

the agencies of the Government. We are now searching for the means for more of such representation.

Today, I am introducing a bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to provide for the establishment of a Public Counsel Corporation. This bill is based on the premise—reinforced time and again in the studies by the Administrative Conference, in articles and books on administrative law and procedure, and in volumes of testimony before a number of House and Senate committees—that large segments of the American public are not adequately represented in the Federal rulemaking process, and thus that the views of those directly affected by administrative agencies of all types are frequently not heard in the formulation of policy.

There are a number of privately funded organizations, many with offices in Washington, that are now making first efforts at representing before Government agencies segments of the heretofore unrepresented public in specific substantive areas. Examples of these are the Center for the Study of Law and Social Policy, the Center for the Study of Responsive Law, the Washington Research Project, the Citizens Advocate Center, the Citizens Communications Center, the Consumer Federation of America, Action on Smoking and Health, Citizens Board of Inquiry into Health Care, and the Welfare Rights League, to name but a few.

These are beginning to take their place beside older organizations, for example, the Legal Defense Fund, the NAACP, the ACLU, and the Sierra Club. These organizations have performed and will increasingly perform important functions in representing citizens' interests before Federal agencies. But the demand for such representation far exceeds that which they can on their own supply. They are all dependent on individual contributions or foundation funding, and thus they often have neither the present resources nor the long range financing to budget complex projects or long range activities, both of which are necessary for effective participation on administrative proceedings. Thus there remains

a huge public representation gap which only public resources can fill.

The Public Counsel Corporation I propose would be a nonprofit Corporation modeled after the Public Broadcasting Corporation, funded by the Federal Government and directed by a board of presidential appointees. The Corporation would be authorized to represent directly or by contract the interests of the unrepresented public in agency proceedings, either on its own initiative or by request of the agency. It could initiate rulemaking proceedings and could represent individuals or groups seeking judicial review or consideration of administrative actions or inactions where the issues involved substantially affect the interests of the unrepresented public.

The Corporation would also serve a clearinghouse function of collecting and disseminating information concerning rulemaking affecting the unrepresented public.

The term "unrepresented public" is generally defined in the bill as "persons or groups of persons whose collective interests are not likely to be adequately represented in regulatory agencies of the United States because such persons or groups lack resources or institutional mechanisms to provide such representation." I believe that the Board of the Corporation can determine the precise substantive areas of involvement based on input from presently existing public interest organizations and on a study of areas where the public is not at present adequately represented by any groups or organizations.

The Public Counsel Corporation cannot insure that Government regulators will consider the needs of the consumer, the poor, the elderly, the minority groups, and other citizens. It is not an exclusive remedy. The Corporation set up by the bill might exist side by side with a Utility Consumers Council, or might be incorporated into and utilized to expand the representational elements of the Independent Consumers Council.

I hope that hearings on my proposal will bring out not only the value of independent representation of public interests before Government agencies, but how the various proposals currently be-

fore Congress can be amalgamated to insure that the processes of Government are opened to widespread public participation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3434) to amend title 8, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a Public Counsel Corporation to insure full participation by and on behalf of unrepresented citizens in administrative rulemaking proceedings, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1970

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 497, and in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, February 16, 1970.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 16, 1970, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, February 10, 1970:

U.S. ATTORNEY

D. Dwayne Keyes, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of California for the term of 4 years, vice John P. Hyland.

U.S. MARSHAL

Carl H. Slayback, of Illinois, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years, vice James J. Moos resigned.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Beagley, Larry E.	Ekle, Thomas L.
Braun, Frank IV	Rickman, Dwight G.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, February 10, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

His Grace, Bishop Papken, primate's legate of the diocese of the Armenian Church of America, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Father of all, You are the source of all inspiration and wisdom. Be with these leaders of our country.

Give them Your strength to solve the complex problems of today and every day.

As they are seeking divine guidance, be with them and attend to their various needs with a faith that will not shrink under the pressure of external foes and internal crises.

Fortify them all to uphold and protect the freedom we inherited and enjoy. As children of God let them strive earnestly to be just peacemakers.

In February as we honor the memory of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, additionally Armenian-Americans take pride in honoring their greatest ancestral heroes, the Vartanian Saints, who 1,500 years ago protected the Christian faith from the onslaught of the sun worshipers.

O God, replace our weakness with Your courage; endow us with Your generous love and hope. Take our indifference and make us men of charity and understanding in dealing with friends and foes.

Fervently we invoke Your protection upon our country. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On February 4, 1970:

H.J. Res. 1051. Joint resolution designating the week commencing February 1, 1970, as International Clergy Week in the United States, and for other purposes.

On February 9, 1970:

H.R. 15149. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1072. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO WELCOMES BISHOP PAPKEN, OF ST. MARY'S ARMENIAN APOSTOLIC CHURCH IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my constituents of the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, many of whom are of Armenian descent, it gives me great pleasure to welcome here today Bishop Papken Varjabedian, who has served the Armenian Church with dedication and devotion for more than 35 years.

He has served throughout the country, in Troy, N.Y., in Philadelphia, in California and now he is the representative in Washington, D.C., of the diocese of the Armenian Church of America. He was ordained a bishop upon assuming the post of primate of the diocese of the Armenian Church in California in 1957.

Bishop Papken began his religious training in Jerusalem, having attended the Armenian Seminary there from 1932 to 1936. He continued his studies at the Near East School of Theology in Beirut, Lebanon. In 1947 he enrolled at the Berkeley Divinity School which is affiliated with Yale University and received S.T.B. and S.T.D. degrees from that school.

It is fitting that Bishop Papken join us here today, because this week, as we in America commemorate the birth of the Great Emancipator, the Armenian Church commemorates its greatest hero St. Vartan, who led his vastly outnumbered army to martyrdom in 451 A.D. in a battle against the Persians. St. Vartan and his gallant army, by their sacrifice, gave evidence of the fierce devotion of the Armenians to Christianity, and because of this, the Persian onslaught against the Armenian Church failed.

During the span of turbulent centuries that have passed since St. Vartan's great battle, there have been numerous onslaughts by superior foes against the Armenian Church and the Armenian people. None of these onslaughts have succeeded, and today, the Armenians remain steadfast to their church and to their belief in Christianity. Their religion and their culture continue to flourish wherever Armenians live in all corners of the globe.

Since coming to America, Bishop Papken has made several trips abroad, and wherever he has traveled he has told of our great democracy where freedom of religion, freedom of conscience, and freedom of thought are guaranteed to all Americans.

I want to thank Bishop Papken for being with us today and to wish him continuing success in his work with the Armenian Church.

ELECTION TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 829) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 829

Resolved, That the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Devine, be and he is hereby elected a member of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE POSSIBILITY OF JAILING SOUTHERN GOVERNORS

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, according to a news report heard this morning, Jerris Leonard, head of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, has suggested the possibility of jailing southern Governors in connection with their current effort to save public education in their States from complete destruction.

It is well known that the force behind the current integration effort is centered in the Federal Government in Washington and that the problems visited upon our schools are the result of a double standard application of school integration—a standard of summary enforcement in Southern States as against a “wink” in the North.

It would appear that someone high in the administration of this Government has given thought to the jailing of these southern Governors; otherwise, Mr. Leonard, who holds a high responsible, and powerful position within the administration, would have never made reference to the idea of jailing southern Governors.

His statement was shocking and unquestionably designed to intimidate.

I think it is incumbent upon the President and the Attorney General to make public whatever plans are being considered in this regard. I am, therefore, today respectfully requesting the President and the Attorney General to do so. If no such has been discussed or considered at the levels of the Office of the President or that of the Attorney General, then the President and Attorney General should repudiate the idea and Mr. Leonard be ordered to forget it.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1970, I was unavoidably detained at an important meeting downtown. Because my return was delayed, I was not able to vote on the conference report on H.R. 15149, foreign assistance and related agencies appropriations, 1970. At page 1357, I am recorded as being paired against the bill. This is not correct. If present I would have voted “yea.”

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, February 23, 1970, George Washington's

Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday, February 18, 1970.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATING A MEMBER TO READ GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to today, the Chair designates the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) to read George Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the approval of the Journal on February 23, 1970.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM SENATE AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED AND FOUND TRULY ENROLLED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday, February 16, 1970, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

STATE OF THE UNION

(Mr. SCHERLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, I watched the state of the Union as it appears to the Democrats. They did a good job, too, in pointing out all that is wrong. But they never said where they

have been up to now in avoiding or correcting those things that are wrong.

In fact, they went out of their way not to place the blame, because they know too well where the blame rests.

But even more interesting than their message were those who delivered it and those who did not. Those who appeared were all fine, honorable gentlemen, including one candidate for President. But where, I ask, were the rest of the party's leaders?

Where, for instance, was the Democratic whip in the Senate? Where was the Democratic whip in the House? Where was the Democratic nominee for President last year? Where was the Democratic national chairman? Indeed, where was the immediate past President of the United States, who did so much as Senate majority leader, as Vice President, and as President to shape the present state of the Union?

Is it possible that the Democratic former President and the Democratic former Vice President and the Democratic Party chairman have nothing to say about the situation today?

Or is it just that those responsible for this message to the American people did not want to reopen old wounds?

THE PRECARIOUS FISCAL SITUATION CONFRONTING THE COUNTRY

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to extend his remarks on the budget and fiscal situation in the Extensions of Remarks section of the RECORD, and include pertinent tabular material.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, all Members and all citizens—and this certainly includes the press—need to understand the precarious fiscal situation confronting the country. We need to understand that had the budget now before the Congress been submitted under the same budget guidelines that obtained under the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, and under the first 3 years of the Johnson administration, the new budget, submitted last week, would show an estimated deficit for fiscal year 1971 of \$7.3 billion.

That blunt statement of fact will seem strange and perhaps incredible to people who have read the big headlines and who have not studied and understood the fine print.

Let me follow my blunt statement of fact with a few other statements of fact.

We talk about a balanced budget, but under the budget as submitted we will have to raise the debt ceiling by around \$8 billion this year.

We talk about a balanced budget, but we are being requested to provide new spending authority above what was provided last year by way of appropriations and other spending authority, in the net sum of \$9 billion. The gross increase is several billions higher, but there are certain nonrecurring offsets.

This is what the so-called unified budget shows. But even under the unified budget, which takes into account the various trust funds, during the 3-

year period ending with fiscal 1971, we are expecting to borrow from the trust funds, dedicated to social security and otherwise, about \$19 billion in order to meet the regular expenditures of the Government.

My plea is that we take account of this situation.

We should also take account of this: The trend is in the wrong direction. Under the unified budget, which can be misleading, the budget surplus is going down. In fiscal 1970 it is now down from 1969. In fiscal 1971 it is down from 1970.

All I am trying to do is to contribute to a better understanding of the precarious fiscal situation confronting the country. If we do not find a way to dramatize this situation then we are going to have to pay the penalty in accelerated inflation.

THE UNIFIED BUDGET

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy the chairman of our committee is still on the floor, because I should like to ask the distinguished chairman a question. He does not mean to imply that there is some gimmickry here in a unified budget, that did not prevail in the previous administrations, surely.

As I recall, the chairman supported the proposition pushed by the Johnson administration that we go this route.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. No. I charge no gimmickry. I think there has been complete good faith.

All I am seeking to do is to alert the Congress and the country to the facts.

The unified budget is not the creature of the Nixon administration. It was first approved under the previous administration.

Mr. MICHEL. Right.

Mr. MAHON. The point is that this unified budget has—while not designed to do so—misled or confused a lot of people who are not students of fiscal matters. They seem startled when they are told that under the former procedure the new budget for fiscal 1971 is out of balance by \$7.3 billion. This is a shocking fact we must be aware of if we are to meet the situation.

Mr. MICHEL. I will agree with the gentleman. As he well knows, last year when there was considerable talk about a surplus in the neighborhood of some \$6 billion I pointed out at that time that we should not obscure the fact that there were considerable moneys coming into the unified budget from the trust funds—social security contributions, highway, unemployment compensation, and so forth—and that we should not be talking about a big surplus when in fact a good part of it was a result of contributions to the trust funds exceeding pay out.

The recently enacted social security increase of 15 percent alone accounts for over a \$1 billion increase in outgo from

that projected in last September's budget review.

The situation is mighty serious.

I would just like to say to the gentleman that we are certainly going to support him in every effort to hold spending or appropriations down to within these bounds, prescribed by the 1971 Nixon budget, but we have to have the support of the gentleman from Texas and the Members on that side to keep it within bounds. We cannot be coming on the floor next week again, for example, and raising the President's compromise figures on the Labor-HEW bill by over a half a billion dollars and still hold the line. You cannot have it both ways. What we say today will have to be backed up with votes on the floor of this House next week. Otherwise we are just playing games and dangerous ones at that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not about time, speaking of budgets, that we got something that Congress as well as the public can understand by way of budgetary? We have an administrative budget, a unified budget, an expenditure budget, and I do not know how many other budgets. It seems to me the gentleman from Texas can make a real contribution if he will insist upon some kind of a budget that we can understand—not a mixture or an admixture of all kinds of budgets.

THE BUDGET SITUATION

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman yields, I am placing in the RECORD today a comprehensive statement in regard to the budgetary situation showing what the true situation is in regard to the budget. I hope it will be helpful. The present budget is not inaccurate but it is misleading to people who only read the headlines. They read headlines saying there is a surplus, and there is when viewed in a certain context, but in a broader context, and in relation to Federal funds there is not a surplus. We are borrowing this year some \$8 billion from the trust funds which must eventually be restored if social security, highway, and other trust funds are to pay their bills.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. And Congress knew that when it started issuing participation certificates and otherwise borrowing from those funds. Every Member of Congress should have known what would happen; that it was "robbing Peter to pay Paul," and that there would be a day of accounting.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the chairman of the committee. He has made

a very valid argument. The unified budget does in many aspects give us a false picture of what we are actually spending. The argument was made by a Member on this side of the aisle, that the Johnson administration first proposed it. I was one who made the same argument. We need to be alert to the fact that under the past standards that we have adopted we have a deficit in this budget and we cannot continually borrow from our trust funds and get away with it forever. I compliment the gentleman and hope that the entire House, as appropriation bills come before this body, keeps it in mind and also keeps in mind the fact that we are going to have to keep our spending within bounds.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-225)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Like those in the last century who tilled a plot of land to exhaustion and then moved on to another, we in this century have too casually and too long abused our natural environment. The time has come when we can wait no longer to repair the damage already done, and to establish new criteria to guide us in the future.

The fight against pollution, however, is not a search for villains. For the most part, the damage done to our environment has not been the work of evil men, nor has it been the inevitable by-product either of advancing technology or of growing population. It results not so much from choices made, as from choices neglected: not from malign intention, but from failure to take into account the full consequences of our actions.

Quite inadvertently, by ignoring environmental costs we have given an economic advantage to the careless polluter over his more conscientious rival. While adopting laws prohibiting injury to person or property, we have freely allowed injury to our shared surrounding. Conditioned by an expanding frontier, we came only late to a recognition of how precious and how vulnerable our resources of land, water and air really are.

The tasks that need doing require money, resolve and ingenuity—and they are too big to be done by government alone. They call for fundamentally new philosophies of land, air and water use, for stricter regulation, for expanded government action, for greater citizen involvement, and for new programs to ensure that government, industry and individuals all are called on to do their share of the job and to pay their share of the cost.

Because the many aspects of environmental quality are closely interwoven, to consider each in isolation would be unwise. Therefore, I am today outlining a comprehensive, 37-point program, embracing

23 major legislative proposals and 14 new measures being taken by administrative action or Executive Order in five major categories:

- Water pollution control.
- Air pollution control.
- Solid waste management.
- Parklands and public recreation.
- Organizing for action.

As we deepen our understanding of complex ecological processes, as we improve our technologies and institutions and learn from experience, much more will be possible. But these 37 measures represent actions we can take now, and that can move us dramatically forward toward what has become an urgent common goal of all Americans: the rescue of our natural habitat as a place both habitable and hospitable to man.

WATER POLLUTION

Water pollution has three principal sources: municipal, industrial and agricultural wastes. All three must eventually be controlled if we are to restore the purity of our lakes and rivers.

Of these three, the most troublesome to control are those from agricultural sources: animal wastes, eroded soil, fertilizers and pesticides. Some of these are nature's own pollutions. The Missouri River was known as "Big Muddy" long before towns and industries were built on its banks. But many of the same techniques of pest control, livestock feeding, irrigation and soil fertilization that have made American agriculture so abundantly productive have also caused serious water pollution.

Effective control will take time, and will require action on many fronts: modified agricultural practices, greater care in the disposal of animal wastes, better soil conservation methods, new kinds of fertilizers, new chemical pesticides and more widespread use of natural pest control techniques. A number of such actions are already underway. We have taken action to phase out the use of DDT and other hard pesticides. We have begun to place controls on wastes from concentrated animal feed-lots. We need programs of intensified research, both public and private, to develop new methods of reducing agricultural pollution while maintaining productivity. I have asked The Council on Environmental Quality to press forward in this area. Meanwhile, however, we have the technology and the resources to proceed now on a program of swift clean-up of pollution from the most acutely damaging sources: municipal and industrial waste.

MUNICIPAL WASTES

As long as we have the means to do something about it, there is no good reason why municipal pollution of our waters should be allowed to persist unchecked.

In the four years since the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966 was passed, we have failed to keep our promises to ourselves: Federal appropriations for constructing municipal treatment plants have totaled only about one-third of authorizations. Municipalities themselves have faced increasing difficulty in selling bonds to finance their share of the construction costs. Given the saturated condition of today's mu-

nicipal bond markets, if a clean-up program is to work it has to provide the means by which municipalities can finance their share of the cost even as we increase Federal expenditures.

The best current estimate is that it will take a total capital investment of about \$10 billion over a five-year period to provide the municipal waste treatment plants and interceptor lines needed to meet our national water quality standards. This figure is based on a recently-completed nationwide survey of the deficiencies of present facilities, plus projections of additional needs that will have developed by then—to accommodate the normal annual increase in the volume of wastes, and to replace equipment that can be expected to wear out or become obsolete in the interim.

This will provide every community that needs it with secondary waste treatment, and also special, additional treatment in areas of special need, including communities on the Great Lakes. We have the industrial capacity to do the job in five years if we begin now.

To meet this construction schedule, I propose a two-part program of Federal assistance:

—*I propose a Clean Waters Act with \$4 billion to be authorized immediately, for Fiscal 1971, to cover the full Federal share of the total \$10 billion cost on a matching fund basis. This would be allocated at a rate of \$1 billion a year for the next four years, with a reassessment in 1973 of needs for 1975 and subsequent years.*

By thus assuring communities of full Federal support, we can enable planning to begin now for all needed facilities and construction to proceed at an accelerated rate.

—*I propose creation of a new Environmental Financing Authority, to ensure that every municipality in the country has an opportunity to sell its waste treatment plant construction bonds.*

The condition of the municipal bond market is such that, in 1969, 509 issues totaling \$2.9 billion proved unsalable. If a municipality cannot sell waste treatment plant construction bonds, EFA will buy them and will sell its own bonds on the taxable market. Thus, construction of pollution control facilities will depend not on a community's credit rating, but on its waste disposal needs.

Providing money is important, but equally important is where and how the money is spent. A river cannot be polluted on its left bank and clean on its right. In a given waterway, abating some of the pollution is often little better than doing nothing at all, and money spent on such partial efforts is often largely wasted. Present grant allocation formulas—those in the 1966 Act—have prevented the spending of funds where they could produce the greatest results in terms of clean water. Too little attention has been given to seeing that investments in specific waste treatment plants have been matched by other municipalities and industries on the same waterway. Many plants have been poorly designed and inefficiently operated. Some municipalities have offered free treatment to local industries, then not treated

their wastes sufficiently to prevent pollution.

To ensure that the new funds are well invested, five major reforms are needed. One requires legislation: the other four will be achieved by administrative action.

—I propose that the present, rigid allocation formula be revised, so that special emphasis can be given to areas where facilities are most needed and where the greatest improvements in water quality will result.

Under existing authority, the Secretary of the Interior will institute four major reforms:

—Federally assisted treatment plants will be required to meet prescribed design, operation and maintenance standards, and to be operated only by State-certified operators.

—Municipalities receiving Federal assistance in constructing plants will be required to impose reasonable users' fees on industrial users sufficient to meet the costs of treating industrial wastes.

—Development of comprehensive river basin plans will be required at an early date, to ensure that Federally assisted treatment plants will in fact contribute to effective clean-up of entire river basin systems. Collection of existing data on pollution sources and development of effluent inventories will permit systems approaches to pollution control.

—Wherever feasible, communities will be strongly encouraged to cooperate in the construction of large regional treatment facilities, which provide economies of scale and give more efficient and more thorough waste treatment.

INDUSTRIAL POLLUTION

Some industries discharge their wastes into municipal systems; others discharge them directly into lakes and rivers. Obviously, unless we curb industrial as well as municipal pollution our waters will never be clean.

Industry itself has recognized the problem, and many industrial firms are making vigorous efforts to control their water-borne wastes. But strict standards and strict enforcement are nevertheless necessary—not only to ensure compliance, but also in fairness to those who have voluntarily assumed the often costly burden while their competitors have not. Good neighbors should not be placed at a competitive disadvantage because of their good neighborliness.

Under existing law, standards for water pollution control often are established in only the most general and insufficient terms: for example, by requiring all affected industries to install secondary treatment facilities. This approach takes little account of such crucial variables as the volume and toxicity of the wastes actually being discharged, or the capacity of a particular body of water to absorb wastes without becoming polluted. Even more important, it provides a poor basis for enforcement: with no effluent standard by which to measure, it is difficult to prove in court that standards are being violated.

The present fragmenting of jurisdictions also has hindered comprehensive efforts. At present, Federal jurisdiction generally extends only to interstate waters. One result has been that as

stricter State-Federal standards have been imposed, pollution has actually increased in some other waters—in underground aquifers and the oceans. As controls over interstate waters are tightened, polluting industries will be increasingly tempted to locate on intrastate lakes and rivers—with a consequently increased threat to those waterways—unless they too are brought under the same strictures.

I propose that we take an entirely new approach: one which concerns Federal, State and private efforts, which provides for effective nationwide enforcement, and which rests on a simple but profoundly significant principle: that the nation's waterways belong to us all, and that neither a municipality nor an industry should be allowed to discharge wastes into those waterways beyond their capacity to absorb the wastes without becoming polluted.

Specifically, I propose a seven-point program of measures we should adopt now to enforce control of water pollution from industrial and municipal wastes, and to give the states more effective backing in their own efforts.

—I propose that State-Federal water quality standards be amended to impose precise effluent requirements on all industrial and municipal sources. These should be imposed on an expeditious timetable, with the limit for each based on a fair allocation of the total capacity of the waterway to absorb the user's particular kind of waste without becoming polluted.

—I propose that violation of established effluent requirements be considered sufficient cause for court action.

—I propose that the Secretary of the Interior be allowed to proceed more swiftly in his enforcement actions, and that he be given new legal weapons including subpoena and discovery power.

—I propose that failure to meet established water quality standards or implementation schedules be made subject to court-imposed fines of up to \$10,000 per day.

—I propose that the Secretary of the Interior be authorized to seek immediate injunctive relief in emergency situations in which severe water pollution constitutes an imminent danger to health, or threatens irreversible damage to water quality.

—I propose that the Federal pollution-control program be extended to include all navigable waters, both inter- and intra-state, all interstate ground waters, the United States' portion of boundary waters, and waters of the Contiguous Zone.

—I propose that Federal operating grants to State pollution control enforcement agencies be tripled over the next five years from \$10 million now to \$30 million in fiscal year 1975—to assist them in meeting the new responsibilities that stricter and expanded enforcement will place upon them.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Air is our most vital resource, and its pollution is our most serious environmental problem. Existing technology for the control of air pollution is less advanced than that for controlling water

pollution, but there is a great deal we can do within the limits of existing technology—and more we can do to spur technological advance.

Most air pollution is produced by the burning of fuels. About half is produced by motor vehicles.

MOTOR VEHICLES

The Federal Government began regulating automobile emissions of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons with the 1968 model year. Standards for 1970 model cars have been made significantly tighter. This year, for the first time, emissions from new buses and heavy-duty trucks have also been brought under Federal regulation.

In future years, emission levels can and must be brought much lower.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is today publishing a notice of new, considerably more stringent motor vehicle emission standards he intends to issue for 1973 and 1975 models—including control of nitrogen oxides by 1973 and of particulate emissions by 1975.

These new standards represent our best present estimate of the lowest emission levels attainable by those years.

Effective control requires new legislation to correct two key deficiencies in the present law:

a) *Testing procedures.* Under present law, only manufacturers' prototype vehicles are tested for compliance with emission standards, and even this is voluntary rather than mandatory.

I propose legislation requiring that representative samples of actual production vehicles be tested throughout the model year.

b) *Fuel composition and additives.* What goes into a car's fuel has a major effect on what comes out of its exhaust, and also on what kinds of pollution-control devices can effectively be employed. Federal standards for what comes out of a car's engine should be accompanied by standards for what goes into it.

I propose legislation authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to regulate fuel composition and additives.

With these changes, we can drastically reduce pollution from motor vehicles in the years just ahead. But in making and keeping our peace with nature, to plan only one year ahead or even five is hardly to plan at all. Our responsibility now is also to look beyond the Seventies, and the prospects then are uncertain. Based on present trends, it is quite possible that by 1980 the increase in the sheer number of cars in densely populated areas will begin outrunning the technological limits of our capacity to reduce pollution from the internal combustion engine. I hope this will not happen. I hope the automobile industry's present determined effort to make the internal combustion engine sufficiently pollution-free succeeds. But if it does not, then unless motor vehicles with an alternative, low-pollution power source are available, vehicle-caused pollution will once again begin an inexorable increase.

Therefore, prudence dictates that we

move now to ensure that such a vehicle will be available if needed.

I am inaugurating a program to marshal both government and private research with the goal of producing an unconventionally powered, virtually pollution-free automobile within five years.

—I have ordered the start of an extensive Federal research and development program in unconventional vehicles, to be conducted under the general direction of the Council on Environmental Quality.

—As an incentive to private developers, I have ordered that the Federal Government should undertake the purchase of privately produced unconventional vehicles for testing and evaluation.

A proposal currently before the Congress would provide a further incentive to private developers by authorizing the Federal Government to offer premium prices for purchasing low-pollution cars for its own use. This could be a highly productive program once such automobiles are approaching development, although current estimates are that, initially, prices offered would have to be up to 200% of the cost of equivalent conventional vehicles rather than the 125% contemplated in the proposed legislation. The immediate task, however, is to see that an intensified program of research and development begins at once.

One encouraging aspect of the effort to curb motor vehicle pollution is the extent to which industry itself is taking the initiative. For example, the nation's principal automobile manufacturers are not only developing devices now to meet present and future Federal emission standards, but are also, on their own initiative, preparing to put on the market by 1972 automobiles which will not require and, indeed, must not use leaded gasoline. Such cars will not only discharge no lead into the atmosphere, but will also be equipped with still more effective devices for controlling emissions—devices made possible by the use of leadfree gasoline.

This is a great forward step taken by the manufacturers before any Federal regulation of lead additives or emissions has been imposed. I am confident that the petroleum industry will see to it that suitable non-leaded gasoline is made widely available for these new cars when they come on the market.

STATIONARY-SOURCE POLLUTION

Industries, power plants, furnaces, incinerators—these and other so-called "stationary sources" add enormously to the pollution of the air. In highly industrialized areas, such pollution can quite literally make breathing hazardous to health, and can cause unforeseen atmospheric and meteorological problems as well.

Increasingly, industry itself has been adopting ambitious pollution-controlled programs, and state and local authorities have been setting and enforcing stricter anti-pollution standards. But they have not gone far enough or fast enough, nor, to be realistic about it, will they be able to without the strongest possible Federal backing. Without effective gov-

ernment standards, industrial firms that spend the necessary money for pollution control may find themselves at a serious economic disadvantage as against their less conscientious competitors. And without effective Federal standards, states and communities that require such controls find themselves at a similar disadvantage in attracting industry, against more permissive rivals. Air is no respecter of political boundaries: a community that sets and enforces strict standards may still find its air polluted from sources in another community or another state.

Under the Clean Air Act of 1967, the Federal government is establishing air quality control regions around the nation's major industrial and metropolitan areas. Within these regions, states are setting air quality standards—permissible levels of pollutants in the air—and developing plans for pollution abatement to achieve those air quality standards. All state air quality standards and implementation plans require Federal approval.

This program has been the first major Federal effort to control air pollution. It has been a useful beginning. But we have learned in the past two years that it has shortcomings. Federal designation of air quality control regions, while necessary in areas where emissions from one state are polluting the air in another, has been a time-consuming process. Adjoining states within the same region often have proposed inconsistent air quality standards, causing further delays for compromise and revision. There are no provisions for controlling pollution outside of established air quality control regions. This means that even with the designation of hundreds of such regions, some areas of the country with serious air pollution problems would remain outside of the program. This is unfair not only to the public but to many industries as well, since those within regions with strict requirements could be unfairly disadvantaged with respect to competitors that are not within regions. Finally, insufficient Federal enforcement powers have circumscribed the Federal government's ability to support the states in establishing and enforcing effective abatement programs.

It is time to build on what we have learned, and to begin a more ambitious national effort. I recommend that the Clean Air Act be revised to expand the scope of strict pollution abatement, to simplify the task of industry in pollution abatement through more nearly uniform standards, and to provide special controls against particularly dangerous pollutants.

—I propose that the Federal government establish nationwide air quality standards, with the states to prepare within one year abatement plans for meeting those standards.

This will provide a minimum standard for air quality for all areas of the nation, while permitting states to set more stringent standards for any or all sections within the state. National air quality standards will relieve the states of the lengthy process of standard-setting under Federal supervision, and allow them to concentrate on the immediate

business of developing and implementing abatement plans.

These abatement plans would cover areas both inside and outside of Federally designated air quality control regions, and could be designed to achieve any higher levels of air quality which the states might choose to establish. They would include emission standards for stationary sources of air pollution.

—I propose that designation of interstate air quality control regions continue at an accelerated rate, to provide a framework for establishing compatible abatement plans in interstate areas.

—I propose that the Federal government establish national emissions standards for facilities that emit pollutants extremely hazardous to health, and for selected classes of new facilities which could be a major contributor to air pollution.

In the first instance, national standards are needed to guarantee the earliest possible elimination of certain air pollutants which are clear health hazards even in minute quantities. In the second instance, national standards will ensure that advanced abatement technology is used in constructing the new facilities, and that levels of air quality are maintained in the face of industrial expansion. Before any emissions standards were established, public hearings would be required involving all interested parties. The States would be responsible for enforcing these standards in conjunction with their own programs.

—I propose that Federal authority to seek court action be extended to include both inter- and intrastate air pollution situations in which, because of local non-enforcement, air quality is below national standards, or in which emissions standards or implementation timetables are being violated.

—I propose that failure to meet established air quality standards or implementation schedules be made subject to court-imposed fines of up to \$10,000 per day.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

"Solid wastes" are the discarded leftovers of our advanced consumer society. Increasing in volume, they litter the landscape and strain the facilities of municipal governments.

New packaging methods, using materials which do not degrade and cannot easily be burned, create difficult new disposal problems. Though many wastes are potentially re-usable, we often discard today what a generation ago we saved. Most bottles, for example, now are "non-returnable." We reprocess used paper less than we used to, not only adding to the burden on municipal sanitation services but also making wasteful use of scarce timberlands. Often the least expensive way to dispose of an old automobile is to abandon it—and millions of people do precisely that, creating eyesores for millions of others.

One way to meet the problem of solid wastes is simply to surrender to it: to continue pouring more and more public money into collection and disposal of whatever happens to be privately produced and discarded. This is the old way; it amounts to a public subsidy of waste pollution. If we are ever truly to gain

control of the problem, our goal must be broader: to reduce the volume of wastes and the difficulty of their disposal, and to encourage their constructive re-use instead.

To accomplish this, we need incentives, regulations and research directed especially at two major goals: a) making products more easily disposable—especially containers, which are designed for disposal; and b) re-using and recycling a far greater proportion of waste materials.

As we look toward the long-range future—to 1980, 2000 and beyond—recycling of materials will become increasingly necessary not only for waste disposal but also to conserve resources. While our population grows, each one of us keeps using more of the earth's resources. In the case of many common minerals, more than half those extracted from the earth since time began have been extracted since 1910.

A great deal of our space research has been directed toward creating self-sustaining environments, in which people can live for long periods of time by re-processing, recycling and re-using the same materials. We need to apply this kind of thinking more consciously and more broadly to our patterns of use and disposal of materials here on earth.

Many currently used techniques of solid waste disposal remain crudely deficient. Research and development programs under the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965 have added significantly to our knowledge of more efficient techniques. The Act expires this year. I recommend its extension, and I have already moved to broaden its programs.

I have ordered a re-direction of research under the Solid Waste Disposal Act to place greater emphasis on techniques for re-cycling materials, and on development and use of packaging and other materials which will degrade after use—that is, which will become temporary rather than permanent wastes.

Few of America's eyesores are so unsightly as its millions of junk automobiles.

Ordinarily, when a car is retired from use it goes first to a wrecker, who strips it of its valuable parts, and then to a scrap processor, who reduces the remainder to scrap for sale to steel mills. The prices paid by wreckers for junk cars often are less than the cost of transporting them to the wrecking yard. In the case of a severely damaged or "cannibalized" car, instead of paying for it the wrecker may even charge towing costs. Thus the final owner's economic incentive to deliver his car for processing is slight, non-existent or even negative.

The rate of abandonment is increasing. In New York City, 2,500 cars were towed away as abandoned on the streets in 1960. In 1964, 25,000 were towed away as abandoned; in 1969, more than 50,000.

The way to provide the needed incentive is to apply to the automobile the principle that its price should include not only the cost of producing it, but also the cost of disposing of it.

I have asked the Council on Environmental Quality to take the lead in pro-

ducing a recommendation for a bounty payment or other system to promote the prompt scrapping of all junk automobiles.

The particular disposal problems presented by the automobile are unique. However, wherever appropriate we should also seek to establish incentives and regulations to encourage the re-use, re-cycling or easier disposal of other commonly used goods.

I have asked the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality to work with the Cabinet Committee on the Environment, and with appropriate industry and consumer representatives, toward development of such incentives and regulations for submission to the Congress.

PARKS AND PUBLIC RECREATION

Increasing population, increasing mobility, increasing incomes and increasing leisure will all combine in the years ahead to rank recreational facilities among the most vital of our public resources. Yet land suitable for such facilities, especially near heavily populated areas, is being rapidly swallowed up.

Plain common sense argues that we give greater priority to acquiring now the lands that will be so greatly needed in a few years. Good sense also argues that the Federal Government itself, as the nation's largest landholder, should address itself more imaginatively to the question of making optimum use of its own holdings in a recreation-hungry era.

I propose full funding in fiscal 1971 of the \$327 million available through the Land and Water Conservation Fund for additional park and recreational facilities, with increased emphasis on locations that can be easily reached by the people in crowded urban areas.

I propose that we adopt a new philosophy for the use of Federally-owned lands, treating them as a precious resource—like money itself—which should be made to serve the highest possible public good.

Acquiring needed recreation areas is a real estate transaction. One third of all the land in the United States—more than 750,000,000 acres—is owned by the Federal Government. Thousands of acres in the heart of metropolitan areas are reserved for only minimal use by Federal installations. To supplement the regularly-appropriated funds available, nothing could be more appropriate than to meet new real estate needs through use of presently-owned real estate, whether by transfer, sale or conversion to a better use.

Until now, the uses to which Federally-owned properties were put has largely been determined by who got them first. As a result, countless properties with enormous potential as recreation areas linger on in the hands of agencies that could just as well—or better—locate elsewhere. Bureaucratic inertia is compounded by a quirk of present accounting procedures, which has the effect of imposing a budgetary penalty on an agency that gives up one piece of property and moves to another, even if the vacated property is sold for 10 times the cost of the new.

The time has come to make more

rational use of our enormous wealth of real property, giving a new priority to our newly urgent concern with public recreation—and to make more imaginative use of properties now surplus to finance acquisition of properties now needed.

—By Executive Order, I am directing the heads of all Federal agencies and the Administrator of General Services to institute a review of all Federally-owned real properties that should be considered for other uses. The test will be whether a particular property's continued present use or another would better serve the public interest, considering both the agency's needs and the property's location. Special emphasis will be placed on identifying properties that could appropriately be converted to parks and recreation areas, or sold, so that proceeds can be made available to provide additional park and recreation lands.

—I am establishing a Property Review Board to review the GSA reports and recommend to me what properties should be converted or sold. This Board will consist of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality and the Administrator of General Services, plus others that I may designate.

—I propose legislation to establish, for the first time, a program for relocating Federal installations that occupy locations that could better be used for other purposes.

This would allow a part of the proceeds from the sales of surplus properties to be used for relocating such installations, thus making more land available.

I also propose accompanying legislation to protect the Land and Water Conservation Fund, ensuring that its sources of income would be maintained and possibly increased for purchasing additional parkland.

The net effect would be to increase our capacity to add new park and recreational facilities, by enabling us for the first time to use surplus property sales in a coordinated three-way program: a) by direct conversion from other uses; b) through sale of presently-owned properties and purchase of others with the proceeds; and c) by sale of one Federal property, and use of the proceeds to finance the relocation and conversion costs of making another property available for recreational use.

—I propose that the Department of the Interior be given authority to convey surplus real property to State and local governments for park and recreation purposes at a public benefit discount ranging up to 100 percent.

—I propose that Federal procedures be revised to encourage Federal agencies to make efficient use of real property. This revision should remove the budgetary penalty now imposed on agencies relinquishing one site and moving to another.

As one example of what such a property review can make possible, a sizable stretch of one of California's finest beaches has long been closed to the public because it was part of Camp

Pendleton. Last month the Defense Department arranged to make more than a mile of that beach available to the State of California for use as a State park. The remaining beach is sufficient for Camp Pendleton's needs; thus the released stretch represents a shift from low-priority to high-priority use. By carefully weighing alternative uses, a priceless recreational resource was returned to the people for recreational purposes.

Another vast source of potential parklands also lies untapped. We have come to realize that we have too much land available for growing crops and not enough land for parks, open space and recreation.

—I propose that instead of simply paying each year to keep this land idle, we help local governments buy selected parcels of it to provide recreational facilities for use by the people of towns in rural areas. This program has been tried, but allowed to lapse; I propose that we revive and expand it.

—I propose that we also adopt a program of long-term contracts with private owners of idled farmland, providing for its reforestation and public use for such pursuits as hunting, fishing, hiking and picnicking.

ORGANIZING FOR ACTION

The environmental problems we face are deep-rooted and widespread. They can be solved only by a full national effort embracing not only sound, coordinated planning, but also an effective follow-through that reaches into every community in the land. Improving our surroundings is necessarily the business of us all.

At the Federal level, we have begun the process of organizing for this effort.

The Council on Environmental Quality has been established. This Council will be the keeper of our environmental conscience, and a goad to our ingenuity; beyond this, it will have responsibility for ensuring that all our programs and actions are undertaken with a careful respect for the needs of environmental quality. I have already assigned it major responsibilities for new program development, and I shall look to it increasingly for new initiatives.

The Cabinet Committee on the Environment, which I created last year, acts as a coordinating agency for various departmental activities affecting the environment.

To meet future needs, many organizational changes will still be needed. Federal institutions for dealing with the environment and natural resources have developed piecemeal over the years in response to specific needs, not all of which were originally perceived in the light of the concerns we recognize today. Many of their missions appear to overlap, and even to conflict. Last year I asked the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization, headed by Mr. Roy Ash, to make an especially thorough study of the organization of Federal environmental, natural resource and oceanographic programs, and to report its recommendations to me by April 15. After receiving their report, I shall rec-

ommend needed reforms, which will involve major reassignments of responsibilities among Departments.

For many of the same reasons, overlaps in environmental programs extend to the Legislative as well as the Executive branch, so that close consultation will be necessary before major steps are taken.

No matter how well organized government itself might be, however, in the final analysis the key to success lies with the people of America.

Private industry has an especially crucial role. Its resources, its technology, its demonstrated ingenuity in solving problems others only talk about—all these are needed, not only in helping curb the pollution industry itself creates but also in helping devise new and better ways of enhancing all aspects of our environment.

I have ordered that the United States Patent Office give special priority to the processing of applications for patents which could aid in curbing environmental abuses.

Industry already has begun moving swiftly toward a fuller recognition of its own environmental responsibilities, and has made substantial progress in many areas. However, more must be done.

Mobilizing industry's resources requires organization. With a remarkable degree of unanimity, its leaders have indicated their readiness to help.

I will shortly ask a group of the nation's principal industrial leaders to join me in establishing a National Industrial Pollution Control Council.

The Council will work closely with the Council on Environmental Quality, the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, the Secretary of Commerce and others as appropriate in the development of effective policies for the curbing of air, water, noise and waste pollution from industrial sources. It will work to enlist increased support from business and industry in the drive to reduce pollution, in all its forms, to the minimum level possible. It will provide a mechanism through which, in many cases, government can work with key leaders in various industries to establish voluntary programs for accomplishing desired pollution-control goals.

Patterns of organization often turn out to be only as good as the example set by the organizer. For years, many Federal facilities have themselves been among the worst polluters. The Executive order I issued last week not only accepted responsibility for putting a swift end to Federal pollution, but puts teeth into the commitment.

I hope this will be an example for others.

At the turn of the century, our chief environmental concern was to conserve what we had—and out of this concern grew the often embattled but always determined "conservation" movement. Today, "conservation" is as important as ever—but no longer is it enough to conserve what we have; we must also restore what we have lost. We have to go beyond conservation to embrace restoration.

The task of cleaning up our environment calls for a total mobilization by all

of us. It involves governments at every level; it requires the help of every citizen. It cannot be a matter of simply sitting back and blaming someone else. Neither is it one to be left to a few hundred leaders. Rather, it presents us with one of those rare situations in which each individual everywhere has an opportunity to make a special contribution to his country as well as his community.

Through the Council on Environmental Quality, through the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, and working with Governors and Mayors and county officials and with concerned private groups, we shall be reaching out in an effort to enlist millions of helping hands, millions of willing spirits—millions of volunteer citizens who will put to themselves the simple question: "What can I do?"

It is in this way—with vigorous Federal leadership, with active enlistment of governments at every level, with the aid of industry and private groups, and above all with the determined participation by individual citizens in every state and every community, that we at last will succeed in restoring the kind of environment we want for ourselves, and the kind the generations that come after deserve to inherit.

This task is ours together. It summons our energy, our ingenuity and our conscience in a cause as fundamental as life itself.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 10, 1970.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON OUR NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard President Nixon's message on the environment. I am of course delighted that the President has at long last been converted to a supporter of clean water. Such was not the case 10 years ago. At that time, Congress passed a Federal Water Pollution Control Act sponsored by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK). President Eisenhower vetoed that measure. The President, then the Vice President of the United States, insofar as I know, was in full accord with that veto. At any rate, he has never disavowed it. The House on February 25, 1960, voted 249 to 157 to override the veto, this being short of the required two-thirds. On that occasion House Democrats voted 234 to 27 in favor of clean water, Republicans voted 134 to 15 against clean water. That vote clearly demonstrates how the two parties have always stood on environmental issues. This legislation was repassed in 1961 and approved by President Kennedy.

Even today, however, the President is obviously but a halfhearted convert. It is true that his message today would raise the \$800 million annual contract authority level proposed in his budget message to \$1 billion. This, however, is still below the \$1.25 billion authorization provided by Congress for fiscal year 1971 in the 1966 Clean Water Act. In addition, he proposes to keep the appropriation level for water and sewerlines at \$150 million, approximately its past level. Congress last year provided an author-

ization for this program for next year of \$500 million. Waste treatment plants while of course of vast importance cannot operate in a vacuum. It is absolutely necessary to provide the sewerlines to take the waste to the treatment plants. Smaller communities in particular have found it impossible to take advantage of the waste treatment plant grants without also receiving tandem grants for the required lines.

The President has a considerable amount to say on the subject of air pollution, but conspicuously missing from his message is any explanation as to why when Congress voted to up his appropriation request for air pollution from \$96 million to \$109 million, he chose to veto the Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Even for fiscal year 1971, the President proposes an appropriation under that which Congress voted for the current year.

On the subject of parks and public recreation, the message chose to ignore the open spaces program, on the statute books since 1961, a measure which incidentally House Republicans voted 158 to 7 to kill. The President in his budget message has stressed the importance of providing adequate parks and recreational open spaces particularly in and near cities. This is exactly what the open spaces program—administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development—provides. The President's budget request nevertheless is for but \$75 million, a sum identical to that provided by the Congress for the current fiscal year and some \$10 million below the authorized level for 1971 provided in last year's housing legislation.

President Nixon and the Republican Party are of course to be congratulated for having, even at this late date, reached the point of acknowledging that this Nation is beset by environmental problems and now espousing programs, if somewhat halfheartedly, formulated and enacted into law by the Democratic Party a decade ago. But the needs are greater today than they were then, and it is obvious that the Democratic 91st Congress will have to enlarge and reshape the President's proposals if America's natural heritage is to be saved for posterity.

