernize the downtown center of our city. A top level policy committee from government and business is now completing some of the final planning stages as developed by one of America's leading urban renewal firms from Baltimore. So far funding has come from our consolidated government and business has contributed many hours of planning, discussing and decision-making. As the plans become a reality, more government money will be needed, along with private capital, for a massive construction program of redoing older buildings and creating new ones.

2. Employment of the Disadvantaged. As early as 1967, at the request of Mayor Hans Tanzler, we involved ourselves in finding and creating employment for our disadvantaged citizens. After some degree of success, we were the first city to receive a Federal grant in the amount of $41,000.00 to enlarge our efforts. During one nine month period in '68, we placed 307 applicants in meaningful jobs, establishing a retention rate of 72%.

3. To increase the effectiveness of participating firms, the Chamber has sponsored at Jacksonville University for some years now a Supervisory Training Program. Three to four hundred adults are graduated from this vocational educational course each year and registration for future courses continues at this high level.

4. As a successor to our successful, concentrated employment program, we were recently approached by the United States Government and the National Association of Businessmen to become a Jobs Consortium. The project was approved by our Board and we are ready to go in January of 1971 with all the responsibilities of a Consortium to hire, train, counsel and in many other ways, feed into the labor force the under-educated and under privileged.

5. The United States Government spends millions on the extremely necessary ten year census. A new census can be of great use and benefit if proper instruction is given to the users. Last month we sponsored a highly successful census user conference, which enjoyed good attendance and was possible with the cooperation of the United States Department of Commerce, Jacksonville University and our Chamber.

6. In the area of trade missions, we enjoy the total cooperation of our local Department of Commerce representatives and it is gratifying to note that our missions have resulted in some good export trade to help keep a favorable balance of trade with our neighboring countries.

7. Governments seem to be more and more concerned about consumers and we are probably scoring a first in the country with our November 19th automobile conference for consumers, sponsored by the local automobile industries and members of the State Attorney's Office. We hope to furnish consumers information to help them make wise buying decisions and gain greater satisfaction from their purchases.

8. A project, aided by Congressman Charles Bennett, placed a directory of Jacksonville manufacturers as well as the Jacksonville telephone directory in the 214 embassies and consulates that are maintained by the United States Department of State in our world. It will always be a little difficult to assess the productive results of this particular project but if anyone in a foreign country needs any Jacksonville products or services, at least they can get the name and telephone number of our individuals and firms.

9. Vocational and technical education have always enjoyed top priority among our Chamber programs. Right now educators and Chamber members are researching the possibility of a central learning center site dedicated to adult vocational educational programs in the heart of our city. Last year's efforts in this area were instrumental in doubling the number of vocational courses offered by our Junior College campuses in Jacksonville.

10. Business and industry are always extremely sensitive to increased taxes and

higher governmental budgets. Our Chamber led the fight for increasing our budget for public instruction so that Duval County would eventually have a top quality school system. With the aid of our school board, our Legislators in Tallahassee were able to establish a new funding formula which will mean millions of extra dollars to our community in the years ahead for public education.

I could list many more examples of the solid and effective partnership role we assume with government aid and support to help meet the needs of our community.

This Seminar in itself is an example of our mutual interests. Next week Jim Mooney, our Executive Vice President, and I will go to Washington at the request of Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans, to consult with him and other Chamber presidents, in the common problem of aiding minorities to establish businesses of their own in their neighborhoods.

The American system of free enterprise is without question the very best way to give employment, income, consumer benefits and a richer and fuller life to the greatest number of people. America is living proof of this philosophy. Only last week Secretary George Romney, while speaking in Jacksonville, lauded the great contributions that are made by individual citizens in our democracy. He called on all of us to give our maximum private effort to help business and government solve our mutual problems.

Yes, it's good business to concern yourself with the problems and challenges of our community and our government. Yes, and it's also good Americanism to do your part to make the *land we live on, the country we live in* and *the world we live with* an even better place *because we're here!*

CAMPAIGN REFORMS A "RITUAL CHARADE"

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following article written by Jack Gould points up the dangers of escalating expenditures for political advertising. It appeared in the Kansas City Times on October 24, shortly after President Nixon vetoed the bill limiting expenditures for political advertising:

CAMPAIGN REFORMS A "RITUAL CHARADE"

(By Jack Gould)

NEW YORK.—The criticism of President Nixon for vetoing a bill limiting expenditures in political campaigns was chiefly noteworthy for its display of naivete. No realist in the TV medium thought for one moment that the White House would throw away its economic advantage in drowning the opposition in spot commercials or staged discussions, either in the current campaign or in 1972.

Former President Lyndon B. Johnson was no less a master in bending the medium to his will and in 1964 it was Sen. Barry S. Goldwater who suffered the economic disadvantage in his presidential compaign.