We Democrats are of course delighted that the Republicans, as evidenced by the President's message, have successfully traveled the long intellectual road from the 19th century to 1960. But the 1960's are over. The Republican Party is obviously weary from its long journey and can proceed not another mile forward. It will be necessary for us Democrats then to provide the answers to the environmental problems of the seventies. President Nixon's message is solid evidence that the Republican Party is lacking in either the insight or commitment to accomplish this.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE ENVIRONMENT: THE ACTION DECADE BEGINS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the President's message to Congress and to the American public on the subject of our Nation's environment will become the

single most important document of this administration. In fact, it may well become the most important Presidential message of the decade of the 1970's. President Nixon, as no other President in our history, has outlined a program of Federal, State, and local attack on problems heretofore largely ignored—problems which everyone realizes must be solved.

The President's message is courageous to a fault—it is not the standard fare that "big brother" will solve the problem of environmental pollution if only given enough money. No, the President states simply and eloquently that the way to solve the adverse environmental situation created by our unparalleled economic and technological growth is through total cooperation of all levels of government, with all levels of industry and labor. More important, solutions will come if the individual citizen seizes the opportunities afforded him under the new program and attacks pollution in his immediate environment.

We began the year calling this the Environmental Decade. Henceforth, it should be called the Environmental Action Decade.

The President's leadership in this field was revealed to the public last week with his order to eliminate pollution from Federal Government installations. Never before has the Federal Establishment been directed to set its environmental house in order by a specified date. For years, the pollution caused by the Federal Government has been a concern of the Nation's conservationists; now, something positive and concrete is being done. In short, this administration has acted where others have postured.

The 14-point plan for a total attack on water pollution is a perfect indication of the administration's long term concern for the Nation's environment. This is no one-shot, politically oriented, polemic, but a firm commitment to the people that the Nation's water and waterways will be cleaned up, improved, and protected. An important facet of the overall program to combat water pollution is the President's promise for a reassessment in 1973 of the progress of the plan to that date and the requirements for future years' water pollution efforts.

Calling for industrial users to pay fees sufficient to meet the costs of treating industrial wastes is in line with proposals I have made on the same subject and I am heartened that the principle underlying the clean water trust fund is incorporated in the message. I hope that the principle will be extended to cover those municipalities that discharge pollutants into our waterways sometimes in greater quantities than industrial users. The provisions of the program extending the power of the Government to act legally against polluters is vital to the success of the overall program. As the President's message was being delivered to the Congress, the Justice Department was suing polluters in the Midwest. Again, this is proof positive of the administration's commitment to antipollution action.

Although action may be the single outstanding characteristic of the President's program and activities to date

concerning the protection of our environment, the adjective, innovative, must be applied to the plan to convert some Federal properties for use by the public as recreation areas. This innovation, along with full funding of the land and water conservation fund in fiscal year 1971, is an acknowledgement of the President's awareness of the Government's responsibility to plan ahead for the recreation and open-space needs of citizens suffering from unplanned urbanization.

I was particularly pleased with the President's reference to the problem of solid waste disposal and his recognition of the potential for recycling of the materials which presently create heaps of pollution. One immediately thinks of automobile hulks and although that is a major problem, the solid waste resulting from coal production—culm piles—covering acres upon acres of land in many States is a prime example of the need for a reuse technology. With cosponsors from all the coal-producing States I have introduced a bill, H.R. 14557, which would begin an in-depth study of ways to utilize culm materials.

The call for "national air quality standards" is another giant step forward in the battle to preserve the environment. With the establishment of such standards, combined with strict enforcement of the water quality standards, the Government can move on all fronts against all types of polluters.

Last, but by no means least, the President is to be congratulated for submitting a reasonable plan for financing the fight on environmental pollution. Naturally, there will be those who cry that the program is "not enough" or that "the Federal Government should assume more of the financial burden." The amount proposed is a thousand percent more than expenditures in 1969. Whatever the President proposed would be criticized by politicians who habitually call for "more Federal spending" as the solution to any or all problems. President Nixon, correctly judging that the American people know that "Federal money" is their money, has not attempted to politically soften the individual financial responsibilities of the program. The outline proposals constitute a program for the people—all the people—and all the people as taxpayers will have to share in the financial burden. The President has been honest with the Congress and the Nation on a matter which has so often been confused by fuzzy rhetoric. The proposal submitted today to the Congress will not be "the solution" to the problems of environmental pollution during the environmental action decade—it is only a beginning. But what a beginning.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON OUR NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

(Mr. ROBISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker—

This task is ours together. It summons our energy, our ingenuity and our conscience in a cause as fundamental as life itself.

With those words, Richard Nixon concluded his historic message to this Congress on our natural environment—a most welcome message, as received by us today, and a carefully considered action plan that demands an early and favorable congressional response.

Mr. Speaker, though our problems are many, our challenges innumerable, it seems to me that our President has now properly proclaimed the conservation of our environment as our chief task in this decade—and perhaps for the rest of this century.

Though we have learned to live—albeit uncomfortably—with the knowledge that man now has it within his power through nuclear weaponry to obliterate all human life, we must now learn to understand that the scourge of pollution, absent drastic action on our part, presages a possible devastation as thorough as that contemplated in the event of a nuclear holocaust.

This message today should do much to advance that understanding.

And it is a call to broad-scale action on the part of government at every level, on the part of industry, and on the part of every citizen—a call to action that must be heeded.

I congratulate the President on his message, and I pledge him my full support in the implementation of the environmental programs he has recommended.

POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE, CALIF.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 818 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 818

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3786) to authorize the appropriation of additional funds necessary for acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 818 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 3786 to authorize additional funds necessary for acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California.

The purpose of H.R. 3786 is to authorize an increase of \$38,365,000—from \$19,135,000 to \$57,500,000—in the appropriation for acquisition of land for the Point Reyes National Seashore.

Legislation authorizing establishment of the seashore was approved during the 87th Congress, at which time \$14 million was authorized for the acquisition of lands. In the 89th Congress, an additional \$5,135,000 was authorized. Of the total, \$19,135,000, \$17,037,073 has been appropriated to purchase land and the remaining \$2,097,927 is committed to the settlement of existing condemnation cases.

Land price escalation has outdistanced appropriations; reliable cost estimates were not available originally; and the land exchange program contemplated by the act did not work as expected. However, a substantial investment has been made and if the area is to be a useful part of the national park system, then the authorization must be increased.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 818 in order that H.R. 3786 may be considered.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the appropriations of additional funds to assure the acquisition of all remaining non-Federal lands needed to make the Point Reyes National Seashore a successful part of the national park system.

The 87th Congress authorized the purchase of 64,546 acres of land for the park, and authorized \$14,000,000 for this acquisition. At that time it was not expected that it would be necessary to acquire lands located within a "pastoral zone" as long as it was used for ranching and dairying purposes. Land values quickly increased and lands within the pastoral zones were threatened with subdivision.

The 89th Congress responded with an additional authorization of \$5,135,000 for land acquisition. Thus far some \$17,037,073 has been expended on the purchase of some 28,776 acres and \$2,097,927 is committed to the settlement of condemnation cases involving almost 400 acres.

Land costs have continued to rise and the presently owned Federal lands are not contiguous. A substantial investment has been made at Point Reyes and the value of a completed park has increased with population expansion and other uses of available land in the general area.

The bill authorizes the appropriation of an additional \$38,365,000, bringing the total authorizations to \$57,500,000 for the park. This figure is \$5,000,000 above current National Park Service estimates. All funds will be made available from moneys credited to the Land and Water Conservation Fund in the Treasury. This use of the funds will not prejudice any presently planned land acquisition programs for other parks or recreation areas in fiscal 1970. In 1971,

however, this earmarking of the moneys may cause other park sites to be slighted.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) has filed minority views opposing the bill. He believes it changes our basic philosophy concerning the funding of authorized national parks and recreation areas. He points out that the Bureau of the Budget does not support this approach—as evidenced by its letter of September 10, 1969—because it would require that other planned acquisition be curtailed and funds shifted to Point Reyes. He believes that a number of other national parks have an equally good case and that this bill places one park in a preferred position.

The Department of the Interior supports additional funding for land acquisition at Point Reyes. The Bureau of the Budget believes it will cause the curtailment of other planned purchases.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3786) to authorize the appropriation of additional funds necessary for acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3786, with Mr. WATTS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) will be recognized for one-half hour and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) will be recognized for one-half hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before the House is an easily understandable bill. It should not be a controversial bill. It is a bill which is drafted to fulfill a commitment which the Congress made to the people of this Nation in 1962—to make the Point Reyes Peninsula in California a national seashore. To accomplish this objective, H.R. 3786, if enacted, would increase the amount of money authorized to be appropriated for land acquisition from \$19,135,000 to \$57,500,000—an increase of \$38,365,000. The bill, as reported, also provides that none of the lands acquired with these funds are to be resold or leased for any resi-

dential or commercial purposes, except as authorized by law.

As briefly as possible, I want to explain the background which causes this legislation to be before the Members of the House.

Many Members will recall that, when the Point Reyes National Seashore was authorized in 1962, it was estimated that this superb outdoor area could be acquired for \$14 million. Subsequent events proved this authorization to be grossly inadequate. Not only was the estimate based on extremely poor data—rather than competent appraisals—but land prices began to escalate as soon as the Federal Government began to show an interest in the property. The cost estimates also suffered from the fact that the early years of the land exchange program were severely frustrated so as to be an ineffective tool in keeping cash costs minimal. Adding to the problem, lands in the so-called pastoral zone, which were to be retained in private ownership, were threatened with adverse uses totally incompatible with the objectives of the seashore.

Some of these problems might not have been so critical if cash had been available to move promptly forward with the necessary acquisitions. Our report in 1962, and the act itself, implored the Secretary to acquire the lands with dispatch, but funds were slow in coming.

As a result of all of these handicaps, it was necessary to bring this matter before the 89th Congress. At that time, a stopgap measure was considered which had as its limited objective authorizing \$5,135,000 for the acquisition of six specific tracts of land located within the boundaries of the seashore. While it was recognized that there would be a "need for a very considerable increase" in the authorization ceiling, intensive studies were to be made prior to further action by the Congress.

Now we have come a little further. All but about \$2 million of the \$19,135,000 authorized has actually been appropriated and put to use, and the remainder is allocated to acquisitions still being litigated. In 1966, we said that it might be necessary to increase the ceiling to \$57,500,000 based on information supplied to the committee. H.R. 3786 authorizes this amount to be appropriated—hopefully in the immediate years ahead. The one thing that we have learned is that these costs do not diminish with the passage of time. The President has indicated a willingness to move forward with requests for funds as soon as the authorization is approved. This action should not be discouraged; we should move forward as rapidly as possible to complete this program.

I want to point out that the amount included in the bill exceeds the amount which the Department suggested was needed by \$5 million. Normally, the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs do not recommend a ceiling in excess of the amounts suggested by the Department, but in this case we felt fully justified in doing so:

First, because our ceiling was based on data supplied to the committee prior to the submission of the revised amounts recommended by the Department;

Second, because we recognize the difficulties in making accurate estimates when the time frame is not fixed. In fact, the National Park Service has already found it necessary to increase the amounts recommended in the departmental report due to more up-to-date cost information; and

Third, because we want to be able to assure the Members of this House that it will not be necessary to bring this matter up again.

It should be emphasized that we hope we are proven wrong. In the long history of disappointments associated with this land acquisition program, it would be a happy ending if the National Park Service could complete the acquisition of the remaining lands at a cost figure below the ceiling. This is their responsibility. The Director of the National Park Service told us that he had no objection to the higher figure because, he added:

I am not going to spend one dime more than I have to spend, no matter what you authorize.

Before I conclude, I want to say that these funds will be requested as an appropriation from the land and water conservation fund. That fund is the exclusive source of revenues for the Nation's outdoor recreation program, in general. Everyone is aware of the fact that legislation was enacted during the 90th Congress which raised the level of the fund to \$200 million annually for a 5-year period. At no time since that action was taken has any administration, regardless of party, fully utilized the financial resources which were available.

Mr. Chairman, I think that it is important that the Members of this House recognize that the mandate which they gave to the Chief Executive in this respect has been largely ignored. Moneys have been allowed to accumulate in the fund while land acquisition programs—like this one at Point Reyes—have been permitted to falter. There is no economy in holding moneys in a fund where they may draw 4 or 5 percent interest, when they could be put to active use in authorized areas where price escalation is running upward from 10 to 15, and 20 percent per annum.

My friend from Pennsylvania, who wrote some strong minority views in this report, and I are in agreement on this point. We both believe that all of the moneys in the fund should be promptly put to effective and efficient use. We both feel we have been betrayed by the bureaucrats downtown who have deliberately ignored the congressional mandate implicit in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act Amendments of 1969. We both know that only \$111.5 million of the \$200 million available in the fund was requested in fiscal year 1969, and we also know that only \$124 million of the \$288.5 million available in the fund in fiscal year 1970 was requested. Now we are both extremely concerned about the President's 1971 budget which, on its face, requests actual appropriations of only \$168.5 million of the \$364.5 million which is available in the fund and which can be legally used for no other purpose.

If these funds were not sorely needed we would not have urged the enactment of the land and water conservation fund

legislation during the 90th Congress. And more importantly, if the funds are not to be requested then the program to which they are dedicated is seriously and needlessly jeopardized. Both my colleague and I will be very interested in analyzing the President's message on the environment in detail to ascertain if and how this administration plans to utilize these financial resources. If the President, as he suggests, is ready to make these funds work for the program, then there is no reason why the Congress cannot proceed with the consideration and approval of this legislation for Point Reyes and comparable legislation for Cape Cod. I have also written to the Secretary of the Interior asking him to forward to us the views of his Department on such proposed authorization as the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, Gulf Islands National Seashore, and the Voyageurs National Park. If the President means business about the "environment" that we are hearing so much about, then our committee stands ready to hear the arguments concerning the merits of these and other matters of importance to the people of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3786 will be only a page in the middle of a big book. It could well mark the end of a decade of progress in the annals of conservation history, but it could also mark the beginning of a new decade of constructive achievements where the objectives of the past can become the realities of the present. We can make the Point Reyes National Seashore a reality if we enact this legislation and follow through with the funds.

I hope the Members of this House will join me in supporting the enactment of this important measure. I urge the approval of H.R. 3786.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I rise in support of the legislation despite the fact that the committee report, as filed, includes my minority views in opposition to the present enactment of this bill. The reason I filed minority views is not because Point Reyes is not a good project and not that the area should not be preserved and the land acquired. I objected to picking out Point Reyes and authorizing its acquisition in preference to all the other projects that have been authorized by Congresses in years gone by and that also need immediate financing.

Since I filed those minority views, three items have come to my attention which I would like to report to this committee.

First, under date of February 6, I received a letter from Robert P. Mayo, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The letter follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1970.

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: We are writing with further reference to your recent questions about the item included in the President's 1971 budget of \$188.9 million of budget authority proposed for later transmittal under the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

While the specific use of the funds has

not been completely worked out, certain aspects of the Administration's program are now clear.

The funds will be used to support parkland acquisition, both Federal and State, in places located throughout the country.

It is expected that only a limited portion of the \$188.9 million will be used for proposed new national park or recreation areas.

The main emphasis, insofar as Federal recreation lands are concerned, will be on acquisition in currently authorized areas—including some areas on which legislation is needed to increase existing appropriation authorization.

We expect that we will be able, shortly, to further clarify the proposals which will be made pursuant to this budgetary provision. If we can be of further assistance please let us know.

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. MAYO,
Director.

Mr. Chairman, I also have a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, dated February 10, 1970. That letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, February 10, 1970.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: This will respond to your inquiry concerning the proposed usage of the \$188.9 million shown in the President's FY 1971 budget to be expended from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, in addition to the basic budget request of \$188.5 million. The staff of the Department has nearly completed preparation of a proposed breakdown for expenditure of the \$188.9 million, and the bulk of those funds allocated for Federal acquisition would be used for acquisition of presently authorized areas (including areas for which an increase in the authorized ceiling would be required).

I am anxious, as you know, to develop new directions in the general park land acquisition program. In terms of immediate priorities, however, I recognize the urgent need to complete acquisition of those areas which have been already authorized. Accordingly, the overall program for FY 1971 will be directed to a large degree toward that objective.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. HICKEL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Just a few minutes ago Members heard read by the reading clerk the President's message, dated February 10, 1970, in which the President states on page 10:

I propose full funding in fiscal 1971 of the \$327 million available through the Land and Water Conservation Fund for additional park and recreational facilities . . .

With this assurance from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, from the Secretary of the Interior, and from the President of the United States, this bill should be passed.

I would like to comment on the increased cost. I have been told by some people it is unconscionable—and in many respects it is—because certain people in California have deliberately attempted to increase the price of certain land included within Point Reyes National Seashore.

There is only one way the Congress can keep control of the rising prices in the areas which we desire to acquire for parks and recreation areas, and that is the system which was devised and used and approved by the Congress when we

acquired the Redwoods National Park—simply Congress provides in the bill creating the park or recreation area that the land immediately become the property of the United States, and the only problem then is to pay for it. With this method the costs in the Redwoods have not escalated. But the costs in all of the other areas, whether they be in California, Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, Maryland, or anywhere between, have escalated at the rate of 10, 15, and sometimes 20 percent a year.

Even though the people in the Park Service conscientiously try to give to the House and to the Senate committees their best information and their best appraisals, the failure to finance at once causes Uncle Sam to have to pay these increased prices.

With the request the President has in his message today that the land and water conservation fund be increased, I think it is incumbent now upon the Congress of the United States to take the initiative and to say that parks and recreation areas hereafter authorized should use the formula which we used in the Redwoods, which is to acquire the land at the time the President signs the bill. With this, the value is fixed and the only matter we have then is to determine how it shall be paid and to whom it shall be paid.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this bill be passed.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I know there are other members of the committee who share some of my feelings respecting this bill, but I must speak only for myself at this point.

I do not like to bring a bill like this to the floor. The plain matter of fact is that we got caught with our tweeds at half-mast on the cost on this project.

Congress approved it once because Congress thought it was a worthwhile project. It is a project I think is a fine addition to our national park system.

The amount of money involved is great. We cannot stop at this point, because to do so would be to lose the investment we have already made there.

So I find myself in the position of saying that we just might as well close our eyes and vote this authorization through and get this business out of the way, because the longer we keep it in check the greater the cost is going to be.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to say to my colleague, I agree heartily. If we had used at Point Reyes the same formula which we used in the redwoods we would have had the use of this park for 10 years, at the price we could have bought it for 10 years ago.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KYL. We cannot lay the blame for the problem which has developed on somebody else, because the Congress did what it did. This example should be remembered in the future when we come to similar cases. We did some unrealistic

things. We locked land in a single land use for all future time, defying all reason and all logic. Then we got a problem which has to be solved in this fashion. There is a lesson here, and we had better learn that lesson for the future.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my colleague from South Dakota.

Mr. REIFEL. I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as well as the ranking minority member of the committee and the entire committee, for bringing this bill to the floor so that we can vote it into law.

There is one part of the President's message, from which the gentleman quoted, which I consider to be important: increased emphasis on locations that can be easily reached by the people in crowded urban areas.

I spent some time a few years ago in this area, and I visited the land set aside for the park near the city of San Francisco.

It has been the feeling of the chairman of our Subcommittee on Appropriations having to do with the Interior Department and related agencies, the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), and the members—and we have stressed for the last 2 or 3 years—that it is important to obtain property for parks near the city areas where there are people who need recreational opportunities. These should be within walking distance, if possible, and certainly within a few hours of riding distance by bus or car, or even by hitchhiking.

This is one area where this can be accomplished, so I commend the Committee for its action today.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, as coauthor of legislation we have before us today, I rise to advise my colleagues here in the House of Representatives that the need for favorable consideration of this legislation is urgent. The situation we now face at Point Reyes National Seashore is serious.

In addition to the general problem of land price escalation, more magnified at Point Reyes than at any other unit of the national park system, there is an immediate threat to the magnificent national seashore we have begun there. The threat is the imminent subdivision of the 2,400-acre Lake Ranch, which has been called the jewel of Point Reyes Peninsula.

The owners, the Sweet family of Coos Bay, Oreg., do not want to subdivide the property. They believe that the Lake Ranch should be part of the national seashore. Since the seashore was authorized in 1962, they have been waiting for the National Park Service to acquire this land. But the Park Service has used up or committed all the funds we have authorized and appropriated to date, often in order to step in and halt subdivision of other properties. Now, members of the Sweet family say they can no longer

carry the financial burden of the property taxes on the ranch, amounting to about \$22,000 in 1968 alone. Grazing leases yield only \$2,400 in return. The Sweet family is to be commended for its willingness to hold back the developers in order that this may be a national recreation facility. However, there is a limit to how long they can carry this financial burden by themselves. It should be emphasized that the Lake Ranch is critical to the success of the national seashore.

First of all, there is its location. It cuts across the full width of the peninsula and the national seashore area, from Inverness Ridge on the east to the Pacific Ocean on the west. The terrain ranges from the 1,200-foot fir and pine-covered ridge—from which one can see downtown San Francisco, incidentally—to the bluffs of Double Point, one of the peninsula's landmarks, and the ranch's 2 miles of ocean beach. If the Lake Ranch were to be subdivided, visitors to the northern portions of the national seashore would be, in effect, cut off from the southernmost portions.

The remarkable characteristics of this property include the lakes for which it is named. The pelicans and other sea birds come in from the ocean to these seven fresh-water lakes to drink and to wash the salt from their feathers. The shoreline here includes Seal Beach where hundreds of seals raise their pups. The Lake Ranch also is noted for the variety of its upland game and waterfowl, and the abundance of its wild flowers. This diversity and abundance of so many different forms of life has caused the Park Service to propose that the national seashore's nature center and principal nature trails and nature education activities should be located here.

All in all, the Lake Ranch still epitomizes what the National Park Service found when it surveyed all of our ocean shorelines a decade or so ago and reported:

The Point Reyes Peninsula provides a combination of scenic, recreation, and biologic interests which can be found nowhere else in this country as near to a large center of population.

There are other properties within the boundaries of this national seashore that are not yet in public ownership, including many of its 45 miles of beaches, but none is in such a strategic location or presents such a superlative combination of natural and scenic values as does the Lake Ranch.

If we do not act promptly, as time goes on more and more of the peninsula's extraordinary natural values will be lost.

I was, therefore, honored to sponsor, along with so many other members of the California delegation, the legislation before us which would clear the way for sufficient funds to finish the work that was begun by our late colleague, Clem Miller.

As Congressman MILLER and the late Senator Clair Engle, who took the lead in the Senate to save Point Reyes, said when they joined to introduce their Point Reyes National Seashore bills 8 years ago:

If we act sensibly and foresightedly now, while the opportunity remains, we shall have preserved for America priceless heritage to be enjoyed many times over, not only by our generation, but also by those which follow.

Now I would like to comment on land price escalation at Point Reyes.

It may be useful to review the situation 8 years ago, when we authorized this project with an authorization limiting appropriations for land acquisition to \$14 million.

The \$14 million figure was set after the Park Service estimated that the public-use portions of the seashore could be secured within that amount. This figure was arrived at by reducing a total estimated cost of \$35 million by some \$21 million, as follows: \$9 million, estimated value of lands to be acquired by exchange for Federal land elsewhere; \$10 million, estimated value of lands the ranching area or pastoral zone which it was assumed at the time need not be acquired, and \$2 million, estimated value of the A.T. & T., REC, and Vedanta Society lands which it was assumed need not be acquired.

In its report on the 1962 bill, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs noted that it believed the \$14 million figure would be adequate only if several assumptions proved to be true. As summarized later, in 1966 by the Committee—House Report 2067, 89th Congress, second session—these assumptions were—

(1) that the land prices prevailing at the time the appraisal on which the figures was based was made, would remain approximately constant for a few years at least;

(2) that the land acquisition program would be started and carried out promptly;

(3) that a certain portion of the land could be acquired by exchanges rather than by payment of cash; and

(4) that a 26,000-acre pastoral zone within the boundaries of the National Seashore would continue . . . and that little, if any, of the land in this zone would have to be acquired to preserve its character.

None of these assumptions, of course, has proven correct.

The committee report noted this in 1966, when it raised the appropriation limitation to \$19,135,000. It reported then that—

(1) Land prices have risen rapidly and are continuing to do so.

(2) The acquisition program got off to a relatively slow start.

(3) Large-scale use of the exchange authority has been frustrated by developments in an adjoining state (a reference to the objections of the then Governor of Oregon to a proposed exchange of the Lake Ranch at Point Reyes for some BLM timberland in Oregon).

(4) Parts of the pastoral zone have been subdivided and threatened with subdivisions, the development of which will be incompatible with the intended public use and enjoyment of the National Seashore.

The 1966 committee report concluded:

The net result is that there is need for a very considerable increase in the present limitation on appropriations. While the present bill proposes an immediate increase of \$5,135,000 to take care of six specific tracts of land totaling 3,707 acres, the Committee is fully aware of the fact that this is a stop-gap measure and that there will be need for further increases—perhaps to \$57,500,000—before the seashore is fully established.

Since passage of the 1962 act, land price escalation at Point Reyes has averaged from 10 to 20 percent a year. The price rise has been as fast as it has in part because of its location—only some 20 to 30 airline miles from San Francisco.

We should not forget that Cape Cod and Point Reyes were the first of the national seashores and lakeshores of the 1960's. Not only were these the first major units of the national park system to be acquired entirely or even largely with appropriated funds, they were the first so near major metropolitan areas. It was in these respects, an entirely new ball game for the National Park Service and for this committee.

The breakthrough was in line with major recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. If there was one highest priority recommendation for on-the-ground action in the ORRRC report, it was that undeveloped shorelines near metropolitan areas and threatened by incompatible encroachment should be acquired for the public benefit.

Since we began this new era in the history of our national park system, we have learned a great deal. We have learned that we must shorten the timelag between authorization and acquisition. In 1968, we gave the National Park Service for the first time authority to contract for options to acquire land in advance of actual appropriation of funds. And, of course, we authorized more adequate annual financing of the land and water conservation fund—for which we now need full funding at the \$200 million level as we authorized.

Although our experience at Point Reyes has been unfortunate from the standpoint of early completion of the land acquisition program there, it is one of the most instructive examples of the price escalation problem we have experienced. As a result of what we have learned at Point Reyes, we have already begun to improve the land acquisition policies and procedures for the whole national park system.

Mr. Chairman, each of my colleagues today received in the mail a Sierra Club poster portraying the beauty of Point Reyes. May I end this admittedly lengthy discussion of the problems that we face in California in connection with the Seashore by reminding you of this poster and say as I said in my cover letter, "One picture is worth 10,000 words." May I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support the enactment of this legislation so that we can get on with the work we have begun at the Point Reyes National Seashore.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I will not take the entire 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the bill has been ably presented to the Members on the floor by the chairman and the ranking minority member, who have enunciated the problems we have faced in advancing this project to its current position.

I do want to take time to single out, in particular, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) and also the members of the committee, to state how much I appreciate the priority consideration they have given to the advancement of this very unique conservation gem, known as the Island in Time, the Point Reyes National Seashore.

Again, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) has shown, as he did on the Redwood National Park, that he is a man of his word. At that time, I asked for early consideration of the Point Reyes proposal. Today you are seeing the results. This very able, kindly, considerate, and dedicated gentleman from Colorado has, once again, proven to be a staunch friend of conservation. History will record his great efforts and all Americans will enjoy and appreciate his extraordinary contributions to the national park and seashore system.

Mr. Chairman, as one of the principal authors of the legislation to complete the Point Reyes National Seashore, now before the House, I want to urge, in the strongest manner possible, prompt and affirmative action on this proposal.

The Point Reyes National Seashore was originally authorized by the 87th Congress, but this original authorization, plus a supplemental appropriation by the 89th Congress, proved to be insufficient to acquire the necessary property to complete the seashore, primarily due to escalating land values.

At present, the total authorization for Point Reyes is \$19,350,000. The National Park Service has estimated that in order to complete this conservation gem on the north coast of California, an additional \$38 million is required. The legislation now under consideration will authorize these needed funds.

Quite frankly, we are faced with a half-completed, half-usable national seashore that is desperately in need of funds to complete the project. Even in its half-finished state, the Park Service recorded nearly 1 million visitors during 1969.

In my judgment, the Point Reyes National Seashore, which is located just a few miles north of the Golden Gate Bridge and San Francisco, has the potential for one of the finest conservation projects ever undertaken in this country. The general area is one of true natural beauty that is superbly adaptable for park purposes and its close proximity to a major metropolitan complex provides untold opportunities for recreation and for people to enjoy the beauties of nature that abound there.

The need for immediate action is extremely urgent. The threat of imminent subdivision of one of the most beautiful areas of the seashore is a very real and present one. The county of Marin, in which the seashore is located, has all but exhausted all legal means aimed at delaying or preventing this subdivision. It is therefore up to this Congress to provide the necessary funds to prevent the desecration of the land within the boundaries of the seashore.

President Nixon, in anticipation of the passage of this legislation and recognizing the urgent nature of the problem, an-

nounced on November 18, following a meeting with Chairman ASPINALL, Senator MURPHY, and me, that his administration would make the funds available for this project. Since that time, in his budget submitted to the Congress, the President specifically earmarked funds for the Point Reyes project, in the event of passage by the Congress of the necessary authorizing legislation.

Every major conservation organization in the country has announced support of this bill as well as all local governmental units and political subdivisions in the area of the seashore. Governor Reagan has personally announced his unqualified support as has the California State Assembly by official resolution. In addition, I have received and forwarded to the White House more than 400,000 signatures from residents of the San Francisco Bay area and throughout the State of California urging prompt and favorable action by the Congress to complete the seashore.

Therefore, in closing, I respectfully urge my colleagues to assist in providing this generation and future generations with the opportunity to share one of the country's greatest natural assets by making possible the completion of this conservation package that will mean so much to so many.

A half-completed seashore is totally unacceptable and any further delays in providing the needed funds will only compound an already difficult problem and could seriously jeopardize completion of the project for all time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN).

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to speak, once again, to the issue of Point Reyes National Seashore. As you know, and as most Members of this body know, this has been an issue of long-standing interest with me. Nine years ago, my former colleague and dear friend, the late Congressman Clem Miller and I introduced the original legislation to authorize the establishment of Point Reyes National Seashore.

In 1962, President Kennedy signed a bill which established the boundaries of Point Reyes and authorized Congress to appropriate up to \$14 million to purchase it from private owners for use as a national seashore. The House subsequently approved an additional \$5 million. Of the total 54,000 acres available, some 22,000, less than half of the original authorized acreage, has been purchased with the total \$19 million appropriation.

The park today is a series of fragmented patches with little territorial continuity. It has been the subject of untold controversy, and on several occasions was almost lost to bulldozing and subdividing interests.

I have continued the fight to save Point Reyes ever since. This area, poetically described as an "Island in Time" is held by some as a monument to natural beauty and to man's aspirations. This effort is bipartisan in nature and has the support of most of the California delegation, including both of our Senators.

I know that many more of my colleagues in the House share my interest and enthusiasm in conservation projects and my sincere belief in the need to preserve that small part of this country that remains natural and free. Point Reyes is an excellent example of this type of terrain—a wild, unfettered expanse, an embodiment of the soul of this country.

Popular support and demand both in California and throughout the Nation has been overwhelming. The Appropriations Committee has indicated their support for this effort by sending this bill to the floor for our decision, and most importantly, the administration has finally expressed support for Point Reyes by approving the expenditure of the funds necessary to complete the purchase of the remaining acres.

The President's recent budget message has earmarked \$7.1 million as a supplemental appropriation for Point Reyes for this fiscal year, and an additional \$188.9 million for fiscal year 1971 for Point Reyes and "other recently authorized recreation areas." Not only is this a bonus for those of us behind the Point Reyes project, but all conservationists can take heart for the many other priceless parklands in this country that have long been fought for now stand a good chance of being completed.

It is gratifying to me to have administration support for Point Reyes, but it is also equally satisfying and important to have the administration acknowledge the real need and demand for increased outdoor recreation facilities. The President's budget request surely underscores the true value of preserving and protecting areas of natural wilderness.

The passage of this bill will not be a preferential action and will in no way detract from acquiring other sorely needed and desired national parklands. The \$7.1 million approved for this year will be in the form of a supplemental appropriation, in no way jeopardizing other previously planned park acquisitions for fiscal year 1970. The additional moneys requested by the President for fiscal year 1971 are for Point Reyes and "other recently authorized recreation areas."

It is my understanding that the National Park Service and the Bureau of the Budget have jointly worked out a planning schedule and timetable for parkland acquisition. The President's request including funds for Point Reyes in no way jeopardizes this schedule, but rather includes the acquisition of Point Reyes as one among other authorized parklands to be secured.

This bill has been with us for many years. The will of the Congress was clear when it first approved the establishment of Point Reyes as a national seashore some years ago. This important land has been hanging in the balance for too long. The case is imminent; the threat of subdivision and bulldozing is real; its effect would be disastrous, and would be directly contrary to what the Congress initially intended. The President has now realized this and can no longer run the risk of forestalling purchase. If the land is not purchased now, it will not be there to purchase in the

future. Surely we must recognize the values at stake here. Point Reyes is the case in question now, but with completing Point Reyes we may hope to move on toward completing the many other priceless lands that are of prime interest to so many of you. I am convinced that the President's approval of the funds for Point Reyes is indicative of things to come in the area of conservation and preservation of wilderness areas and national parklands. All of us should get behind this effort for it is indeed a nationwide effort. Californians will undoubtedly benefit most immediately and most directly, but all of our citizens have some things to gain. The completion of Point Reyes is only a start in expanding and enhancing the public lands in our national park system.

The current environmental crisis, coupled with our growing concern over the great problems of population explosion, air pollution, the dangers of pesticides, and other ecological crises all speak to the need for accessible wilderness areas. Statistics indicate that national parks are utilized mostly by people from densely populated urban areas. However, the availability of such regions is limited and wholly out of proportion to the total population.

The acquisition of the Point Reyes lands would provide 45 unspoiled shore miles with beaches, caves, rocks, and tide pools for public use and enjoyment. Although the majority of visitors are from the densely populated San Francisco Bay area, the national seashore is of great interest to the entire country. Of some 60,000 miles of shoreline in the United States—not including Alaska and Hawaii—less than 2 percent is publicly owned. Point Reyes is a rarity among those rare miles of public beaches; it is the only California coastal area of beaches, cliffs, rolling hills, forest, and pasture not partitioned or paralleled by highway.

Nowhere else in this country is there a recreation area that offers so much near such a large population center. Classified by the U.S. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review as one of the nine most important and relatively unspoiled natural seashores in the United States, it combines manifold scenic, recreational, and biological interests. Topographically, it boasts broad sand beaches, sheer cliffs, rolling pastures, and wooded uplands and ridges.

Due to this topographical diversity, and a variety of climatic pockets, the area supports abundant plant and animal life of many types. Among these are strands of virgin Douglas-fir, the Monterey pine, and the Bishop pine, as well as six specialized varieties of flora found nowhere else in the world. Animal life in the area includes 164 species of birds. It is the southernmost habitat of the mountain beaver, the wintering ground of a large concentration of black brant geese, and the only remainder mainland breeding ground for a seabird known as the California murre. It is one of the few areas from which both sea lions and harbor seals can be seen.

In addition to serving as a refuge for

plant and animal life not easily seen elsewhere, Point Reyes, offers much to those interested in geology and archeology. Originally the home of the Miwok Indians before the arrival of the white man, 113 aboriginal sites are known, and many are believed to be worthy of exploration. Geologically, Point Reyes is unique in that its rock formations are unlike those on the east side of the San Andreas Fault. It is here, too, that the famous fault shows itself above the ocean.

Of interest to such specialists as the geologist and archeologist, Point Reyes offers unlimited possibilities for enjoyment to everyone. The pleasures of camping, hiking, picnicking, fishing, water sports, and riding can be experienced in an atmosphere of great natural beauty. Such beauty, and the rich variety of wildlife that attends it, should be preserved for future generations, in a world where the magnificence and timelessness of places such as Point Reyes are needed more and more.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to give careful and special consideration to this bill. A yes vote will not only secure Point Reyes as part of our national park system, but will also reaffirm this body's commitment to the preservation of wilderness areas and to this country's dwindling natural resources.

In closing, allow me to quote from one man's poetic description of Point Reyes:

We need the sea.

We need a place to stand and watch and listen—to feel the pulse-beat of the world as the surf rolls in.

We need to keep some of our vanishing shoreline an unspoiled place, where all men, a few at a time, can discover what really belongs there—can find their own Island in Time.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD).

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3786, a bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds in order to carry out the program of land acquisition at Point Reyes National Seashore in California. My colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) and I have cosponsored this legislation as a step toward completing Point Reyes and making it a meaningful unit of the national park system.

Recognizing the need to preserve a portion of our diminishing seashore for recreational purposes, the Congress in 1962 approved and the President signed a law establishing the Point Reyes National Seashore. Funds in the amount of \$14 million were appropriated.

By 1966, however, it became evident that, because of rapidly rising land costs, more money would be required. Thus, an additional \$5,135,000 was authorized as a stopgap measure.

To date, these funds have been used to purchase 22,816 acres of the total 54,136 acres intended for acquisition.

Now, H.R. 3786 increases the authorization by \$38,365,000, thus raising the ceiling to a total of \$57,500,000.

As indicated in the report of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, this is the amount considered necessary in order to insure an adequacy of funds for acquisition in an area where land costs are expected to rise. These funds are to be made available through the land and water conservation fund, which was designed specifically to expand our Nation's outdoor recreation resources. The administration has indicated that the money can be allocated during this and the next 2 fiscal years.

It should be obvious that speedy completion of land purchases at Point Reyes is imperative. The seashore is located only 30 miles from San Francisco, in a rapidly expanding metropolitan area. Its proximity to this densely populated area makes the seashore a unique one in this country, and it has been preserved so far only because the main flow of traffic from San Francisco has been away from the shore. This situation is changing, however, and the land near the shore is now coming into great demand.

We can no longer vacillate. Each delay means only increased costs as the land involved jumps in value.

Strong public interest in and support for the preservation of Point Reyes has been expressed, both to myself and the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) and to our colleagues in the Senate. With considerations of economy in mind, I urge the House today to act favorably on H.R. 3786 so that the Point Reyes National Seashore can be completed within a reasonable amount of time and so that a magnificent portion of our coastline can be preserved for the enjoyment of our citizens.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for the bill before us today, H.R. 3786, which, as reported with an amendment, authorizes the appropriation of funds at an adequate level to permit the acquisition of all non-federal lands still needed to complete the Point Reyes National Seashore on the California coast.

Congress first authorized funds for the acquisition of the 64,546-acre Point Reyes National Seashore in 1962, realizing the need both to preserve the Nation's natural resources and to provide its citizens with national recreational areas.

However, as a result of numerous problems, including improper estimates on land costs and increases in land prices, the national seashore envisioned by Congress in 1962 has still not been completed.

This legislation, as amended, would increase the authorization for acquisition of land in Point Reyes from \$19,135,000 to \$57,500,000—an increase of \$38,365,000—which would enable Point Reyes to become an important part of our national park system.

This bill also includes an amendment which I offered during the marking up session of the Committee and which provides that no property or interests in any lands acquired within Point Reyes may be conveyed or leased for residential or

commercial use except for those public accommodations, facilities, and services provided for in Public Law 89-249, establishing concession policies in areas administered by the National Park Service.

The purpose of my amendment is to insure the integrity of the seashore and to prevent the Department of Interior from selling land within the Point Reyes National Seashore for private development.

During the hearings, the Department of Interior revealed plans to sell 9,200 acres, one-sixth of the land within the boundaries of the seashore, to a private developer for residential use as a restricted subdivision with related commercial facilities, including shopping centers.

In his testimony before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation on May 13, 1969, National Park Service Director George Hartzog contended that he had authority to sell back land under a 1968 amendment to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, and that in Point Reyes the Interior Department could recoup \$10 million.

During my questioning Mr. Hartzog stated that, although control would be exercised over lot sizes, location, quality of building sites, and architectural design—in order to prevent a building “offensive” to the park such as a high rise apartment—no control would be exercised over those who purchased the land from developers.

In other words, the land would be sold to the developer, who could then sell it as he saw fit for whatever price he wanted.

In a December 9, 1969, letter to me from Thomas Flynn, Assistant Director of the National Park Service, the proposed subdivision of the 9,200 acres was broken down—1,475 lots of which 75 were marina frontage and view, 1,250 were interior lots, and 150 were proposed golf course sites.

As a matter of public policy, a private country club development should not be created within the national park system.

This plan would place the Government in the role of a speculator and a land developer, having acquired the land ostensibly for public conservation.

The proposal to sell the land to private owners for development is clearly inconsistent with the intent of Congress when it authorized the Point Reyes National Seashore in 1962. It would deplete the seashore by one-sixth, allowing for the resale of the land to developers who would build homes, shopping centers, and other facilities totally inconsistent with the purpose of the park.

The Senate Interior Committee, in Senate Report No. 1071, accompanying S. 1401—Public Law 90-401—which amended title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, said the following in reference to the authority provided to the Secretary of the Interior to sell back and lease back lands:

While the Secretary is authorized to convey such freeholds or leaseholds in a manner which is, in his judgment, consistent with the purpose for which the area was authorized by the Congress, the committee wishes to make clear the legislative intent that new commercial development such as residential

subdivisions . . . is not to be considered within the purposes for which such areas were, and will be, authorized by Congress. (Senate Report No. 1071, p. 8.)

Despite the intent of the committee not to allow the sell-back and lease-back authority to include sale to developers for subdivision, the Department of Interior decided to go ahead with the sale.

And for this reason, I introduced my amendment to H.R. 3786 to preserve the integrity of Point Reyes National Seashore. Certainly, such a sale or rental would greatly damage the overall purpose of establishing the seashore as a national park—to retain its natural, recreational, and historical resources for all Americans.

The committee has set an important precedent in reporting out the bill with the amendment which states:

No freehold, leasehold, or lesser interest in any lands hereafter acquired within the boundaries of Point Reyes National Seashore shall be conveyed for residential or commercial purposes except for public accommodations, facilities, and services provided pursuant to the Act of October 9, 1965 (Public Law 89-249; 79 Stat. 969).

Congress must neither countenance nor sanction the carving out of enclaves of private privilege within the national park system.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 3786.

If the 1970's is to become the decade during which we pledge to keep our environment free—we cannot start off in a better way than to make this investment—an investment which will preserve a large part of our land unfettered from commercial development for the benefit of everyone, in this decade and in the future.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH).

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I wholly share the sentiments of Chairman ASPINALL and my friends JOHN SAYLOR, DON CLAUSEN, and BILL MAILLIARD in regard to the need and desirability of this legislation. Open spaces near our large population centers are disappearing rapidly, and any money appropriated for acquiring such land is money well spent.

There are, of course, other parks similar to that at Point Reyes, close to centers of population, that were authorized years ago and which were not completed because of rising land costs and other factors. One such park is the Cape Cod National Seashore, which was authorized nearly 10 years ago, and which is still incomplete.

I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee would care to comment on the likelihood of Cape Cod Seashore's completion being funded, in view of the President's recent actions and our own here today?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. KEITH. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, we have requests down at the administration. Included among them, of course, is the additional authorization for Cape Cod. But the President's message being

what it is today, it makes no difference to the chairman of the committee and I am sure to the chairman of the subcommittee whether it is Cape Cod or Delaware Gap or Assateague. We will try to bring these things into the picture just as rapidly as the administration downtown and the Interior Department will send them up.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the statement of the chairman of the committee. It does make a difference to me and to my constituents.

As the gentleman knows well, the cost of this delay has been enormous. The original estimate of \$16 million was sufficient to purchase 16,400 acres of land, leaving only 7,519 acres unacquired. Today it is estimated that it will cost more to acquire those last 7,500 acres than it did to acquire the first 16,400. And prices of land in the area are still rising.

They say that “he who hesitates is lost,” and the history of the Cape Cod National Seashore is a perfect example of that.

So while I feel the Point Reyes bill we are considering today is a highly worthwhile measure, I would like some assurances that our voting for this measure will not be detrimental to other such projects, like the Cape Cod National Seashore—which have been waiting much longer for funding.

There are landowners on Cape Cod who have been kept in limbo for nearly a decade, waiting for the Federal Government to act upon its commitment to complete acquisition. And I think it only fair that the Cape Seashore be given highest priority in any program of national parkland acquisition.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding this time to me.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to tell my colleague that with the assurance of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Interior, and the message which we just had from the President that Cape Cod will be authorized very shortly—that an authorization will be forthcoming.

Mr. KEITH. I thank the gentleman for that assurance.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3786—a bill to increase the amounts authorized to be appropriated for land acquisition at the Point Reyes National Seashore. This bill, which was cosponsored by almost 30 Members of the House, has as its chief objective the authorization of adequate funds to acquire all of the lands within the boundaries of the seashore.

For the past several years, the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation has sought to expand the number of outdoor recreation areas near our cities and metropolitan areas. We have recognized that they should be as convenient as possible for the large urban populations and yet be suitable additions to the national park system. Unfortu-

nately, not all available lands near or in our cities are appropriate for national park status, nor are all potential national park lands located near our cities.

Large, undeveloped, natural and scenic areas located in proximity to our major cities are few and far between. But Point Reyes is such an area. It is located about 30 miles from San Francisco and its outdoor recreation potential is so great that it can be a valuable resource for the millions of people living nearby. At the same time, its natural and scenic values are so outstanding that the area is important to people from all parts of the country.

The popularity of this area continues to expand. Even with the scattered and fragmented land ownership pattern which precludes efficient public use of the federally owned lands, large numbers of people are already visiting the area. In fact, it has been reported that the 1969 visitation figure for the area would probably top a million—almost a two-fold increase over the 575,000 visitations reported the year before. These outdoorsmen come for a variety of reasons, but the diversified resources at Point Reyes are conducive to boating, hiking, fishing, swimming, camping, riding, and many other popular outdoor activities.

The outdoor values of Point Reyes have not changed appreciably since the Congress authorized it as a national seashore in 1962, but land prices have increased tremendously. In the mid-sixties, we recognized that land prices in this area were escalating at a rate of about 15 percent per year, and we know now that the rate of increase is not likely to diminish in the future. Even the Department of the Interior, which relied on data only about a year old in making its report to the committee last May, made a reappraisal of the anticipated land costs and increased its estimates significantly before this legislation was reported by the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation.

In addition to land price escalation, the Members should realize that this bill contemplates the acquisition of 26,000 acres of land which we never expected to have to purchase under the original act. These are the so-called pastoral zone lands which were to be retained in private ownership for ranching and dairy purposes. Unfortunately, for a variety of reasons, these activities have been declining and the Park Service has been forced to acquire some of the lands to head off subdivisions and other adverse uses. Under the terms of the bill before you, adequate funds will be authorized to acquire all of these lands so that they will be available for the use and enjoyment of all Americans for all time.

Our objective at this area has been frustrated because the authorization ceiling has apparently been too restrictive, because the Budget requests have been too slow and too small, and because appropriations have fallen short of the need. Regardless of where the fault may lie, the authorization recommended in this bill—H.R. 3786—is ample to complete the task and, if this measure is enacted, the mandate to complete this project will be clear. We hope that these funds can be made available promptly.

Unless they are, no one can be sure that this job can be completed at or below the ceiling. The Director of the National Park Service has indicated that his estimates are reliable only if he has the funds in hand within the next 2 fiscal years. Knowing how long it has taken to get the authorized funds that have been available for this area so far, it is conceivable that all or part of the \$5 million authorization which the committee is recommending will be needed.

Mr. Chairman, it is very important that the authorizing and the appropriating committees work together closely on this entire outdoor recreation program. Our purposes are one and the same—to make reasonable progress toward a desirable goal. The enactment of any authorizing legislation justifies the existence of a Federal undertaking and it represents a commitment on behalf of the entire Nation, but it takes appropriations to convert these projects into tangible realities which the public can see, and, use and enjoy. Both elements of the legislative process are indispensable: without an authorization, the Appropriations Committees are powerless to make moneys available; without appropriated funds, an authorization is a project or program on paper, only.

I hope that the House will approve H.R. 3786 which provides one link in the chain, and I hope that the Bureau of the Budget, and the Appropriations Committees, and the Congress will extend and strengthen that chain so that Point Reyes can truly become a national seashore worthy of the name.

By way of a summary, Congress in 1962 authorized the Point Reyes National Seashore. Some progress has been made in acquiring land and the money authorized has been spent or obligated, but many of the most valuable seashore holdings are still not in Government ownership, so that the park is not yet a manageable area. Yet there is much interest in the park, and a million visitors are anticipated this year.

Having to increase an authorization in this manner is unpleasant, but I believe that the future value of Point Reyes to our Nation will justify our action. We have partly established a badly needed seashore area. We now have no choice but to finish the job. Land values in the area are increasing at 10 to 20 percent each year. Delay in action is poor economy.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in support of this bill. I think now is the time to begin to acquire these lands around our national seashores as soon as possible because of commercial and private development which will take place unless this is done.

Mr. Chairman, although this particular project is located in the State of California, it obviously will benefit people who travel there from other States. However, I urge the acquisition and completion of other areas such as Cape Cod in the State of Massachusetts and

Cumberland Island in the State of Georgia. We have this island on the coast of the State of Georgia which is the largest island on the entire eastern seaboard. In my opinion this is the least we can do for future generations in order to assure that there will be spaces available and that they will not be taken over by commercial and private groups.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strenuous opposition to the legislation now under consideration, H.R. 3786, to authorize the appropriation of additional funds for the acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California. I do not oppose this legislation because I believe completion of the Point Reyes Seashore is unnecessary, but because I object to the manner in which this legislation has been brought to the floor in violation of time-honored means for establishing funding priorities for acquisition of land for our national park system.

In its report on the legislation, the Bureau of the Budget states, and here I quote:

The priority of a particular area seems to us to be a complex product of perhaps six principal and several additional factors, most of them highly judgmental. These six principal factors are: (1) the priority of the principal federal purpose to be served by the area (bearing in mind that areas are authorized for a wide variety of purposes), (2) the overall quality of the area for its principal purpose (recognizing that most areas are authorized for more than a single purpose), (3) the relative supply of other areas serving a similar purpose for potential users as well as the number of such users and the proximity and accessibility of the area to them, (4) the relative cost of the area compared with other areas which would serve a similar purpose, (5) the threat to the area by conflicting purposes or adverse development, and (6) price escalation potential, particularly as escalation might be affected by authorization.

While we believe these are the key factors, we have not as yet been able to apply them in sufficiently precise fashion to provide a clear and objective basis for allocating a higher or a lower priority, for example to Point Reyes acquisition than to Cape Cod (or the Delaware River Gap National Recreation Area serving Philadelphia which I represent) or to give a seashore recreation area higher or lower priority than areas with other principal purposes.

This aforementioned report is the last word that we have on H.R. 3786. It would appear from this report that the Bureau of the Budget has some doubts about which national park projects should have priority and this fact is pointed out quite graphically near the end of the departmental report where we read:

While under the circumstances we would have no objection to the bill, we must reiterate that funds likely to become available will not be sufficient to permit acquisition of such areas without extensive curtailment in already programed acquisition.

Thus, I would say that we can assume that the Bureau of the Budget has some reservations about the bill we are now considering in view of the limited acquisition resources available from the land and water conservation fund. Yet on November 18, 1969, a press conference takes place at the White House and sud-

denly we are advised that the principles which have guided the Congress over the years with regard to the funding of the national parks and recreation program have been thrown out of the window. While the Bureau of the Budget, speaking for the administration, says that there are no funds available for new parks or increasing authorizations because of budgetary restraints, the press conference says that a commitment has been made for the Point Reyes project and funding will be available.

I believe that the Point Reyes Seashore may well be needed by the residents of the San Francisco area but certainly no more than the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area is needed by the residents of New York and Philadelphia.

I represent the northeast section of Philadelphia and I assure you all that is a paucity of recreational opportunity in my district and its environs. Our situation is certainly as serious as is the San Francisco predicament and I object strongly to the administration's attitude that our national parks and recreation areas program is to be made a partisan political football. If it could be demonstrated that the San Francisco need for the Point Reyes Seashore was greater than Philadelphia's need for the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, then I would not object to the authorization and expenditure of Federal tax dollars for this purpose. However, under the circumstances that the Point Reyes matter has been decided—outside the orderly procedures for establishing priorities we have all agreed upon—I must oppose this bill and, accordingly, I will vote against it.

We have established an accepted system of priorities for authorization and funding of national park and recreation program projects. Let us continue to abide by these priorities and considerations and let the chips fall where they may. I urge all my colleagues to consider carefully the implications of the Bureau of the Budget report on their States and congressional districts when it states:

While under the circumstances we would have no objection to the bill, we must reiterate that funds likely to become available will not be sufficient to permit acquisition of such areas without extensive curtailment in already programed acquisition.

I believe we cannot let party labels decide our national park and recreation area priorities. I urge that this bill be defeated.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, in these familiar lines, Lord Byron paid poetic tribute to the shores of the vast, blue ocean:

There is a pleasure in the pathless woods;
There is a rapture on the lonely shore.

I am here today to urge that we pay financial tribute to the recreational and esthetic needs of the American people. Unless we appropriate the funds needed for the authorized acquisitions at the Point Reyes National Seashore, we will be denying our people an essential part of the natural heritage they are entitled to enjoy. The need, as I see it, Mr. Chair-

man, is quite evident. This glorious strip of "lonely shore" at Point Reyes is within a 2-hour drive for 5 million people living in the greater bay area of San Francisco. It is a part of our national plan to put the parks where the people are.

In times past, it was said that the national parks represent the best that is America. With the overcrowded park conditions we have now, can we make that same statement today? Last year an observer declared that our national parks and seashores have become national slums. At Yosemite, for example, attendance has almost doubled in the past 5 years. On a July Fourth weekend, 74,000 persons were logged in.

One sensible way to alleviate the traffic jams and congestion, is to provide more space for our national parks and seashores. This is exactly what H.R. 3786 is designed to do for one of our most critical recreation areas—the Point Reyes National Seashore.

Furthermore, it is urgent that we enact this legislation without delay. Since 1962 when the seashore was established, the constant escalation of land prices has greatly increased the cost of authorized acquisition of private land still within the boundaries. With the \$57,500,000 authorized by H.R. 3786, the National Park Service will be able to acquire the remaining dairy farms, ranches, and other private lands within the seashore boundaries. As conditions exist now, this hodgepodge ownership pattern results in an unmanageable patchwork, for most of the ocean beach in the area is still privately owned.

I am not sure that solutions to all the problems facing the National Park Service will be simple—or even possible—but I do feel certain that the enactment of this legislation is a step in the right direction.

At the beginning of this environmental decade of the seventies, we have pledged to the people of America that we will seek to improve the quality of the environment—that we will try to make it possible for more Americans to enjoy Byron's pleasure of the pathless woods and the rapture of the lonely shore.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, the passage of H.R. 3786 is a fitting tribute and creates a lasting monument to a man who served ably in this House and who championed the cause of the preservation of the magnificent Point Reyes area, the late Honorable Clem Miller.

The Point Reyes National Seashore was envisioned by him and the bill establishing its boundaries was signed by President Kennedy in 1962.

With the passing of H.R. 3786 we have seen to it that Clem Miller's dream will be completed and that this "Island in Time," the Point Reyes National Seashore will be preserved for future generations to enjoy and to explore.

At a time when this Nation is becoming increasingly aware of the environment in which we live, it is fitting that this legislation is passed and provides for the completion of this National

Seashore which stands as a tribute to the foresight and concern of the man who conceived it, our late colleague, Clem Miller.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3786

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8 of Public Law 87-657 of the Eighty-seventh Congress is repealed and that there is enacted in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, except that no more than \$57,500,000 shall be appropriated for the acquisition of land and waters and improvements thereon, and interest therein, and incidental costs relating thereto, in accordance with provisions of this Act."

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 8 of the Act of September 13, 1962 (76 Stat. 538), as amended (16 U.S.C. 459c-7), is amended (a) by deleting '\$19,135,000' and inserting '\$57,500,000', and (b) by changing the period at the end of the section to a colon and adding 'Provided, That no freehold, leasehold, or lesser interest in any lands hereafter acquired within the boundaries of the Point Reyes National Seashore shall be conveyed for residential or commercial purposes except for public accommodations, facilities and services provided pursuant to the Act of October 9, 1965 (Public Law 89-249, 79 Stat. 969).'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WATTS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3786) to authorize the appropriation of additional funds necessary for acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California, pursuant to House Resolution 818, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks immediately prior to the passage of the bill H.R. 3786 today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 497. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the two Houses from February 10, 1970, to February 16, 1970.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader if he will advise us as to the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Monday is Consent Calendar day, and there are five suspensions:

H.R. 1049, to amend the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act;

H.R. 14300, to facilitate the disposal of Government records and to abolish the Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers;

H.R. 14116, to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act;

H.R. 13582, to authorize the waiver of claims of the United States arising out of certain erroneous payments; and

H.R. 13008, Job Evaluation Policy Act of 1970.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day, and we will also have:

H.R. 14810, to authorize production research under marketing agreement and order programs, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate; and

H.R. 15165, to establish a Commission on Population Growth, and the American Future, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, we will have the Department of Labor-Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 9355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. BROZMAN.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 14 United States Code 194(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. ST. ONGE and Mr. MESKILL.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 46 United States Code 1126c, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. CAREY and Mr. WEICKER.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 5355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, and Mr. McKNEALLY.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 6968(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. FLOOD, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. MINSHALL, and Mr. MORTON.

THE EPIC OF ST. VARTAN THE BRAVE

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today it was my pleasure to welcome Bishop Papken, representative of the diocese of the Armenian Church of America in Washington, D.C., as guest Chaplain.

During his prayer and during my own welcoming remarks, mention was made of St. Vartan, who in A.D. 451 led his army in a battle against the Persians. As a result of this battle, the Armenian Church and the faith of the Armenians in Christianity was preserved.

At this point in the Record I would like to include a brief history of the epic battle which occurred in A.D. 451, over 1,500 years ago. The article about this event follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE EPIC OF ST. VARTAN THE BRAVE*

More than fifteen hundred years ago an epic celebrated by Armenians everywhere took place. It symbolizes the resolute courage and firmness of faith of a people. Vartan, the Armenian general, and 1035 comrades fell, on May 26, 451, A.D., in the plain of Avarayr, ancient Shavarshan, in the shadow of the Biblical Mount Ararat, battling against an overwhelming army of another King of Persia, in defense of their national homeland and Christian faith. That memorable conflict, though it ranks as a military defeat, secured the preservation of a Christian bastion in the Near East.

In the calendar of the Armenian Church, an annual day is set apart in memory of those 1036 martyrs, for their loyalty to a supreme ideal. And the Armenian communities throughout the world are dedicating the present year to the celebration of the fifteen-hundredth anniversary of that battle.

THE SOUL OF ARMENIA

The adoption of Christianity as the state religion of Armenia angered the Sassanid Kings of Persia, her suzerains, who saw in the change not only a political but a cultural danger. In their determination to spread the Mazdean religion in western Asia and thereby to consolidate a unified front against Roman influence, the Sassanid monarchs took steps to avert the apparent threat.

On the other hand, the cause of Christianity in Armenia was not innately secure. A considerable part of the nobility still clung to their ancient gods and in reality were silent partners of the Mazdean priests, although hating them in their hearts. The assassination of King Trdat III, the first patron of the new religion in the country, was ascribed to pagan plotters. Even Gregory, the "Illuminator," the first Patriarch (257-325), had retired into seclusion to avoid his opponents. His immediate successors met violent deaths, instigated by members of the royal family.

Why was there such a relapse? Christianity, according to tradition, had been preached even by Christ's apostles, Thaddeus and Bartholomew. Church history declares that Roman legionnaires of Galatia and Asia Minor, 10,000 in number, embraced Christianity and took refuge in the plain of Ararat, in Armenia during the reign of the Emperor Trajan (98-117). All eventually became martyrs. A bishop, Ghevond (Leondius) by name, occupied the see of Artaz, in Armenia, and was martyred at Shavarshan in 190. Another bishop, Mehrujan, to whom a letter had been sent from Bishop Dionisius of Alexandria (according to Eusebius), also met death for his faith at Artaz about the end of the third century.

Persecution at last ceased. Trdat III, his family and courtiers, were baptized by St. Gregory on January 6th, 303, the Feast of Baptism and Epiphany. Constantine the Great promulgated the Edict of Milan in favor of the new religion in 313. His own baptism took place in 327 on the day of his death. Paganism had suffered a signal reverse in the year 311 when Maxim Daja, the Roman Governor of Syria, was repulsed by Trdat III in his attempt to uproot the new religion from Armenia by armed force.

Notwithstanding such sponsors of Chris-

* Based on the classical History of Vartan by Ellsaeus (5th century) and translated by C. F. Neumann (1830) as published by the Diocese of the Armenian Church, New York, 1951, on the occasion of the fifteen hundredth anniversary of the Epic.

tianity in Armenia, there remained still much to be done to achieve real success. The new religion was too abstract to appeal to the heart and mind of the majority of the population, because church and community remained too far apart from each other. Bible readings, prayers and hymns were conducted in foreign languages; Syriac in the much larger Persian section and Greek in the Western. Occasional translations during church services and the sermons in the Armenian tongue did not mean much, the congregations being unable to retain or memorize them.

At this critical juncture, there appeared on the scene a man named Mesrop-Mashtots, former secretary of the royal chancellery. Encouraged by the scholarly Katholikos, Sahak Partev, and financially aided by the King, Vram-Shapuh, Mashtots, after extensive travels and untiring research, invented the Armenian alphabet. That blessed achievement was followed by the translation of the Bible under the guidance of Sahak, first from the Syriac, and then from the Greek Schools were opened and a craving for knowledge was stimulated. Community of thought, sentiment and interests thus came about. The country boy was trained in company with the sons of the nobility; the grandson of the pagan priest together with the issue of the house of St. Gregory, among whom was Vartan Mamikonian, the future hero of liberty, the son of the Patriarch's daughter, Sahakanush. This process of education made Armenia a happier land, an object of admiration to the world (Pavstos).

The literary movement, through the rendering into Armenian of the works of various Church Fathers and ancient lay thinkers, developed with amazing swiftness, in less than half a century. Another outcome was the awakening of a national consciousness. The numerous clans, separated from each other by geographical, political and social barriers, were now being drawn together by the spiritual tie of the written and spoken Word. The Armenian Soul came into being. The nation might lose its independence, it might be scattered to the four corners of the earth, but it would still survive in spirit.

To what extent the Armenian soul had been crystallized may be seen in this uprising in the middle of the Fifth Century, just sixteen years after the complete translation of the Scriptures. Armenia at that time had no king. The leaders of the nation, lay and clerical, many of them brought up in the Sahak-Mesropian schools, and well versed in the teachings of Christianity, assembled at Artashat and bravely though courteously rejected the command of their sovereign lord, the Persian King of Kings, to replace their religion with that of sun and fire. "From this belief no one can move us," they declared, "neither angels nor men, neither fire nor sword or water or any other bitter torture."

This bold stand was not an empty gesture. In the following year, 451, 66,000 volunteers assembled to oppose the formidable force of Iazdegerd II, and sealed the nation's pact of attachment to faith and homeland, with the blood of Vartan and 1,035 fellow-martyrs on the battlefield. Greatly outnumbered, they suffered defeat, but the physical military disaster was destined to result in spiritual victory.

REVIEW OF THE TIMES

After the fall of the Arsacids of Persia, the dynasty of Sassan, the Persian, ruled over the land of the Armenians. The Sassanids were ardent followers of the Magian religion, and inflicted great oppression upon all who did not adhere to their beliefs. Their dominion in Armenia began during the reign of Arshak (363-381), son of Tiran, grandson of Trdat, and continued until the sixth year of King Artashes, the son of Vramshapuh.

After the overthrow of Artashes by the

King of Kings in 428, the government fell into the hands of Armenian nakharars (saharaps or great princes), and whenever the Persian monarch demanded it, the nakharars led their horsemen to war. The fear of God was still firmly established in Armenia, from the beginning of the reign of the Persian Shapuh until the second year of Iazdekerd (Iazgerd), the son of Vram, in whom Satan found a willing accomplice. Spewing forth the venom, with the fury of a wild beast he fell upon the country of the Greeks, pressing on as far as the city of Mdzbzin (Nisibin). He laid waste sundry provinces of the Romans (Romans), and after burning the churches, he dragged the booty and prisoners in his train, terrifying all the troops and the country.

Now the blessed Horom (Byzantine) Emperor Theodosius (the Second, 408-450), would not give battle, but sent Anatol, his Eastern commander, to the Persian court with much treasure for a peace conference. Now those Persians who, after their conversion to Christianity, had fled to the Imperial city of Constantinople, were delivered into the Persian King's hands; and all things required by him were agreed to. The Persian King, having been appeased by these concessions, returned to his capital, Tizbon (Ctesiphon).

Having thus secured his position, he proceeded to turn all people away from the Christian faith; some by threats, others by imprisonment and torture. But observing that many of his subjects fled the country and scattered to various foreign parts, he called his advisers together for consultation. The Magi (priests) said, "Vallant King, the gods have given thee the empire and victory. They require no corporeal homage, but they expect that all nations of thy kingdom shall be brought under one law, after which thou wilt also subject the land of the Greeks to thy belief. Gird thyself, then, O King, gather an army and set out against the Land of Kushans of the East, assemble all the tribes, lead them within the Gates of the Watch and set up thy residence even there. Shouldst thou hold them all fast in a distant foreign land, thou wilt then attain the object of thy wishes. But exterminate the sect of the Christians."

This advice appeared excellent to the king, so an edict was dispatched to all parts of the country, reading, "To all peoples of my kingdom, Aryans and non-Aryans; our greetings of benevolence increase for you. Rest ye in good health. We ourselves are in good health thanks to the gods!"

"Without in any way troubling you, we went forth to the land of the Greeks, and without bloodshed, by kindness only, we gained the submission of the whole country. Be ye of good cheer and rejoice boundlessly. And now receive ye the word which we are about to announce to you. We have made an inflexible resolution; to storm forth towards the East, to subjugate, with the help of the gods, the land of the Kushans. As soon as ye see this edict, ye will promptly assemble around me your horsemen, to proceed with me to the land of Apars."

This proclamation was sent through the lands of the Armenians, Georgians, Albanians, Lephnians, Dzodeans, Gorgeans and Aghtznig, and many distant countries which in former times were not required to journey that way. From Great Armenia came an army of nobles and their sons, and men of the Ostanik class of the royal house. Similarly, recruits were collected in the lands of the Georgians and Lephnians, and from the southern provinces, near the frontiers of Tajkistan, from Horom Land, the lands of Kordeg, of the Goths, Dzovdeans and Arznarzun; all of whom were believers in one Catholic and Apostolic Church. These people in their innocence, cheerfully hastened, with all their warlike accoutrements, to offer their military service. With them also went many priests and church ministers, with gospels in their

hands. None of these nations had the slightest inkling of the king's intent. They were all obedient to the precepts of God, mindful of the lesson of Paul (Eph. VI, 58); "Be obedient servants to your masters. Do not oppose them, but show them homage; serve them in love, as though you were serving God and not man; for the Lord will reward you for all your pains."

Fortified by such exhortations, they had left their country, eager to comply with the king's command.

The king manifested pleasure in seeing before him the nobles and so great a host. Concealing his design, he lavished honors upon them. Then he proceeded against the Huns of Kushanland, but failing to subdue them after two years of struggle, he sent the troops back, each command to its own province, and summoned others in their stead.

As to the Romans, they remained true to their treaty obligations. The Khaylenturgs ceased their attacks upon the Watch of Jor, the Huns were restrained within their boundary. The king therefore sent joyful tidings to the fire-temples and perpetuated his abominable religion, increasing the offerings of fat oxen and long-haired white bulls and goats. He also honored the fire-priests with crowns and distinctions, and decreed that the Christian properties be plundered.

Puffed up by arrogance, he now believed himself to be superhuman, worthy to be classified among the immortals. He could not control his wrath when told of the crucifixion, burial and resurrection of Jesus. About that time, an Armenian youth of princely descent, Garekin by name, became engaged in argument with the king about the mission of Christ in this world. The monarch was so irritated by the bold assertions of the young man that he ordered the latter's imprisonment and torture, and finally, his execution.

Exasperated by the unyielding attitude of the Christians in the army and among the civilians, the king now resorted to drastic measures. He separated nobles from common people, and although bitter at every Christian, he persecuted the Armenians more than others. He seduced some of them with gold, lands and high honors. He often spoke to Armenian princes in wheedling words: "Oh, if you would only accept the doctrine of the Magi into your souls! Oh, that you would exchange the heresy of your minds for the true and excellent laws of our gods! You would then stand as equals to my own noblemen; nay, I would even exalt you still higher."

This campaign of hypocrisy continued from the fourth year of his reign to the eleventh. But as the Christians grew stronger, he became more indignant and issued a command. "All peoples and tongues," he said, "must give up their false beliefs, worship the sun, bring offerings to him and call him God. They shall feed the holy fire and fulfill all other ordinances of the Magi."

He then marched to the land of Itaghia. The King of the Kushans took to flight, his cities and fortresses were plundered and his subjects carried away captives. The Magi now told the king that the gods required no other evidences of homage but that he should banish all heresies, and make the Zoroastrian religion dominant. It was thereupon planned to confine the cavalry forces of the Armenians, Georgian and Albanians within the Gates of the Watch, closing the road leading to the West, and leaving open only the passage to the East. Thus enclosed as in a cage, the Christians were ordered to deny God.

Their only answer was, "We call heaven and earth to witness that we have never been negligent in our duty to the king; that we have never been cowards, and that we are being punished for no just cause."

When this plea reached the king's ears, he

swore an oath that, "I will never set you free until you fulfill my demand." On the thirteenth day of the detention of the Armenians, the king gave them a sumptuous banquet. He spoke to them in a kindly manner, urging them to eat of the flesh of sacrificed animals, which the Christians were forbidden by their religion to touch. Having failed in this, the king resumed his policy of oppression.

The new governor of Armenia, Denshapuh, inaugurated a new poll-tax system for Armenia, hypocritically promising exemption from all other kinds of taxation and reduction of the charges of military service. But proofs of his evil designs were only too plainly evidenced by new governmental regulations, tax increases, the hitherto unknown taxing of hermits and monks, and the fomenting of discords between prominent families through official intrigues. To these irritants was added a heavier blow—the demotion of the Hazarapet, Vahan Amatuni, who had governed the nation in a paternal manner. His post was given to a Persian. The position of Chief Justice, until then held by the Churchmen, was transferred to a Mogpet or fire-temple priest.

Exactions became extremely oppressive when the legal tax of 100 dahekan was raised to 200 for priests and 300 for bishops. Taxes were now imposed not only on edifices in good repair, but also upon ruined buildings. Flagrant injustices were sanctioned also in the division of hills, plains and woods. The officials conducted themselves, not as agents of the king, but as plunderers. On finding even these processes ineffective in bringing about apostasy, Denshapuh sent to Armenia a document compiled by Zoroastrian priests, allegedly proving the truth and excellence of their religion, and fervently calling for its adoption. The paper began with the customary salutation: "Mihnerseh, the Vzruk (Vizier), generalissimo of Erans and Anerans, many greetings to the people of Greater Armenia." But it closed ominously with:

"Two courses are now before you to choose; either that you write, word by word, an answer to this message, or that you repair to the court and be present at the Great Assembly."

Upon the receipt of the document, the bishops met at Artashat, together with distinguished princes, and compiled a 4,000-word answer, opening with the customary flattering phrases:—

"Bishop Hovsep (Joseph), together with all who are united with me, from the great to the little, to thee, Mihnerseh, the great Hazarapet (General) of Aryans and non-Aryans, great and abundant salutations, in peace-loving mind, to thee and to the entire Aryan army." Then followed a laborious treatise on Christian doctrine, together with a refutation of the Zoroastrian tenets, and a final resolve:

"From this confession none can ever shake us, neither angels nor men, neither sword, fire, water or any bitter tortures. All our goods and chattels we commit into your hands; our bodies also are at your disposal. Do as you will. If you choose to leave us in the free exercise of our faith, we on our part will exchange you for no other lord on earth; neither, however, will we own in heaven any other Lord than Jesus Christ only, beside whom there is no other God."

This document was signed by the following bishops:

Hovsep, Bishop of Airarat, Sahak of Taron, Meliteh of Manazkert, Yeznik of Bagrevand, Surmak of Bznuniq, Tajat of Tayq, Tatik of Bassen, Kassun of Turuberan, Eremia of Mardastan, Eulali of Mardaghi, Anania of Sewniq, Musheh of Ardzruniq, Sahak of Rshtunig, Bassil of Mokq, Cad of Vanand, Yeghisheh of Amatunig, Eghbayr of Antsevatziq, Eremia of Apahunig.

At the royal court, the letter was read

before a large assembly. The king, inflamed with rage, declared his determination not to relent until the Christians abandoned their "erroneous doctrines." He then ordered his chancellor to prepare a summons to be served upon certain distinguished persons in Armenia, whose names he himself selected. They were as follows:

Vassak Sewni, Nershapuh Ardzruni, Artak Rshtuni, Qai Khorkhoruni, Vartan Mamikonian, Manej Apahunig, Vahan Amatuni, Cute Vahevanian, Shmavon Antsevatzi.

It was the custom, when Armenian troops came to the court, that some officer be sent by the king to meet them, to inquire as to the health and well-being of the Armenian land, and having twice or thrice performed this ceremony, the king would preside at a review of troops and publicly thank the Armenian notables, each one by name, recalling the deeds of bravery and services contributed to the monarchy by their ancestors. But on this occasion nothing of the sort was done. Instead, a distant rumbling, like that of a winter storm, seemed to threaten terrible destruction. "I have sworn an oath by the sun," roared the king, "by the great god who, with his rays, illumines all the world, who, by his warmth, vivifies all creatures, that if, on the morrow, on his marvelous appearance, every knee does not bend before him and acknowledge him as god, I will bring you all manner of punishment and penalties, until you bend your will to my command."

Unalarmed by this threat, the Armenians humbly presented to the king another written answer: "We beseech thee, O brave king, lend ear to our few words and listen patiently. We wish to remind thee of the days of Shapuh, the king of kings, who was the father of thy grandfather, Iazdegerd. God gave him the land of the Armenians as a heritage when, already, it was under the same profession of faith in which we, at the present day, still live. Our fathers and the grandfathers of our fathers cheerfully performed for him the duties of obedience, fulfilled all his commands and were frequently honored by him. From that time until the present, we have continued the same duties, and indeed, even more to thee than to thy predecessors."

The letter closed with statements of the amount of taxes they had been paying, and some details of services they had been rendering to the Persian Empire.

The king's reply was blunt: "I look upon it as a loss to keep the tribute of your land in the royal treasury, and I hold your valor of no avail, for in your ignorance, you offend against the truths of our belief. You despise our gods, you pollute the burning flame and defile the water; you bury your dead in the earth, which you thus defoul; and while you do not receive the kirdigar, you render assistance to Ahriman. And worst of all, you do not at all times approach your women, which gives most joy to the gods . . . I am much troubled in spirit, lest on your account the gods should be enraged, and take vengeance on us . . ."

Again the Armenians pleaded for tolerance, again reciting theological arguments in defense of their faith, finally declaring their readiness for all torments, even for death.

Red with rage, Iazdegerd voiced new threats: "I will load you with chains and send you to remote parts of Sacastan, where many of you will perish from the heat. The survivors I will cast into prison. I will send your country an innumerable force, with elephants; your wives and children shall be banished; your churches and chapels demolished . . . and should anyone oppose my will, he shall be trampled by wild beasts . . ."

The nakharars were then led away from the monarch's presence, guarded by a chief executioner. But there was no weakening of

spirit among them, though they were eager for some suggestion of rescue. In their confinement, they thought of the Biblical Abraham and exclaimed, "We are as Isaac, bound on the holy altar. Receive, O Lord, our souls, and deliver not thy church to the scorn and jest of this tyrannical ruler."

One of the king's privy councillors loved Christ in secret. Aware of the king's intention to inflict the long-threatened punishment on Armenia, he advised some of the prisoners to deliver themselves from danger by stratagem. While secretly maintaining their loyalty to God, he advised the princes to send word to the court that they would comply with the royal order. At this news, the king happily altered his plans. He now poured honors upon the Christians, raised them all to their former rank, gave to each of them farms and towns belonging to the royal Armenian patrimony. He then sent, as teachers of fireworship, an army of 700 Magi under a high dignitary, with a strong military escort. The nakharars, too, returned to Armenia.

Before arriving in Armenia, the Magi had determined by lot in what language and what order to conduct instruction, for they were commanded to convert not only the Armenians but all the neighboring tribes. A royal ordinance allowed six months for the accomplishment of this task:—

"Before the day of Navasard arrives, the churches in the kingdom of the Great King shall have been pulled down . . . their books shall be taken away and sent to the royal treasury; the sound of psalms shall be silenced and the reading of the prophets shall cease; the priests shall not teach the people in their homes, and the believers in Christ, men and women, who dwell in abbeys shall be forced to return to the normal modes of life."

"Furthermore, the wives of the princes shall be brought to the Magi to receive instruction, and the sons and daughters of the noblemen and of the common folk shall be instructed by the same Magi in a public assembly. They shall abolish the laws of matrimony, which, according to Christian custom, they have received from their fathers; and a man shall take several wives instead of one, so that the Armenian population may be much increased. . . ."

"No man shall kill any living thing without making an oblation (offering), whether it be a sheep, goat, bear, bird or sucking pig. None shall knead cakes without (wearing a) pantam, dust and filth shall not be thrown into fire; hands shall never be washed without bull's urine. Serpents, foxes and hares shall not be killed. Otter, salamander, frog or any other kind of worm shall be destroyed and their bodies collected, to be brought to the proper officer, in accordance with the measure of quantity required by royal ordinance."

"All these things shall be done within a year."

The Magi of the higher and lower classes, having received these instructions, were eager to reach Armenia. They were too pleased at the prospect before them to complain of the length of the journey, by day and night.

Vartan was well aware of the wavering spirit of some of those who were attached to him, but his courage did not fail him and he endeavored to cheer and inspire the men under him. After seizing the royal residence by assault, he commanded the troops to assemble in Artashat and replaced the faltering and disloyal officers by his own brothers and nephews. The leading personalities in his command were as follows:—

Vartan spoke to the princes and their men as follows:—

"I have been in many battles; you, too, with me. Sometimes we have bravely vanquished the foe; sometimes they have vanquished us. We have often been conquerors.

But on all occasions we thought of worldly purposes only, and we fought merely at the command of a mortal king. . . . All of us have many wounds and scars upon our bodies, and great must have been our intrepidity to have won those marks of honor. But I consider the exploits whereby we have received those marks useless and empty because they have achieved nothing permanent. If, however, you have done such deeds of valor in obedience to a mortal ruler, how much more will you do then for our immortal king, the Lord of life and death, who judges everyone according to his works. . . .

"Now, therefore, I entreat you, my dear companions—and especially, as many of you, although greater than I in bravery, worth and inherited distinction, have of your own free will and out of your love, elected me as your leader—I beg of you all, high and low, to listen to me in a sympathetic spirit. Fear not the number of heathen, shield not your necks from the sword of mortal man, but act so that the Lord may give the victory into our hands, that we may annihilate their power and lift on high the standard of truth. Should our life's purpose be completed by a holy death in battle, let us meet it with a joyful heart. . . ."

After delivering this speech before the assembly, the valiant Generalissimo further comforted the men privately according to their personal needs. To him who was unarmed, he sent weapons; to him who was not adequately clothed he supplied garments, and he gave a horse to him who needed one. With generous pay he made them all happy. He ordered the troops to march before him in review and congratulated many by name. Well versed in the Holy Scriptures from his early youth, he read aloud from the Sacred Book the valorous deeds of the Maccabees, explaining the course of events; how, in defense of God's law, they had fought against the Seleucian king, Antiochus, and that, although they had suffered death, the remembrance of their bravery had been preserved and made them immortal on earth as well as in Heaven. After this exhortation, Vartan took his station on the plain, arranging the groups and encircling them with the cavalry.

A few days later, the Persian army arrived in the cantons of Her and Zarevand (modern Khol and Salmast, Persia). Here they halted, pitched their tents, erected fortifications, dug trenches, built wooden stockades and secured the camp in all possible ways. A number of enemy raiders went forth to forage and plunder, but a band of 200 Armenians under Amatuni drove the marauders back to their camp.

Again Vassak resorted to perfidy. He sent renegade priests to seduce the common soldiers, but was still unable to accomplish his design. The priest Ghevond was called upon to come forward. He stood forth and delivered a stirring discourse before the clerical messengers in a loud voice, after which the soldiers spent the night in spiritual meditation, the catechumens among them being baptized. In the morning they received Holy Communion. The entire army said joyfully, "May God look down in mercy upon our voluntary self-sacrifice, and may he not deliver the Church into the hands of the heathen."

THE ARMENIANS IN BATTLE

The Persian general, seeing his emissaries driven away, relinquished his hope of dissolving the Armenian forces. After consulting Vassak, he called his staff officers and ordered the herd of elephants to march, with 3,000 lancers to each elephant. He admonished the nobles to "Be mindful of the precious oil and crown, of the wine and the enviable marks of honor which will be offered you by the court. You will become lords of provinces and owners of vast principalities. You know the valor of the Armenians, and the courage of every one among them."

He also reminded them of their friends who had skulked away from battle and been sentenced to death, their sons and daughters, in fact, their entire families being placed on an equality with aliens, deprived of their inheritance.

He then arranged the army for battle, extending the vanguard across the plain. On the right and left wings stood one elephant each, surrounded by 3,000 lancers, while around himself he collected such a body of hardy warriors as to give the force the appearance of an impregnable castle or fortress. He distributed the banners, ordered the flags to wave, and all to be ready at the sound of the great trumpet. The troops of the Abbarhaigs, of the Gajians, of the Huns, of the Kakhians and all the selected men he assembled in one place and commanded them to be ready to break in on the right wing of the Armenian army.

Meanwhile Vartan, after consultation, disposed his officers as follows: the first division he entrusted to the Prince of Ardzrunis, and with him the Prince of Moks as adjutant-general. These two he placed over the whole army. The second division was under Khoren Khorkhoruni, with Nerseh Qajberuni as adjutant-general. The third division was entrusted to Tatul Vanandetzi, with Tajat Qntuni as adjutant. The fourth division was taken over by himself, with Arshavir and his own brother Hamazaspian as adjutants. He appointed outposts and commanded resistance to the Aryans (Persians) stationed at Derbend Pass, on the Caspian shore.

Both armies, thus fully arrayed, rushed against each other, like clashing clouds thundering forth, with peals resounding through hills and vales as loud as the yells of the combatants on each side. The gleaming of the helmets of the warriors rivalled in luster the beams of the sun; the flash of the swords and spears was like the glare of flames in the sky. But who shall describe the terrible noise when all listeners were deafened by the whizzing of arrows and the impact of the shields? Nussalavurd ordered Artashir, who was on the wild beast as on a watch tower or as in a fortified city, to incite his troops by the sound of the trumpet, and he himself plunged among the foremost ranks. Not a little carnage did the valiant Vartan and his colleagues inflict, until he himself was found worthy of martyrdom on the spot.

The battle continued, the day waned and night approached. Bodies were heaped around fallen cedars. On all sides were broken spears and shattered bows, wherefore the sacred bodies of the wounded could not be recognized. The survivors were scattered amongst the hills and castles. Now that the Armenian leader had fallen, there was no longer any chief around whom the broken forces could rally. So they took refuge in the vastness of the country.

Of the royal house of Arshakuni, of that of Ardzrunis and of other princely houses, there were yet others, 740 in number, whose names have been inscribed in the Book of Life. In all, there fell 1,036 men, 9 nakharars included.

On the side of the infidels, the number of dead was 3,544, among whom were nine distinguished persons, on whose account Nussalavurd was deeply concerned, for he saw that the loss of his army was several times as great as that of the Armenians.

A MODERN APPRAISAL

"Vartan's death was a heavy loss for Armenia, but the battle of Avarayr saved the nation, for the Persians, staggered by so vigorous a resistance, halted in order to recoup their losses. About this time grave dangers from the Huns appeared on their eastern frontiers, and their armies had to hasten to the plains of the Oxus River, to check the invaders; and thus Armenia was

for a long time delivered from the Magian menace. The memory of Vartan's supreme sacrifice, and those of his comrades has been so affectionately cherished that the Armenian Church still celebrates the anniversary of the battle of Avarayr and pays tribute to those who fell on that day."—Jacques de Morgan, *Histoire du Peuple Armenien*, 1919.

In the history of entire Christendom the Battle of Avarayr is the first instance where a country as a whole rose to arms and fought an unequal war for the defense of the Christian faith and of religious freedom. This action, which was taken in a remote century of ancient Christian history by a relatively small nation living in an outlying area of the civilized world of that time, is significant in that it consolidated the foundations of the ramparts of Christian civilization in the East which Asian paganism never succeeded to destroy in the course of its continued onslaught until modern times.

ST. VARTAN, A.D. 451—ARMENIANS DEFENDING THEIR FAITH

More than fifteen hundred years ago the Armenian people rose as a nation to defend its faith. The first nation to adopt that faith and the first to go to war to defend it, it fought with all its might in the face of devastating pressure imposed by the fanatical ruler of the fire-worshipping Sassanids. Vartan, the commander of the Armenians, on the eve of the climactic battle exhorted his troops with the following words:

"You and I have been in many battles together. In some we triumphed over our enemies; in others we met defeat at their hands. But our victories have been more in number than our defeats.

"On all these occasions, however, sacrifices were made for personal glory, because we were fighting merely at the command of a mortal king. He who deserted was branded a coward throughout the land and met merciless death; whereas, he who pressed onward valiantly enjoyed national fame for bravery and received splendid gifts from the temporal and mortal king.

"We all have numerous wounds and scars on our bodies, and there have been many deeds of valor for which we have been excellently rewarded. But I consider all these notable accomplishments ignoble and useless and all the honors idle, because they will all fade away.

"Now then, if we were able to perform such brave deeds in obedience to a mortal commander, how much more should we do for our immortal king who is the Lord of the living and the dead and Who will judge men according to their deeds.

"I entreat you, therefore, my brave companions, especially because many of you surpass me in valor and precede me in princely rank. But since you of your own free will have selected me as your leader and commander, let my words be pleasant and agreeable to you all, great and small: Fear not the heathen hordes and never turn your backs to the frightful sword of mortal men; because should our Lord grant us victory, we shall destroy their might and the cause of righteousness shall be exalted. But if the time has come for us to meet a holy death in this battle, let us accept our fate with joyful heart, without mingling cowardice with our valor and courage.

"We all recall two or three engagements in which our Lord came to our aid with a mighty force and enabled us to earn great fame in bravery, to smite the royal armies fiercely, to obliterate the sacrilegious idolatry in some places, and to destroy and annihilate the ungodly decree of the king. He who intended to cause injury to our holy church with words and commands is now fighting with bows, spears, and swords. He who thought that we donned Christianity

like a garment has now discovered that, as man cannot change the color of the skin, so he cannot and will never succeed in altering our minds, because the foundations of Christianity are firmly set on an immovable rock, not only on this earth, but in heaven above, where neither rains fall, nor winds blow, nor floods are formed.

"Stand firm by our resolute Commander, who shall never forget your deeds of valor. Fear is a sign of doubt; but as we have repudiated doubt long since, let fear also disappear from our hearts and minds."

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, in the past year since coming to Washington from Philadelphia, Bishop Papken has continued his efforts to bring the message of love and fellowship from the ancient Armenian Church to fellow Americans of varying faiths.

Bishop Papken is well known in Philadelphia having served the Armenian Church there for many years. While there he was continuously involved in community activities and ecumenical work.

In his dual capacities in Washington, D.C., as primate's legate of the diocese of the Armenian Church of America and pastor of St. Mary's Armenian Church on Fessenden Street, he ministers to the spiritual needs of his parish which encompasses the whole of Greater Washington and represents the whole Armenian Church.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker. I would like to add my words of welcome this morning to great Bishop Papken. Many of my constituents in the 16th District know him well. Thousands of Armenian immigrants came, over 50 years ago, to settle in the fertile valley surrounding Fresno. They brought with them the skill of working with the grape arbor from the old country. Nurtured by the sun of California and the air of American freedom, these people created their gardens of Eden.

Bishop Papken when he was primate of the diocese of the Armenian Church in California often visited Fresno. I join with my constituents to wish this worthy churchman well in his labors in the vineyard of the Lord.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, Bishop Papken honors us with his presence here today. He is one of the outstanding church leaders in our country.

For the past 35 years he has served as deacon, priest, and bishop in one of the most ancient churches of Christendom. In fact, Americans of Armenian descent this month pay tribute to the memory of St. Vartan and his soldiers, heroes of the Battle of Avarayr, 1,500 years ago in ancient Armenia, when the people of that country fought against the Persians to preserve their Christian faith.

Throughout his long years of service, Bishop Papken has constantly worked toward the unity of peoples of all faiths. In his present post as primate's legate of the diocese of the Armenian Church in America he has participated in numerous communitywide activities.

I am pleased to note that he numbers among his friends many of my constituents of eastern Connecticut who are of Armenian descent. I wish to join with them today in extending a warm wel-

come to Bishop Papken on his visit to the U.S. House of Representatives and the inspiring words of his prayer with which he opened our session today.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to hear the opening prayer of today's session of the House of Representatives delivered by Bishop Papken. I remember well when he was ordained a bishop and assumed the primacy of the diocese of the Armenian Church in California in 1957.

During his years in Los Angeles, he formed lasting section of religious faiths. He came before us today representing Armenian Americans in their annual commemoration of St. Vartan, hero of the battle of Avarayr, 1,500 years ago in Biblical Armenia, in which the Armenians fought the Persians to preserve their Christian faith.

In keeping with a true concept of Christianity, Bishop Papken has pioneered in the ecumenical activities of the Armenian Church and I wish him abiding success as he continues to preach the brotherhood of man and freedom of religion and conscience.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks welcoming Bishop Papken.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

HEARINGS ON BILLS TO REPEAL THE EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT OF 1950

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, 16 bills to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, sponsored by not less than 133 Members of the House, have been introduced in the first session of this Congress and have been referred to the House Committee on Internal Security. Ten bills—while not expressly repealing the act, but which are drafted to that effect as an amendment to title 18, United States Code, sponsored by 22 Members of the House, some of whom have likewise joined in the foregoing bills referred to the Committee on Internal Security—have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Likewise, a Senate bill, S. 1872, sponsored by 21 Members of the Senate, reported on December 22, 1969, without hearings by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and passed on that day without debate or recorded vote in the Senate, has been transmitted to the House and referred to the House Committee on Internal Security.