The point is that whenever either party believes TV will serve its partisan ends, then meaningful reform in campaign abuses is just a ritual charade. The name of the game is to get elected or reelected, and if TV is the supposed magic wand that assures success, then the status quo is going to prevail.

This year's exercise in proposed reform follows the traditional pattern. Noble words circulated in Congress about the evils of selecting candidates through the power of the purse, but when the chips were really down the idea once again became academic as the President advanced labored reasons why the bill had defects.

Consider the realities apropos this November. While Congress bemused itself with fitful hearings, both Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller in New York and Gov. Ronald Reagan in California had contracted for gobs of spot commercials. Through neatly timed maneuvering it turned out that the congressional bill would not apply to this year's election in any event. The image-makers in the two largest states didn't have to state their pragmatic approach: Did the White House want to take the risk of jeopardizing Republican governorships of the two largest states?

Nixon also had to look ahead. If the equal-time provision of Section 315 of the federal communications act were amended to allow coverage of the two principal candidates, a provision of the bill, he would find it politically awkward to avoid debates.

But Nixon was singed once in his debates with the late President John F. Kennedy and deciding two years ahead of the event that he would expose himself again to such a risk runs contrary to human nature.

Johnson adopted the go-it-alone tactic in a different way. As all incumbents do, he saw no point in enhancing the TV exposure of Goldwater, so first the word went out to the Democratic congressmen to forget any amendment inviting debates. Then he declined to appear on regular discussion programs, because under the rules of fairness the senator would have had claim to equal time.

Both parties, in effect, want to and do control the TV medium and therein lies the deep danger. Stations are licensed by the Federal Communications commission as an arm of Congress, with the Senate having the power to pass on presidential nominees for the agency.

In both Democratic and Republican regimes the long political arm of the White House has always had an important influence on the FCC, and Congress has treated the agency like a malleable child. The regulatory body charged with the critical determination of the future of communications, with all its effects on elections, is essentially a repository for political patronage.

The circumstances require a whole new approach to the concept of a free press. Surely that freedom must be defended, but practically it is also increasingly irrelevant.

The prime source of information and opinion, which the drafters of the Constitution and Bill of Rights sought to protect, no longer lies in the unlicensed press. For untold millions, especially those who prefer news and pictures and crisp bulletins, yesterday's "free press" is now government-regulated television, with a federal regulatory agency supplanting the editor as the ultimate umpire of journalistic standards.

In short, politicians with a partisan ax to grind—not journalists, who at least theoretically are committed to the credo of objectivity—have taken over the mainstream of journalism. If the politician is important or loud enough, his raised voice or eyebrow is sufficient in itself to convince the television broadcaster of the advisability of self-censorship to avoid jeopardizing a license worth millions.

This transition from free-enterprise journalism to government-dependent journalism has taken place in an atmosphere of astonishing indifference to the change. Such is the emotional impact of television's moving and talking personage that the image-makers swiftly moved in to convert governmental leaders to pitchmen selling their views on crucial issues of government, the way manufacturers sell automobiles and soaps.

Instead of being called to task for what they might be doing to a fair and viable democracy, these image-makers have been lionized as some sort of super wizards.

As long as today's government-dependent journalism rests in the hands of politicians whose omnipresent thought is the matter of election or re-election meaningful reform of television's role in politics is just a pipe dream.

The routine is monotonous: To pacify the public there is a gesture of concern just before an election, with action always too late to have any meaning. Then the issue is tidily shelved.

What to do? A brave broadcaster might reject all commercial spots in exchange for a fair balance of free time for all major candidates. By begging Congress for relief, the broadcasters are parties to the game: They know nothing will happen. A house rule on politics and a willingness to defend the rule up to the Supreme court if necessary would be a true test of their sincerity and determination.

The League of Women Voters, universally respected for its nonpartisanship and hard work, might be one organization which could explore the complete removal of TV from political domination and champion new ground rules applicable to all parties in or out of power. It might take years to accomplish, but the present state of chaos on the air took 20 years to develop.

Escalating expenditures for political advertising threaten to make a mockery of democracy, and the content of the political spots is an appalling oversimplification of critical matters affecting voters of all persuasions.

Some generation at some point will have to rally momentum for an overhaul of the relationship between those chosen to govern and society's most powerful means of persuasion—TV. The debasement of both is hardly a matter to be ignored or mourned and joked about, election after election.

SENATE—*Tuesday, November 17, 1970*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of all, who art above all and through all and in all, without whom life has no spiritual source or divine meaning, but with whom there is power for the present and hope for the future, we turn to Thee as did our fathers in their day for light and guidance through all perils and difficulties. Give us, as Thou didst give them, the patience and the wisdom to strive for a redeemed and righteous nation, a cleansed earth, and a society of peace and justice. Release Thy spirit anew upon the world and, above and beyond our human limitations, bring to fulfillment the divine intention for all mankind.

Through the toiling hours of this day,