The committee which I chair has received numerous inquiries with respect to the disposition of these bills. In view of the interest on this subject, both within and without the House, I want to advise the Members, and others concerned, that it is my intention to hold

hearings on such bills commencing on this March 16, 1970. Indeed, I also want to take this opportunity to urge the Members of the House and other persons who have an opinion on the important questions raised by these bills to appear and to give the committee the assistance of their views.

That the bills raise questions not free from difficulty may perhaps be inferred from the fact that while, as early as June 10, 1969, I had requested the views of the Department of Justice on bills introduced to that date which would repeal this act, it was not until last December, toward the close of the first session, that these views were obtained through the Department's Deputy Attorney General, Richard G. Kleindienst. Noting that—

Various groups, of which our Japanese-American citizens are most prominent, look upon the legislation as permitting a recurrence of the roundups which resulted in the detention of Americans of Japanese ancestry during World War II. The repeal of this legislation will allay the fears and suspicions—unfounded as they may be—of many of our citizens.

Since in the opinion of the Department, the allaying of these fears would outweigh "any potential advantage" which the act may provide in a time of emergency, the Department therefore recommended its repeal.

The Emergency Detention Act of 1950 is an independent act which constitutes title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950. It is a wartime measure which would, in short, authorize the detention of persons whom there is a reasonable ground to believe would probably engage in acts of espionage or sabotage during a period of proclaimed national emergency in the event of: First, an invasion of the United States; second, declaration of war by Congress; or third, insurrection within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy. In the years following the adoption of the act, the event for its application has not occurred. The act has therefore never been applied, nor has it been judicially construed.

The Emergency Detention Act of 1950 was legislation enacted in 1950 on the recommendation of a number of Senators whose expertise in the area of subversion and sincere concern for constitutional considerations and individual liberties, are entitled to great weight. The act, in fact, incorporates the provisions of the bill S. 4130, introduced in the 81st Congress, which was drafted and sponsored by Senators Kilgore, Douglas, Humphrey, Lehman, Graham, Kefauver, and Benton. There are few who would dispute the civil libertarian credentials of a majority of these sponsors. Although initially offered by them as a substitute for title I of the Internal Security Act of 1950, and originally opposed by Senator McCarran on alleged grounds of "unconstitutionality," the Emergency Detention Act was subsequently amended to meet his objections and, as thus amended, was finally enacted as title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950 upon the basis of the cogent argumentation advanced by its sponsors.

In drafting the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, the Senators who sponsored

the legislation were fully aware of the unfortunate occurrence during World War II. That the provisions of the title were not directed towards persons of a particular national origin, race, or religion, is made manifest in its legislative history. The act was directed to the inner "hard core" of the Communist Party organization. Senator Douglas, who was a principal proponent of the act, made this clear when, in the course of debate on the act, he said:

I would say that apparently, according to Mr. Hoover, what we have in [sic] an inner Communist Party organization, which has an inner "hard core" of determined revolutionaries. Then, within the Communist Party, there is a wrapper, so to speak, of those who are Communists, but who probably are not potential saboteurs. There would then be various other ramifying circles.

What I am trying to say is that the real danger to the United States is with the "inner hard core." If what we want to do is to punish the outer extremities, let Senators go ahead and do that. But I think the real danger to the United States is from this inner "hard core," who are potential saboteurs and spies. Mr. Hoover says there are 12,000 of them. In my judgment, if we had a period of national emergency—and I think it is pretty close to being a period of national emergency now—the best thing the country could do would be to "put them on ice," so to speak, treating them nicely, but to take them out of circulation so that they could not commit acts of sabotage or spying.

The particular fear evoked among our Japanese-American citizens seems to rest on the assumption that the act authorizes the establishing of the same "detention centers," "concentration camps," or "relocation centers" with which they were afflicted in World War II. At that time, about 112,000 Japanese residents of Western States, approximately two-thirds of whom were natural-born citizens of the United States, were removed from their homes and placed first in temporary camps and later in ten "relocation centers" situated in several Western States.

However, "relocation centers" which had been established during World War II were not established pursuant to the provisions of the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, which was not of course then in existence. Moreover, such action would not be authorized by this act against either Japanese nationals or American nationals of Japanese ancestry. While it is true that an earlier act, the act of April 16, 1918—50 U.S.C. 21—would expressly authorize the President to apprehend, restrain, or remove, during war or invasion, alien enemies resident in the United States, which could have been applied to resident Japanese nationals during World War II, that statute would have been inapplicable to citizens of the United States who, although of Japanese ancestry, were relocated during the war.

Relocation centers established during World War II were in fact established pursuant to an Executive order of President Roosevelt, Executive Order 9066, February 29, 1942, 7 Federal Register 1407. Issued about 2 months after the attack on Pearl Harbor, at a time when fear that a Japanese invasion of the

west coast was imminent, the order was promulgated by the President, as expressly set forth in its terms, by virtue of the constitutional authority vested in him as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

By the terms of the order, the Secretary of War was authorized and directed to prescribe military areas "from which any or all persons may be excluded, and with respect to which, the right of any person to enter, remain in, or leave shall be subject to whatever restrictions the Secretary of War or the appropriate military commander may impose in his discretion." This order, indeed, was in effect "ratified" by the Congress in the act of March 21, 1942—56 Stat. 173—by which it was made a misdemeanor knowingly to enter, remain in, or leave prescribed military areas contrary to the orders of the Secretary of War or the commanding officer of the area.

The authority of the President to issue this order, when questioned, was generally upheld. However, its application to particular circumstances was in part circumscribed by decisions of the Supreme Court. In order to prevent espionage and sabotage, it was held in *Hirabayashi v. United States*, 320 U.S. 81 (1943), that the freedom of movement of such persons embraced within the order could be restrained by a curfew; and it was held in *Korematsu v. United States*, 323 U.S. 214 (1944) that such persons could be excluded from a defined area. However, in *Ex parte Endo*, 323 U.S. 283 (1944) it was held that a citizen of Japanese ancestry, whose loyalty was conceded by the Government, could not be detained against her will in a relocation camp.

Thus the President, unguided and unrestrained by Congress, took the course he did to detain many loyal American citizens of Japanese ancestry, an action which, in my opinion, may be regarded as a dark day in our history. On repeal of the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, and in the absence of any legislation on this subject, we are restored to the position in which we found ourselves at the commencement of World War II. It is surely a serious question, requiring further exploration, whether we wish to leave the door open to similarly ill-advised and hasty action in the future. Therefore, it is my opinion that the vital interests which the sponsors of the bills seek to protect can be best served only by the development of a record on the basis of which reasoned action can be taken.

That such should be our course is further reinforced by the consideration that the circumstances giving rise to the enactment of the Emergency Detention Act remain very much in existence today. The Internal Security Act of 1950, containing two titles at the time of its adoption: Title I cited separately as the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, and title II cited separately as the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, was enacted in September of 1950 shortly following the invasion of South Korea by Communist forces. These titles were an expression of congressional concern in the face of accumulating evidence of a threat posed by a foreign directed and controlled Com-

munist apparatus within the United States.

The nature of this threat with which the Congress sought to deal is expressed in the act by detailed legislative findings based upon extensive evidence adduced before various congressional committees. The first of these findings, expressed in title I of the act, and reiterated in identical language in the prefatory findings of title II, was as follows:

There exists a world Communist movement which, in its origins, its development, and its present practice, is a world-wide revolutionary movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in the countries throughout the world through the medium of a world-wide Communist organization.

Further findings, expressed in both titles, determine that the direction and control of the "world Communist movement" is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country and that in furthering the purposes of the world Communist movement, set forth above, that country has established and utilizes in various countries "action organizations," organized on a secret, conspiratorial basis, which operate to a substantial extent through "Communist-front" organizations so as to conceal their true character and purpose.

These findings, Mr. Justice Frankfurter observed, were the product of extensive investigation by committees of Congress over more than a decade and a half. They cannot, he said, be dismissed "as unfounded or irrational imaginings." *Communist Party v. Subversive Activities Control Board*, 367 U.S. 1, 95 (1961). Indeed, in that case, which was the first test of the act, the Court upheld the determination of the Board that the Communist Party, U.S.A., was a Communist-action organization operating within the United States under Soviet Union control for the purpose of installing a Soviet-style dictatorship in this country. This determination remains undisturbed to this day, although the Communist Party has the opportunity under section 13(b) of the Internal Security Act to have this question redetermined on petition to the Board.

It can hardly be expected that the Party would seek to disturb this conclusion in light of its long and continuous record of obedience to the Soviet Union. As recently as June 1969, Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., led a delegation of the party to the international conference of Communist parties in Moscow, at which he and his associates pledged continuing support to the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. At the conference, Henry Winston, Chairman of the Communist Party, U.S.A., proudly stated that they had affixed their signatures to the decisions of the conference. Likewise attending the February 1968 preliminary consultative meeting of 79 Communist parties convened in Budapest, Hungary, Gus Hall declared that the fight against "U.S. imperialism" was

the central issue uniting them. In May 1969 at New York, 245 delegates in attendance at the national convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., pledged overwhelming support to his leadership.

Title I of the act, designated the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, contains provisions designed to control certain aspects of the threat posed by the world Communist movement, by establishing a system for the public disclosure and identification of Communist-action and Communist-front organizations operating within the United States. This title had its genesis in the Mundt-Nixon bill—H.R. 5852—of the 80th Congress. The provisions of this bill were further elaborated in S. 2311, introduced by Mr. MUNDT in the 81st Congress following his election to the Senate, together with Senators Ferguson and Johnston of South Carolina. Not limited as a wartime statute, but applicable in time of peace, its essential disclosure concept has been sustained by the Supreme Court. *Communist Party versus SACB*, supra.

On the other hand, title II, the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, presently in issue, was intended to cope with other aspects of this threat. It is designed as a wartime statute to cope specifically with the activities of espionage and sabotage. It was directed to certain hard-core activists seeking to effect the objective of the world Communist movement or of other movements or organizations having as a purpose the destruction of the Government of the United States and to substitute therefor a totalitarian dictatorship controlled by a foreign government. To achieve its objective the act authorizes the detention of such persons during the period of emergency, while according such persons detailed hearings and judicial review. This title has its origin, as previously indicated, in the bill—S. 4130—introduced in the 81st Congress by Senators Kilgore, Douglas, Humphrey, Lehman, Graham, Kefauver, and Benton.

The necessity for the detention measure was expressed by them in the findings—section 101 of title II—as follows:

(10) The experience of many countries in World War II and thereafter with so-called "fifth columns" which employed espionage and sabotage to weaken the internal security and defense of nations resisting totalitarian dictatorships demonstrated the grave dangers and fatal effectiveness of such internal espionage and sabotage.

(11) The security and safety of the territory and Constitution of the United States, and the successful prosecution of the common defense, especially in time of invasion, war or insurrection in aid of a foreign enemy, require every reasonable and lawful protection against espionage, and against sabotage to national-defense material, premises, forces and utilities, including related facilities for mining, manufacturing, transportation, research, training, military and civilian supply, and other activities essential to national defense.

(12) Due to the wide distribution and complex interrelation of facilities which are essential to national defense and due to the increased effectiveness and technical development in espionage and sabotage activities, the free and unrestrained movement in such emergencies of members or agents of such organizations and of others associated in their espionage and sabotage operations

would make adequate surveillance to prevent espionage and sabotage impossible and would therefore constitute a clear and present danger to the public peace and the safety of the United States.

(13) The recent successes of Communist methods in other countries and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions, and make it necessary that Congress, in order to provide for the common defense, to preserve the sovereignty of the United States as an independent nation, and to guarantee to each State a republican form of government, enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence of such worldwide conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purpose in the United States.

(14) The detention of persons who there is reasonable ground to believe probably will commit or conspire with others to commit espionage or sabotage is, in a time of internal security emergency, essential to the common defense and to the safety and security of the territory, the people and the Constitution of the United States.

That the provisions of the title were not directed toward persons of a particular national origin, race, or religion, is thus manifested not only in its legislative history, but is likewise clear in the actual provisions of the title. In deciding the issue of the existence of reasonable ground to believe that a person will probably engage in or conspire with others to engage in espionage or sabotage, section 109(h) of the title provided that the Attorney General and reviewing authorities are authorized to consider evidence of the following:

(1) Whether such person has knowledge of or has received or given instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or procedures of a government or political party of a foreign country, or in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or procedures of the Communist Party of the United States or of any other organization or political party which seeks to overthrow or destroy by force and violence the Government of the United States or of any of its subdivisions and to substitute therefor a totalitarian dictatorship controlled by a foreign government, and whether such knowledge, instruction, or assignment has been acquired or given by reason of civilian, military, or police service with the United States Government, the governments of the several States, their political subdivisions, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the Canal Zone, or the insular possessions, or whether such knowledge has been acquired solely by reason of academic or personal interest not under the supervision of or in preparation for service with the government of a foreign country or a foreign political party, or whether, by reason of employment at any time by the Department of Justice or the Central Intelligence Agency, such person has made full written disclosure of such knowledge or instruction to officials within those agencies and such disclosure has been made a matter of record in the files of the agency concerned;

(2) Any past act or acts of espionage or sabotage committed by such person, or any past participation by such person in any attempt or conspiracy to commit any act of espionage or sabotage, against the United States, any agency or instrumentality thereof, or any public or private national defense facility within the United States;

(3) Activity in the espionage or sabotage operations of, or the holding at any time after January 1, 1949, of membership in, the Com-

munist Party of the United States or any other organization or political party which seeks to overthrow or destroy by force and violence the Government of the United States or of any of its political subdivisions and the substitution therefor of a totalitarian dictatorship controlled by a foreign government.

It was undoubtedly based upon these considerations, that the Department of Justice, in its expression of views, adverted to the fact that the apprehensions of a number of our citizens as to the application of the statute to "various groups," of which our Japanese-American citizens are most prominent, was "unfounded." Nevertheless, it appears both from the statements of sponsors of legislation to repeal the title, and from the rather extensive mail we are receiving emanating from nationality and racial groups, that these apprehensions do exist.

In light of the experience in World War II, it is understandable that some of our citizens, particularly those of Japanese ancestry, and some of other racial or religious groups as well, might be disquieted by rumors of the existence of "concentration camps." These rumors were given some further plausible credence when, during the Korean war, pursuant to the provisions of title II, then enacted, and in readiness for its possible enforcement in the event of a full-scale and declared war, certain facilities to meet the requirements of the title were held in readiness for a few years with funds authorized by Congress. These facilities were located at Tule Lake, Calif.; Wickenburg and Florence, Ariz.; El Reno, Okla.; Allenwood, Pa.; Avon Park, Fla. However, these facilities were never used for the purposes of title II, since the events that might call them into use had not been determined to have occurred. About 1957, the project was discontinued. No facilities have been maintained since that time, and no funds have been appropriated, for that purpose.

Nevertheless, rumors of the existence of "concentration camps" have continued to persist. The history of this controversy has been summarized in a letter of the Assistant Attorney General to a Member of Congress, then a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, dated May 9, 1968, a copy of which is appended to my statement. Indeed, in the prior administration, the Department of Justice, responding to numerous inquiries with regard to the alleged existence of "concentration camps," took the position that such "disquieting rumors" were stimulated, and started spreading in 1966, "probably" as the result of allegations contained in an article captioned "Concentration Camps, U.S.A.," written by a Mr. Charles R. Allen, Jr., at the request of the so-called Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties and widely disseminated by it. This pamphlet, reviewed by the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice, was found to be "replete with inaccuracies."

The controversy which appears to have been generated by the dissemination of the Allen pamphlet appears likewise to have inspired articles on the

subject in newspapers and magazines of national circulation, which had the result of giving further currency to the rumors. This was particularly the case during the high period of riots in the cities. The Washington Post, for example, on March 3, 1968, carried an article titled "Negro Detention Camps: Debunking of a Myth," which reported an inquiry made of J. Walter Yeagley, Assistant Attorney General, whether title II "of the McCarran Act" could be "legally applied against a nameless mass of Negroes who happened to be in a street where a riot was taking place." Mr. Yeagley is quoted as replying that—

I know of no contingency plan for mass Federal detention of Negroes under Title II or any other statute. It would be absolutely unconstitutional for what Rap Brown accuses us of doing.

Subsequently, on May 6, 1968, the House Committee on Un-American Activities issued its report—House Report No. 1351, 90th Congress, second session—titled "Guerrilla Warfare Advocates in the United States," in which it was suggested, among other things, that, in the event of guerrilla warfare, guerrillas engaging in acts of overt violence should forfeit their rights as in wartime, and that various detention centers to be operated under title II "might well be utilized for the temporary imprisonment of warring guerrillas." The release of this report precipitated other articles, among which was that appearing in the May 6, 1968, issue of the Washington Post, followed by a May 28, 1968, article in Look magazine. To the careless observer it was made to appear that the United States was maintaining concentration camps for the internment of Negro militants and other dissenters.

Indeed, this controversy became a matter of international interest following, as might well have been anticipated, a TASS—Moscow—international broadcast, in English, on May 7, 1968. The text of the broadcast is as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Frightened by the growth of the Negro movement in the country, U.S. authorities are planning the severest measures to suppress the movement. The House Un-American Activities Committee, which has acquired the reputation of an oppressor of anything progressive in America, has published a report proposing mass roundups and arrests in Negro ghettos and the throwing of active civil rights fighters into concentration camps.

The hue and cry thus generated, agitating many loyal citizens, was taken up by other revolutionary organizations, including the Black Panthers, which appears to be a black Maoist group. An article contained in the July 12, 1969 issue of its publication, the Black Panther, titled "Concentration Camps," a copy of which is appended to my remarks, is illustrative of the alarming character of the mass of misinformation purveyed on this subject.

In addition, metropolitan newspapers and magazines, including some in the Washington area, have carried articles conveying the erroneous conclusion that the power of detention was presently possessed by the executive. Apparently the articles were written by persons who

had not read title II. A cursory examination of the title will reveal that the President does not now and never has had such power, for the conditions precedent which would bring such power into being have never occurred. In the light of such widespread misinformation, it is no wonder that, in both administrations, the efforts of the Department of Justice to dispel the erroneous impression that "concentration camps" were maintained in the United States was not wholly successful.

It is, of course, my hope and intent that, in the consideration of bills to repeal title II, we shall be able to divorce ourselves from such emotional considerations, which can throw more heat than light upon the issues. I do not think it relevant to the consideration of these bills that the controversy, or even some of it, may have been inspired by unfounded rumor instigated by alleged subversive individuals or organizations. The basic issues presented by these bills are questions of the act's necessity, its constitutional propriety, and the relevancy of the measure to the objectives sought to be attained. The title must ultimately stand or fall on these basic issues. I do not think that, under the circumstances, any useful purpose can be served by an inquiry into the origin of the controversy. Nor shall I tolerate any suggestion or implication that the effort to repeal the act is purely a subversive conspiracy.

It is my hope that in the disposition of these bills we shall make some contribution to the Nation's security consistently with other national interests and a due respect for constitutional liberties. This will involve a thorough inquiry into the provisions of the title, as well as the necessity for appropriate remedial alternatives. In dealing with these complex issues, as I have said, the committee will need the assistance of interested Members of the House and other public-spirited citizens who will share with us their knowledge, research, and judgment, to the end that we shall accomplish a result which is best for the Nation as a whole. I would ask that all Members interested in the questions raised by the bills give the committee the benefit of their thought and judgment.

The material referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1968.

Hon. JOHN C. CULVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Considerable public attention has recently been focused on the subject of "emergency detention" and "concentration camps or detention centers" allegedly maintained by the United States under the provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950, otherwise referred to as the McCarran Act.

Rumors about the existence of "concentration camps" in the United States started spreading in 1966, probably as the result of allegations contained in an article captioned "Concentration Camps USA" written by Mr. Charles R. Allen, Jr., at the request of the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties. This pamphlet has been reviewed by this Division and found to be replete with inaccuracies. You may wish to refer to the reports of the hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities for background information on the Citizens

Committee for Constitutional Liberties which commissioned Mr. Allen to write his article.

More recently, an article in the May 6, 1968 issue of "The Washington Post" captioned "HUAC Would Intern Any Negro 'Guerrillas'" attributes to the HUAC a suggestion that "guerrilla warfare" advocated by militant black nationalists might be countered by "detention centers" among other devices. According to this article Committee Chairman Willis declared that "mixed Communist and black nationalist elements across the Nation are planning and organizing guerrilla-type operations against the United States. In the event of such violence the Committee contended that 'the guerrillas would be declaring a state of war within the country and therefore would forfeit their rights as in wartime.'" According to the HUAC report "The McCarran Act provides for various detention centers to be operated throughout the country and these might well be utilized for the temporary imprisonment of warring guerrillas."

A review of emergency detention provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 will reveal that there is no support therein for the establishment of detention centers for the purposes set forth in the HUAC report. That Act provides that in the event of (1) invasion of the territory of the United States or its possessions, or (2) declaration of war by Congress, or (3) insurrection within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy, the President is authorized to proclaim the existence of an internal security emergency and during such emergency, acting through the Attorney General, to apprehend, and by order, detain persons as to whom there is reasonable grounds to believe that such persons will engage in or conspire with others to engage in, acts of espionage or sabotage.

In keeping with the provisions, facilities were maintained for a few years with funds appropriately authorized by the Congress for this purpose. These facilities were located at Tule Lake, California; Wickenburg and Florence, Arizona; El Reno, Oklahoma; Allenwood, Pennsylvania; and Avon Park, Florida. These facilities were never used for the foregoing purposes. About 1957, the project was discontinued, the camps abandoned and since that time no such camps have been maintained and no funds have been appropriated for this purpose.

The installations at Allenwood and Florence are now used as regular Federal Prison camps where minimum security inmates charged with a variety of offenses are confined. The site at El Reno is used as grazing land for cattle kept by the farm operated by the nearby Federal Reformatory in which youthful offenders are confined. The Avon Park installation was taken over by the State of Florida as the Avon Park Correctional Institution. The Wickenburg site, which had been leased from the City of Wickenburg was turned back to the City in 1956. The Tule Lake site, which formerly belonged to the Department of Interior, was returned to the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior in 1956.

Attorney General Ramsey Clark stated, during his appearance on April 7, 1968, on NBC's "Meet The Press," that there are no concentration camps in this country and there will be no concentration camps in this country. He added that "Rumors, and fear that arises from rumors, are a great threat to us. Fear itself is a great threat, and people who spread false rumors about concentration camps are either ignorant of the facts or have a motive of dividing this country."

The following appeared in an article in the March 3, 1968 issue of "The Washington Post," captioned "Negro Detention Camps: Debunking of a Myth";

Assistant Attorney General J. Walter Yeagley, whose Internal Security Division

of the Justice Department would administer Title II of the McCarran Act if it were invoked, says there are two basic reasons why the Act could not be legally applied against a nameless mass of Negroes who happen to be in a street where a riot is taking place:

The Act requires that each "detained" person be arrested on a warrant specifying his name and stating the Government's belief that he may engage or conspire to engage in sabotage or espionage.

Even if the rioting were formally declared an "insurrection," there is no evidence to date that it is or may be fomented "in aid of a foreign enemy," as required before Title II could be applied.

"I know of no contingency plan for mass Federal detention of Negroes under Title II or any other statute," says Yeagley. "It would be absolutely unconstitutional for us to do what Rap Brown accuses us of doing."

Sincerely,

J. WALTER YEAGLEY,
Assistant Attorney General.

[From The Black Panther, July 12, 1969]
CONCENTRATION CAMPS

In a recent article I've written about the extermination of our Black population. Well, now if you are still not convinced here comes the where's.

Let's deal with the names and locations before going any further:

Tule Lake—California.
Wickenburg—Arizona.
Florence—Arizona.
Safford—Arizona.
Tucson—Arizona.
El Reno—Oklahoma.
Montgomery—Alabama.
Greenville—South Carolina.
Mill Point—West Virginia.
Allenwood—Pennsylvania.
Avon Park—Florida.
Elmendorf—Alaska.

Well these are the known areas for detention. This may be your home tomorrow or it may be your place of burial the day after. I stated "Maybe," because I don't know if you are armed or not and I don't know if you are brainwashed and, or narrow-minded or not and I don't if you exercise the wisdom of being prepared just in case the Black Panther Party is right or not. I don't know if you value your life enough to fight for it. So I'll stick to "Maybe."

Three of these detention centers are now in operational use in a slightly different guise, the rest (as far as I know) are ready and available with a minimum of preparation—and all that is needed to fill these camps with thousands of Black, whites, browns, is a high ranking pig—(probably one you voted in) to launch "Operation Dragnet."

The warrants already exist. The concentration camps are mostly ready and waiting. Only the time to fill them has not yet arrived. Operation Dragnet is the manifestation of Title II of the Beastly McCarran Act, a law which when put into force can slap at least 12,000 suspected subversives behind barbed wire within 24 hours.

On September 22, 18 years ago Congress, by a two-thirds vote, made an official public law 831. Now it is known as the Internal Security Act of 1950. Under it, the president is authorized to declare the existence of an "Internal Security Emergency" caused by war, invasion or civil uprising.

Thus giving the pigs the power to arrest and jail anyone they think will engage in or probably conspire against the government of the United States. You can be snatched off the streets or from your home and never be heard from again. (Remember the beginning outrages against the Jewish population of Germany) Ponar. Without even a hearing, Title II permits the G-men or other arresting officers to jail you for 48 hours—and if in that period of time the Attorney General's

office feels that you are any way a threat to National Security, your hearing as well as your whereabouts can be kept secret. Anyone considered as a ghetto dweller can be a threat because the manner of life you are forced to live warrants change, not to mention, revenge.

The Bay Area is full of FBI, CIA (G-Men) or shall we say S.S. I advise you not to take this lightly, because if you are not following the advice and tactics set down for you by the Black Panther Party, then you are virtually defenseless.

For you brothers and sisters who plan to survive here in the Bay Area or anywhere in fascist U.S.A. I say to you "All Power to the People". For the rest I will sadly say, that Tule Lake, Calif., nine miles outside of Newall is waiting for you. From 1942 through March 1946 it held 16,000 Japanese-Americans, when they were released they fled the barbed wire and clapboard GI barracks like the wretched internees they were.

Tule Lake has been on standby since 1952, about the same time that the numerous passification and dividing programs popped up on the scene. The plan is set out in elaborate detail in a government document of the 90 Congress and session called House Report No. 1351 and is dated May 6, 1968. Here is how the Blacks will be dealt with: Identification cards will be issued, and combat areas such as ghettos or riot torn college campuses, will be sealed off, and then—

1. A curfew would be imposed on the enclosed areas. No one would be allowed out of or into, the area after sundown.

2. During the night, authorities will not only patrol the boundary lines, but will also attempt to control the streets and, if necessary send out foot patrols through the entire area. If the guerrillas attempt to either break out of the area or (try) to engage the authorities in combat, they will be readily suppressed.

3. During a guerrilla uprising, most civil liberties will have to be suspended: Search and seizure operations would be instituted during daylight hours. Anyone found armed or without proper identification will be immediately arrested.

Most of the people of the ghetto would not be involved in the guerrilla operations and, under conditions of police and military control, some would help in ferreting out the guerrillas. Their help will be invaluable.

4. If the guerrillas were able to hold out for a period of time then the population of the ghetto would be classified through an office for "control and organization of the inhabitants."

This office would distribute census cards which would bear a photograph of the individual, the letter of the district in which he lives, his house and street number and a letter designating his home city. This classification would aid authorities in knowing the exact location of any suspect and who is in control of any given district. Under such a system, movement would be proscribed and the ability of the guerrilla to move freely from place to place would be seriously curtailed.

5. The population within the ghetto would be exhorted to work with authorities and to report both on guerrillas and any suspicious activity they might note.

Police agencies would be in a position to make immediate arrests, without warrants, under suspension of guarantees usually provided by the Constitution.

6. Acts of overt violence by the guerrillas, would mean that they have declared "a state of war" within the country and, therefore, would forfeit their rights as in wartime.

The McCarran Act provides for various detention centers to be operated throughout the country and these might well be utilized for the temporary imprisonment of warring guerrillas.

7. The very nature of guerrilla operations as presently envisioned by certain Communists and black nationalists would be impossible to sustain. According to the most knowledgeable guerrilla warfare experts in the country, the revolutionaries could be isolated and destroyed in a short period of time.

And that's official. That's Uncle Sam's plan. Thousands of human beings are already slated for this degenerate beastly system's secret camps. The odds are one in 200 that you are among them.

How do the names get there? Post office, police records, credit cards, welfare roles, school records, medical records, employment records, credit ratings.

Purpose of concentration camps: "The concentration camp, first used against the people of Germany was one of the fundamental institutions of the Nazi regime. It was a pillar of the system of terror by which the Nazis consolidated their power over Germany. It was a primary weapon in the battle against the Jews, against the Christian Church, against labor, against opposition or non conformity of any kind."

"The concentration camp involved the systematic use of terror to achieve the cohesion within Germany which was necessary for the execution of the Nazi conspirators plans for aggression. It was the final link in a chain, of terror and repression which involved the S.S. and the Gestapo, and which resulted in the apprehension of victims and their confinement without trial, often without charges and generally with no indication of the length of their detention."

Statement of American prosecution of Nuremberg War Crimes Trials 1946—Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression.

THE HONORABLE JAMIE L. WHITTEN, OF MISSISSIPPI

(Mr. NATCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have served as a member of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives for a period of 15 years. During this time I have had the distinct privilege and honor of serving on the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that provides the funds for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies with my friend, JAMIE L. WHITTEN, who has been the chairman of this particular subcommittee ever since I have been a member.

As chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Congressman JAMIE L. WHITTEN has established an excellent record and is recognized throughout the 50 States as one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives. He is a true friend of the American farmer.

I have served on the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations longer than any present member other than my chairman, JAMIE L. WHITTEN. When I was first selected to go on the Committee on Appropriations it was my hope and desire to serve on the Agriculture Subcommittee. In addition to serving on this subcommittee, I am a member of the subcommittee that appropriates the funds for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and, in

addition, am chairman of the District of Columbia Budget Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, JAMIE L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi, is recognized as one of the Nation's strongest advocates of conservation of natural environment, and on January 23 was honored by the National Limestone Institute at their annual congressional banquet.

In recognition of Congressman WHITTEN's long service to the benefit of the Nation's agriculture and his continuing hard work to conserve natural resources, the 549 members of the National Limestone Institute adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the Honorable Jamie L. Whitten, Member of Congress, selfless public servant to his state and nation without surcease since the age of 21, devoted advocate, missionary, and dedicated leader on behalf of the priceless heritage of our nation's lands has achieved an unexcelled magnitude of accomplishments therefor; and

Whereas he has guided the development of a record of strong support in the Congress for soil conservation programs, the Extension Service, 4-H Club work, rural electrification, loans for rural housing, flood prevention and watershed programs; and

Whereas Congressman Whitten has long been the resolute leader of the Congress in providing monies for all conservation programs, and is the recognized champion in protecting, preserving, restoring our natural resources "which will always be the base upon which all the rest of our economy depends;" and

Whereas during his incumbency as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture the American farmer has become enabled to produce food and fiber for our people in large quantities and at low costs which are unmatched anywhere in the world; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the National Limestone Institute, Inc., in Convention in Washington, D.C., this twenty-third day of January, 1970, that the Institute express its grateful appreciation for his superlative work; and,

Be it further resolved that the Honorable Jamie L. Whitten be the 1970 recipient of the National Limestone Institute's Distinguished Service Award for Outstanding Contribution to the Nation's Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, presentation of the Distinguished Service Award by Robert M. Koch, president of National Limestone Institute, followed Congressman WHITTEN's address to the institute's members and congressional guests on "Some Problems Created by Urbanization."

Congressman WHITTEN is only the 10th man to receive the National Limestone Institute Award for Distinguished Service to the Nation's agriculture since the institute was formed 25 years ago.

THE SUPREME COURT AND THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

(Mr. McMILLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has rendered a number of decisions during the past few years that have vitally affected our public school system here in the United States. We realize that the Supreme Court reinterpreted the Constitution and legislative clause on integration which so substantially affected our school system.

One of the Court orders recently rendered in my congressional district has done great damage to the public school system and race relations in one of the outstanding counties in my district and in the State of South Carolina. There is no county in the United States where both white and black races enjoy such excellent relations as they have always enjoyed in the county of Darlington, S.C. We have some real leaders in both races and they have always cooperated and lived congenially together. I had received no complaints from Darlington County concerning integration until the recent Court order which is completely tearing down the public school system in that county.

I have had numerous telephone calls and letters during the past week from both races, black and white, stating that they strenuously objected to the recent Supreme Court order which will, unless changed, cause a number of seniors in the Darlington public schools to fail to graduate this year.

I, of course, realize, and I think all my constituents who will take time to think will realize, that Members of Congress have no jurisdiction over court orders rendered and prepared by the U.S. Supreme Court. However, I do wish they would discontinue issuing orders of this nature in the middle of a school term if the judiciary is actually interested in educating our younger generation. I know that this is a matter that is squarely between the school officials, the individual people in every State, and the Federal courts. It is not a problem for politicians and I was hoping that the people in my district would not try to make a United States court order a political football, as our wonderful school system should not be subjected to politics.

On two occasions within the past year the House has added amendments to appropriations bills calling for freedom of choice and no busing of children for the purpose of racial balance in our schools. However, both these bills have failed to pass the U.S. Senate. The southern Members of Congress fully realize that all the Court orders have been directed toward the Southern States and we have done everything legally possible to use the legislative process to correct this situation. We simply do not have sufficient votes to overturn any of the Supreme Court's decisions since the North, East, and West have been voting against us.

I have a bill for freedom of choice before the House Judiciary Committee. However, I am not naive enough to think the committee chaired by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER would ever favorably report my bill to the floor of the House.

Our only chance is to add amendments to the appropriations bills with the hope that we can get a freedom-of-choice bill finally enacted into law.

TO PROHIBIT INVOLUNTARY BUSING OF SCHOOLCHILDREN

(Mr. TAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today I

introduced a bill to prohibit the involuntary busing of schoolchildren and to adopt freedom of choice as a national policy. The forced busing of school children away from neighborhood schools is wrong and Congress must find a way to stop it. It is costly, time consuming, and dangerous. It in no way improves the quality of education. It cuts across both races and does damage to both races.

I favor equality of educational opportunities by providing a good school in every community and giving all pupils genuine freedom to attend the school that their parents choose. This would give all children of all races an equality of education and an equality of liberty.

The neighborhood school backed by community support has become the backbone of American education and it is being destroyed by busing. Parents all over the South do not understand why their right to send their children to the neighborhood school a few blocks away is being denied. They resent this tyranny from the judiciary and from HEW. No parents, black or white, have told me that they prefer that their children be bused away from the neighborhood school to the other side of a town or county.

As you recall, last year the House passed an amendment to the HEW appropriations bill providing that no Federal funds could be used for the busing of pupils in order to secure racial balance. Then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Mr. Finch, opposed the amendment bitterly and persuaded the Senate to kill it. Yet the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, controlled by Secretary Finch, is applying two sets of standards in the Nation—one for the South and one for the rest of the Nation. Certainly the same guidelines should be enforced uniformly throughout the Nation. Such an enforcement would bring an end to busing, because people throughout the Nation would see the futility of it. Busing to secure racial balance was tried in New York City and then abolished by act of the New York Legislature. If people in New York do not want this system for themselves, surely they would not try to force it on another section of the Nation.

ROGERS PUSHES "GET THE LEAD OUT" CAMPAIGN

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the recent action taken by certain members of the automobile and petroleum industries since last week when I called for a "Get the Lead Out" campaign.

As I have proposed, there would be a phasing out of leaded gasoline, thus allowing the automobile industry to install more effective muffler devices to cut down on the pollution emitted from autos.

Two petroleum firms have indicated they would be willing to develop lead-free gasoline if the automobile industry

would develop engines which could use lower octane gas.

And we also have pledges from certain automobile manufacturers that indeed they will develop an engine which will use lead-free gas and will install muffler systems which will be capable of eliminating between 90 and 97 percent of the hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide which now pollutes our air.

I commend these companies. But at the same time, I would point out that only a portion of the petroleum industry has come forth and indicated they are willing to help clean up the air.

We are now in a "chicken and egg" debate. The oil companies say they will develop lead-free gas if the automakers will develop engines. From the first statements from both industries, it is obvious that the production of lead-free gas is a technical possibility, as is the development of lower combustion engines.

I have already mentioned that the Subcommittee on Public Health is planning to continue hearings on H.R. 14733 the Clean Air Act which I introduced last session and we hope that by the hearing date the oil companies will have reached a unanimous decision to help us fight air pollution by producing lead-free gasoline. If not, then standards for fuel I feel will be forthcoming.

Last month I wrote to several companies asking what would be involved in producing lead-free gasoline. As yet, I have not heard from all such companies.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge that all the petroleum companies now remaining silent on this issue make their stand known.

We could start this program this year and have a complete conversion within 5 or 6 years. I feel this would represent the single greatest breakthrough in the fight to make our environment a cleaner one particularly when one realizes that 60 percent of air pollution comes from the automobile.

AID FOR ISRAEL

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, while communism continues to stir up conflicts all over the world, it is heartening to see at least one country standing up to Soviet pressures.

That country is Israel. And that country deserves our whole-hearted support. In light of continuing Soviet aid to Nasser there is only one side for us to be on here, oil or no oil.

Twenty-two years of Arab siege have weakened neither Israel's determination nor ability to survive. Indeed, that small State is now stronger than ever.

But the Soviet Union has virtually donated billions of dollars worth of arms to its Arab clients, tossing in thousands of Soviet "advisers" to accompany the arms. Egypt's Nasser, the Russian's chosen instrument for spreading Russian influence and power in the Middle East, has been the best customer. The Soviet-groomed, Soviet-armed Nasser today poses the greatest threat to Israel's security. The United States must see to it

that Israel remains capable of meeting that threat.

The United States has never given arms to Israel, and Israel does not ask that it do so now. Nor has Israel ever asked that American boys be sent over to fight in her defense. She asks only that we sell her the weapons that she needs to defend herself. Surely, we can do no less.

The Arab countries buy from both East and West—and at favorable terms. Now that France has become a major supplier of the Arab States and is embargoing shipments to Israel, Israel's position has become more critical than ever.

In view of Israel's virtual dependence on the United States for arms, I think that we must make it clear that when we meet her military requests we do so willingly and gladly—for this is one country completely committed to democracy and to freedom.

A strong Israel is the best deterrent to Soviet-Arab aggression. For if the Egyptians or the Russians have reason to doubt Israel's ability to thwart an attack, that attack will most certainly come. The United States, by complying with Israel's requests to purchase arms, can help make sure that no such doubts arise. President Nixon has pointed out the necessity of providing Israel with a margin of military superiority over the Arab States, and I strongly support this view.

But in addition to the military offensive in the Middle East there is also a diplomatic offensive. When the Arab armies and their Soviet arms went down in June 1967, Soviet prestige in the area went with them. Thus the Soviets have been trying to recoup their losses by backing the Arab postwar demands to the hilt in the diplomatic arena.

The Russians would like nothing better than to vest the Arab bloc with a status-quo-ante Arab aggression settlement. This is exactly what they are trying to do. But the Israelis are not about to give up any of their hard-won territorial gains—nor should they—without a concrete assurance of Arab willingness to accept peace with Israel, once and for all and to recognize Israel as a *de jure* State. This assurance can come only from the Arabs themselves, and it can only be communicated by the Arabs to the Israelis—not by ill-intentioned Soviet diplomats to their well-intentioned American counterparts. And this assurance, if it is to be worthy of the name, must be sealed in a peace treaty.

If Israel relinquished these territories in advance of a peace treaty, there would be no peace treaty forthcoming, for there would be nothing to induce the Arabs to join Israel at the peace table. And there would be little to stop the Arabs from launching, another full-scale war, for they would be led to believe that a new attempt would at worst simply leave them back where they started. Their loss of arms has been more than made up for by the Soviet Union.

Israel's stamina in the face of the military and political Soviet-Arab offensive provides a ray of hope for all small countries who have reason to fear the heavy hand of the Soviet Union. She knows that

she cannot afford to settle for anything short of a real Arab peace treaty, and she is going to stay where she is until she gets one. The integrity and the wisdom of Israel's position should be clear to all those who sincerely want peace to come to the Middle East.

It is in America's interest to strengthen Israel and we should not impose conditions—political or economic—in transferring arms to Israel which in any way abridge her sovereignty or prejudice her prospects, for the attainment of a real peace with her neighbors. Such a settlement is urgently needed in the cause of world peace.

VAGUE CHARGES AND QUOTING OUT OF CONTEXT ON C-5A

(Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat startled and somewhat amused by remarks of the senior Senator of Wisconsin which appeared in the February 5, 1970, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I was startled, Mr. Speaker, because it appears to this Representative that the Senator is practicing by his statement precisely what he is complaining about others having done; namely, making vague charges and quoting out of context.

I am amused, Mr. Speaker, by the expertise of confusion, in the political sense, with which the senior Senator attempts to accomplish this by his statement.

In the statement he refers to some unnamed individuals or groups as having made certain vague, undefined statements about him. If the Senator desires to make accusations, let him specifically name those to whom he attributes these statements. Otherwise, one may wonder about the origin of the statements.

Let him not engage in the old political game of using terms such as "some people," "they," and like vague references to nameless individuals who he says are accusing him of some act or the other.

I state here and now that the Senator's qualifications to judge whether the C-5 is safe at any load are the same as his qualifications to judge whether from a technical view the Apollo spacecraft is safe at any load.

But aside from that, there are certain items that can be determined from the record and the Senator quotes Al Smith as stating:

Let us look at the record.

And he continues:

Let us examine the misstatements and misrepresentations and lay them side by side with the truth.

Then the Senator proceeds to use a series of jumbled statements, some taken out of context, by which he attempts to defend the so-called charges he says "some" have made against him. I still do not know who these nameless people are.

But let us look at the record. In the first statement he makes a charge that

the C-5A did not meet the FAA requirements. This aircraft, of course, is not designed for commercial use but for military use and military standards are the criteria to be met. However, the FAA requirements referred to are probably those in the Whittaker report, page 3, listed below:

h. Sink rate reduction from 10 f.p.s. (FAA certification requirement) to 9 f.p.s. The current standard MIL-8862 specifies 10 f.p.s. but does not specify design strength at 150% of limit load without failure as used for the C-5 with 9 f.p.s. sink rate.

This item acknowledges that the C-5 is designed to higher strength than FAA requires. The standard military 9 feet per second can be put in perspective with the realization that the C-130 transport is designed to 9 feet per second and engages in assault takeoffs and landings daily in Vietnam, as much more demanding environment than any commercial airliner is exposed. It certainly complies with all requirements for the mission it is designed to accomplish.

Second, the Senator tries through an obvious twisting of the Whittaker report to make it appear that the mere fact that there have been a series of changes in the specifications of the aircraft is something of a horrible nature when, in fact, the report from which the Senator takes his information points out that the changes are beneficial.

Mr. Speaker, there have been some 46 designed performance changes to date and quoting directly from the report:

None of these changes has degraded the mission performance requirements, e.g., payload/range, takeoff, and landing distance or cruise speed . . . for these criteria changes (are) to the mutual benefit of both the Air Force and the contractor. It looks as though we will have a good aircraft.

Now why did not the Senator quote this section?

Then the Senator, practicing some more of the deception which he is decrying, attempts to make it appear that the Whittaker report verifies that only 40 airplanes are needed. He does this by taking out of context statements on page 3 of the report. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those who do not have the report, I would like to quote in full the pertinent section:

This fact was a consideration in the decision to have 6 squadrons of C-5A aircraft and reduce the programmed C141 force from 20 squadrons to its current level. An extrapolation of this thesis using currently projected C-5A costs again demonstrates that if (emphasis added) the outsize requirements necessitates the procurement of at least (emphasis added) 40 C-5A aircraft, additional quantities of this aircraft will be the most economical means of meeting all types intercontinental military airlift needs beyond present airlift force capacities (emphasis added).

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Whittaker report, which the Senator attempts to distort, confirms that the original requirement based on a decision of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was for six squadrons—96 airplanes plus spares and others for a total of 120—not for 40. The only statement about the 40 is that if outsize requirements dictate the need of at least 40, the most economical means

of providing for the necessary airlift requirements would be additional C-5A's. After having read the Whittaker report, I must admit that I am somewhat astounded that the Senator could interpret it in the manner that he did, but for the benefit of all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I placed its actual words in the RECORD.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Senator ignores that part of the Whittaker report relating to the cost of the C-5 as related to the 747 and makes a vague charge that one cost twice as much as the other. On page 3-5 of the Whittaker report it says:

Cost of the standard commercial version of the 747B-F (without AGE, data, or training costs) is estimated at about \$22 million each (similar quantities to C-5A buy). The comparable C-5A cost is \$26.9 million.

The report goes on to note that the 747 does not have the needed military features of the C-5 which would cost extra in the 747.

However, the most astounding statement by the Senator is that the 747, a civilian plane, is comparable to the C-5 in most aspects. What a tremendous oversimplification. True, both the C-5 and the 747 have four engines, are land planes, and are of about the same size and speed, but that is like saying a woman is comparable to a man. Just as a man can never birth a baby the 747 could never do the job of the C-5.

Mr. Speaker, to illustrate the differences, I quote from the Whittaker report on page 2:

In addition to the gross tonnage capability improvement, the most remarkable aspect of the C-5A introduction is a very significant gain in military flexibility. The C-5A evolved from a Specific Operational Requirement (SOR) prepared by the Air Force from Army requirements. It was based on all of the operational experience derived from more than a decade of airlift usage in Berlin, Beirut, the Congo, Korea and extensive development exercises in the field.

The major features designed into the C-5A enable it to reach any part of the globe with a minimum number of refueling stops, or, if necessary, without stopping, by the use of aerial refueling. Its high flotation 28 wheel landing gear will permit it to land on 4000 ft. unpaved fields. Its cargo deck is low to the ground (truck bed height) and enables easy, quick loading and unloading. For vehicular loads, the aircraft drops each end of its cargo deck to provide ramps for roll-on roll off access. In the event of resupply requirements not near an airfield, the rear of the aircraft opens to permit airdrop delivery of loads up to units of 50,000 lbs. It is equipped with special avionics which enable it to pinpoint any target location at night or in adverse weather and to achieve that objective in formation with other C-5A's if large scale simultaneous deliveries are required. In summary, the C-5A provides mobility to our General Purpose Forces which is superior to that which can be achieved with any other transport system in the world.

There is no practical alternative to achieve this capability. The 747 and other commercial augmentation aircraft of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) will be able to assist in meeting resupply airlift requirements, but will not be able to operate into unimproved airfields or airfields without ground handling equipment for loading and unloading, nor to accept outsize cargo, nor to operate under the unprotected conditions

for which the C-5A has been designed, nor to function in the air drop resupply role.

Now, for the Senator's charge that the C-5 is unsafe to fly until what he called the problem of the wing crack is solved, let us look at the facts.

It is quite correct that a minor wing structure modification is required on the C-5. This was pointed out by laboratory test and the discovery of a hairline crack in a cap on a wing spar in C-5 No. 3.

After engineers designed and tested an appropriate strengthening modification for the wing, C-5 No. 3, the structural test airplane, returned to Marietta for installation of the modification. During flight testing, airplane No. 3 was utilized in flight and ground operations well above load factors and weights permitted on other airplanes so as to verify C-5 structural integrity. The world's heaviest airplane takeoff weight, 798,200 pounds, was accomplished on No. 3 to allow in-flight maneuvers at the C-5's maximum design gross weight. While Galaxy No. 3 was being readied for the modification, small 8-inch cracks were detected on both the left and right wings in the area destined to be modified. Ship No. 3 had been flying for an unknown number of hours with the cracks present thereby confirming Lockheed's design philosophy of "damage tolerant." This philosophy demands design of the structure that if a structural weakness occurs there will be sufficient strength in an adjacent structural member to carry the load transferred from the weakened member and prevent a catastrophic loss. The wing structure of the C-5, as typified in ship No. 3, clearly demonstrated that a structural failure is compensated for by adjacent structure.

On discovering the cracks on ship No. 3, Lockheed immediately undertook detailed inspection of the other nine C-5's that were flying. All these airplanes were cleared by experts, not politicians, and returned to flight status.

Professional aerospace experts from both the Air Force and Lockheed after detailed investigation have validated the safety margin for the C-5 and approved continued flying with appropriate operational restrictions.

There is absolutely no need to ground the C-5 pending retrofit of the modification in the view of responsible highly competent aeronautical engineers.

Apparently, the Senator is unaware of the plan to incorporate the wing modification on airplanes No. 14 and subsequent prior to delivery to the Air Force. Additionally, the proposal calls for retrofit of the modification in all airplanes except No. 5 by mid-August. In fact, airplane serials 1, 3, 6, and 9 are currently in work for the wing beefup.

I cannot help but think that the Senator is trying to trade on his reputation as a fiscal expert to endow statements on technical matters with the aura of unquestionable truth. Further, I cannot help but ask myself this question. Is he engaging in a personal vendetta to make the C-5 scapegoat? I ask this because he, a politician as am I, would try to substitute his judgment on technical matters for that of professional aeronautical engineers.

PRESERVING THE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL

(Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which is addressed to a serious problem confronting all sections of our Nation—the disruption of the neighborhood school system through the busing of schoolchildren, the pairing of schools, and other devices aimed at achieving racial desegregation and/or racial balance in the Nation's schools. This is far more than a regional problem, but one which is confronting parents, children, and school officials in many places throughout the United States. If we permit the basic American institution of the neighborhood school to be destroyed, in my judgment there will be far-reaching effects upon the life of our society far too adverse to justify any alleged social gain achieved thereby.

Most Americans who are parents select the neighborhood in which they live with great care. For most of us the quality of the neighborhood's schools constitute a basic prerequisite for moving there. The typical American devotes time, energy, and money through the local PTA and in other ways toward the improvement of the neighborhood's school or schools which his children attend. To require his children to walk or be bused past their neighborhood school is an unreasonable and unwarranted abrogation of the obvious rights of parents and children alike. Why should parents work to purchase a home and continually strive to provide for their children the best possible environment if the Federal courts, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or any other authority in turn compels the children of those parents to attend other schools which are in many instances well removed from the neighborhood in which they live?

This innovation in American education by those who advocate the achievement of racial balance as the primary value of an educational system subjects young children to difficulties and dangers clearly beyond any involved in their attendance at a neighborhood school. It is unreasonable in the extreme, for example, to compel first graders to walk extra distances and cross major traffic arteries at the rush hour when such children could attend schools closer to their homes. To force a young child to attend a school which his mother cannot easily reach in the event of injury or illness is a similar intrusion upon the rights of parent and child. In too many instances, furthermore, efforts to achieve racial balance in our schools are subjecting schoolchildren to pressures and prejudices which are seriously disrupting their education.

Mr. Speaker, the battle to preserve the neighborhood school is a fight for the rights of all Americans, regardless of their race or creed and against the clear abrogation of these rights which we are witnessing today. Because this is a battle which the Congress ought to fight and

which we must win. I am introducing legislation on this date which would prohibit any elementary or secondary school student from being required to attend a school other than that school in closest proximity to his home, without the consent of his parents.

The legislation which I am introducing today has nothing to do with the composition of a school's student body, racial or otherwise. Nor is desegregation of schools by other lawful and less disruptive means in any way affected by this measure. It would, for instance, still allow for the desegregation of faculties by means of transfers and it would fully preserve voluntary transfer rights.

This legislation provides full recognition and preservation of the rights of those children who feel—or whose parents feel—that their educational opportunities can be bettered through transfer to other schools. This bill would also protect, however, the rights of those parents and children who do not wish to travel great distances to schools when appropriate schools already exist in their own neighborhoods. Toward this end, there is a definite need for such legislation which simply and specifically precludes the compulsory attendance of students at schools far from their homes.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow attempts to change the composition of our Nation's schools to thwart their basic purpose of providing quality education. Nor can we allow such attempts to abrogate the rights of those very persons our educational systems are meant to serve.

It is tragic that the Nation's schools have become a battleground in our time, but for the sake of all Americans the battle for the survival of the neighborhood school system in our country is one we cannot afford to lose.

HOW TO GET INTEREST RATES DOWN

(Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned about inflation, high interest rates and the scarcity of funds for mortgages. Few find inflation attractive but too many lose sight of the devastation it creates when called upon to support the measures necessary to correct it.

I share the concerns of my colleagues. I recognize that in a period such as this the burden of responsibility, should I say the burden of statesmanship, hangs heavy upon us. Yet, I must say that I feel that we in Congress must share the blame for these problems and I know that we can help correct them.

As the ranking minority member of the House Banking and Currency Committee I am particularly concerned about the general scarcity of mortgage funds and the fact that those funds which are available are so costly that they price low and middle income people out of the market. Even the interest subsidy programs we have enacted are less effective and can aid fewer people when rates are high.

Unfortunately this seems to be a subject somewhat like the weather in that everyone talks about it but no one does much about it. One reason I believe is because it is so hard for most people to see and understand the relationship between inflation, high interest rates, and tight money. I was pleased to find an article by Mr. Ralph F. Leach, vice chairman of the board of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. in the January 1970 issue of the Morgan Guaranty survey entitled "How To Get Interest Rates Down." I submit this article for inclusion with these remarks and commend it to you for reading.

The article is outstanding not because it tells us of any simple cure. It does not. It says just what every intelligent economist has been saying for months, namely that high interest rates are a result of, I repeat "a result" of inflation. I know there are a few, including a minority of the majority in this House who would argue that high rates are a cause of inflation but in the over view of our total national economy this position cannot be sustained.

What makes this article remarkable and informative is that it draws a direct correlation, in language the layman can understand, between rates of inflation and interest rates. It offers real and supportable promise that by getting inflation under control we can bring interest rates down and improve the availability of funds for mortgages.

For those of you who enjoy higher mathematics I refer you to a study entitled "Interest Rates and Price Level Changes, 1952-69" in the "Bulletin of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis" for December 1969. This highly technical study demonstrates the means by which conclusions such as those reached by the Morgan Guaranty Bank would be made.

What both these studies bear out is that long-term interest rates at any given time are the product of two things. First is the basic return which the lender feels is necessary for the use of the money. Second, the additional percentage the lender feels is necessary based upon the future rate of inflation.

I could explain this second point by relating it to risk. It is a risk of not getting back the same number of dollars, in purchasing power as were lent out. We are all familiar with the fact that some loans involve more risk than others and that those with a higher risk involve a higher rate. The U.S. Treasury, for example, has always been able to borrow at a relatively low rate as compared to the rates charged to an individual or a company whose credit standing is not well established.

We all talk about "reasonable" interest rates but no one seems to be able to define "reasonable." I found Mr. Leach's article provides some basis for judgments in this area. After reviewing the economies of industrialized nations he found that Great Britain had enjoyed a stable economy from 1850 to 1900 and that long-term funds were available at 3 percent in that country during that period. Using this as a base, that is the basic rate a lender expects to obtain for the

use of money, and the GNP inflator to compute the risk of inflation he was able to chart an amazing correlation between the sum and rates actually charged. Using this approach it is possible to say at least that it is reasonable to expect a certain rate of interest to accompany a certain rate of inflation. Most regrettably I have to report to you that with our present rate of inflation it is unreasonable to expect interest rates to decline.

I am particularly concerned that all members should recognize and understand this relationship between inflation and high interest rates because it will require the concerted effort of us all to correct this problem. It is one thing for us in the Banking and Currency Committee to identify inflation as the culprit which has driven up interest rates, disrupted the flow of mortgage money and stymied our efforts to achieve our housing goals. But no one committee, in this House can recommend any one action to cure inflation—it requires the concerted and coordinated effort of all of us working together.

Nor can we shirk this responsibility or shift it to others. Passage of legislation to authorize the President to impose credit controls is the kind of weak escapism we cannot afford. It suggests that we place the blame for inflation on the private users of credit and restrict it to cure the problem. My constituents do not fall for that and I dare say yours do not either. They know that the real culprit is the Federal Government—that its spending must be controlled and that control must first be exercised here in the Congress. If it is I think we can rest assured interest rates will decline and funds for home mortgages will again be available. The article follows:

[From the Morgan Guaranty Survey, January 1970]

HOW TO GET INTEREST RATES DOWN

(This article is an expanded and updated version of the testimony presented by Mr. Ralph F. Leach, Vice Chairman of the Board of Morgan Guaranty Trust Company, to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate on March 26, 1969.)

The year just ended can be characterized, with little risk of overstatement, as an astounding period for the cost of credit in the money and capital markets. Interest rates reached levels unmatched in modern times. The yield on three-month U.S. Treasury bills exceeded 8% at the peak in December. High quality long-term corporate bonds often required a yield well in excess of 9% in order to be attractive to investors—resulting in borrowing costs never before experienced in corporate financial history. Municipal issues moved up in yield until at the peak they offered, on average, a return of nearly 7% tax-free. And borrowing costs for the Treasury on its notes and bonds were higher than at any time in the past 100 years.

Homebuyers, meanwhile, saw the interest cost of a mortgage loan climb steadily during 1969 to reach 8½% and even more in some areas. Bank loans, too, grew more costly and harder to get as 1969 wore on—reflecting the severely restrictive policies pursued by the Federal Reserve.

With credit costs at such stratospheric heights it is not surprising that cries have gone up in Congress and elsewhere to get interest rates back to a "normal and reasonable" level. At Morgan Guaranty Trust

Company—and I think it is fair to say in the banking community generally—we are disturbed about the economic and financial situation which has brought interest rates to such high levels. While there has been a modest easing in rates in recent weeks, everyone agrees that interest rates at current levels still are much too high for the long-run good of the country.

Bankers, it is often said, rub their hands together in great glee when interest rates climb steeply. It happens, however, that this just isn't so. Many people overlook the fact that there are two sides to the phenomenon of rising interest rates. The obvious assumption is that, since higher rates mean more income for lenders, bankers and other lenders always try to push rates to the highest possible level. The other side of this, often forgotten or ignored, is that banks are borrowers as well as lenders and higher rates mean higher costs for them. In addition, banks have large portfolios of fixed-income securities, and higher interest rates mean depreciation in the market value of these holdings.

Interest rates, of course, are a price—the price of borrowed money. Since interest rates merely express the price relationship which mediates between the demand for and the supply of credit, getting interest rates down from today's high levels and keeping them there in the 1970's will require three things, most probably in combination:

1. Some dampening of the overwhelming desire to use borrowed money.

2. An increase in the willingness to save money.

3. A significant and lasting reduction in the rate of price inflation below last year's 6%, as measured by the increase in the consumer price index, the highest in nearly two decades.

Point number 3—the need sharply to reduce inflation—is of critical importance. From many years of living day to day in the markets where money is bought and sold, borrowed and lent, it is my feeling that the level of interest rates, by and large, reflects the appraisal of borrowers and lenders of the prospects for future price stability. This is particularly true of long-term rates, since an investor who is turning over his savings to someone else under a long-term fixed-income contract naturally will expect not only a reasonable return to compensate him for the use of his money but an additional rate of return to compensate him for any anticipated loss of purchasing power. Another way of saying this is that only those countries which can demonstrate long-run price stability can expect an economic and savings pattern which will provide low long-term interest rates.

The observed link between interest rates and the pace of price inflation is not, of course, something that only recently has come to light—as the box on this page indicates. However, we at Morgan Guaranty have used this link as the basis for extensive analysis designed to aid the bank and its customers in anticipating interest rate movements for business purposes. In doing this we have utilized techniques of the new science of operations research. Our objective has been to improve our own investment performance and the counsel we give our clients with respect to their financing plans.

We started our analysis by trying to determine a proper assumption as to a reasonable rate of return in a noninflationary setting. Our observations, historical and more recent, led us to conclude that an expectation of absolute price stability over the life of a long-term security involving virtually no credit risk would produce an interest rate of about 3%.¹

¹ Such a rate is comfortably above what J. M. Keynes considered a rock-bottom floor

We tested this assumption over periods of financial history in the U.S. and other countries. Unfortunately, there are not many periods of price stability to study. Wars and their accompanying inflation have erupted with distressing regularity. The financial upheavals associated with the great depression of the 1930's knocked relationships out of kilter for quite a while in most countries. During World War II—and continuing up to 1951—interest rates were artificially pegged in this country.

It is interesting, however, that in the one extended period of price stability recent enough so that we have fairly good records of both rates and prices, the idea of a basic 3% rate seems to be supported. The economic history of the last half of nineteenth-century England reveals that by and large it was a period free of inflationary pressures, and that the consumer's shilling bought approximately as much at the end of the century as it did in the 1850's. Long-term British issues fluctuated around a 3% yield during the entire half-century; in fact the rate tended to decline as the period of price stability lengthened.² What this suggests is that long-term interest rates at any given time are the product of two things: a basic return of something approximately 3% plus some additional percentage based on investors' expectations of future inflation.

THE INFLATION-EXPERIENCE FACTOR

To quantify this expectational factor, we took various measures of inflation and checked out their correlation with interest rate movements. As one measure, we tried using the average of consumer prices. This index, however, deviated rather widely at times from the trend in bond prices. The measure which showed the highest degree of correlation was the annual rate of increase in prices as reflected in the GNP deflator, that broad measure which the U.S. Department of Commerce employs to eliminate the effect of price changes from the gross national product. The time period for which the deflator showed the smallest deviation from bond prices turned out to be the 24 months preceding any given interest rate reading. Most of the time, that is, the addition of this "inflation-experience factor" to 3% has produced a reasonably good approximation of actual marketplace interest rates. This can be seen from the chart on page 8, depicting experience during the 1960's. The line labeled "actual" records the trend of yields on new issues of high grade corporate bonds. The line labeled "calculated" was arrived at by combining 3% with the "inflation-experience factor," based on the GNP deflator.

The generally close correlation between the calculated rate and the actual rate set in the marketplace seems persuasive documen-

demanded by lenders. In his *General Theory of Employment Interest and Money*, he referred to a "minimum rate of interest acceptable to the generality of wealth-owners"—a rate which he suggested might be 2%. Reflecting his rather unsympathetic attitude toward the rentier, Keynes footnoted the nineteenth-century saying, attributed to Bagehot, that "John Bull can stand many things, but he cannot stand 2 per cent."

² The British *Radcliffe Report* in 1959 lends support to the idea of a basic 3% gilt-edged return. Sir Roy Harrod, in his testimony, urged that 3% "on which (Britain) prospered and expanded for a century" has a claim to be regarded as a normal rate to which reasonable policies will bring the market "quite naturally, without any fuss or bother." Professor J. R. Hicks based his belief in this concept of a normal 3% rate "... on a review of the last two hundred years," arguing "that it has generally been during wars and their aftermaths that the long rate has been appreciably above the 3% level..."

tation of the link between inflation and interest rates.

The implications of this for national economic and financial policy are clear. It is imperative that such policies concentrate on controlling inflation and reducing the expectation, all too widespread in homes and businesses, that a high and ever rising rate of inflation will continue in the months ahead.

With a lowering of the inflation rate, or even a lessened expectation that the current rate will be maintained, a lowering of interest rates very likely will follow. In fact a realization on the part of investors that the Congress, the Administration, and the Federal Reserve System are determined to control inflation would in itself have a powerful effect on the interest rate level.

Dr. Arthur F. Burns, in Congressional hearings last month on his appointment as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, emphasized the importance of curbing inflation in order to bring down interest rates:

"At the present time we suffer from a lack of confidence on the part of business and financial people in the willingness of this government to pursue an anti-inflationary policy . . . We must have a budget for next year which will be regarded by financial people as being anti-inflationary. If we do that, then I think our monetary authorities will no longer carry the heavy burden that they have been carrying. The inflation premium on interest rates will . . . tend to come down, and we could all begin to look forward to easier credit—lower interest rates."

Dr. Paul McCracken, Chairman of President Nixon's Council of Economic Advisers, linked inflation and interest rates in an interview in *U.S. News & World Report* on January 12, 1970.

"Today's high rates . . . are in part a reflection of past errors in economic policy. Once the economy starts expanding at too rapid a rate, bringing on sustained inflation, lenders of money insist on a rate of interest that leaves them with a decent return after inflation."

Some people argue that interest rates could be kept from rising by the adoption of a perpetual easy-money policy. Simply inject reserves into the banking system, they say, and low levels of yields will automatically follow. For a while, indeed, such a policy can keep rates low in the short-term end of the market. However, each increment of reserves supplied by the Federal Reserve System under this concept only serves to convince another segment of investors that price stability has been sacrificed, at least for the time being, to expediency. At each stage, we find these investors turning to equity-oriented employment of their funds and avoiding investment in long-term fixed-income securities. As a consequence, a monetary policy which is judged by the market to be unduly easy, or easy for too long, will almost certainly result in raising rather than lowering long-term interest rates.

The experience of 1967 (see accompanying chart) illustrates this point. Beginning late in 1966, long-term yields had started downward while the short-term money market was still fairly tight, reflecting market conviction that the Federal Reserve clearly intended to curb inflationary pressures. For a while after monetary policy turned easy, both long- and short-term rates moved lower. Fairly early in 1967, however, the market began to sense that the massive stimulative thrust of both fiscal and monetary policy risked an early resumption of inflationary pressures. From February until June, despite a steady supply of reserves to the market which pushed short-term yields steadily downward, long-term rates moved back up because inflationary expectations were increasing.

Experience in past years, particularly in 1967 and 1968, has convinced borrowers and lenders alike that in any future period of

uncertainty as to the economic outlook—that is, a situation in which the Federal Reserve System is confronted with a risk of a business slowdown or potentially greater inflationary pressures—doubts will be resolved on the side of economic stimulation.

This market conviction not only has produced high rates, it also has undermined the breadth and resilience of the fixed-income securities market. Yet the survival of this market is essential to the whole financial fabric of the country. Healthy debt markets are vital if businesses in the 1970's are to raise the funds needed to equip a growing work force and if the nation is to meet its vast social needs. It is true that some underdeveloped countries manage to survive without long-term capital markets—that is, of course, one reason why they are underdeveloped. And the United States doubtless could, over a period of time, restructure its markets and institutions to the expectation of perpetual inflation and still survive—but only at a tremendous cost in our standard of living.

We have come dangerously close to the total disruption of financial markets by yielding to the tempting thought that a little inflation never hurt anyone. The notion surely is open to challenge, but in any case what this country has experienced has not been a "little" inflation. The harm done in the last three or four years will take time to undo.

OUTLOOK CONSIDERATIONS

Against the background of a demonstrated link between inflation and interest rates, what is a reasonable expectation for borrowers in the future? More specifically, is there a chance that interest rates will be brought down—and brought down in a substantial way—this year and in 1971?

In attempting a look ahead, it is helpful to glance once again at the chart on page 8. From that, it can be seen that actual market-place interest rates during the last half of 1969 rose considerably above those that would have been expected on the basis of inflationary experience during the preceding two years. Whereas new issues of high-grade bonds carried yields of about 8.7% in December 1969, the sum of the basic interest rate of 3% and the "inflation-experience factor" works out at only about 7.7%.

Conceivably, the considerable discrepancy between the actual and the calculated interest rates may well be the result of the sort of "credibility gap" that Dr. Burns alluded to in his testimony before Congress in December. It evidences an assumption by borrowers and lenders that disinflation will not be pursued effectively and that high rates of inflation will persist for many months. As a consequence, it may very well be that, in the extremely distorted inflationary environment of 1969, investors tended to put more emphasis on immediately past experience as against experience over as long a period as two years.

If the assumption of continuing high rates of inflation were to be shattered by evidence of decisive support in Congress and in the Administration for sticking to policies aimed at restoring price stability, it is entirely reasonable to expect that interest rates promptly would head downward.

Monetary policies of the Federal Reserve, in fact, have been severely restrictive. The federal budget over the past year has tended to dampen economic activity, though fiscal restraint in 1970 is threatened by the end to the surcharge, by revenue losses from tax reforms, and by the large-sized increases voted in Social Security benefits. Only a tight-fisted hold on spending programs now can keep the federal budget from slipping rather heavily into the red.

As policies of monetary and fiscal restraint have taken hold, economic activity has slowed noticeably. Total output in the fourth quarter of 1969 showed no growth at all in

real terms. A number of prominent economists—including those in my own bank—see a distinct possibility that a recession may already have gotten under way.

The consensus of many economists is that inflation probably will in some degree moderate in 1970, and slacken further in 1971. The inflation rate, for example, is seen in many of these forecasts as dropping from the 4.5% rate, as measured by the GNP price deflator, for the fourth quarter of 1969 to roughly a 3.5% pace by the end of 1970. There is hope also that the trend will continue in 1971, producing a rate of inflation perhaps no more than 3% by the end of that year.

If in fact these forecasts of lower rates of inflation turn out to be fairly accurate, historical experience suggests that interest rates should decline from today's roof-top levels. Using the strictly mechanical approach of a 3% basic interest rate plus the inflation-experience factor, based on a moving average of prices over the previous two years, high-grade bond yields might fluctuate around the following levels: from the 8¾% of the fourth quarter 1969 to 8% by fourth quarter 1970, and down to 7% by the end of 1971.

Even if one had a sure-fire method for predicting inflation rates, it should be obvious, of course, that this approach is no foolproof formula for predicting interest-rate levels.

Many forces besides inflation influence interest rates at any given time. Only a partial list of such factors would include the stance of monetary policy, new financing volume, savings rates, and investor preferences. For the short run, trading swings in the market-place can cause rates to fluctuate on either side of the level indicated by the rate of inflation. And even for the long haul it surely would be unwise to forecast interest rates simply on the single consideration of the expected rate of price inflation.

Yet it is abundantly clear from the record that investors are naturally concerned with what they expect is going to happen to the value of the dollar. It follows, then, that the rates at which they will put their funds out to hire surely will reflect such a basic concern.

INFLATION AND INTEREST RATES: A LONG-OBSERVED LINK

The observed link between interest rates and the rate of inflation reaches far back into financial history.

Economist John Stuart Mill noted in his *Principles of Political Economy*, published in 1848:

"Depreciation, merely as such, while in process of taking place, tends to raise the rate of interest: and the expectation of further depreciation adds to this effect; because lenders who expect that their interest will be paid, and the principal perhaps redeemed, in a less valuable currency than they lent, of course require a rate of interest sufficient to cover this contingent loss."

But even at that early date Mill found that others had already made the same point. Nearly 40 years earlier—in 1811—Henry Thornton, the British monetary theorist, stated:

"In countries in which the currency was in a rapid course of depreciation, supposing there were no usury laws, the current rate of interest was often . . . proportionately augmented."

Irving Fisher, after years of study, concluded in 1896 that there was a close correlation between prices and interest rates. In his book *Appreciation and Interest*, Fisher wrote that high interest rates accompanying high prices, and low interest rates accompanied low prices. He viewed interest rates as being made up of two components:

1. The "real" rate of interest, to which real saving and investment respond,

2. An added premium based on expected changes in the price level.

The St. Louis Federal Reserve Bank, in its December 1969 *Review*, devoted 20 pages to an analysis of interest rates and price changes in the period 1952-69. The major finding—and its significance in measuring the impact of monetary policy—was put this way by the St. Louis Reserve Bank:

"Past price movements exert a major effect on nominal (observed) interest rates, with the effect largely manifested within two years. Consequently, most of the rise in market interest rates since 1965 can be attributed to the current inflation.

"This finding has an important implication for market interest rates as an indicator of the thrust of monetary actions on economic activity. High market interest rates do not necessarily indicate monetary excessive monetary ease (as measured by rapid expansion of the money supply), which results in rapidly expanding total spending and eventually inflation."

WHAT IS THE NIXON PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE—AND WHERE IS IT?

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, depressions in this country have historically been farm bred and farm fed. The Great Depression of 1929 had been preceded by a decade-long agricultural depression in rural America. The Republican Party, dominant in our National Government during the 1920's, turned a deaf ear to the economic anguish of the American farmer. This helped make inevitable the general economic collapse which followed. American agriculture revived and prospered during 20 years of Democratic rule but with assumption of office by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson in 1953, farm income began a precipitous slide downward. Four years later we experienced our most severe post World War II economic slump, the 1957-58 recession. I am fearful we are now headed down the same unfortunate path toward economic hard times for the American farmer and ultimately for the country as a whole.

After more than a year under the Republican administration of President Nixon, the Congress continues to wait in vain for proposals by the administration on farm programs.

Over and over again—at meeting after meeting—we have been told that answers were forthcoming to questions on how to deal with problems of the American farmer. Despite this promise of answers, we have received nothing in the way of constructive proposals on the part of the Department of Agriculture. Actually, the new administration has quickly mastered the put-off promise and appears to have made the technique a matter of common usage at the Department of Agriculture.

A new deal for the American farmer—we heard that theme repeated often by members of the Republican Party in the last election. Much was made by them over their promise of a Secretary of Agriculture who would speak to the White House for farmers, instead of speaking to farmers for the White House.

We have had a new Secretary for the Department of Agriculture for more than a year and I believe that farmers, and many of the Members of this body, are anxious for him just to speak—period. We would like to know his views; we would like—and have a right—to know how he and the administration stand on farm programs—what they have done so far, and what they expect to do.

For months the Secretary of Agriculture and an attachment of aides have been meeting informally with members of the Committee on Agriculture of this body. From these meetings, I am told, the impression has emerged that on policy the new Department officials are about as rootless as a tumbleweed in a whirlwind. They have been steadfast only to the suggestion that they will administer whatever Congress enacts.

What kind of leadership is this? What are farmers and Members of Congress to expect? In order to pass meaningful, sound farm legislation, we must have the President's proposals and his support. I and many others are increasingly troubled by this approach, or perhaps better, this lack of approach.

Consider the events of this past Tuesday, February 3. At long last the Department of Agriculture sent forward to the Agriculture Committee of this body some proposals for farm legislation and what were the circumstances? These proposals were not even given the administration stamp of approval.

They only carried the notation that herewith was a composite—a synthesis—a so-called bipartisan consensus—of legislative opinions expressed at the informal meetings, held earlier with the Agriculture Committee, Chairman POAGE immediately repudiated the suggestion that the proposals submitted came even close to a consensus of the group.

Certainly the issues at stake require more courage and initiative than what has been shown by the Department leadership thus far. The hour already has grown very late.

If no action is taken on new legislation, as now appears possible, because of the administration's lack of proposals, the Secretary of Agriculture will be required by law to proclaim wheat marketing quotas no later than April 15, 1970, and hold a referendum of wheat farmers on strict marketing controls prior to August 1. When last held in April of 1963, such a referendum was defeated. Today farmers are waiting with worry, fear, and doubts. In the case of wheat, the lead time required for intelligent planting decisions has been dissipated and farmers simply will not get details on programs far enough in advance.

The other major commodity programs expire at the end of this year. Will the lead time in the case of each of these be dissipated in inaction also?

The importance of action on farm legislation cannot be overemphasized, not only for its impact on the farmers of our Nation, but because of its impact on our total economy.

It is obvious that any producing group which buys about \$27 billion in production goods per year is an important factor in our general economy. The com-

mercial farmer buys about 5 percent of our total steel production, about \$1.6 billion of our petroleum products or about 11 percent of the total sold. He buys a lot of rubber for his cars and tractors. It is estimated that his purchases are the basis for about 6 million jobs in machinery, chemical, and other supply industries. In turn, his products are the basis for processing and marketing industries which provide an estimated 14 to 16 million jobs.

There is a growing trend in our expanding industrial economy, to underestimate the importance of the farm sector and its contributions to the total economy; unfortunately, this sector receives less and less emphasis. The significance of the farm sector in its interrelations to the rest of the economy however must be recognized because its products are necessary for our existence. We must have food and fiber to meet domestic requirements; we should also have enough additional food and fiber to help balance our trade.

We must also consider the impact of agriculture on the total economy. Recent data from my neighboring State of Kansas show this impact to be staggering. On the average, \$1 of farm income generated \$3.33 of total income, whereas \$1 of nonfarm income generated only \$1.46 of total income.

In addition, the farm sector in that State expended 84.4 percent of its income in the nonfarm sector, whereas the nonfarm sector expended only 10 percent of its income in the farm sector; and, lastly, there was an increasing interdependence between farm and nonfarm sectors in the period 1950 to 1966.

In recent years, the clamor to abandon farm programs has increased considerably in volume. I believe it is significant that critics of these programs in general offer no alternatives, and have ill-considered the consequences their actions might bring about.

I repeat: The hour already has grown late. President Nixon's administration must come forward, and come forward immediately, with legislative proposals and push for enactment of legislation which so vitally affects our farmers and our total economy.

It has the responsibility. It cannot shirk it. It cannot dodge it. If because of this administration's lack of agricultural proposals, lack of leadership or both, American agriculture suffers disaster, the responsibility will be at the door of the White House.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the other Members of the House who are stressing the need for more equitable farm legislation. Four years ago on this very date, as a result of a special election, I was privileged to become a Member of this great body. In this short period of time, this Nation has become the victim of almost unprecedented spiraling inflation and practically every segment of our economy has participated, through wage and price increases, except the American farmer.

It is ironic that in this inflation the American farmer is today receiving less of the consumer's dollar than he did 20 years ago while his cost of production

has increased several times. This, in itself, emphatically demonstrates the need for improved farm legislation. It is no wonder that we find a rapidly decreasing farm population, almost to the extent of being a national catastrophe. Many of you are concerned with an increased food stamp program—and, certainly, this is no criticism of food stamps—but I think it in order to remind you that if our farmers cannot survive economically then, heaven forbid, we will become a "have not" nation as it relates to the production of agricultural commodities. And, what, may I ask, would be the value of the food stamps if, indeed, there was no food for which to redeem them?

And so, those who are concerned with the overall economy and well-being of this Nation should look sympathetically at the plight of the farmer and join those of us who are attempting to bring forth legislation which might solve this acute problem.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CHAOS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS OF THE SOUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the southern region of this country is in the throes of a very serious problem—a problem that can no longer be considered regional. However, I fear that those of you in this body who represent constituencies outside of the South are not interested enough in this very serious matter.

The matter is the future of the public school system in a number of Southern States. It is serious to the extent that a large percentage of students are now attending poorly staffed and poorly equipped private schools and a significant number are just not attending school at all. It is serious because within the public school system itself only chaos is master. The teachers have been reshuffled and must start anew midway through a semester. The students have been thrown into mass confusion as a result of busing, transferring problems, new teachers, and new surroundings. Some children are about to be transferred to their third school this year.

Think now, what I am saying to you. Great numbers of students are being transferred in February and March, not between semesters, not at the end of a school year, but right in the middle of a semester. How does the receiving teacher grade the transferred student that she has never seen before when half of his work in the semester has been before another teacher in another school? Well

some schools have had to create artificial semesters and for many students there will be an extra set of grades. The poor teachers are swamped with extra work and there is chaos in the administrative office of the school boards.

Can all this be what we want for our children?

Yet, just about the only people in this or the other body expressing concern about the worsening situation are those colleagues who represent constituencies in the South. One's first impression of the inattention paid by those Congressmen outside of the South is that they either just do not care because the victims of the Supreme Court policies are not their constituents, or they just do not understand the problem.

But, Mr. Speaker, if you do not understand the problem it is because you have not been listening. Maybe we have cried "wolf" too often. But I am most serious when I say that our schools are facing a chaotic situation.

The problem of the schools, affecting several million southern children, is a national problem, not a regional one. You see, the last vestige of our old dual school systems is about gone. This leaves us with integrated schools much like you have in the North. But the courts have not been willing to stop there. In their zeal to drive us to the wall, the judges are treating our children like so many parcel post packages to be delivered around town or across the county. Well, it's time for the same court decisions to be applied in your part of the country. I can assure you that you would then understand the problem most clearly.

Let me point out part of that problem.

I would remind my northern colleagues that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 stated specifically that no official or court of the United States was empowered "to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance."

I would also remind you that desegregation is defined in the Civil Rights Act as follows:

Desegregation shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

The intention of Congress was clear in 1964, but HEW and the courts from the very beginning found many ways to get around the law by arguing that the many guidelines and orders they were issuing were not to "overcome racial imbalance," but rather were to break up a dual school system.

Mr. Speaker, the dual school system in most of the South is now a thing of the past. But still the army of bureaucrats and judges continue their relentless march through the South. I suppose the thing I resent most is that while this is going on; while the courts have misconstrued the Civil Rights Act of 1964; while the HEW continues to ignore the clear intent of Congress, the Members of this great body sit here in silence ignoring the fact that the courts and the bureaucrats are thumbing their respective noses at us. Does the 1964 law mean

what it says or not? Are you willing to stand behind the laws you pass or not? Is it okay for the bureaucrats and the courts to ignore the laws passed by the Congress as long as they do not interfere with the status quo in your congressional districts?

Where does it all end? Unfortunately it will not end until some of the same unconstitutional court decisions are applied in your part of the country as they are being applied in mine. We watched many of you squirm when President Nixon proposed that the Voting Rights Act be applied in the North as well as the South. Now let's see what happens when your constituents are bused across town; when they are moved from their neighborhood schools; when the public school systems of your district are thrown into utter chaos. That is when it will all end. That is when you will finally understand the problem. That is when the Congress will finally demand the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare follow the law. And that is when Congress will finally call the hand of the courts.

Look, Mr. Speaker, we in the South know we have been wrong in the past. As a region we have struggled mightily to keep things as they were. Frequently, we have not come into court "with clean hands." But that day has passed now. The zealots are overrunning our land. The all encompassing octopus of Government—having enjoyed great feast at the expense of the South—is still hungry; its appetite only whetted, not satisfied. And so our children are made to suffer.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to demand that the bureaucrats and the courts follow the law. I call on the Departments of Justice and Health, Education, and Welfare to follow the law. And finally, and most reluctantly, I say to Health, Education, and Welfare and the Justice Department, if you are not going to follow the law, then by all that is holy enforce your illegal edicts in every region of this land just as you do in the South. Then, Mr. Speaker, the cries of righteous indignation will issue from the now silent figures of our northern friends. And then maybe we will finally get some action out of this sleeping Congress.

Listen to me, Mr. Speaker. Hear my words. I am talking in the emotional terms of a man concerned about what is happening in his city and his State. I am concerned about what is happening to the millions of southern children, whose educated minds are so desperately needed if the South as a region is ever to move out of the economic dark ages. I am concerned about the effect such action by the courts is having on the feeling of respect for law and order, long one of the most admirable characteristics of the southerner.

Mr. Speaker, you should know that most of the people now crying for relief from oppressive court orders, now seeking an end to discrimination of the worst kind, are not radicals. They are concerned citizens, both black and white, who do not want to see an end to public education. They are solid members of their community, who only seek a chance to live their lives without the uncon-

stitutional interference of the Supreme Court. I beg my colleagues to let them have that right. Remove the heel of Government from our necks and let us once again turn our attentions to providing good, sound educational opportunities for all our citizens.

Is that too much to ask?

PANAMA CANAL POLICIES: STATE DEPARTMENT CONFUSION CLARIFIED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood), is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, informed leaders of the Congress in both House and Senate have long recognized the Panama Canal as posing one of the gravest questions now facing the United States. Though various Senators and Representatives, in addresses and statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD over a period of years, have covered the significant angles of this complicated subject, the mass news media, with rare exceptions, has failed to clarify the issues. Too often what has been published was inaccurate, lacking in realistic perspective, misleading and confusing. All of this proves that the writers involved have had no adequate knowledge of the essential facts, or the necessary objectivity to deal with matters of such vast import.

It was, therefore, with much interest that I read in the Washington Post two letters to the editor on the canal question. The first, on December 28, 1969, by Emmett Harris, correctly expressed the fear of loss by the United States of its control over the vital waterway; the second, on January 4, 1970, by Robert McClintock, a career official of the Foreign Service of the Department of State, ridiculed the fears of Mr. Harris and grossly misinterpreted the terms of the proposed new Panama Canal treaties.

With the purpose of dispelling the resulting confusion, Capt. Franz O. Willenbucher, a retired career officer of the Navy and lawyer with long experience in Panama Canal treaty matters, on January 13 wrote a letter to the editor of the Washington Post, which this paper declined to publish. This letter admirably clarifies the key issues in the canal question and makes two specific recommendations for the actions that should be taken by our Government. They are: First, a formal declaration in opposition to the surrender by the United States of any of its sovereign rights, power, or authority over the Canal Zone territory and Panama Canal to any other nation or to any international organization; and second the enactment of legislation for the major modernization of the Panama Canal.

As to the fundamental question of safeguarding U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal enterprise, more than 100 Members of the House have introduced identical resolutions opposing the projected surrenders at Panama that were referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which committee has not yet held hearings, nor has it indicated when

they will be held. Also, Mr. Speaker, I may add that extensive hearings by this committee on similar resolutions in 1967 were held but never printed as is customary in such cases and the committee never made a report.

In regard to the major modernization of the Panama Canal, identical bills are pending in both the House and Senate. The form of modernization provided for in them contemplates retention by the United States of its full sovereignty over both the zone territory and canal, enables the maximum utilization of all work so far accomplished on the great waterway, avoids the dangerous pitfall of treaty involvements with Panama and other countries directly affected, and preserves the economy of Panama through the employment of thousands of Panamanians on the canal enterprise, and large expenditures in Panama of more than \$100 millions annually.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House of Representatives on January 19, 1970, entitled, "Panama Giveaway: Time for Action has Come." I quoted the full texts of the pending measures now before the Congress along with another thoughtful letter by Captain Willenbucher published in the December 25, 1969, issue of the Washington Evening Star.

Because letter-writer McClintock is now assigned for duty as Special Assistant to the Undersecretary for Political Affairs, it is unthinkable that he would write the letter he did without superior approval. For this reason, it was probably a trial balloon for what could be a move to reopen the negotiations for the proposed 1967 giveaway treaties that are again being vigorously demanded by radical elements in Panama.

As the indicated series of letters is highly pertinent to the present canal situation and should be read by all Members of the Congress and cognizant officials of the executive branch of our Government, I quote the two that were published in the Washington Post, along with the complete text of the one that the Post refused to publish:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 28, 1969]

FEAR FOR THE CANAL

Personnel changes on the State Department's Panama desk indicate that favorable consideration of the Panama Treaty is again about to be given. Since the closing of the Suez Canal, only the Straits of Malacca and the Panama Canal remain under non-Communist control. The release of the Panama Canal to the Republic of Panama is to place the control of that vital waterway in jeopardy. Steps should be taken to block the Panama Treaty.

EMMETT HARRIS.

WASHINGTON.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 4, 1970]

A MATTER OF STRAITS

I read with some amusement the letter published in your edition of Dec. 28 from Mr. Emmett Harris in which he expresses fear that personnel changes in the State Department indicate that favorable consideration of the Panama Treaty is again about to be given. Mr. Harris concludes that "since the closing of the Suez Canal, only the Straits of Malacca and the Panama Canal remain under non-Communist control."

This simplistic view of the geography of

the oceans does not conform with the facts. The two principal straits governing egress from the Soviet Union toward the West—the Bosphorus and Dardanelles and the Baltic Belts—are controlled by our NATO allies, Turkey, Denmark and Norway, with Sweden neutral. On the other side of the world egress by the Soviet Union from the Sea of Japan is controlled at the Strait of Tsushima by South Korea and Japan and at the Hakodate Strait also by Japan. The entrance to the Persian Gulf is the Straits of Oman, controlled by Iran. The Straits of Gibraltar, traversed by Soviet warships as well as the Sixth Fleet, lie between non-Communist Spain and Morocco. In fact, your correspondent Mr. Harris should be informed that there are no inter-oceanic straits or canals in Communist hands anywhere, except for a few passages between the Kuriles from the Sea of Okhotsk.

As for Mr. Harris's fear that "the release of the Panama Canal to the Republic of Panama is to place the control of that vital waterway in jeopardy," the main stock-in-trade of the present Guardia government in Panama is anti-communism; nor do the proposed treaties give away the Panama Canal.

Probably if Mr. Harris were to learn that this commentary on his geography was written by a State Department officer, his suspicions would be deeply increased. However, at least one advantage of writing as a State Department officer is that we know our facts.

ROBERT MCCLINTOCK.

WASHINGTON.

JANUARY 13, 1970

To the Editor,
Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a career naval officer who, while on active duty in the Navy Department, shared with others responsibility for certain national defense aspects of the Panama Canal, participated in drafting some of the provisions of the Hull-Alfaro Treaty of 1936-39, and, consequently, long interested in questions affecting its operation and security, I read the letters of Emmett Harris and Robert McClintock in the Washington Post of Dec. 28, 1969 and January 4, 1970, respectively, with more than casual interest. The Harris letter, while basically sound, is, unfortunately, very much too short. The effect of the McClintock letter is to confuse by emphasis upon irrelevant matter and a disregard of essential facts.

Ever since the 1917 Communist overthrow of the Russian Government and the influence at Petrograd of John Reed, the notorious Harvard-educated Communist, long range Soviet policy has aimed at gaining control of key strategic water transportation routes. While the other waterways mentioned by Mr. McClintock, a career officer of the United States Foreign Service, are important, they are dwarfed into insignificance, when compared with the ONLY two interoceanic canals: Suez and Panama.

In the Middle East, the stage was set for Soviet dominance by two colossal diplomatic blunders which we, ourselves, made during the Eisenhower administration. The first was our determined insistence that Britain withdraw from the Suez Canal Zone, to which demand it reluctantly succumbed only after ruthless pressure, including our sale of sterling on a scale which would have broken the pound. The second was our refusal, in 1956, to help finance the Aswan Dam project, as something which could not be done, only to witness its successful construction, as a monument to Soviet persistence to achieve its ultimate aim of Communist control over the Suez Canal. Following our refusal of such financial aid, the British having been forced to withdraw, the Suez Canal Zone was nationalized on July 26, 1956 by Egypt, which occasioned the closure of the Canal for the first time. It was subsequently reopened and

for a time operated until it was again closed in 1967, as the result of the Arab-Israeli war. It has since remained closed with evil consequences to world shipping. The predictable result of our own ineptitude has been directly to aid Communist Russia in becoming the likely heir to the Suez Canal should Israel fall, thus placing ourselves in the difficult position of choice between possible necessity of direct military aid to Israel should her independence be threatened or the loss of the Suez Canal to Communist control.

In the Caribbean, which is sometimes described as our fourth front, Soviet power in 1959 gained control of Cuba on the northern flank of the Atlantic approaches to the Panama Canal, a situation which also resulted from our diplomatic ineptitude. Since then, Communist agents in Panama, among them Thelma King, a former member of the Panamanian National Assembly and now a leading commentator on Panamanian television, led in agitation against the United States. These activities were featured by Red-led Panamanian mob assaults in January, 1964 against the Canal Zone, causing the death of four of our soldiers and large losses of United States property in Panama and the United States owned Zone territory. This violence led to the negotiation of three proposed new Canal treaties which would, if adopted, cede United States territory and property at the Canal Zone to Panama.

Many members of Congress have recognized the dangers inherent in the existing situation in Panama. Starting on October 27, 1969 (the birth date of Theodore Roosevelt who, while president, provided the leadership for achieving for the United States full sovereign powers over the Canal Zone) more than 100 members of Congress have introduced identical resolutions, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should maintain and protect its sovereign rights, jurisdiction, and control over the Canal and its operation and not surrender any of those powers in any degree to any other nation or any international organization.

It is, also, important for the people of our country to know that legislation to provide for major modernization of the Panama Canal has been introduced in both Senate and House to effectuate plans already developed, that such modernization does not involve a new treaty with Panama, since it does not require any additional land or waters or any new authority and that it would preserve and increase the economy of Panama as well as serve the best interests of the United States and other nations which are important users of the Canal.

It might be well for those who advocate surrender of its sovereign rights over the Panama Canal Zone by the United States to answer certain pertinent questions, including the following:

(1) Why should the total net investment of more than \$5,000,000,000 of United States taxpayers' money in the Canal, including expenditures for defense which incidentally must continue, be completely ignored and lost?

(2) Why have our treaty negotiators wholly disregarded the provisions of Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, which vests the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States in Congress (Senate and House) and not alone in the treaty-making power (President and Senate)?

(3) Would not the surrender of the United States control over the Canal Zone and the Canal instantly create a power vacuum (as occurred in the Middle East through our ineptitude) that would promptly be filled by Soviet power, all leading to Communist dom-

ination of the Canal and of Panama itself and over other Latin American countries? Witness Cuba where we assisted Soviet Russia in gaining its foothold in this very area.

Based upon its actions in 1967 and again in 1969, our House of Representatives will, no doubt, vigorously oppose any attempt to give away the Canal or any future canal which may be constructed with United States taxpayers' money, as is contemplated in the proposed treaties, which aroused a storm of protest in the United States when their contents became known.

The McClintock letter appears to be a trial balloon on the part of the old State Department-White House clique which, for years, has been advocating a give-away policy not only with regard to our possessions in Panama, but also by insisting that the British do likewise, as we did with reference to the Suez Canal.

Our people must realize that the real sovereignty issue at Panama is not United States control of the Canal Zone versus Panamanian control; it is United States control versus Communist control in that coup-ridden country. Any other view is, to say the least, naive and blind to the true interests of the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere.

Two years before Panama ceded to the United States territory to construct the Canal, the Hay-Pauncefote treaty of 1901 was consummated between the United States and Great Britain, under the precise terms of which, as a mandate of civilization, we agreed to operate any isthmian canal which we might construct on the basis of "entire equality" with tolls to be "just and equitable" to all. This we have scrupulously done. Consequently, there cannot be, nor is there any, just or supportable reason why any nation, much less Panama, should want our authority and control diluted in any way. Certainly, the time has come for Congress to assert itself. It should promptly adopt the resolution pending in the House of Representatives covering the sovereignty question. It should also, forthwith, enact the legislation, pending in both houses of Congress, for major modernization of the Panama Canal, something which the State Department appears not ready to accept, despite the fact that it is the single most logical solution to this vital problem in these difficult times of world-wide political instability.

FRANZ O. WILLENBUCHER,
Captain, USN, (Retired).

LEGISLATION TO BAN THE SALE OF LEADED GASOLINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBERSTEIN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on August 4 and 5, of last year I introduced H.R. 13281 and H.R. 13321, to my knowledge the first bills ever introduced in the Congress to regulate or ban the sale of lead in gasoline. H.R. 13281 would require a health warning on all advertising of leaded gasoline; while H.R. 13321 would eliminate the depletion allowance for all oil companies that continue to sell or manufacture leaded gasoline.

At the time I noted that the health effects of lead on the nervous system, on reproductive organs, as a cause of blood, coronary, and kidney disease and on lung damage have been known for many years. It was also clear that the increase in the level of lead both in human beings and in the air over our major cities

was in almost direct proportion to the amount of leaded gasoline produced. Yet no State or Federal standards for lead had been established.

I followed this up at an ad hoc hearing on air pollution in December with expert testimony from witnesses like Ralph Nader and the former New York City Commissioner of Air Pollution, Austin Heller, who testified as to the dangers of lead.

It is a strange coincidence that the pronouncement of public concern recently heard from the auto industry on auto pollution appear to date from about the time of this hearing.

In January I sent a telegram to Governor Rockefeller of New York, calling on him to initiate action to ban lead in gasoline. I noted that leaded gasoline was the single greatest source of lead in the atmosphere, and that while doctors and scientists have not set a threshold for lead concentration as a health hazard, "we cannot permit this experiment with human life to continue."

The President's announcement today in his environmental message supporting the banning of lead in gasoline is thus a source of pride to me. However, it must be made clear that the banning of lead is not the ultimate solution to the problem of auto pollution, and that it is probably fair to say that one of the contributing factors to the Presidential support was the reversal of the traditional position of the auto industry on the question.

A year ago the auto industry opposed the banning of lead in gasoline. Public indignation over auto-caused air pollution, and the growing support for banning the inherently polluting internal combustion engine, forced the industry to jettison its traditional alliance with the oil companies in order to try to save the internal combustion engine itself from being banned. Eliminating lead from gasoline would bring about a moderate reduction in pollution from the automobile. This is why I have advocated action against it. It will not, however, bring about the kind of significant reduction that will mean clean air.

The auto industry hopes that by supporting the banning of lead, public attention will be diverted from the internal combustion engine to the oil industry until the furor subsides and the threat of legislative action is ended.

I do not intend to let this happen. Last July I introduced legislation to ban the internal combustion engine unless it could meet rigorous new pollution standards. Next week I intend to offer a set of recommendations that will eliminate the automobile as a source of pollution. It is today responsible for 60 percent of air pollution in this country and up to 92 percent in urban areas. These recommendations will come in a report developed as a result of the December hearings.

The text of H.R. 13281 and H.R. 13321 follow, as do my RECORD statements when I introduced them, my telegram and the reply from Governor Rockefeller, a recent Washington Post article on leaded gasoline, and other related information:

H.R. 13281

A bill to require advertising for gasoline that contains lead to contain a statement that the gasoline contains lead and that inhaling its fumes can be fatal and to require that such statement be prominently displayed where such gasoline is sold

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall be an unfair or deceptive act or practice within the meaning of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act to fail to display, clearly and prominently, (1) in all advertising of gasoline that contains lead, and (2) at all places where such gasoline is sold the following statement: "This gasoline contains lead. Lead fumes are poisonous. Prolonged exposure can be fatal." The statement required to be displayed prominently at the places where such gasoline is sold shall be composed of letters four inches high and one-half inch thick.

Sec. 2. (a) This Act shall be enforced by the Federal Trade Commission under rules, regulations, and procedures provided for pursuant to the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(b) The Federal Trade Commission is authorized and directed to prevent any person from violating the provisions of this Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this Act; and any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act as though the applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this Act.

Sec. 3. The first section of this Act shall take effect ninety days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 13321

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that after 1970 no oil or gas depletion deduction shall be allowed a company which is engaged directly or indirectly in the sale to consumers of petroleum products containing lead

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 613 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to percentage depletion) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) DENIAL OF DEPLETION TO COMPANIES ENGAGED IN SALE OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS CONTAINING LEAD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, no deduction for depletion shall be allowed a taxpayer with respect to any oil or gas well under section 611 for any taxable year, whether the applicable allowance for depletion would be determined under subsection (b) (1) of this section or otherwise, if such taxpayer is determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate to be engaged in such taxable year directly or indirectly, through one or more affiliates, parents, subsidiaries, or related companies, or otherwise, in the sale at retail to consumers of gasoline or other petroleum products to which lead has been added."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1970.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 4, 1969]

LEGISLATION TO REQUIRE A HEALTH WARNING ON ALL ADVERTISING FOR GASOLINE CONTAINING LEAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New

York (Mr. FARBERSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 13281, legislation to require a health warning on all advertising for gasoline containing lead.

The amount of lead in the air over New York City has almost tripled in the 45 years since tetraethyl lead was introduced as a motor fuel additive. Similar trends have been noted in other cities and in increasing atmospheric lead contamination even in such remote locations as Greenland and Antarctica.

Lead has so contaminated the oceans, surface waters, air, and food that man today bears a body burden of lead far above the natural level of intake. The average lead concentration in the bodies of Americans today is many times the level found even a few years ago.

There is absolutely no doubt that automobiles in general and the lead gas-using internal combustion engine in particular is the No. 1 villain. According to the Public Health Service, the automobile is the single largest contributor to the lead in our atmosphere. Forty-five percent of all lead in gasoline by weight ends up in the atmosphere.

The Air Pollution Control Administration forecasts the continued upward surge in the lead content of our air at an annual rate of approximately 4½ percent. In terms of the next 4 years, this means 38 million more pounds of lead pollution.

Lead pollution level for automobiles, 1968-72, Air Pollution Control Administration—Total emissions nationwide

[In millions of pounds per year]	
1968	199
1969	208
1970	217
1971	227
1972	237

The effects of lead poisoning have been well known for many years. Lead poisoning can attack the central nervous system, peripheral nerves, smooth muscles, and reproductive organs, as well as cause blood disorders, coronary and chronic kidney disease, and lung damage. This is amply demonstrated by the fact that Tetraethyl Lead Corp., major producer of lead in the United States, has almost been forced to go out of business several times as a result of successful lawsuits by former employees whose health was permanently impaired through exposure to lead. Yet the danger from lead for a majority of the population comes not from individual contacts, but from cumulative exposures to lead; for lead particles build up in the body.

Despite this, there are currently no State or Federal air quality standards for lead in the United States although the Air Pollution Control Administration last week ordered oil companies to provide it with data on additives in fuel. The Soviet Union is already regulating the lead content of gasoline, and the panel on electrically powered vehicles recommended in 1967 that standards for the lead content in gasoline be immediately established. A scientific task force on environmental problems in Sweden has recommended the total banning of lead additives from gasoline.

I cannot stand by and watch the long-term harmful effects of lead pollution remain masked only to be detected too late to prevent serious damage. We may already be perilously close to the threshold of lead toxicity as a result of environmental exposure.

The legislation I am today introducing would require all advertising for gasoline containing lead to contain the warning:

"This gasoline contains lead. Lead fumes are poisonous. Prolonged exposure can be fatal."

The bill would also require the prominent

posting of the same health warning near gasoline pumps in service stations.

This proposal is the second in a three-bill package relating to the effect of automobiles and air pollution. On Thursday I introduced legislation that would ban the manufacture or sale of automobiles powered by internal combustion engines after January 1, 1978. The final bill, which I intend to introduce on Tuesday, will call for a tax incentive to oil companies which eliminate lead from gasoline.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 5, 1969]

LEGISLATION TO REPEAL OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FOR COMPANIES WHO MANUFACTURE LEADED GAS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBERSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 13321, a bill to repeal the percentage depletion allowance for oil companies which continue to manufacture gasoline containing lead after January 1, 1971.

This legislation is not simply a matter of tax reform. Congress hopefully is going to reduce the 27½-percent depletion allowance anyway. Lead fumes from gasoline contribute very heavily to the \$12 billion annual cost of air pollution as well as representing a serious health hazard. There are practical and relatively inexpensive alternatives to lead in gasoline. The petroleum industry, however, like the auto industry, has generally resisted efforts to put these alternatives into effect, because it does not want to go to the expense and effort necessary to effect a conversion. The economic incentive can serve as a significant stimulus. The big oil companies must take some corrective action or pay the bill.

There are two alternatives to gasoline containing lead. One would be to either replace lead with other additives or to modify the refining process. Lead functions in gasoline as an antiknock ingredient. Nickel and boron are among the additives which can be substituted to perform the same function. American Oil Co., on the other hand, has modified its refining process to bring about a higher level of paraffins in order to produce its unleaded gas. In either case refined gasoline is still the basic fuel which goes into the internal combustion engine.

The second alternative is the replacement of gasoline by natural gas. Natural gas can be used in internal combustion engines just as refined gasoline is. Natural gas, however, does not pollute the atmosphere to the extent regular gas does, and produces no lead emission. This is demonstrated by recent truck tests conducted by the Air Pollution Control Administration in Detroit:

Comparative truck emissions for leaded gasoline and propane—Air Pollution Control Administration

[In grams per mile]	
Carbon monoxide:	
Gasoline	17.00
LPG (propane)	16.00
Hydrocarbons:	
Gasoline	28.80
LPG (propane)	8.00
Oxides of nitrogen:	
Gasoline	8.00
LPG (propane)	4.00
Lead:	
Gasoline	3.17
LPG (propane)	0

Methane in the compressed form is now just beginning to come into use as a substitute for gasoline. As tests with a 1968 Ford Ranchero demonstrated, methane produces an even lower level of pollution emission than propane:

Comparative pollutant emission for leaded gasoline and methane

[In grams per mile]

Carbon monoxide:	
Gasoline	28.20
Methane	2.11
Hydrocarbons:	
Gasoline	2.56
Methane	1.41
Oxides of nitrogen:	
Gasoline	3.82
Methane	.51
Lead:	
Gasoline	3.17
Methane	0

Even aside from the level of pollution emission, methane offers other benefits over leaded gasoline. It is cheaper to operate, does not clog spark plugs, dilute or contaminate the oil, or corrode the exhaust pipes. Furthermore, it rates as safe as if not safer than gasoline by the insurance industry.

The bill is the third and last in a legislative package I have proposed to reduce air pollution caused by automobiles. My initial bill would ban the manufacture and sale of automobiles powered by internal combustion engines after January 1, 1978. The second would require a health warning in ads for gas containing lead.

My bill is admittedly a stopgap measure. It would alleviate air pollution somewhat until we can entirely do away with the internal combustion engine by bringing about a modification in the fuel component of the engine. But we cannot wait for the internal combustion engine to be eliminated before we begin to do something drastic about automobile pollution. Human lives are too important to be dependent upon the automobile industry's willingness to produce low-pollution cars on a large scale.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 8, 1970]
GASOLINE FIRMS MAY HAVE TO GET THE LEAD OUT

(By Thomas O'Toole)

One of the first casualties in the nation's new war on pollution might be the lead in gasoline.

In recent weeks, amid the furor against dirty air and President Nixon's promise to clean it up, the city of New York, the state of California, the President of General Motors Corp., a Congressman from New York and one from Florida have all made threatening statements about leaded gasoline.

After introducing a bill to disallow oil and gas depletion allowances to any company selling leaded gasoline, Rep. Leonard Farbstein (D-N.Y.) went one step further a few weeks ago in a telegram to New York's Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

"We cannot permit this experiment with human life to continue," the telegram read. "Urge you to recommend the banning of leaded gasoline in New York State."

Rep. Paul Rogers (D-Fla.) was a little less vehement about the lead in gasoline, but as the second ranking Democrat on the House Subcommittee on Public Health, Rogers might swing a little more weight on the issue than Farbstein.

"We have pretty well established that 60 per cent of our air pollution comes from the automobile," Rogers said recently in asking the subcommittee to look into the causes of air pollution, "and everything we've heard thus far indicates that lead in fuel may be a major factor in the pollution problem."

FACTS AND FANCIES

Like many another issue in air pollution these days, the facts and fancies about leaded gasoline and its impact on the air and public health are little known and often contradictory.

What are the facts about the lead in gasoline?

Lead was introduced into gasoline to raise

its octane rating 47 years ago, and as automobile engines grew bigger and more powerful so did the amount of lead in the gas. Each gallon of today's gasoline has about 4 grams of lead in it, which adds up to 700 million pounds of lead consumed each year by gasoline sales.

While there is no hard agreement about how much lead gets exhausted into the air, most experts say that about 70 per cent of the lead in gasoline comes out of a car's tailpipe. The disagreement is over how much drops onto the ground as solid lead particles and how much wafts into the air as an aerosol. A conservative estimate is that half the exhausted lead gets airborne, meaning that at least 250 million pounds of lead swirl into the air every year from automobile exhausts.

There is no doubt that the nation's cities have more lead in their air today. Most cities with populations of about 1 million have 2 micrograms of lead for each cubic meter of air, while cities of 2 million have 2.5 micrograms of lead per cubic meter of air.

Two years ago, Los Angeles had 5 micrograms of lead per cubic meter of air, the highest in the nation at the time. But last year, New York City's Department of Air Resources measured the lead on East 45th Street at 7.5 micrograms of lead.

OVER THE EDGE

The most recent study of a city's air was done by a team of scientists from Scripps Institute of Oceanography in San Diego. They found that the lead in San Diego's air has gone up 5 per cent every year for the past three years, and at present contains as many as 8 micrograms of lead for each cubic meter of its downtown air.

"It seems like we're about ready to go over the edge," said Scripps' Dr. T. J. Chow. "The Public Health Service recommends that the air in lead not exceed 10 micrograms per cubic meter."

Doctors disagree on the scope of lead's hazards, but they all agree it's no help to health.

Lead poisoning is one of the oldest occupational diseases known, its symptoms classic in medical textbooks. A lead overdose can change red blood cells, hemoglobin and the metabolism of body enzymes. Long-term lead intake can cause chronic kidney disease and damage the brain.

Usually, lead poisoning is the result of unknowingly swallowing or even eating lead, not breathing it in almost invisible quantities with air.

But in the air, the lead exhausted by cars has a particle size just small enough to be inhaled and just big enough to stick to the lung. What lead does to the lung is largely unknown, but a recent study of rats inhaling lead exhausts showed that they were unable to "cleanse" other particles trapped by the lungs.

At least some of the lead in the lung moves through the body. One doctor studying the tissue from bodies of people who had lived in large American cities found lead in the aorta, kidney, lung, liver, pancreas, spleen, bone, trachea, larynx and prostate.

BEGINNING TO MOVE

Still, no medical study has ever said that auto-exhausted lead has caused disease in man.

"Exposure to small amounts over a long time are unclear," said one report on lead in the atmosphere last year.

A growing number of complaints against leaded gasoline accuse it not of being a health hazard, but of becoming a nuisance.

One California study claimed that atmospheric lead accounted for a reduction in visibility of as much as 25 per cent in the Los Angeles Basin. A scientist at the University of Washington suggested that lead exhausts might play a "significant role in the atmospheric processes that cause smog."

Whatever the reasons, some people have begun to move against leaded gasoline. Legislation has already been written to reduce and ultimately remove lead from gasoline sold in California, and the state itself is about to test some of its cars with unleaded gasoline.

New York City's Department of Air Resources has said that it wants to buy unleaded gasoline for its 3,600 cars and 8,700 trucks. That's a sizable order. The city spends as much as \$3.5 million (tax-free) a year to buy gasoline for its vehicles.

More and more motorists are turning to lead-free gasoline, though their motives might be more to cut down on wear to their engines than to improve the public health.

American Oil Co. says its lead-free gasoline now accounts for 20 per cent of its total gasoline sales, and at many of its stations the lead-free gas outsells the cheaper brand with lead in it. Its sales of lead-free gasoline in Atlanta alone were up 16 per cent last year, and the sales growth of the unleaded product in 22 states was enough a year ago to expand company production of the lead-free gas by 70,000 barrels a day.

PENNY A GALLON

The biggest obstacle to the elimination of lead in gasoline is economics. American Oil charges a penny more per gallon for its unleaded gas, and it claims it costs more than a penny per gallon to mix gasoline in the right way to get the octane rating of the unleaded gas high enough to work in today's car engines.

Universal Oil Products Co. says it has a process to make high octane gas without lead for a penny more per gallon, but the company that supplies most of the tetraethyl lead in the U.S. tells a different story.

The Ethyl Corp. claims the average increase in cost to make an unleaded gasoline would be 4 cents per gallon, and closer to 8 cents per gallon for small oil refineries. The company estimates that the cost to the country would be \$3.5 billion a year, with the petroleum industry having to pay more than \$6 billion to construct the new refineries it would need.

Even if Ethyl's figures are correct, the lead might be taken out of gasoline anyway. A few recent events suggest that it might happen in the next five years, starting with a speech by Edward N. Cole, president of General Motors.

Pointing out that unleaded gasoline cuts down engine wear, reduces auto exhausts and improves the performance of antipollution mufflers on cars, Cole concluded:

"The potential gains which might be realized through removal of tetraethyl lead from automobile gasoline should be evaluated."

By the end of last week, it was clear that just such a thing was already being studied, Mobil Oil Corp. disclosed that major oil companies had begun talks with auto manufacturers about how both industries might cooperate in removing the lead from gasoline.

In effect, one Mobil executive said, the auto makers told the oil companies that the "lead must go."

A few days later, Atlanta Richfield said it was making plans to test market a lead-free gasoline in California next year if the car manufacturers could design an engine for 1972 models that would run on a lower octane gasoline than that used today.

"The implication is obvious here," said an oil company official. "Atlantic already knows that Detroit has such an engine right now."

All this is window dressing to what the Nixon administration might do to outlaw lead in gas, a possibility that strongly exists. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare, is studying the issue right now, at the same time that the Commerce Department is weighing the effects of a ban on lead on the oil and chemical business.

President Nixon himself alluded to a ban on leaded gasoline in his State of the Union message, in which he promised a clean-up campaign against the automobile.

"Adequate control," he said, "requires further advances in engine design and fuel composition."

While he didn't mention it, the President meant the lead in gasoline and an engine that could run just as well on regular unleaded fuel. He might not be thinking of removing all the lead in gasoline, but he is almost certainly thinking of laws that would gradually cut it down.

[From the New York Daily News, Jan. 11, 1970]

FARBSTEIN BIDS ROCKY PUT BAN ON LEADED GAS

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Leonard Farbstain, Manhattan Democrat, asked Gov. Rockefeller today to ban the sale of leaded gasoline in New York as an air pollution control measure.

In a telegram to the governor, Farbstain said the lead content in gasoline used as automobile fuel was a major source of pollution and would pose an increasingly serious health hazard if unchecked.

"There is absolutely no doubt that the automobile is the No. 1 villain," Farbstain said. "Fifty per cent of all lead in the atmosphere is attributable to automobiles. In the last 40 years, the percentage of lead in the air of New York City has almost tripled."

He suggested that New York follow California's example and use compressed natural gas as auto fuel. "Methane and related fuels are less expensive than regular gasoline and cause one tenth the pollution," he said.

[From Gasoline Retailer, Jan. 21, 1970]

NEW YORK REPRESENTATIVE SEEKS BAN ON LEADED GASOLINE

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Leonard Farbstain (D-N.Y.) has called upon Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller to take action to ban the sale of leaded gasoline in New York State.

"Gasoline is the only major uncontrolled source of lead in the atmosphere," Farbstain wired Rockefeller. "We cannot permit this experiment with human life to continue," he said.

Farbstain has introduced legislation in Congress to ban the use of lead in gasoline. It is expected that he will push this suggestion and others in a congressional appearance in early February.

The New York congressman's action followed Gov. Rockefeller's proposal to set up a new Dept. of Environmental Protection. While the New York City congressman supports Rockefeller's suggestion, he called for immediate action to eliminate this source of pollution.

There are currently no state or Federal standards for the control of lead, although state and local jurisdictions do not have the authority to regulate the contents of fuels sold within their boundaries, according to Farbstain. The Soviet Union, he added, is already regulating the lead content of gasoline, and a scientific task force has recommended Sweden do the same.

Farbstain said "that lead fumes from gasoline contributed very heavily to the \$20 billion annual cost of air pollution, and unlike other pollutants, lead accumulates in the body, thus increasing the hazard to health as exposure continues. One of the major auto companies recently came out for a ban on lead."

"There are two alternatives to gasoline containing lead," according to Farbstain. "One would be to replace lead with other additives or to modify the refining process, as American Oil Co. is currently doing. A second is to replace leaded gasoline with natural gas."

"California has recently announced that it will use compressed natural gas in its vehicles," Farbstain said. He urged New York to "follow California's example. Methane and related fuels are less expensive than regular gasoline and cause one-tenth the pollution."

"There is absolutely no doubt that the automobile is the number one villain," Farbstain stressed. "Fifty percent of all lead in the atmosphere is attributable to automobiles. In the last 40 years the percentage of lead in the air of New York City has almost tripled."

JANUARY 9, 1970.

HON. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor, the State of New York,
Albany, N.Y.

DEAR GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER: Urge you to recommend the banning of leaded gasoline in New York State as part of your program on the environment. Gasoline is the only major uncontrolled source of lead in the atmosphere. We cannot permit this experiment with human life to continue. Reasonably inexpensive alternatives to lead in gas exist.

Urge you also to follow California's example and establish a program to use compressed natural gas or other low-pollution fuels in place of gasoline in state vehicles. It will not only cut pollution, but is less expensive.

LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, N.Y., February 4, 1970.

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
U.S. Representative, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FARBSTEIN: Governor Rockefeller has asked me to reply to your telegram of January tenth, in which you suggest that the State of New York ban the use of leaded gasoline.

The State Health Department has been aware of growing concern over this contaminant source, and as a result, has been studying its effects on health and possible alternatives to its usage. However, much controversy still remains as to the actual impact of this material on the environment. When the facts become clear and if standards are required, we are confident, as you are, that a suitable additive substitution can be made. Currently, one major producer markets a lead-free gasoline at a slightly higher price.

In addition, concerned State agencies are presently studying the possibility of using low pollution fuels as possible power sources for general vehicle use. They are following closely and evaluating the various experimental and pilot projects presently being conducted.

Thank you for your interest in this matter.

Sincerely,

ALTON MARSHALL.

AMERICAN OIL CO.,
Chicago, Ill., December 4, 1969.

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter about the use of lead in gasoline. While American Oil Company certainly has a concern for public health and welfare, I am afraid in this instance it would not be honest for us to accept the compliment paid us concerning our unleaded product.

You see, we cannot truthfully claim that our unleaded Amoco Super Premium gasoline was developed as an anti-pollution measure. We have manufactured it for many years—and people have continued to buy it—primarily because it is good for automobile engines, especially valves, spark

plugs, and mufflers that are susceptible to corrosion from lead deposits.

American Oil's unleaded premium represents less than 20 percent of our total production of gasoline. All our regular grades use lead compounds to increase anti-knock potential and, in most areas of the United States, we also market a leaded premium. This is another reason why we could not, in all candor, make any widespread claims for an anti-pollution product.

It is not that we are not concerned with the pollution problems of auto emissions. We are doing basic research in this area ourselves, and we are contributing to the research done by others, such as the American Petroleum Institute and the Inter-Industry Emission Control Program.

More specifically, we are also concerned about the potential problem of lead in the atmosphere, and we are watching carefully the studies that are still going on in an effort to determine how big the problem may actually be. That is the difficulty, of course; to date, no one knows with any certainty what effects on human beings are likely from current or future levels of lead in the atmosphere.

What our company—and the oil industry generally—hopes will happen is that these studies will be permitted to continue so that they can result in solid facts on which we can base action. Perhaps the time will come when a reduction of lead in gasoline will be necessary, in spite of the added cost it will entail, both to the industry and the consumer. If so, we hope these burdens will not be imposed before it is known whether they will actually contribute significantly to solving our pollution problems.

Now, about your specific questions:

(1) What automobiles need—and particularly automobiles with today's high-compression engines—is high octane fuel. As it happens, lead is the least expensive way of raising the octane rating of gasoline. Cars either need fuel containing lead or some other alternate high-octane product.

(2) We have not carried out any studies solely by ourselves on the health effects of lead, although we do participate in the financing of such studies through the American Petroleum Institute.

(3) and (4) Our unleaded Amoco Super Premium is a unique fuel which satisfies the octane requirements of most automobiles. Neither it nor any other gasoline satisfies the requirements of all cars.

(5) We produce the anti-knock effects of lead by special processing and by blending in more high-octane components, including aromatics and paraffins.

(6) Consumer price depends greatly on the effects of competition in the marketplace, so I cannot give you a flat answer to this question. Generally speaking, however, our dealers price unleaded Amoco Super Premium higher than competitive leaded premiums.

I hope that this response to your inquiry is satisfactory and that I have been able to answer your questions in a way that will be helpful to you. Thank you again for your interest.

Sincerely,

ERNEST L. GODSCHALK.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 6, 1970]

SHIFT TO LEAD-FREE GAS DEBATED—MOVE WOULD IMPLY BIG CHANGES BY OIL AND CAR FIRMS

(By Martin Skala)

NEW YORK.—For a long time salesmen for the American Oil Company have been begging management to let them market Amoco's leadfree gas on the West Coast. In the smog-laden Los Angeles area, salesmen reckon, the "clean-burning" fuel could be a

big hit with thousands of motorists as well as with pollution-control officials.

Lead additives are under increasing attack by automakers as an unwanted source of pollution in automotive exhausts, and Amoco is the only major oil company producing an unleaded product.

So far, Amoco's managers have resisted their salesmen's pleas. The company figures that construction of a second refinery to produce unleaded gas for the West Coast wouldn't be profitable unless the fuel was priced several cents a gallon above competing "premium" brands. Amoco's experience in the East shows a reluctance among motorists to pay more than a cent a gallon additional for a high-octane, lead-free gas.

COST AFFECTED

Most oil companies, some of whom have considered producing an unleaded fuel in the past, would probably agree with Amoco.

If lead is removed from gasoline, says Rawleigh Warner Jr., chief executive officer of Mobile Oil Company, "the consumer will probably pay more—whether in cash per car or per gallon or in a less efficient automobile." Oil executives estimate the additional costs of producing high-quality leadless gasoline—primarily more extensive refining—would raise gas prices by 3 to 4 cents a gallon.

RESPONSIBILITY SHIFTED

Furthermore, auto engines will probably have to be reengineered, with less emphasis placed on high compression ratios. Most of the 100 million cars and trucks now on the road couldn't operate efficiently on unleaded gas.

An antiknock compound, tetraethyl lead, provides even burning of fuel in combustion chambers. It boosts the octane rating of gas more cheaply than traditional refining methods.

A strong booster of lead compounds in days when the horsepower race was in full swing, Detroit's turnabout is something of a shock to the oil industry. It is viewed as part of an effort to place more of the burden of battling automotive pollution on fuel-makers. As federal antipollution law now stands, car builders are the only ones responsible for controlling the various contaminants in exhaust gases.

Some critics of lead additives assert that the 400 million pounds of lead poured into the atmosphere each year from vehicular tailpipes constitute a health hazard. But there is little scientific evidence to support this view, most medical authorities agree.

Detroit's principal objection to leaded fuels is their corrosive effect on new types of pollution-control equipment, such as catalytic mufflers. The absence of lead, automakers contend, would make it easier to reduce hydrocarbon emissions in accordance with tough emission-control standards proposed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for 1980.

PRODUCT DEFENDED

Makers of lead compounds, quite naturally, have risen to the defense of their product. But the number of oil companies taking Detroit's lead-must-go message seriously is increasing.

"The issue is one of trade-offs," says one of Mobil's fuel researchers. By this he means the auto companies and fuelmakers must evaluate the complex interrelationships between octane levels, compression ratios, the use of lead, and costs. If Detroit were to mass-produce cars with lower compression ratios, for example, conversion to unleaded fuels would be less costly to oil refiners. This is because less-powerful engines don't require high-octane ratings to operate efficiently.

Privately, some oil-company executives say the lead question may have to be resolved by

federal regulation. Washington may be forced to set standards for fuel composition in order to move the entire petroleum industry toward a common goal.

If lead additives are prohibited, oil-industry executives say two things are certain. First, there would be an enormous push to build new refining capacity, possibly as much as \$6 billion worth. This is more than the refinery industry has spent on new construction in the past 10 years.

PLATINUM SUPPLY CRUCIAL

Secondly, there would undoubtedly be a big scramble for platinum, which is widely used as a "reforming" catalyst in producing high-octane levels. Far larger quantities of the precious metal would be needed in refinery processes.

According to an American Petroleum Institute study, now several years old, refiners would need an additional 3.4 million ounces of platinum to maintain current octane levels without lead. This is equivalent to seven years' normal consumption.

The big spurt in demand would probably send platinum prices soaring. The white metal, whose major sources are South Africa, the Soviet Union, and Canada, already sell for \$135 an ounce. Supplies are limited, although South Africa, the biggest free-world platinum producer, is expanding platinum output significantly.

"It will replace gold as South Africa's No. 1 export metal in the '70's," forecasts Charles R. Stahl, publisher of Green's Commodity Market Comments. Mr. Stahl figures enough platinum will be available to meet the petroleum industry's demand, provided refiners are willing to pay the price.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 6, 1970]

ATLANTIC RICHFIELD MAY MAKE GASOLINE LEAD-FREE; HENRY FORD SUPPORTS THE IDEA

NEW YORK.—Atlantic Richfield Co. announced qualified plans to make a lead-free gasoline for the California market by late 1971 as a step toward eventually removing lead from all its gasoline.

The plans would be dependent on auto makers agreeing to produce a new internal combustion engine to use unleaded fuel.

In Detroit, Henry Ford II, chairman of Ford Motor Co., said that "just as soon as we are assured that an adequate supply (of lead-free fuel) will be available, we will build our new cars with modified power systems so that they can operate effectively" with the new fuel. Mr. Ford's comment represents the first specific promise by any Detroit auto maker to alter automobiles to handle lead-free gasoline.

The announcement heated up a growing debate over leaded fuels and their relation to automotive air-pollution problems. Auto makers say they'd like to have lead removed from gasoline because it poisons the catalysts in devices used to remove pollutants from auto exhausts. Some medical studies have concluded that there isn't any scientific evidence that lead itself is an air-pollutant danger to health.

A subcommittee has sent to the Transportation Committee of California's state assembly a bill that would phase out lead content in gasoline over a four-year period. California motorists are the nation's largest consumers of gasoline.

The bill would require that lead content in gasoline drop to two grams a gallon by July 1, 1971, to one gram a year later, to one-half gram the next year and to no lead at all by July 1, 1974.

Gasoline throughout the country generally contains an average of about 2½ grams of lead per gallon, with premium containing about one-half gram more a gallon than regular.

Robert O. Anderson, chairman of Atlantic

Richfield, said, "The combination of a lead-free gasoline and a new engine designed to use this fuel appears a most promising route to the development of an essentially pollution-free automobile."

He said that California was selected as the first place for Atlantic Richfield to make and sell an unleaded gasoline because "the problem of air pollution is most severe there at the present time." A spokesman, however, reported, "We regard our action as the first step in an orderly process which will ultimately result in the removal of lead from all gasoline."

Mr. Anderson asserted that the automotive industry is on the verge of designing an engine that would operate on lead-free gasoline. And he said Atlantic Richfield's proposed gasoline change is aimed at helping automotive engineers "in their efforts to bring an essentially pollution-free internal combustion automobile from the drawing boards to the general public without undue delay."

He added that the company is convinced that the combination of a new engine and a lead-free gasoline will "ultimately solve the problem of the automobile as a major polluter of the atmosphere."

He said the move would require "major modification" of the company's big Watson, Calif., refinery, south of Los Angeles. And he said the plans would be contingent on sufficient 1972 model cars requiring the new fuel.

The company declined to say whether the unleaded gasoline would have to be a lower octane (lower quality) fuel than present leaded gasoline, or whether it will cost motorists more. But others in the oil industry generally contend it would have to be of lower octane, and would have to carry a higher price.

The vice president-research of another major oil company asserted, "To maintain present octane ratings without lead would just be too costly to the industry and to the motorist."

Mr. Ford recently wrote the heads of 19 major oil companies saying that there is a need for nationwide availability of lead-free gasoline. In his letter, Mr. Ford repeated the company's finding that "most of our advanced-vehicle exhaust emission control systems (such as those using catalysts, thermoreactors and exhaust-gas recirculation) have a shorter life when leaded fuel is used."

Mr. Ford proposed to the oil executives that they retain the two-fuel system currently utilized by most oil companies "to ease any resulting problems" from making lead-free gasoline.

He suggested that one fuel could be lead-free with an antiknock rating equivalent to that of today's regular-grade fuel. He added that "all new engines manufactured by us following the countrywide introduction of this fuel would be modified to function properly on this fuel with emission-control devices." And, he said, this lead-free fuel also would satisfy the needs of 63% of all used cars currently in use.

Mr. Ford suggested that the remaining 37% of used cars in use could be serviced by a second fuel that could be leaded and that would have an antiknock equivalent to that of today's premium-grade fuel.

Mr. Ford also asked the oil executives to let him know when they thought lead might be removed from premium-grade fuel "so that we might again build new cars with more efficient engines requiring higher octane fuel."

Floyd D. Gottwald Jr., chairman of Ethyl Corp., a principal producer of lead antiknock compounds for gasoline, has estimated that unleaded gasoline of current octane ratings would cost motorists about four cents a gallon more than leaded gasoline.

Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) currently markets an unleaded gasoline in Eastern markets.

Competitors say it sells for an average of one cent a gallon more than leaded gasoline. And they note that most of Indiana Standard's gasoline is leaded and that costs escalate as an increasing share of total gasoline output is made unleaded.

Atlantic Richfield said it is still studying how it would market an unleaded gasoline through its service stations. Most of the 100 million cars and trucks on the road require leaded fuel, as gasoline is currently constituted and a spokesman says "as long as the public needs leaded gasoline, we'll make one."

One oil company researcher reports that the standard procedure for making unleaded gasoline is to add more "aromatics," the volatile, high value lighter products of oil refining. This, he says, both costs more and results in a gasoline subject to greater evaporation loss (from auto fuel tanks and carburetors). Mr. Gottwald asserts the added aromatics could worsen auto air pollution as much as 25%, according to Government tests.

Concerned over such problems, one oil executive said California and Atlantic Richfield may be moving too rapidly toward unleaded fuel before enough is known about how it will affect air pollution and auto performance.

The oil industry is the nation's second largest user of lead. In 1968, refineries consumed 237,589 metric tons of lead in the form of tetraethyl lead. Only storage batteries accounted for more lead use, and gasoline took more lead than paint, ammunition and solder combined.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 1970]
POLLUTION ROLE OF LEAD DISPUTED—ETHYL CORP. SAYS ANTIKNOCK HOLD NO HEALTH MENACE

(By John J. Abele)

Claims that the presence of lead antiknock compounds in gasoline adds to air pollution were disputed yesterday by the Ethyl Corporation, a leading manufacturer of the compounds.

In a special report to the company's stockholders, Floyd D. Gottwald Jr., chairman, declared: "There is no proof whatsoever that the use of lead antiknocks in gasoline is or will be detrimental to public health."

Last week, Rawleigh Warner Jr., chairman of the Mobil Oil Corporation, told a group of security analysts here that because of growing concern over air pollution, automobile manufacturers had indicated to oil companies that "lead must go."

Mr. Gottwald, however, contended that the use of unleaded gasoline could lead to an increase in pollution, would raise the cost of gasoline by about 4 cents a gallon, and would require the use of more crude oil than present manufacturing processes.

"Smog will not be reduced by elimination of lead antiknocks," Mr. Gottwald said, "but will probably be increased because unleaded high-octane gasoline yields higher emissions of hydrocarbons that react to cause smog."

"The emissions from fuels using lead antiknocks have been thoroughly studied for more than 40 years, but the substitution of non-leaded gasolines for leaded gasolines may very well introduce health hazards that are presently unassessed."

LOWER COST SEEN

The Ethyl chairman also said that the use of leaded gasoline "conserves the nation's petroleum resources" and provides lower-cost gasoline to consumers.

"Automobiles can be engineered to produce low levels of exhaust emissions when operating on leaded fuels," he added. "Moreover, high octane gasolines will continue to be essential to the proper functioning of present engines in the current generation of automobiles."

In another development, officials of the Continental Oil Company said here yesterday that \$8 million of the company's \$350 million capital expenditure program this year would be directly devoted to various types of pollution control.

The officials emphasized that the \$8 million figure reflected only projects specifically designed to curb pollution.

Many other projects, they said, have anti-pollution features included as a part of the overall cost. Defenses against pollution also represent a large factor in regular operating costs, they added.

John G. McLean, president, told a press luncheon that Continental expects earnings in 1970 to be higher than the \$146.4 million, or \$2.77 a share, reported for 1969.

Factors that are expected to contribute to the increased profits, he said, include higher production in Libya and Dubai, operations at a United Kingdom refinery that was completed last year and increased coal production in this country.

A SPECIAL REPORT—THE STATUS OF LEAD ANTIKNOCKS IN GASOLINE

(By Floyd D. Gottwald, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Ethyl Corp.)

To the Shareholders of Ethyl Corp.:

As a shareholder of Ethyl, you are probably aware by now of the continued attention being given to the relation of the automobile to air pollution. Some statements have been made that lead antiknocks in gasolines will make it more difficult for the automotive industry to build cars meeting the low exhaust emission standards forecast for the future. The question also has been raised as to whether concentrations of lead now in the air, or likely to be in the air in the future, might be harmful to the health of the public. Such considerations have raised other questions as to the possibility of reducing or even ultimately eliminating lead antiknocks in gasoline.

We want to advise you of your Company's position and of our continuing effort to protect both our stockholders' and the public interest. Based on years of intensive study, we believe:

1. There is no proof whatever that the use of lead antiknocks in gasoline is or will be detrimental to public health.

2. "Smog" will not be reduced by elimination of lead antiknocks, but will probably be increased because unleaded high-octane gasoline yields higher emissions of hydrocarbons that react to cause smog.

3. The emissions from fuels using lead antiknocks have been thoroughly studied for more than forty years, but the substitution of unleaded gasolines for leaded gasolines may very well introduce health hazards that are presently unassessed.

4. The use of lead antiknocks conserves the nation's petroleum resources.

5. Gasoline will cost the motorist more if leaded antiknocks are not used.

6. Automobiles can be engineered to produce low levels of exhaust emissions when operating on leaded fuels. Moreover, high octane gasolines will continue to be essential to the proper functioning of present engines in the current generation of automobiles.

Brief background for each of these statements follows:

1. There is no proof whatsoever that the use of lead antiknocks in gasoline is or will be detrimental to public health.

During the more than forty years of use of lead antiknock compounds, the effects of these materials have been studied extensively by government, industry, and the medical and scientific world. Thus, lead antiknock compounds are among the most comprehensively studied products from the standpoint of public health. A great many statements from competent authorities could be quoted. Following are only a few:

From the U.N. World Health Organization in 1965:

"There has been no increase in lead contamination in the last two decades. . . . If there has been any change it would appear that at present man is exposed on the whole to less lead in his environment than he was twenty years ago."

From the American Medical Association's Committee on Occupational Toxicology in 1966:

"The Committee feels obligated to point out that as a result of years of careful clinical study of workers in the lead industry significant, subtle and unrecognized or 'unrecognizable' changes are not occurring in the general population as a result of its exposure to environmental lead. In fact, this vast clinical evidence, evaluated by a great number of clinically-trained scientists, suggests that the general public is not now, nor in the immediate future, facing a lead hazard."

From a publication by Dr. Thomas J. Haley, an expert in the field of toxicology in 1966:

"The supposed chronic lead intoxication from environmental contamination is a myth, not a fact."

Thus, authorities in the field recognize that lead is and always has been widely distributed in everything on the earth, including man. It is true, of course, that lead in excessive amounts can be harmful. Similarly, many other useful things which are essential in human and plant metabolism are harmful in excessive amounts. In the case of lead, extensive studies of urban atmosphere and people exposed to it have been made and are being made in cooperation with representatives of the U.S. Public Health Service. These studies of large numbers of people in large cities have shown no evidence of health problems due to lead.

2. "Smog" will not be reduced by elimination of lead antiknocks but will probably be increased.

A published and generally-accepted investigation carried out by Midwest Research Institute showed that adding lead antiknocks to gasoline had no influence on the amount of photochemical smog formed from vehicle exhaust emissions or the amount of eye irritation produced. The investigators summarized their work as follows:

"Neither tetraethyl lead nor halogen-containing scavengers of lead have any detectable effect on the smog-forming potential of automobile exhaust."

It is now recognized that if unleaded high performance gasoline were to be produced nationwide, the hydrocarbon composition of the gasoline would have to be altered to reach present octane number levels. Generally, this would mean increasing the concentration of aromatics in gasoline. Therefore, the exhausted hydrocarbon products of the gasoline would be expected to be different and to have different smog-forming potential. Recently an investigation of the smog-forming potential of leaded and unleaded fuels embodying such changes in hydrocarbon composition was conducted by the Bureau of Mines Petroleum Research Center at Bartlesville, Oklahoma. The publication based on this work includes the following statement:

"Leaded and the comparable quality prototype unleaded fuels yielded about equal amounts of emissions. This was true for both evaporative and exhaust losses. If the photochemical effects is considered, the fuel factor is shown to exert significant influence. The fuel alterations from leaded to unleaded changed emission characteristics so that the pollution effect was increased by as much as 25%."

Extensive studies also indicate that increased aromatic content substantially increase eye irritation.

3. The emissions from fuels using lead antiknock have been thoroughly studied but the substitution of unleaded gasolines for leaded gasolines may very well introduce health hazards that are presently unassessed.

As mentioned earlier, gasoline would contain greater concentrations of aromatics if lead antiknocks were not used. Such an increase in aromatics may very well introduce a new and serious health problem because of the exhaust materials produced. Under these circumstances, the choice would be between emissions whose health hazards are presently unassessed and the continued use of lead antiknocks which have been studied for more than forty years with no proof that a health problem exists.

Further evidence indicates that the use of lead antiknocks reduces the emissions of aldehydes by cars. These materials are irritating to the eyes and nose, are odorous and undesirable, and have been described as "instant smog."

4. The use of lead antiknocks conserves petroleum resources.

It would take about 6% more crude oil to make gasoline of present-day quality if lead antiknocks were not available. This is because more extensive refining operations would have to be carried out to raise the octane number of non-leaded gasoline. For the United States as a whole, this means that 250 million additional barrels of crude oil would have to be consumed annually if lead antiknocks were unavailable.

5. Gasolines will cost more if lead antiknocks are not used.

The amount by which the cost of producing gasoline would be increased if lead were not used would vary among individual refiners. We estimate that the average increase in cost for equal road performance for the entire U. S. refining industry would be about 4¢ per gallon. The cost increase might be twice as much for small refiners, and it is likely that many of them could not continue in business if lead antiknocks were not available. For the nation as a whole we estimate this would result in an increase of 3.5 billion dollars in the annual cost of gasoline. In addition, the petroleum industry would be faced with a capital expenditure of more than 6 billion dollars to build the additional refining facilities needed to produce non-leaded gasoline. This is more than the refinery industry has spent on new construction in the past 10 years!

6. Automobiles can be engineered to produce low levels of exhaust emissions when operating on leaded fuels.

Spectacular improvements have been made by the automobile industry in reducing all automobile emissions. Ethyl's engine modification work shows that automobile engines can continue to be improved to give even lower levels of emissions when operated on leaded fuels. Until different engines designed with distinctly lower compression ratios are mass produced, high octane gasolines will continue to be essential to the proper functioning of present engines in the current generation of automobiles. Any effort to achieve that octane without lead will have the serious adverse effects referred to above.

We concur with the opinion of others that the present internal combustion engine offers the best promise for continued improvement and solution to the automotive phase of the overall air pollution problem in the United States. We differ in opinion with some on the approach. Our goal is to contribute to the attainment of the best solution. We firmly believe that through our continuing cooperative efforts with the automotive and oil industries and all levels of Government, the primary goal of an essentially pollution-free car is feasible.

SUMMARY

Improving the environment is now an accepted national goal and one we wholeheartedly endorse. But in seeking to attain this desirable goal, it is well to proceed only on the basis of established facts and not to be stampeded into condemning proven products or embracing untested theories. Tetra-

ethyl lead is a proven product which has served the automotive public well and safely for more than 40 years. Until there is scientific proof of its having any significant adverse effect on the environment, and certainly until a safe and effective substitute for it is found, this product will continue to provide the public with the most efficient gasoline known to our technology.

In summary, these are the basic reasons for the continued use of lead antiknocks in gasoline. We believe no justification has been established for their elimination or reduction. Restrictions on lead antiknocks would certainly increase the cost of gasoline and waste petroleum resources, not only without improving the quality of the atmosphere, but with substantial risk of seriously degrading the present quality of the atmosphere.

UNIVERSAL OIL PRODUCTS CO.,
Des Plaines, Ill., December 5, 1969.

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
Custom Court House Building,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FARBSTEIN: It has been brought to our attention that you are holding a meeting December 8th in New York City for the purpose of discussing automobile exhaust emissions and its effect on pollution in the New York metropolitan area.

Just yesterday, the writer testified before a sub-committee of the California Legislature on certain aspects of the auto exhaust pollution problem with relation to the effect of lead in gasoline and the use of catalytic exhaust emission control devices. Since I believe our evidence is pertinent to the discussion you have arranged, I thought you might appreciate having a copy of our testimony for subsequent review.

If you are interested in any other aspects of this matter please feel free to call upon us for further information.

Sincerely yours,

J. O. LOGAN.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN O. LOGAN, PRESIDENT OF
UNIVERSAL OIL PRODUCTS CO., DES PLAINE, ILL.,
TO THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON
TRANSPORTATION OF THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., December 4, 1969.

The Assembly's Transportation Committee's Subcommittee on Air Pollution Hearing on (1) the feasibility of altering fuel composition and (2) the desirability of reducing or eliminating lead additives in gasoline.

In summary, we believe—

1. It is technically possible to reduce or eliminate lead additives with no sacrifice in gasoline quality.

2. To do so will require sizable capital investment, but this investment is not unreasonable if expended over a period of years.

3. The manufacturing cost to produce unleaded gasoline should not exceed 1¢ per gallon and will be substantially less if only a portion of the lead is eliminated.

4. Using unleaded gasoline a high percentage of the remaining exhaust pollutants can be eliminated for the life of the vehicle by using suitable catalytic converters.

5. Using leaded gasoline a lesser portion of the exhaust pollutants can be eliminated because the catalytic converter loses efficiency more rapidly and might have to be replaced during normal car life.

[From the Report of the Panel on Electrically Powered Vehicles, October 1967]

(c) Lead Emissions—Lead alkyls are added to gasoline to increase octane ratings and reduce engine knock. Current concentrations of this additive range from approximately 2 grams per gallon for regular blends to 4 grams per gallon for some premium grades. Most of the lead component of gasoline is subsequently transferred to the atmosphere as lead compounds in the exhaust.

The sharp increase in motor vehicle mileage over the past two decades has been accompanied by a similar rise in the use of lead additives. These totals and projections to the end of the century are shown in Figure 6 (figures not printed in the RECORD).

Concern over the use of lead additives is concentrated upon its possible effects in the following areas: (1) human health, (2) increased emission levels of other exhaust pollutants, (3) modification of atmospheric processes, and (4) deactivation of catalysts or absorbents which may be necessary to reduce the emission of other pollutants.

The major fears from rising lead levels in the environment stem from a belief that many of the adverse health effects may be chronic or cumulative and not early, or easily, detectable. This concern is accentuated by the fact that in addition to ingestion, inhalation is a major route for bodily absorption of lead. The motor vehicle is the major producer of airborne lead compounds in urban areas.

In addition to its possible effects on human health, lead is reported to be a contributing agent to higher emission levels for hydrocarbon exhaust contaminants. It appears from available data that lead deposits in the engine account for a gradual increase of 30 to 40 parts per million in hydrocarbon emissions. This increase is a minor percentage of the hydrocarbon exhaust levels allowed under present Federal standards, but it could become significant under more restrictive future regulations if the lead effect does not show a reduction in proportion to the reduction of other exhaust emissions.

Definitive quantitative data regarding the effects of lead in all these areas of concern may not be available for many years. The processes involved are extremely complex and the early isolation of this single variable to determine past, present, cumulative, and synergistic effects is unlikely. Once this is realized, the question becomes one of identifying the risks and the selection among alternative strategies in view of these risks.

If the risks are very low, then the easiest, or lowest cost strategies may be selected without hesitation until all the relevant evidence has been gathered. However, the growing rates of lead emissions into the atmosphere present a potentially serious problem. The controversy in the medical profession regarding the dangers to public health is an indication that the problem cannot be dismissed without concern. The possibility is real that long-term harmful effects may be masked and detected too late to prevent serious damage.

These uncertainties, with their corresponding health and economic impacts, dictate immediate action if the risks are to be reduced. As a minimum, steps should be taken to assure that current atmospheric lead levels are not exceeded. This goal can be achieved in the face of a rising motor vehicle population because satisfactory engine performance is possible with lower lead levels in gasoline. Non-leaded fuels with adequate performance characteristics can be produced through a modification of existing refining processes. It has been estimated that the elimination of lead from gasoline, on the basis of current engine design and fuel requirements, would involve an approximate \$4 billion investment by the petroleum industry and an increase of about 20% in the manufacturing cost of gasoline.¹ It should be emphasized that these estimates are based on octane levels required by the current internal combustion engine. If en-

¹Lawson, S. D.; J. F. Moore, and J. B. Rather, Jr., "A Look at Lead Economics in Motor Gasoline," American Petroleum Institute, Division of Refining, Reprint No. 36-67, 32nd Midyear Meeting, Los Angeles, California, May 16, 1967, 35 p.

gines are designed and used which can perform adequately at lower octane levels, some or all of this cost may be avoided.

The Panel recommends the following:

Recommendation 5: The Federal Government should immediately establish standards for the lead content in gasoline which will prevent any further increase in the total quantity of lead emitted to the atmosphere. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should begin an intensive study of the long-term health effects of lead in the atmosphere to determine requirements for future action.

[From the Scientist and Citizen, April 1968]

INTRODUCTION TO A CONTROVERSY

"Some maintain that a large segment of the population is already perilously close to the threshold of lead toxicity as a result of environmental exposure; others take an almost diametrically opposed position," says Dr. Leo J. Gehrig of the Public Health Service.¹ Is the public forever to be at the mercy of the inability of the experts to agree, or is there an alternative to hopefully awaiting the rarely-seen unanimity?

When scientists disagree, *Scientist and Citizen's* approach is to present as clearly as possible the best available evidence and explain the differences which exist among the experts. We believe that an informed public is best equipped to decide the social issues that so often arise from decisions which must sometimes be made, despite scientific uncertainty.

In the case of lead contamination, the question is clear: Should steps be taken to limit the amount of lead in our environment? It has been proposed that new and stricter standards be set for lead concentration in the air, in food and in water. It has been suggested that lead additives in gasoline be prohibited. (In Sweden, a scientific task force on environmental problem has already recommended this step.)

Much of the disagreement about lead is centered on the work of Dr. Clair C. Patterson. Patterson, in a series of studies and articles, has argued that the average lead concentration in the bodies of Americans is many times the natural lead concentration in human tissues. He has presented geochemical studies which estimate the natural lead concentrations in air, water and food to be far below current levels. He places the blame for the drastic increase in environmental lead on recent industrial contamination, especially from airborne lead emitted from auto exhausts.

Patterson says that industrial lead has so contaminated the oceans, surface waters, air and foods, that man today bears a high body burden of lead from this artificially accelerated intake. He warns of the likelihood of chronic, low-level damage from lead as contamination of the air from industrial sources—especially leaded gasoline—increases.

Lead poisoning has been detected by clinical signs and symptoms such as those outlined in Dr. David Elwyn's article in this issue, or by chemical tests of blood and urine. In general, blood tests are the physicians' chief tool for detecting lead poisoning. Blood lead levels from 0.05 to 0.4 parts per million have been considered within the range of normal exposure; those of 0.4 to 0.6 indicative of occupational exposure to lead; those of 0.6 to 0.8 abnormally high and indicative of danger from lead poisoning. A blood level above 0.8 parts per million is considered strong evidence of lead poisoning. According to most studies, the average blood lead level of the population is about

0.25 parts per million, usually thought of as "normal," and well within safe limits of exposure.

The crux of the problem is that the classical and generally accepted concept of acute lead poisoning lacks terms to answer Patterson's arguments. There is no recognition, for example, of "low-level" lead damage; lead poisoning to the clinical practitioner is defined by the presence of recognizable signs and symptoms; to the experimental researcher, lead poisoning is conceived of in terms of labelled ranges of blood lead concentration: normal, occupational exposure, dangerously high, intoxicated. With few exceptions, there was a general dismissal by occupational toxicologists of Patterson's most significant points: that the increasing concentrations of lead in the air are bound to show up as increasing amounts of lead in the body, and that this process has in fact already resulted in dangerously high levels of lead contamination, as represented in the "normal," average blood lead level of 0.25 parts per million.

There are, of course, areas of general agreement. Because lead is so commonplace and so useful and because it has long been recognized as a poison, its occurrence in nature and its physiological effects have been studied for centuries.

There is no significant disagreement on the amount of lead in the environment. This is largely a matter of direct measurement of lead concentrations in air, water, foods and organisms. The studies which have been made to date offer clear and relatively unambiguous data about the prevalence of lead in the environment.

There is no significant disagreement about the source of lead in the environment. The natural distribution of lead is well known, and industrial lead contamination can be determined by direct measurement.

There is no disagreement about the harmful effects of large doses of lead on human health. Classical lead poisoning has long been familiar to doctors, and it has been the subject of detailed and comprehensive monographs.^{2,3} Although much uncertainty remains as to the mechanisms by which lead causes harm, there is no doubt that continuing large doses of lead—or a single massive dose—can cause serious, often fatal illness. There is general agreement that blood lead levels above 0.5 parts per million are indicative of abnormal exposure, and that blood lead levels in the neighborhood of 0.8 parts per million are consistent with the appearance of clinical symptoms of acute lead poisoning.

Finally, there is no evidence that any amount of lead has beneficial effects on health.

The areas of disagreement about lead are also easily identified, and they are many. But four key questions are at the heart of the disagreement about lead contamination:

Has the rate of environmental lead contamination increased in recent years?

Does a rise in environmental lead contamination necessarily result in an increase in the average body burden?

Has the body burden of lead in human beings increased in recent years?

Does long-term, low-level exposure to lead damage health?

The articles by Schroeder, Hardy, and Patterson in this issue seek to cast light on some of these questions. Patterson's studies of polar lead, for example, show a sharp increase in atmospheric lead contamination.

² Aub, J. C., L. T. Fairhall, A. S. Minot, and Paul Reznikoff. "Lead Poisoning." *Medicine Monographs*, Vol. VII, Williams and Wilkins, Baltimore, 1926.

³ Cantarow, Abraham, and Max Trumper. "Lead Poisoning," Williams and Wilkins, Baltimore, 1944.

Goldsmith and Hexter (see page 71) have found a clear relationship between increasing atmospheric contamination and increasing blood lead levels. However, the overall effects of increasing lead contamination on human health remain uncertain, and the most important question—whether low-level exposure to lead is harmful—cannot be answered clearly and unequivocally.

What must be weighed, then, are the unknown health costs of continued exposure versus the known economic cost of reducing the risk. Only the public can judge whether the threat of illness from current levels of lead exposure is worth the cost of curtailing lead concentration.

Lead is a more immediate and dangerous threat to a small segment of our population—children in the slums. Here the danger is not in doubt; the facts are clear. The social decision requires weighing the lives of children against the cost of new or rehabilitated housing in the slums. The articles by Elwyn and Simon and the report from the Rochester Committee for Scientific Information deal with this aspect of the problem.

Should standards be set for the control of lead contamination? As always, the answer depends on the public's ability to weigh the extent of the risk against the cost of protection. Only in this way can we avoid decisions based on groundless fears or blind complacency.

LEAD IN THE MODERN ENVIRONMENT: HOW MUCH IS NATURAL?

(By Clair C. Patterson with Joseph D. Salvia)

In July, 1965 a Boeing 707 took off from McGuire Air Force Base, carrying our small party from the California Institute of Technology. Within a few hours the big jet had left behind the summer heat of New England. It was bound for Thule, Greenland, where we would spend ten weeks collecting samples of snow from three types of sites: from the vertical faces of ancient glaciers at the edges of the ice caps; from deep tunnels at the polar research station Camp Century; and from surface snow layers in undisturbed virgin regions of the arctic.

Drs. T. J. Chow of the University of California, M. Murozumi of the Muroran Technical Institute in Japan, and I have collaborated for years in the study of lead contamination.

From studies of changing lead concentrations in polar snows of recent centuries and in seawater, we hoped to gather data which would determine the extent to which industrial lead has contaminated the atmospheres. The remote polar icecaps far from any immediate source of lead contamination, seemed the ideal proving ground. As rain and snow "scrub" the atmosphere, airborne dust particles and suspended aerosols are carried to earth. By careful measurement of annual samples of precipitation, changes in the relative concentrations of lead and other substances in the air can be determined. We hoped to measure long-term variations of lead contamination by gathering lead samples of snow layers from the polar icecaps.

The annual snowfall in polar regions is relatively small—about one foot per year in the Antarctic and three feet per year in the Arctic. Because of the low year-round temperature and the absence of melting or surface activity, snow is deposited in distinct annual layers which remain relatively undisturbed. Each layer is an intact record of what was in the air when the snow came down; the thickness of the polar icecaps is comprised of centuries of such records. In 1964 we had begun a series of expeditions to collect samples of ice and snow and measure the lead content. These expeditions culminated with the Greenland and Antarctica expeditions of 1965–66.¹

¹ Footnotes at end of article.

¹ "Symposium on Environmental Lead Contamination," Public Health Service Publication No. 1440, Washington, D.C., March, 1966, p. 3.

I was accompanied on the Greenland expedition by three students from the California Institute of Technology. The plane carried tons of equipment, much of which had been developed for our purposes, and tested in earlier, preliminary expeditions in the United States and Greenland.

After disembarking at Thule, our party and equipment were trucked to Camp Tuto, on the edge of the ice sheet, where we gathered blocks of ice from tunnels driven deep into the vertical faces of the glacier sheets. Samples of ice, dated by carbon 14 determination at about 800 B.C.,² were taken from the exposed ancient edges of the ice sheet.

We then flew by helicopter 140 miles eastward to Camp Century, a center for U.S. arctic research until its abandonment in 1967. In its deep snow tunnels were year-round living quarters, shops, and laboratories, heated and powered by an atomic reactor and supplied in the summer months by a tractor from Camp Tuto. Here at Century we gathered more samples of ice and snow, this time from the walls of a thousand-foot long tunnel which slanted to a depth of more than 300 feet beneath the arctic ice. Samples of annual snow layers dating back more than 200 years were gathered by workers cutting the frozen blocks from the walls with chain saws.

Snow samples were dated by several different methods; stratigraphic techniques (annual layers are identified by variations in seasonal textures of the snow); direct measurement of accumulation on stakes; measurement compaction of successive snow layers; determination of lead 210 (a radioactive isotope of lead common in air—it is the daughter product of radon, a radioactive gas). Lead 210's twenty-two-year half life can be used to date snow as old as seventy years. An additional aid to dating recent samples was the known location of two layers of snow dated by fallout contamination from atomic and hydrogen bomb tests.

Our party, joined by a dozen soldiers, from the U.S. Army Research Support Group, embarked from Camp Century in August. We travelled hundreds of kilometers upwind in three fifty-ton caterpillar snow tractors, each pulling a train loaded with supplies, and research and communications equipment. The weather was bad and we traveled through almost continuous storm, checking our course with a sun compass when possible. When the storms obscured the sun, we held our course by sighting back along flag-markers that we set out as we went. At a desolate, virgin site, working parties dug a trench fifty feet deep and 300 feet long to collect samples of snowfalls from the last fifteen years. (The Camp Century site, contaminated at the surface by human activity since 1954 and by slight melting of the upper layers of snow in summer, was unsuitable for the collection of recent samples.)

In November, 1965, I went to Antarctica to conduct similar experiments in the southern hemisphere, accompanied also by three Caltech students and by four students from the University of Canterbury in New Zealand. We flew from New Zealand to McMurdo Sound in Antarctica in Air Force C-130 turbo-prop planes, and from there to the mile-high Byrd Station, halfway between the South Pole and the edge of the Antarctic ice sheet, where even midsummer temperatures fall to ten degrees below zero.

Here, with electric chain saws and an electric winch, we dug an inclined tunnel more than 300 feet long and 140 feet deep. As in the arctic expedition, all personnel worked ten to twelve hours a day for many weeks, in low temperatures and at high altitudes. Because of the extreme demands, only young, strong men in top physical condition were chosen for the expeditions.

Again as in the arctic expedition, the project was concluded by gathering surface snow

samples from a virgin site, uncontaminated even by the activities of the few men at tiny Byrd station. This time, we travelled many miles upwind from Byrd, on the mile-high Antarctic plateau. Our four man party travelled in a single snow-cat pulling a freight sled. At the final site, deep in this remote region, we excavated by hand a hundred-foot long inclined shaft to collect samples.

In both the Greenland and Antarctic expeditions, surface laboratories were set up at sites remote and upwind from the main camp tunnel entrances. Power lines from camp generators had to be laid to supply the electric cutting tools in the shafts and the ice-melters in the laboratories. Transformers were installed and laboratory buildings were built and their interiors lined with plastic sheeting.

The ice blocks were collected by men completely encased in plastic suits, working with acid-cleaned stainless-steel electric tools to prevent contamination of the snow. The shaft at Byrd alone required four weeks to excavate, working two ten-hour shifts per day.

Samples were taken from ten different time-levels in each deep shaft; from five different time-levels in each virgin site trench, and from several different levels at each glacier-edge site. The ice blocks gathered from each site were melted in the surface laboratories and transferred to large, chemically clean plastic drums for transport back to laboratories in the U.S., where they were analyzed for concentrations of lead and other substances.

For lead analysis, we use an extremely sensitive and accurate method called isotope dilution—a small quantity of lead isotope tracer is added to the snow water, mixed with the lead in it, withdrawn, and analyzed on a mass spectrometer to determine the ratio of tracer lead to sample lead. This method is complex, tedious and expensive, so the work is slow and costly. For determination of other elements, we use isotope dilution (potassium, calcium, titanium), neutron activation (sodium, chlorine), atomic absorption (sodium, potassium, magnesium), spectrophotometric techniques (chlorine), and emission spectrographic techniques (silicon).

For the simple lead curve of sixteen points shown in Figure 1, about 400 lead analyses of various kinds have been performed over a period of four years. The scatter in these points is due mainly to our improper sampling techniques. At the time the ice samples were taken we were ignorant of seasonal variation effects, and we failed to mix equal proportions of rich and lean winter and summer layers in all samples, which introduced a pronounced scatter upon the yearly trend.

The analytical work was done cooperatively by Morozumi, Chow, and myself in our laboratories at the Muroan Institute of Technology, the University of California at San Diego, and the California Institute of Technology.

Three polar field expeditions were carried out between July 1964 and February, 1966. But the polar snow studies were only one aspect of our inquiry into environmental lead contamination.

Chow is conducting a program of collecting measurements of lead concentrations in continental and oceanic atmospheres, rainfall, harbor waters, soils and grasses, and coal. Since March, 1967, he has operated a continuous air sampling program, monitoring lead in the atmosphere in the San Diego-La Jolla area. In 1967, the Scripps Oceanographic Institute's research vessel *Argo* collected samples of lead in oceanic air from thirty stations along its path from San Diego to American Samoa. Chow has found much less lead in the air over the mid-Pacific than in rural American air, indicat-

ing that country air outside cities is also polluted with lead. Chow has also analyzed lead content in coals from the major American mining areas, and in samples of soils and grasses gathered near busy U.S. highways in Maryland.

Dr. M. Tatsumoto, Dr. Chow, and I have made studies of lead and barium concentrations in sea water.³ Most of this work has been in process for several years and it will probably be several years more before a comprehensive picture is completed.

Researchers have studied the distribution and concentration patterns of lead in sea waters all over the world. Long-term surveys have been made of the concentrations of lead in urban and rural atmospheres, and of the surface water systems which supply drinking water to most Americans. Geochemical studies and experiments have sought to determine the relationships between lead and other substances in their natural distribution.

The research of recent years has added to the already considerable knowledge of lead in the environment. The polar snow studies furnish evidence of a sharp increase in lead contamination of the atmosphere. The lead content of North polar snows has increased gradually and dramatically with time, displaying a marked parallel with the increase in lead smelting and in consumption of leaded gasoline. Near the North Pole, lead concentrations apparently have increased about four hundred per cent between 1750 and 1940; since 1940, there has been another, sharper increase, this time by about three hundred per cent. Lead content in snow dating from 1750 is about twenty micrograms per ton; from 1860 about fifty micrograms; from 1940 about eighty micrograms; from 1950, about 120 micrograms; and from 1965, about 210 micrograms (See Figure 1).

This corresponds with what is known about the increase in lead smelter production following the industrial revolution, and the increase in the use in leaded gasoline in recent decades. Samples of snow taken from the North Greenland ice sheet furnish concentration profiles of other substances during the same period (See Figure 2). There has been no significant change, for example, in the concentrations of sea salts and calcium in snow during the last two centuries.

These findings become more significant in the light of the data gathered in Antarctica, where lead concentrations in snow samples taken near the South Pole were in sharp contrast with the Greenland results. The highest lead content of the Antarctic samples was about equal to the 800 B.C. sample, lowest value found in Northern snows. Older samples, taken from snow layers approximately two centuries old, showed no significant decrease in lead content. These findings suggest that the increase in lead content of Northern snows is due to atmospheric contamination, for most industrial contamination of the air occurs in the northern hemisphere and the prevailing air currents set up an effective barrier against the transmission of airborne contaminants from the northern hemisphere to the southern.

Measurements taken in the Atlantic, Pacific and the Mediterranean show that the recent distribution of lead in sea waters follows a pattern of relatively high surface concentrations which decrease sharply with depth,⁴ a pattern similar to that of strontium 90 and cesium 137, which are products of radioactive fallout from nuclear explosions,⁵ and whose current concentrations in sea water are without doubt the result of recent contamination from two decades of atomic bomb testing (See Figure 3).

Footnotes at end of article.

The lead pattern is strikingly different, almost the opposite, of the barium concentration in sea water (See Figure 4). Barium, an element closely related to lead, appears in low surface concentrations which increase with depth.⁴ This reflects a history approximately in accord with the natural prevalence of barium in the environment. Since barium is of little industrial significance, this pattern is probably an indication of the distribution to be expected in the absence of industrial contamination.

Research in the field of environmental lead has not only shown an increase in lead concentration in the atmosphere and in the seas. Contamination from industrial lead is everywhere: air, water, food, and man himself carry many times the amount of lead they would bear in an uncontaminated environment. City dwellers are especially subject to high concentrations of lead, largely due to the discharge into urban air of tons of lead from the exhaust wastes of automobiles.

The Survey of Lead in the Atmosphere of Three Urban Communities,⁶ compiled in Cincinnati, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles, by a working group from public health agencies, the Kettering Laboratory and industries producing leaded gasoline, shows annual average airborne lead concentrations in these cities of 1.4 micrograms per cubic meter of air in Cincinnati, 1.6 micrograms per cubic meter in Philadelphia, and 2.5 micrograms in Los Angeles. These figures range from thirty to fifty times the average existing rural concentration, and five thousand times the estimated natural concentration.

Shortly after this report was issued, I criticized the California State Department of Public Health and the U.S. Public Health Service for collaborating with the leaded fuel-producing industries in seeming to exonerate leaded fuels as a source of increased lead burdens in the bodies of city dwellers.⁷ I pointed out that these agencies had ignored the obvious relationships which existed between present blood lead levels, lead concentrations in air, and material balance considerations of the sources of lead in the atmosphere.

California State Department of Public Health investigators John R. Goldsmith and Alfred C. Hexter, working with data from the above survey and from experimental data compiled by Dr. Robert A. Kehoe, now recognize a predictable dose-response relationship between increased respiratory exposure and increased blood lead levels. Goldsmith and Hexter now take issue with Kehoe, the Professor Emeritus of Occupational Medicine at the Kettering Laboratories, who says:

"So long as a larger quantity of lead is absorbed by the average citizen from food and beverages than from the air . . . the control of atmospheric lead cannot be expected to obviate a potential lead hazard to the general population, since it does not concern itself with the principal source of such hazard."⁸

On the basis of accepted measurements of intake and absorption rates for lead, and recent measurements of airborne lead concentrations, Goldsmith and Hexter now contend, as I had pointed out earlier, that total lead absorption from alimentary and respiratory tracts are of similar magnitude, and that for residents of highly contaminated areas such as Los Angeles, the amount of lead absorbed from inhalation may be greater than that from food and drink.

They conclude that airborne lead is a principal source of body lead, at least for city dwellers, and that it is a real hazard:

Increased respiratory exposure within the range observed in community air pollution is capable of producing materially increased storage of lead in the body as reflected in blood lead level; and that further increases in atmospheric lead will result in higher blood

lead levels in the population in a predictable relationship. (Italics added)

This conclusion is still not universally accepted, however. Some authorities see no immediate threat in atmospheric lead contamination. In 1960, Dr. Kehoe had this to say of the public health implications of lead exposure:

"It is fair to say that, at the present time, in the United States, the absorption of lead on the part of the public, generally, is attended by no hazard. This is not to say that there may not be situations productive of danger and of actual cases of lead poisoning within the population. . . . On the whole, however, the food and beverages of the nation contain but little more lead than that which occurs naturally in them, while the ambient air, even in the more heavily contaminated areas of our cities, is contaminated with lead only to the extent of a few micrograms per cubic meter. . . . We have found no reason to believe or to suspect that the quantities of lead involved in this normal metabolism of lead have increased within the past twenty-odd years."¹⁰

It seems to have been generally accepted by many people in the fields of public health and occupational medicine that—excluding occupational exposure to lead—the lead content in a typical man's blood and tissues is well within the margin of safety. This assumption—and it is important that we identify it as such—is based on other assumptions, now questionable in the light of recent studies of lead in the environment.

NATURAL LEAD STATES

It is assumed that lead in food and water is not much above natural levels. It is assumed that the typical lead burden in man today is not much above what would be expected in an entirely natural, uncontaminated environment. It is assumed that this lead burden is normal, or little above normal, in terms of man's body chemistry and the physical environment out of which he evolved. It is assumed that there has been in recent years no significant increase in lead in man's immediate atmospheric environment and therefore no significant increase in lead intake by human beings.

Drs. Leonard J. Goldwater and A. Walter Hoover of Columbia University said in 1967:

"Concern has been expressed that increased burning of gasoline by the internal combustion engine and the wider use of lead in industry are causing additional exposures to lead in our environment. At the same time the amounts of environmental lead from insecticides, lead pipe and paints have decreased. It would appear that the increase of lead from the former sources has been balanced by decrease from the latter."¹¹

These assumptions are not demonstrable. They may be entirely false.

A most serious flaw in the above argument is that airborne lead pollution does not replace a segment of the lead pollution of foods with equal effect. For a unit of lead entering the lungs and a unit of lead entering the stomach, nearly an order of magnitude greater fraction is absorbed into the body by the lungs. Much of the lead entering the stomach passes through the gastrointestinal tract unabsorbed. The above-mentioned studies of lead concentration in modern and prehistoric environments casts serious doubts, furthermore, on what may be the most harmful assumption—that the typical American is in no danger from lead poisoning today and has been in no danger for decades. It may well be that any interpretation of the danger of lead to typical human beings today is meaningless except in the light of more accurate knowledge of a genuinely natural lead environment.

It is difficult to measure natural concentrations of lead in foods by studies of contemporary plant and animal tissues from relatively uncontaminated rural or primi-

tive areas because industrial lead pollution is so widespread and of such long standing duration. I have been compiling a history of world lead production, and figures from that study show that very large quantities of lead have been smelted in southwest Asia and Europe since 2500 B.C., the time when men discovered how to obtain silver from lead ores. The huge amounts of lead that accumulated from these operations has provided the foundation for a widespread use of lead in human societies throughout the world during the last four thousand years. The Romans produced an average of more than 60,000 tons of lead each year for four hundred years, and most of this lead was shipped to Italy, where it was utilized by a population of about ten million free people and four million slaves. With an industrial per capita consumption of approximately 0.004 tons of lead per person per year, the Romans are essentially indistinguishable from modern, industrialized Americans, who have an industrial per capita consumption of lead of about 0.006 ton of lead per person per year.

Natural lead concentrations can also be estimated by comparing the occurrence of lead with that of such commonplace elements as calcium, strontium, and barium. Because these elements, unlike lead, are not of industrial importance, their occurrence in plant and animal tissues has not changed significantly since primitive times.

Man's natural sources and rates of lead intake can be estimated from the same and similar data. These studies of processes which determine the natural lead content of air and water suggest that, in an uncontaminated setting, essentially all of man's lead intake comes from food, with insignificant amounts originating in air and water. The total lead intake of a man in a natural environment is estimated on this basis at about 20.5 micrograms per day.¹²

Kehoe¹⁰ and others have studied lead intake and output and established accepted rates of lead absorption in blood and tissue. About ninety-five per cent of ingested lead—that is, lead taken in from food and beverages—is excreted in the feces. Most of the five per cent which remains is absorbed into the blood and later excreted in urine. But a very small portion of this absorbed lead is retained in the tissues, mostly in bone, so that over a period of years a body burden of lead is accumulated which varies with the changing conditions of lead exposure.

This body burden is a function of lead intake, rate of absorption, and rate of retention of absorbed lead. Of the twenty micrograms that are thought to have been ingested daily by man in an uncontaminated state, only about five per cent, or one microgram, is absorbed into the blood, and most of this absorbed lead is stored by the body; a man in an uncontaminated environment would accumulate a body burden of several milligrams during his lifetime.

Lead exposures are usually expressed today by the amount of lead in the blood. It is necessary, therefore, to convert this estimated natural body burden into an estimated level of lead in the blood. In the absence of other information today, one may suppose that the natural distribution of lead in the body is in the same proportion which prevails today. In the U.S., the significant range of blood lead is from about 0.05 parts per million to 0.4 parts per million,^{10 12 13 14 15} with a mean level of about 0.25 parts per million; while the mean body burden is about 200 milligrams of lead. Following the same proportion, the estimated natural blood level would be about 0.0025 parts per million, or only a hundredth of current typical levels.

There is a possibility that this proportionality may not be quite so linear. That is, in contaminated states the blood may not reveal the full extent of the total body bur-

Footnotes at end of article.

den of lead, so that changes in blood lead concentrations, in going from natural to contaminated environments, are not so severe as corresponding changes in total body burdens of lead. We may, therefore, be underestimating blood lead levels in the natural state.

All of these estimates of the natural lead state in man are based on a set of relationships which exists in the occurrence of certain subgroups of metals (including lead) in the earth's crust and in man, and on observation of the behavior of these metals in the human body. Details of the geochemical processes involved and full documentation of the studies which contributed to these estimates can be found in my article, "Contaminated and Natural Lead Environments of Man," *Archives of Environmental Health*.⁷ Although these estimates cannot carry the weight of direct observation, they represent the only comprehensive attempt yet made to determine natural lead states.

When estimates of natural states are placed together, they give the following perspective of the position of primitive man with respect to lead in his environment:

About 0.01 parts per million of lead in human foods.

About 0.5 micrograms of lead per liter of water.

About 0.0005 micrograms per cubic meter of air.

Total lead intake of about 20.5 micrograms per day for a 150 pound man.

Average body burden of about two milligrams for a 150 pound man.

Average natural blood lead level of about 0.0025 parts per million.

The next step in the process is to survey existing lead states and compare the situation today with these estimates of natural lead states.

LEAD TODAY

The industrial use of lead today is so massive that the amount of lead mined and introduced into our relatively small urban environments each year is more than a hundred times greater than the amount of natural lead leached each year from soil by streams and added to the oceans over the entire earth.¹⁰ There are indications that about nine-tenths of the lead in the young surface layers of the oceans in the northern hemisphere is industrial in origin,^{17,18} and that the atmosphere of the northern hemisphere contains about a thousand times more than natural amounts of lead.¹⁹

As a result of this contamination, the ratio of industrial lead to natural lead may be very high in common foods and other biological materials, and lead concentrations in typical people and environments far above natural levels. How has the 1,200,000 tons of lead annually consumed by American industry affected man's intake of lead and body burden?

In one survey of foods in Britain and the United States,²⁰ the American beverages were found to have only five times the estimated natural lead content, but in this case and in two other surveys,^{9,21} all other foods showed a much higher lead content, ranging up to 4.2 parts per million in British beverages.

and is excreted. The important factor, for our purposes, is the amount of lead that is absorbed into the blood.

As mentioned before, in the discussion of lead intake under natural conditions, only five per cent of the body's lead intake from food and water is absorbed even temporarily into the blood and tissues.²² In striking contrast, about forty per cent of the lead that is inhaled is absorbed by the body.²³

By grouping the population at large into urban and rural, smokers and non-smokers, the population can be divided into categories according to variations in respiratory exposure, and their respective rates of lead intake and absorption can be compared as shown in Table I.

There is probably very little difference in the average lead content of food and water consumed by people in these four population groups. The large differences in the amounts of lead absorbed by the groups is the result of differences in the amounts of lead they inhale from air or from smoking.

Although there is very little difference in total lead intake among these groups, the differences among these groups in lead absorption and blood lead levels, as shown in Table II, contrast sharply. The total increase in lead intake from lowest to highest is only about twelve per cent, but increases in absorption and blood lead levels are close to 100 per cent. This disproportion is the result of the higher absorption factor of inhaled lead, and serves as another forceful warning of the greater hazards from lead in urban air and in tobacco smoke.

In summary, there is no doubt that industrial lead, especially lead from auto exhaust wastes, has greatly increased lead contamination of the atmospheric environment in the modern era. The studies of lead concentrations in northern polar snows and in sea waters of the northern hemisphere indicate a significantly sharp increase in lead contamination in the last few decades. As a result, people in the northern hemisphere, especially city-dwellers, have been exposed to constantly increasing amounts of lead. Most of this increase seems to be in the form of airborne lead aerosols, so that it is now clear that atmospheric lead contamination is, at least in large cities, a hazard of equal or greater magnitude than lead in food and water.

It has been demonstrated that there is a clear dose-response relationship between atmospheric lead contamination at levels common in urban air pollution and the blood lead levels of those exposed.

What will happen if lead contamination continues to accelerate in the future as it has in the last two hundred years? There is good reason to believe that consumption of leaded gasoline will continue to increase as the number of automobiles increases and as auto engines become more powerful.

The public may soon be forced to decide whether the health hazards inherent in contamination from lead are outweighed by the social and economic exigencies of today's patterns of lead consumption. For more than forty years federal and state health authorities failed to recognize this hazard, and my lead contamination study met severe opposition at first, but the climate of opinion has changed. The possibility of danger from current levels of lead pollution is now a respectable viewpoint even in the field of medicine.²⁴ Federal and state health people are re-examining the situation. It may be that increasing lead contamination will soon necessitate the setting of standards for lead contamination of the atmosphere.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Patterson, C. C., T. J. Chow, and M. Murozumi. "The Possibility of Measuring Variations in the Intensity of Worldwide Lead Smelting During Ancient and Medieval Times

TABLE I

Source of lead	Amount per day	Lead intake (in micrograms)	Amount of lead absorbed by various groups (in micrograms per day)			
			Rural non-smokers	Rural smokers	Urban non-smokers	Urban smokers
Food.....	2 kilograms.....	400	20	20	20	20
Water.....	1 kilogram.....	10	1	1	1	1
Urban air.....	20 cubic meters.....	26			10	10
Rural air.....	do.....	1	0.4	0.4		
Tobacco smoke.....	1 pack.....	24		10		10

TABLE II

Approximate number in group	Micrograms of lead taken into the body per day	Micrograms of lead absorbed per day	Parts per million of lead in blood
30,000,000 urban smokers.....	461	41.0	0.21
70,000,000 urban nonsmokers.....	437	31.0	.17
30,000,000 rural smokers.....	436	31.4	.17
70,000,000 rural nonsmokers.....	412	21.4	.11

It should be pointed out that if a person ingests, for a prolonged interval, food and liquids averaging several parts per million of lead, he will become incapacitated with acute classical lead poisoning. It is interesting to note that studies which showed that this was true¹⁰ were being made at about the same time U.S. government health agencies, at Congressional urging, had finished investigations of lead arsenate pesticides in 1939 and had set maximum permissible levels of lead in apples at 7 parts per million. Data pertinent to the ill effects of several parts per million of lead in food are summarized on page 74 of Kehoe's *Harben Lectures*.¹⁰

In the United States, the average lead concentration in foods is about 0.2 parts per million, about twenty times the inferred natural concentration.

Lead concentration in fresh surface waters and in local water supplies has been the object of many surveys in this country.²⁵⁻²⁷ On the basis of these surveys, average concentrations are about 0.008 parts per million of lead in rivers and about 0.011 parts per million in

municipal water supplies. The increased lead content in municipal water supplies is probably due to contamination from lead piping in the water systems.

A conservative estimate of average lead concentrations in existing urban atmospheres is about 1.3 micrograms of lead per cubic meter.^{28,29} For existing rural atmospheres a similarly conservative estimate would be about 0.05 micrograms per cubic meter.^{14,30} These estimates are based on direct measurements of lead concentrations in selected urban and rural atmospheres.

An additional and important contribution to respiratory lead exposure originates in recent decades from tobacco smoke. The lead in tobacco comes from auto exhaust fallout and lead arsenate insecticides. In this country, the average one-and-a-half pack-a-day cigarette smoker used to be exposed to about 24 micrograms of lead per day by inhalation.³¹

All the above data can be summarized to give a fairly accurate estimate of an average person's lead intake. But most of the lead passes directly through the digestive system

Using Lead Aerosol Deposits in Polar Snow Strata," to be published in *Contributions of the U.C.L.A. Center for Medieval Studies: International Conference on the Application of Science to Medieval Archaeology*, October, 1967, Los Angeles.

² Oeschger, H., B. Alder, H. Loosli, C. Langway, and A. Renard. "Radio Carbon Dating of Ice," *Earth and Planetary Science Letters* 1, 1966, p. 194.

³ Tatsumoto, M., and C. C. Patterson. "The Concentration of Common Lead in Sea Water," *Earth Science and Meteoritics*, North Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1963.

⁴ Chow, T. J., and C. C. Patterson. "Concentration Profiles of Barium and Lead in Atlantic Waters off Bermuda," *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, Vol. 1, No. 6, Nov. 1966, pp. 397-400.

⁵ Broecker, W. S., and E. R. Bonebakker. "The Vertical Distribution of Cs-137 and Sr-90 in the Oceans," *J. Geophys. Res.* 71, 1966, p. 1999.

⁶ "Survey of Lead in the Atmosphere of Three Urban Communities," Public Health Service Pub. No. 999-AP-12, Cincinnati, 1965.

⁷ Patterson, C. C. "Natural and Contaminated Lead Environments of Man," *Arch. Environ. Health*, Vol. 11, Sept., 1955.

⁸ Goldsmith, J. R., and Alfred C. Hexter. "Respiratory Exposure to Lead: Epidemiological and Experimental Dose-Response Relationships," *Science*, Vol. 158, October 6, 1967, pp. 132-34.

⁹ Kehoe, Robert A. "Standards with Respect to Atmospheric Lead," *Arch. Environ. Health*, Vol. 8, February, 1964, p. 352.

¹⁰ Kehoe, R. A. "The Harben Lectures, 1960, the Metabolism of Lead in Man in Health and Disease, Present Hygienic Problems Relating to the Absorption of Lead," *Journal of the Royal Institute of Public Health and Hygiene* 24:81, 1961.

¹¹ Goldwater, Leonard J., and A. Walter Hoover. "An International Study of 'Normal' Levels of Lead in Blood and Urine," *Arch. Environ. Health*, Vol. 15, July, 1967, pp. 60-63.

¹² Hamilton, A., and H. L. Hardy. "Industrial Toxicology," Paul B. Hoeber, Inc., div. of Harper and Bros., New York, 1949.

¹³ Cantarow, A., and Max Trumper. "Lead Poisoning," Williams and Wilkins Co., Baltimore, 1944.

¹⁴ Hofreuter, D. H., et al. "The Public Health Significance of Atmospheric Lead," *Arch. Environ. Health*, Vol. 3, 1968, p. 568.

¹⁵ California State Dept. of Public Health. "Health Effects of Atmospheric Lead in Los Angeles," preprint of preliminary study for "Survey of Lead in the Atmosphere of Three Urban Communities," (see Ref. 6).

¹⁶ Chow, T. J., and C. C. Patterson. "The Occurrence and Significance of Lead Isotopes in Pelagic Sediments," *Geochim. et Cosmochim. Acta* 26, 1962, p. 263.

¹⁷ Tatsumoto, M., and C. C. Patterson. "The Concentration of Common Lead in Sea Water," *Earth Science and Meteoritics*, ed. Geiss and Goldberg, North Holland Pub. Co., Amsterdam, 1963.

¹⁸ Tatsumoto, M., and C. C. Patterson. "Concentrations of Common Lead in Some Atlantic and Mediterranean Waters and in Snow," *Nature*, Vol. 199, 1963, p. 350.

¹⁹ Murozumi, M., T. J. Chow, and C. C. Patterson. "Concentration Profiles of Lead and Silicon in Greenland Snow," to be published.

²⁰ Schroeder, H. A., and J. J. Balassa. "Abnormal Trace Metals in Man: Lead," *J. Chronic Diseases*, Vol. 14, 1961, p. 408.

²¹ Monier-Williams, G. W. "Public Health Reports," Ministry of Health, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1938.

²² Durum, W. H., S. G. Heidel, and L. J. Tison. "World-Wide Runoff of Dissolved Solids," *I.A.S.H. Commission of Surface Waters*, Publ. No. 51, p. 618.

²³ Turekian, K. K., and M. D. Kleinkopf. "Estimates of the Average Abundance of Copper, Manganese, Lead, Titanium, and

Chromium in Surface Waters of Maine," *Bull. Geol. Soc. Amer.* 67:1129, 1956.

²⁴ Kleinkopf, M. D. "Spectrographic Determination of Trace Elements in Lake Waters of Northern Maine," *Bull. Geol. Soc. Amer.* 71:1231, 1960.

²⁵ Kehoe, R. A., J. Cholach, and E. J. Largent. "The Concentration of Certain Trace Metals in Drinking Water," *J. Amer. Water Works Assoc.* 36:637, 1944.

²⁶ Braidech, M. M., and F. H. Emery. "Spectrographic Determination of Minor Chemical Constituents in Various Water Supplies in the U.S.," *J. Amer. Water Works Assoc.* 27:557, 1935.

²⁷ National Water Quality Network, Annual Compilation of Data, U.S. Public Health Service Publication 663, 1959-1962.

²⁸ Chambers, L. A., M. J. Foter, J. Cholach. "A Comparison of Particulate Loadings in the Atmosphere of Certain American Cities," *Third National Air Pollution Symposium*, Pasadena, Calif., 1955.

²⁹ Air Pollution Measurement of the National Air Sampling Network, U.S. Public Health Service Publication 978, 1962.

³⁰ Patterson, C. C., T. J. Chow and M. Murozumi. "Concentration Profiles of Lead and Silicon in Greenland Snow," to be published.

³¹ The concentration of lead in American tobacco has decreased from a high of about 130 parts per million during the early fifties to an estimated 20 ppm today. These values are inferred from arsenic values: H. S. Satterlee. "The Problem of Arsenic in American Cigarette Tobacco," *New England J. Medicine* 254:1149, 1956; J. H. Weber. "Arsenic in Cigarette Tobacco," *J. Sci. Food Agric.* 8:490, 1957; F. F. Guthrie, C. B. McCants, and H. G. Small, Jr. "Arsenic Content of Commercial Tobacco, 1917-1958," *Tobacco Service* 3:62, 1959; *Tobacco* 148:20, 1959.

³² Alimentary absorption of water-soluble lead is about ten per cent (see Ref. 9). Food lead is less readily absorbed, and the value may be closer to five per cent, a value which has been observed for soluble barium. See N. H. Sanborn. "Substitute Solders and Substitute Metal Containers for Canned Food Products," Nat. Canners Assn., Works Project Bureau, Research Proj. NRC-502N, 1943.

³³ Langham, W. H. "Radioisotope Absorption and Methods of Elimination: Relative Significance of Portals of Entry," *Symposium on Radioisotopes in the Biosphere*, edited by R. C. Caldecott and L. A. Snyder, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1960.

³⁴ Sherman, H. C. "Chemistry of Food and Nutrition," 8th ed. MacMillan Co., New York, 1952.

³⁵ Brecher, R., E. Brecher, A. Herzog, W. Goodman, and G. Walker. "The Consumers Union Report on Smoking and the Public Interest," Consumers Union, Inc., New York, 1963.

³⁶ Statistical Abstract of the United States, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1963.

³⁷ United States Census of Population, 1960, Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census 1.

³⁸ Editorial. "Atmospheric Contamination with Lead," *Annals of Internal Medicine*, February, 1968, p. 488.

GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to remind my colleagues that once more, the day after tomorrow, the time has come when we join with our loyal Polish-American friends to pay honor to that great patriot and hero of our War of Independence, Gen. Thaddeus

Kosciuszko. Although I cannot claim Polish ancestry, I share with those who do, the same deep feelings of gratitude and respect for our beloved Revolutionary hero.

It is worthwhile for all of us who are engaged in the daily task of making contemporary history to turn back the pages and review problems faced by the men who have preceded us in these historic halls. It is good for us to read again of the types of leadership demanded of our Chiefs of State and those who were at the helm of our legislative bodies during the great epochs of our history.

I find it particularly gratifying to be reminded once more of the galaxy of bewildering problems which faced our illustrious first President and our pioneering forebears in the Congress. My gratification does not come from recalling the problems, but rather in the manner in which George Washington solved them. I am gratified, too, in witnessing again the kind of men upon whom the Father of Our Country relied for encouragement and help. One of these close and trusted friends was a Polish soldier and statesman who became one of General Washington's most trusted military aides and one of President Washington's most intimate friends.

Even as a young boy growing up in Poland, Thaddeus Kosciuszko possessed a keen discernment of right and wrong plus an unswerving determination to do something about the wrongs he encountered about him. His passionate love of liberty and the independence of his people thrust him into the leadership of those who resisted the dismemberment of Poland by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. For his fearless efforts in behalf of his countrymen, Kosciuszko was exiled from his native land. This young officer's love of freedom was so deep, it was only natural that he had compassion for the American patriots who were beginning their struggle to throw off the shackles of British enslavement.

I hope that someday a record of the meeting of this young Polish zealot with General Washington may be found. It would be a fascinating bit of history to learn in detail how this young officer presented himself as a volunteer to help the Commander in Chief of our Continental Army. His presentation must have been of the same high order as his subsequent military service.

General Washington had young Kosciuszko commissioned a colonel of engineers in the raw and fledgling Continental Army.

He performed his first assignments of strengthening the fortifications along the Delaware River and at West Point with such zeal and with such despatch that even Thomas Jefferson was so impressed that he remarked that the young Polish officer was "the purest son of liberty I have ever known."

Kosciuszko gave of himself and his experience without reservation as he served General Washington month after month during the 6 grim and hungry years of war. He not only contributed great skill as an engineer and tactician but he endeared himself to his troops and fellow

officers for his valiant and courageous leadership on the fields of battle. Because of his valor and because of his accomplishments, a grateful Congress bestowed upon him all the rights and privileges of American citizenship along with a grant of 500 acres of land and \$12,000 cash. We recall with great feeling and admiration General Kosciuszko's moving instructions to his dear friend Thomas Jefferson, who was the executor of his last will, that these moneys should go for the freeing of slaves in the United States of America.

Many Americans then and even now regret that Kosciuszko decided to forego making this country his home and bask in the love and adulation of his adopted countrymen. Yet all Americans deeply respect and admire him for his decision to return to his homeland to lead Polish patriots to fight for their independence. His efforts in his homeland were spectacular and of such magnitude that Catherine the Great unleashed all her mighty military strength to crush the uprising.

And so the unfortunate destiny of our great American hero was not to enjoy the fruits of a good life among his devoted American friends, but to be captured in battle and consigned to life imprisonment in a stinking dungeon. Only upon the death of Catherine was he freed from prison—a wasted and suffering man but still with his love of freedom burning fiercely.

Today, Thaddeus Kosciuszko lies buried in the Wawel Cathedral in Krakow among Poland's most historic and honored dead. I have paid my respects to him there.

Today in America, Mr. Speaker, Thaddeus Kosciuszko lives in the hearts of his fellow men. On Thursday, the anniversary of his birth, we join with his countrymen and with our fellow Americans so proud of their blood relationship to him, to revere his name and to praise his deeds. We herald him not as a foreign-born officer but as a true American patriot.

MARILYN ANNE MCKAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened not to have personally known Marilyn Anne McKay, because she had an extraordinary gift for life that I am sure will live as a testament to a generation seeking to bear personal witness to the dignity of mankind.

For in the work and hopes and determination of this 23-year-old girl, there is a vision of life strong enough to overcome the disillusionment of a generation perplexed by a world it inherited but did not shape.

She explained to the Peace Corps:

It seemed to me that I had so much given to me that it was a moral obligation of mine to give up some of my time to help others who were not as fortunate as I.

She died a few weeks ago in Africa after devoting herself to teaching the children of a remote village in outer

Liberia. Marilyn was vacationing in Kenya with two other Peace Corps volunteers, Susan Davey and Martha Merrill, when their car was struck by a train. It was the Peace Corps' worst single tragedy.

Marilyn McKay grew up in a section of my district in Queens, N.Y., where she was blessed with a family rich in spiritual character as well as material wealth. Her sister is a nun, Sister Theresa, a member of the order of Daughters of Wisdom in Norfolk, Va. And she had a brother who also tragically died in an auto accident 10 years ago.

A graduate of St. John's University, she was caught up in the youthful turmoil of our times, yet firm in her religious conviction that she need not be passive while expressing devotion and love for her country. While a student, she tutored the less fortunate children of the city, symbolizing the belief of today's youth that their personal affluence is peculiarly empty if others live ignorant of their potential.

For from what I understand of this young lady, as she moved from childhood to adulthood, her adolescence was a time of setting personal goals that demanded the best of her abilities while devoted to her idealistic convictions. In this she reflected the quieter and undramatic side of today's youthful rebellion, the dedication and knowledge that only hard work produces change.

Joining the Peace Corps, she defined this personal goal:

I have seen so much of the hardships that poorer people have (. . . in New York City) that I felt a definite need within myself to try and do something to alleviate at least a small part of the suffering in the world.

In the Peace Corps, teaching in the difficult, demanding environment of the small village of Barziwen, a grueling 6-hour drive from Liberia's capital city of Monrovia, Marilyn fulfilled her promise. Her devotion to her Peace Corps assignment found expression in helping to build common bridges amongst people of different cultures, creating a world of understanding and promise—instead of despair and hopelessness.

In the wake of Marilyn's tragic death, the McKay family has set up a memorial fund in her name. It suggests to me the remembrance of a young girl who called forth the best in human nature while challenging our complacency.

Her death calls to mind, what Tennyson once wrote:

That which we are, we are;
One equal temper of heroic parts,
Made weak by . . . fate, but strong in will
To strive, to seek, to find and not to yield.

LIBERTY UNDER ATTACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VANIK). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a free country—or is it?

I have watched repeated attacks on individual liberty in the past few months, and I wonder if we are still a free country, and if we are, how long we will remain that way.

The Vice President has made violent attacks against the press in general and certain individual newspapers in particular, using language such as we have not heard since Senator GOLDWATER made his famous assault in 1964.

I have seen written into law a bill making it a crime to cross State lines with the intent of creating a riot. We well know that such a law is so vague that it is of extremely dubious value and is in all likelihood unconstitutional, a law so poorly drawn that Attorney General Clark refused to prosecute under it, yet which is used by the present Attorney General to prosecute a trial in Chicago that is so bizarre as to defy description, a trial that is in every respect a disgrace to our whole system of justice.

I see the administration pressing for a law that will irrevocably change, limit, and impair the right of our citizens to reasonable restraints on the search of their private homes by agents of the Government.

I see wholesale, admittedly illegal wiretapping justified by a fantastic legal argument of the Justice Department.

I see the Justice Department seeking wholesale confiscation of private, unpublished notes, film, and other material gathered by reporters. This action alone casts grave doubts on the extent of freedom of the press, which is the right of the people to know. It is an assault on the press such as has not taken place in living memory.

I see the use of the military draft as punishment for defiant acts, until at long last the Supreme Court has declared this outrage illegal.

Those who have concern about freedom had better pause now and think of what has been happening to our liberty, and ponder how much of it we have lost and are in danger of losing. I am one of those. It is time that we think of what is happening and time that we warn of the dangers we are facing. Liberty is under attack in our own land.

Consider the matter of the press.

I am not uncritical of the press. Indeed, I doubt that anyone has disputed more strongly than I, or at greater political danger, television network reporting that I felt was erroneous. But it is one thing to dispute the factuality of a broadcast, and quite another to bring to bear all the powers of Government against a reporter or a news institution, to force from them information that is confidential and has heretofore been considered privileged.

We have just seen the spectacle, not merely of the Vice President attacking newspapers, but of the Justice Department issuing carte blanche subpoenas to force reporters and their companies to produce unpublished notes and film, and other materials, as part of a Government investigation. This is dangerous business, because it smacks of using the press as an arm of the police, of using raw data as part of a general Government fishing expedition. The Attorney General now confesses that the action of issuing these subpoenas was a mistake. But he offers no real guarantee that it will not happen again, it seems clear indeed that he intends to continue using newsmen for

information when he deems this necessary, just as he intends to tap any telephone line that he deems necessary.

Some newsmen are of the opinion that the Justice Department, by demanding subpoenas for material on certain types of stories, intends to intimidate newsmen from covering those stories. Others theorize that the issuance of such subpoenas will cause news sources to refuse to talk to reporters. Either way, news about the subjects in question would dry up, and the Attorney General would not see stories about subjects that he did not like. He would substitute his desire to kill stories about the Black Panthers for the right of the people to know about this group, its actions, and its beliefs.

Perhaps the Attorney General is concerned about the accuracy of news items. But that offers no ground upon which to subpoena information that was never published; how could an unpublished item give rise to concern about items that were in fact published? Perhaps the Attorney General in his zeal forgets that the best guarantee of accurate news is free newspapers. He would do well to remember Jefferson's comment that—

The press is impotent if it abandons itself to falsehood.

If Mr. Mitchell is concerned about news accuracy, then he should assure the press its full liberty, for in the end, if the press is inaccurate, its stories will be rejected by the people who read them. It is a controlled press that cannot be contradicted; it is a controlled press that cannot expose facts needful of exposure; and it is a controlled press whose falsehoods cannot be denounced.

If the Government intimidates reporters, or uses the powers of Government to suppress their activities, or to cut the press off from its sources of information, our press will in fact be controlled, and to the extent that it is controlled, our people will have lost their right to know the truth—and it is the truth that makes men free.

This is no matter of mere passing concern; it is no isolated incident. For this matter touches upon the very heart of the relationship between a reporter, his duty and his responsibility, and the rights of the people and the rights of the Government.

Surely the Government has a right to seek information from any source, when it is seeking facts regarding criminal matters. But that must be a restricted right. The Government in a free land cannot resort to torture, it cannot force a man to testify against himself; it must use legal means to get its information; it must protect the rights of the innocent. The Government has in the past asked reporters to supply confidential information only on a very limited basis. It has never launched a broadside attack against reporters and the press such as we have just seen; and the reaction of the press to this attack is understandable. Mr. Mitchell's recognition of his error and his public pledge to the contrary notwithstanding, the liberty of the press has been infringed, and there is no guarantee that it will not happen again.

In addition to the attacks on the press, both political and legal, we are witnessing a drive for a type of search warrant such as must not exist in any country calling itself free.

What free country would grant police the right to smash down, without warning, a private door? Yet that is what we are being asked to do. The search warrant procedure in the Drug Act would permit police to obtain from a magistrate search warrants that would enable the police to attack households without warning. Our law has for centuries given special status to a man's private home; no police could enter without a duly obtained warrant, and no police could enter without warning. But we are now seeing an erosion of that very fundamental right of freedom from unreasonable search, in the name of nailing a few narcotics users.

Granted, it is possible for users of drugs to dispose of key evidence in drug cases in the seconds that it takes for the police to announce their presence. Yet it is not the users who are most dangerous to our society—it is the big pushers who are not going to be caught up in this crude dragnet at all. Moreover, I can foresee the day when the so-called no-knock warrant will be sought for gambling cases, for in gambling operations it is also possible to destroy records and crucial evidence in a matter of seconds. Then the no-knock warrant will be sought for other offenses. Where will it end? Who knows, for the camel whose nose we now see in liberty's tent is a formidable one.

The demand for more and more police power of this type will not end crime; it will not do anything more than erode freedom. Law and order is one thing, but tyranny is quite another. We have to be willing to take risks for liberty, just as we have to be willing to take risks for peace, as the President is so fond of saying.

How much risk are we willing to take to preserve our own liberty? If the Attorney General's policies seem to say anything, it is that he is not willing to take much risk at all. Yet if there is anything that we ought to be willing to take risks for, it is our own liberty, for our own freedom not to be intimidated, controlled, and threatened by limitless police power granted the State by men who are too unwise to uphold their liberty, or too afraid to defend it.

HON. JOSEPH P. ROSTENKOWSKI

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished majority leader Hon. CARL ALBERT, in expressing my condolences to our distinguished colleague, Congressman DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, who serves as whip of the Illinois delegation and as chairman of the Democratic caucus, on the loss of his father, the Honorable Joseph P. Rostenkowski.

For over 25 years I have known Joseph Rostenkowski. He served as committee man and alderman of the 32d ward on

the Near Northwest Side of Chicago. Joe was a lifelong leader of the Democratic Party in Cook County. He was an outstanding public official serving the wants and needs of the immigrant Polish district which he represented from 1931 to 1955. He served as collector of customs in the Chicago Port. He was a veteran of World War I. He served in many civic organizations and devoted a lifetime in Democratic politics as State senator, alderman, ward committeeman, and delegate to the national convention.

Joe served his city, his State, and his Nation with dedication and devotion, and he will be missed not only by me but by his countless friends and associates who have known Joe and his willingness to always extend a helping hand to his fellow man.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Annunzio joins me in extending to DAN and his two sisters our heartfelt sympathy on the loss of their father.

ABM—THE RIGHT TO KNOW

(Mr. GIAIMO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, from the time that the anti-ballistic-missile system was first discussed by this House in early 1968, I have questioned the need for its immediate deployment. I have done so not because I doubt the need for the best possible defense for the United States, but rather because I fear that deployment of ABM before all research and development activities are completed will result in an imperfect system and will cost the American taxpayer millions of dollars in unnecessary cost overruns.

In last year's Defense appropriations bill, \$400.9 million was appropriated for continued ABM research and development which the Defense Department said was necessary to perfect the system. Also included in this bill, over the objections of several of my colleagues and me, was a total of \$359.5 million for deployment at sites in Montana and North Dakota. This measure was signed by the President on December 29, so it is safe to assume that the necessary research and development for which we appropriated over \$400 million has not yet been completed.

In light of this, I was dismayed to discover in an article in the New York Times of January 30 that the administration plans to ask for \$600 million to build additional missile sites in Washington State, Michigan-Ohio area, Missouri, Washington, D.C., and southern New England. I have learned since then that more money for research and development will also be requested.

I find it difficult to understand how the administration can propose these new sites at the same time that its Defense Department admits to a need for millions of dollars worth of additional research and development. It has been shown time and again on other sophisticated weapons systems that concurrency of research and development and production results in imperfect weapons and unnecessary

additional expense. Such concurrency has cost the American people more than \$16 billion in the last few years, yet the administration seems determined to make the same mistake on what may be our most complex and expensive weapons system.

More importantly, however, I am concerned by the lack of information from the Defense Department on just where these missile sites are to be located. Why is it that the people of southern New England, Washington, D.C., the Michigan-Ohio area, Missouri, and Washington State had to learn about these proposed sites from the New York Times rather than from the Defense Department? Certainly, national security is not a factor in this case since the construction of these sites and their locations will soon be common knowledge anyway. It appears, unfortunately, that the Defense Department has remained silent in order to prevent public concern and criticism about the locations of these ABM sites until construction begins.

Once again, the Defense Department has forgotten the basic fact that, in a democracy, the people have a right to know. Since the American taxpayer is expected to foot the bill for ABM, he certainly has the right to criticize, on his own or through his elected representative, the location of any of these sites. It is absurd for the Defense Department to think that it can remain immune to public questioning about ABM by merely keeping silent.

I have asked the Secretary of Defense to provide more details about the proposed site location in southern New England, and I urge our colleagues from other affected areas to do the same. In the meantime, I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD the New York Times article of January 30, which must serve, unfortunately, as a poor substitute for a Defense Department policy statement:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 30, 1970]

PRESIDENT SEEKS ABM EXPANSION BUT PLANS REVIEW

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON, January 29.—President Nixon has decided to seek an expansion of the Safeguard missile defense system and of the funds to be requested for it from Congress in the next budget, Administration officials say.

But Mr. Nixon has ordered an 11th-hour restudy of the specific proposals of the Defense Department, largely because of concern about Soviet reaction to the move, the officials add.

The new budget, which goes to Congress on Monday, will contain a request for about \$1.5-billion, roughly \$600-million of which would be earmarked for expanding Safeguard beyond the first two sites narrowly approved by the Senate last August.

FIVE SITES RECOMMENDED

The remaining funds, about \$900-million, would be devoted to completing most of the financing for the first two Safeguard sites, which were approved by Congress after a bitter debate. Construction of those first sites is just getting started.

The Defense Department and the Army have recommended a second step that would include construction of two new sites and land acquisition and preliminary preparation of three additional sites.

According to reliable Administration and Congressional sources, these would involve the following:

A new Safeguard site at Whiteman Air Force Base, in Missouri to protect Minuteman missile silos in the area against a possible Soviet attack.

A new defense site in upper Washington State to shield against any launching of missiles from Communist China.

Site acquisition and preparation of a defense around the nation's capital to protect national leaders and their communications against a surprise Soviet attack.

Similar acquisition and preparation of sites in both southern New England and in the Michigan-Ohio area to protect against a Chinese attack.

LONG REVIEW MADE

Military and diplomatic sources say that, after a long review, the Pentagon became convinced that an expansion of Safeguard should proceed because of the continuing buildup of the threat from both Russia and China. The move would also be designed to increase pressure on Soviet negotiators in the arms control talks to try to come up with a relatively early agreement on limiting strategic weapons.

The Pentagon sent a variety of possible expansion proposals to the White House but urged selection of the package that features both additional protection of Minuteman offensive missiles and a start on a "thin" nationwide defensive screen against the kind of attack on cities that China is expected to be capable of launching in the mid-nineteen-seventies.

But at a National Security Council meeting within recent days, the sources said, arms control officials strenuously raised objections to starting on the nationwide defense system at this time.

WHAT WORRIES RUSSIANS

The Russians, they argued, are less worried about Minuteman defense than about a start on a broader national defense system that could conceivably be expanded one day to try to protect many American cities against a large-scale Soviet attack.

Even though the Johnson and Nixon Administrations have disclaimed any intention to expand Safeguard into a heavy defensive system, the protesting officials pointed out, the system to protect against a Chinese threat would technically be adaptable to heavy expansion merely by adding a lot of short-range antiballistic missiles around a number of American cities.

Concern on this score might compel the Russians to build a lot more intercontinental missiles, thus undermining hopes for freezing offensive systems in the arms talks, which are to resume April 16 in Vienna. The disarmament officials urged delay on this part of the Safeguard expansion until the talks are further along.

Officials say the President thought this argument had enough merit to warrant further study before the final Safeguard expansion package is settled on.

Because of this last minute review, officials were not sure late today whether the President would go into much detail on his Safeguard decision in his Budget Message on Monday, or would keep his remarks on that subject fairly general, leaving a fuller explanation until later.

In support of their position, Pentagon officials argue that the Soviet Union has constructed even more intercontinental missiles in 1969 than Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird projected in Congressional testimony last spring. The Chinese missile program, they say, is not moving any faster than expected but, in the words of one analyst, "is a year further along the road."

To delay defensive measures unilaterally

while the Russians are speeding up their offensive buildup would merely decrease pressure on them to come up with an agreement to hold down deployment of both offensive and defensive weapons, Pentagon officials argue.

Their specific Safeguard proposal is based on the following rationale:

To add a defense of the Minutemen at Whiteman to the first two sites around Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana and Grand Forks Air Force Base in North Dakota would be in recognition of the Soviet buildup with its big SS-9 missiles, now approaching 300, up from the 230 SS-9's mentioned by Mr. Laird last spring.

The site in Washington State would be aimed to start a defense strictly against China in hopes of achieving a full defense against China by the mid-nineteen-seventies, when China is expected to have anywhere from 15 to 40 intercontinental missiles.

Preliminary work on the three other sites would be aimed to reduce the time that would be required to build full Safeguard systems at those places in the event they should be required.

SURVEYS WOULD BE MADE

The work would include aerial surveys in three locations to find suitable sites; test borings of the land to insure it is solid enough to support the heavy facilities; and acquisition of the land and access routes for heavy construction equipment.

The site near the nation's capital would be designed to protect the decision-makers, especially from an attack from Soviet missile submarines lying just offshore in the Atlantic.

The sites in the Northeast and along the Michigan-Ohio border would be designed to complete the five northern-most sites designed against a Chinese attack. These would include the Malmstrom and Grand Forks sites, which have capabilities of covering a large part of the north-central part of the border against Chinese attack as well as close-in defense of Minutemen against a Soviet strike.

One knowledgeable official described the basic differences of approach between Pentagon and arms control officials as being a philosophical difference over the effectiveness of the carrot or the stick. "The military men prefer the stick, while the arms controllers feel the carrot would be more effective," he said.

U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CONTINUES ITS OFFENSIVE ON ORGANIZED CRIME

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, legislatively and operationally there has been much recent activity aimed at defeating organized crime. Much more must be done at all levels of government. Not only that, but governmental activity alone, however effective, is not enough. To achieve a total engagement against that enemy an involved and concerned private sector is indispensable.

One of the most encouraging developments in the evolution of greater public concern about organized crime has been the strenuous and effective actions of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in this regard.

Recognizing organized crime as one of the most ominous threats to the well-being of our private enterprise system, the chamber has embarked on a number

of programs which not only dispel myths and tell the facts about organized crime but also tell the public what steps to take in combating it.

As was stated in a report by the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs, which I chair:

One of the greatest menaces that organized crime presents is the ability, through accumulation of illegal gains, to infiltrate legitimate business. (Federal Effort Against Organized Crime: Report of Agency Operations. H. Rept. No. 1574, June 20, 1968).

The chamber's deskbook on organized crime, published last September, is a definitive blueprint for effective action by the businessman against syndicated crime.

Recently at the eighth conference of trade and professional associations, which form an integral part of the U.S. Chamber, an illuminating and hard-hitting action forum on organized crime was conducted.

Charles Rogovin, administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and Aaron Kohn, director of the New Orleans Metropolitan Crime Commission, as panelists quite dramatically conveyed the real threat that American business faces from the crime confederation.

In the question and answer period which followed short presentations by the panelists, it was pointed out that the businessman faces one problem the syndicate does not, the problem of crime. Syndicates derive approximately one-third of their business intake of up to \$50 billion a year as untaxed profit. A portion of this profit results from the sale of merchandise which has been stolen from the free marketplace. This, of course, poses formidable, if not insurmountable, competition to the legitimate merchant.

To eliminate the organized crime menace each and every businessman must become aware of the importance of organized crime, support legislation drafted to combat it, respond to its symptoms, speak out against it using tools such as the chamber's deskbook on organized crime, and pass up profitable organized crime-initiated arrangements that may be so appetizing when offered. In summary: "All that is necessary for the triumph of this evil is do nothing."

The association department of the chamber of commerce is well equipped to join in the battle against organized crime. The more than 1,100 trade and professional associations that make up its membership are linked together with the millions of businessmen united under the leadership of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It is extremely significant that this conference selected the menace of organized crime as the issue to focus on during its yearly meeting.

Again I commend the chamber and its association of tradesmen and professionals for their stepped-up offensive on organized crime. The chamber has indeed been a principal catalyst in achieving increased public awareness and involvement in the fight.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

(Mr. SCHADEBERG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, our Nation and Congress are rapidly realizing that the most important area facing us is environmental protection. Citizen groups are being formed to study what the individual can do to reduce pollution, businesses are realizing that the protection of the environment is as important to our continued economy as the profit margin, college groups are organizing teach-ins on this issue, and Congress is being deluged by requests for increased appropriations and new programs.

In my district in Wisconsin, an example has been set by a group of citizens who have realized that the only way to control pollution is through the individual effort working through the locally constituted form of government. Instead of sitting back and decrying the few years of life which we have ahead of us, this group, which calls itself the Neighborhood Organizations Working—NOW—and which represents and acts in concert with other organizations on Lake Delavan, Wis., has been working very strenuously with the State, with the Federal Government through my office, and with the local municipalities.

As a result of their continuing efforts, a lake which was rapidly dying stands a good chance of providing the citizens of southern Wisconsin with continuing recreational facilities. It is with a sense of admiration for these efforts, and with the purpose of showing to America how pollution control progress can be made, that I place two recent articles from the Wisconsin State Journal in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These articles give needed recognition to the local efforts on the part of Sage T. Gunderson, Ross Robbins, Richard Gifford, Steve Mestan, A. John Beucus, and Joseph M. Monroe.

The articles follow:

HOW CITIZEN GROUP SAVED LAKE DELAVAN— WATER WAS SUFFOCATED BY EFFLUENTS

(By Dennis Madigan)

A little-used Wisconsin statute, a family heirloom Masonic ring, and citizen concern translated into action have combined to spur the cleanup of Lake Delavan.

The quality of fishing and swimming in this 2,072-acre Walworth County lake has declined in recent years. During the past summer at several points along its shoreline, algae was so dense boats could not pass through it.

The problem is nutrient-filled runoff which fertilizes the lake.

Awareness of Lake Delavan's deterioration dates back as far as 1935.

Tom Gunderson, of Neighborhood Organizations Working (NOW), a federation of concerned local groups, has clippings on Lake Delavan's condition dating back that far. They were given to the NOW leader by his father.

Citizen concern peaked early in 1969 when the Delavan Fish and Game Assn. authorized a \$4,000 study of the nutrient problem in the lake by Limnetics, Inc., a Milwaukee firm.

Limnetics reported on Apr. 17 that 40 per

cent of the nutrients came from improperly treated sewage effluent from the City of Elkhorn. Another 5 per cent of the nutrients was attributed to the treatment plant at the Walworth County Home and Hospital.

Septic tanks around the lake, Limnetics said, contributed about 25 per cent of the problem, and feedlot runoff in the lake's watershed was the cause of 30 per cent of the nutrient enrichment.

Three days after the Limnetics report, NOW was formed.

And four months after NOW went into action, on Aug. 20, Gunderson and five other Lake Delavan landowners dusted off Section 537 of Chapter 144, Wisconsin Statutes, and filed complaints against Elkhorn and Walworth County.

The six-man group took the name of the Lake Delavan Improvement Assn.

The statute, which has only been brought into play on a half dozen occasions since it was created in 1966, directs the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to hold a public hearing when six or more citizens file a verified complaint on alleged or potential pollution.

After filing the complaint, the association and NOW continued to develop support for their efforts.

On Oct. 4, Gunderson and Delavan Enterprise Editor Albert L. Petermann set out to photograph the 12-in-thick layer of algae clogging one of the bays.

Petermann suggested Gunderson scoop up a handful of the growth.

Agreeing, Gunderson began to remove the heirloom 32d Degree Masonic ring he wore on the little finger of his right hand, explaining he didn't like to submerge it in the algae.

The ring, in the family since his grandfather acquired it in 1892, slipped from his grasp, bounced once on the dock, and settled slowly into the algae.

Donning skin-diving gear, Gunderson descended slowly into the bay in search of the family heirloom. After settling into several feet of sediment and never touching solid bottom, he decided the best strategy would be to sift the sediment through a piece of large mesh hardware cloth.

Instead of disturbing the sediment, Gunderson reached deep into it with the hardware cloth and swept it upward through the sediment and algae.

He found the ring on the second upward sifting.

NOW found added support after Petermann published the photo of Gunderson sifting sediment.

On Nov. 18, the Delavan Lake Sanitation District, including the Towns of Delavan and Walworth, was formed, with Gunderson as president. All septic tanks with the potential to drain into Lake Delavan will become part of the district, virtually eliminating 25 per cent of the nutrients.

On Jan. 7, the City of Elkhorn, cooperating through City Atty. Rodney Thorson and Ald. Thomas Godfrey, agreed to several steps to curtail any further occurrence of improperly treated sewage entering the lake.

The action was agreed to at the DNR hearing which resulted from the complaint filed four months earlier. Another 40 per cent of the nutrients have been accounted for.

Walworth County, at the same hearing, agreed to a study of its treated effluent to determine if Limnetics' report was accurate. Another 5 per cent of the problem is under surveillance.

Gunderson reports the latest NOW efforts center on establishing a watershed project to eliminate the remaining 30 per cent of the nutrients threatening the life of Lake Delavan.

Judging from past action of local citizens, the Lake Delavan watershed will be a reality—soon—through NOW.

ONLY SIX PEOPLE NEEDED TO ACT AGAINST POLLUTER—BUT IT'S COMPLICATED, EXPENSIVE

If you want to take a polluter to court, there's a Wisconsin statute—Section 537 of Chapter 144—that permits you and five other citizens to carry out the action.

That may sound simple.

It appeared that way in the Lake Delavan Improvement Assn.'s recent action against the City of Elkhorn and Walworth County.

But it's important to remember that both Elkhorn and Walworth County were ready to cooperate with the association.

Elkhorn had just completed two years of exhaustive studies on its sanitary sewer system to find where excess clear water—from rain and other runoff—was entering the system. These waters pushed sewage volume above Elkhorn's plant capacity and caused discharge of improperly treated effluent.

Elkhorn's findings, on file with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) at the time of the hearing, said the age of the sanitary sewer system made limiting excess clear waters impractical. Elkhorn was prepared to expand its plant and treatment facilities.

Walworth County had recently installed treatment equipment at its County Home and Hospital and readily agreed to a check of its efficiency.

The statute was created in 1966 as part of the water resources legislation passed that year. It was later amended, when Wisconsin's air pollution and solid waste regulations were adopted, to include any instance of alleged or potential environmental pollution.

In the four years 144—537 has been around, only a half dozen hearings have been requested.

The particulars of the law, plus the very real possibility of encountering opposition instead of cooperation from polluters, may help explain why it has been used so infrequently.

Finances and time play the major roles in carrying a citizen-polluter confrontation to its conclusion.

Any six citizens may file a verified complaint—made under oath and notarized—with DNR. The filing, if proper, initiates action by the department to hold a hearing on alleged or potential pollution.

DNR has the option of asking the complainants for a security deposit of up to \$100. This keeps the complainants honest and discourages cranks.

The responsibility for carrying the case forward rests with the complainants.

When a complaint is filed, it must be specific. Generally, this means such things as date, time, extent, and effect of the pollution must be stated. Facts and figures are needed to back up the specifics in the complaint.

Legal counsel is necessary.

The bills for fact collection and legal help must be paid by the six citizens.

The Delavan Lake group raised funds for its action through citizen and organization contributions. Specific facts were gathered by Limnetics, Inc., Milwaukee, at a cost of \$4,000 underwritten by the local Fish and Game Assn.

Richard J. Steinberg, Milwaukee attorney and counsel for Limnetics, Inc., was retained as legal counsel for the association.

Within 90 days of the complaint filing, DNR is required to hold the hearing. Within 90 days following the hearing, DNR is required to issue an order based on evidence presented at the hearing.

While one type of order can direct a polluter to correct a situation, other types of orders can be issued.

DNR may dismiss the complaint for lack of evidence or other reasons.

It may also find the complaint was filed in bad faith. In this case, the party complained

against can recover hearing expenses through action in a civil court.

On the face of it, a six-month time frame—from filing to order—may not seem bad.

However, another Wisconsin statute says any ruling of a state agency is subject to court review. DNR hearings are termed quasi-judicial. This means the department order may be challenged by the polluter.

Review and appeal processes can delay implementation of the order by as much as a year, if it is upheld.

Add to this the six months between filing and order and you have a long, arduous—and costly—process.

There was no challenge by either Elkhorn or Walworth County in the association's action.

The success of the Lake Delavan Improvement Assn. can be duplicated. All it takes is six citizens, a large share of time and money, and a touch of good fortune.

PORNOGRAPHY

(Mr. SCHADEBERG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to call your attention to an article entitled "Pornography" which was researched and written by Jay Reed, a writer for the Milwaukee Journal, and which appeared in this great metropolitan newspaper from my State, in its magazine section "Insight."

This article points out better than any I have seen how the pornographer has taken a place on Main Street, U.S.A., and has thereby cloaked his business of pollution of the mind in an aura of respectability which he does not deserve.

He is doing this because of the determination of Congress and the Post Office Department to close his previous channels of communications, the mails. Now he must ply his wares and his smut on the city streets and avenues.

I take this opportunity to remind the Congress that this business is far too embroiled in the seamy aspects of life to be considered respectable. I challenge this industry to prove that it deserves a place in any city, in any State.

I hope that you, Mr. Speaker, and other Members of this august body will read Mr. Reed's article and offer support to House Resolution 797, now before the Committee on Rules, which would establish a select committee to probe the extent of this industry in America.

The article referred to follows:

PORNOGRAPHY

(By Jay Reed)

Not all of Milwaukee's garbage is collected by city sanitation crews. Not all of the stuff that brings on sickening swirls of nausea finds its way to incinerators and dumps. Not all. Bet your life, not all. A lot of it is stacked in neat, cellophanned rows in a dozen or so Milwaukee smut shops, otherwise known as magazine stores. It sells to a panting public, so inclined, at prices ranging from 75c to as much as 28 bucks a clatter if your thing is dirty movies.

This may or may not seem like much depending upon your state of affluence, but what you have to remember is that we are not talking here of the stuff of normal life like milk or bread or oranges or even beer. We're talking about the literary reverse that

attracts maggots to the dumps of the human mind. We're talking, plainly, about dirty books.

I have just completed a survey of Milwaukee smut shops. I visited all of them, or all I could find. I purchased representative magazines and books and newspapers in some, but not all of them. And I read the material from cover to cover. I browsed a lot. I observed the patrons. And I spent time in the shops ranging from 8:30 in the morning until 11 at night on various days of the week and on weekends. Since this is not an ordinary report, the reader should know this: After four years of active duty with the Marine Corps infantry here and overseas; after an overseas stint as a war correspondent; after some international travel as a merchant seaman, I do not classify myself as a prude.

I have had intimate association with purple portions of society in a half dozen or more countries. I thought I had seen it all—or most of it—over the years.

Yet, over a period of 10 days, I have purchased and read written material here in Milwaukee that made my stomach crawl. Some of it was debased enough to make me think of Singapore's waterfront as a virginal place, clean and fine as mom's good old apple pie.

So we live in a permissive society.

So the highest courts in our land and the most respected judicial minds in this country have been unable to make definitions of "obscenity" and "pornography" precise enough for legislation.

So one of the most popular best selling novels in recent times concerns a man whose single passion, masturbation, makes him incapable of love.

So in a hit play of the times the actors take off their clothes and scream obscenities at the audience.

So for the price of \$2.75 you can buy in downtown Milwaukee right now a book by one Hilda Carter or Hilda Arthur—depending upon which page of the book you believe—that describes in sickening detail, from first paragraph to last, every sexual experience and act of perversion you can think of.

So what?

Well, here is what.

There has to be something wrong with a society that permits the open sale of such a book under the guise of a literary effort. Legalizing the sale of pornography would be one thing. There would be, at least, some little honor in that. But a hypocritical burying of the public head in legal sands is something else. That is what is happening.

Sure, there are those who will say that to suppress by law activities or expressions that some consider immoral or sinful is to deprive those of contrary opinion of their constitutional rights.

There are those who will say there is no such thing as a dirty book.

They will say that a four letter word that shocks a churchgoing housewife in Wauwatosa will not mean a thing to a pulp cutter in Woodruff.

They will say that words describing sexual acts are largely used as curses, jokes, or in contempt; that they are dirty only to those for whom sex itself is dirty.

They will say our customs and codes of morality are changing. They will say there can be no law discriminating against hard core pornography that does not, at the same time, infringe upon the rights and freedoms of the serious writer to portray life as he sees it and the right of any citizen to read it if he should choose to do so.

They will say these things. And much, much more.

To which I must say: Oh, hell!

It is one thing to applaud so-called sexual freedom as a healthy reaction against the hypocrisy of self-confessed "good" people

who practice in private what they condemn in public.

But it is quite another to accept the growing abuse of this freedom by commercial interests who use it in the name of art or literary effort to debase and vulgarize sex, language and all of the other basic instincts.

To discriminate between healthy freedom and sick license is a difficult, if not downright dangerous thing to do, but it will be done before the conclusion of this article, rightly or wrongly.

But let us now, for the moment, take a look at the Milwaukee situation.

It is easy, if you have the price, to buy a "dirty" book at any one of a number of downtown locations. Two executives of the National Citizens for Decent Literature, as a matter of fact, toured Milwaukee bookstores about a year ago and called the city "one of the worst in the nation" as far as the availability of smutty material is concerned.

The stores are strikingly similar in outward appearance. Their windows are either thickly curtained or painted, in most cases. You can't see in. But the come-ons are displayed.

They consist of a suggestive cover or two, a magazine featuring the word "Sex," an assortment of paperbacks with lurid titles, pictures of unclothed females with strips of tape sometimes placed over strategic areas. Most of the shops also display a sign advertising adult magazines and another saying "You Must Be 21 to Enter."

So spend a half an hour with me now in a typical downtown Milwaukee smut shop.

Let's go in at noon because it is a fairly busy hour. There are plain shelves against plain walls. The lighting is good. The magazines are racked singly, segmented, as it were, by general subject matter. There are the girly types in one area; the male nudes in another; the paperbacks in yet another.

There will be a section of photo magazines devoted solely to closeup shots of male and female sex organs. There will be pamphlets dealing with artificial organs. Yet another section features erotic phonograph records and filmstrips.

The floor is carpeted. Through the entrance to the right there sits behind a small counter a middle aged man who watches with bored interest the comings and goings of customers. Down the center of the room are two rows of tables on which are stacked more picture magazines. The variety of stock is astonishing. The store features a section of photo magazines and written material entirely for homosexual interests which is the largest I have ever seen.

And it also features a complete display of "sexploitation" papers, lavish with four letter words, paid personal solicitations for every category of sexual partnership, group or single, devices—mechanical and chemical—for increased sexual prowess and articles on new cultural developments.

Most sell for 75c a copy. One called "Screw" features as one of its lead articles a story on the joys of masturbation while watching television.

The profusion of paperbacks caters to all conceivable erotic or sadistic tastes.

Certain of the magazines are enclosed in cellophane. Except for their covers, their contents cannot be seen. Their prices, generally, are a dollar or two higher than the others. Presumably, they are of better quality or contain a "hotter" array of material. The ones I purchased, however, were little different than the overall run.

Price ranges are fairly standard, although at least two stores hike the prices printed on the covers. A picture magazine selling for \$3, according to the price printed on its cover, was hiked to \$4 by a sticker pasted over the original price. A paperback with a printed price of \$1.95 was pushed to \$2.75.

Businessmen and young executives make up a good part of the noon smut trade. They

stride in purposefully, select carefully and then they stand there and read or flip through the pages of the picture stuff. One man in a blue suit, white shirt and polished shoes munched a sandwich while he read.

Milwaukee authorities say they have no idea what the total yearly profits are of those who deal in smut. But Citizens for Decent Literature estimates the business grosses something like \$2 billion annually.

Most of the smut coming into Milwaukee is published in New York and California. There are no smut publishers in Wisconsin, so far as local authorities can determine. Mail order smut, on the other hand, comes from a variety of states and Scandinavian countries.

Obscene material is reaching the hands of Milwaukee children and authorities are concerned. Capt. Leonard Ziolkowski, head of the police vice squad, said his department had received a number of complaints from parents but, too often, they had already destroyed the evidence.

I interviewed a half dozen students at Milwaukee high schools. They were random interviews lasting from a couple of minutes to a half hour.

In each case, they had seen "dirty" material. Two students showed me examples of the material. One was a picture magazine displaying photos of nude men and women performing acts just short of actual intercourse and perversion. There was a film strip of a nude woman dancing. There was a plastic viewer through which the film could be viewed. And there were a half dozen pamphlets advertising sex books and film and erotic equipment that could be purchased through the mails.

The students claimed they had not purchased the material. "The other kids had it," they said.

Whatever the extent that young people receive obscene material, authorities believe it is adults, rather than youngsters, who feed the smut industry. The kids I talked with tended to shrug it all off. One senior at Marshall High School said he had seen "quite a bit" of smutty material. How did he feel about it?

"I think it's pretty funny."

Milwaukee has an ordinance against distributing obscene material to juveniles. Currently in State Assembly committee is a bill making it illegal to distribute harmful material to anyone under 18.

The problem is now, as it always has been, in defining what is obscene.

Supreme Court rulings on what is obscene and what is not involve three basic factors. To be obscene the work:

1. Must be without redeeming social value.
2. Must be an affront to contemporary community standards.
3. Must have a clear appeal to prurient interest in sex.

This, of course, is what has opened the door to a full scale assault on the sort of reading material that once was looked at behind the barn or in the confines of a hotel room in Paris for those who got there.

There is an incapability today among people to establish a line, not drawn by law but by each individual's deepest instincts. That is the key. What is offensive or obscene is not pictures or descriptions of two naked people making love but the context in which it is presented.

That is my argument with those magazines which can be purchased so easily in Milwaukee today.

The real obscenity, in my view, occurs when sex itself becomes the object of contempt, when sadism enters in, when aggression is committed against the human body or the human spirit.

There is a need in Milwaukee and elsewhere right now to hold a public lynching of a madman called hypocrisy.

We must call it like it is and quit the kidding.

There is pornography. You know it.

There is obscenity. You know it.

And neither one has anything to do with honest sexuality and the freedom of expression essential to full social development.

It is dirty, miserable, sordid stuff—the law notwithstanding—and it's piling up on Milwaukee's mental doorstep.

Somewhere there must be a garbageman who will carry it away.

THE PROPOSED NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT ACT

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, last week this body was scheduled to consider H.R. 12025, the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act. However, the bill was removed from the calendar; and, thus, any final action by the House has been postponed.

In order that I might make my own position with respect to this legislation clear, I am taking the liberty of inserting these comments in the RECORD at this time.

Approximately 1 year ago, the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, held extensive hearings concerning the very rapid rise in the prices of plywood and lumber which was then occurring. Of course, our hearings were instituted because of the jurisdiction which our committee has over those Federal agencies charged with improving the quality and quantity of housing for American citizens, particularly those in the low-income bracket. Needless to say, we were concerned that a sharp rise in a commodity basic to home construction, timber, and its related products, would undermine our efforts to achieve our national housing goals.

The following facts became readily apparent in the course of our hearings:

First. Approximately 54 percent of the standing timber existing in the United States which is suitable for commercial purposes is located in Government owned and controlled national forests.

Second. Receipts from the sale of timber from the national forests are now paid into the general fund of the Treasury while funds for the operation of the U.S. Forestry Service—an agency of the Department of Agriculture—are appropriated by the Congress. Appropriations for the Forest Service are never as great as receipts from the sale of the timber and they are not adequate to meet the needs of the Forest Service if proper land management techniques are to be employed.

Third. The national forests are not now producing the timber of which they are capable: it is estimated that with proper land-management techniques the productivity from our forests could be raised to 7 billion board feet per year in the next 10 years.

Fourth. The national forests can reach this high degree of productivity without destroying the uses of forest areas for recreational and wildlife purposes, provided adequate funding is provided to the Forest Service.

Fifth. Under present funding arrangements, the Forest Service is unable to provide the degree of land manage-

ment which is necessary for the preservation and sustainment of present forest areas, it being recognized that presently 4.8 million acres need reforestation.

Of course, the facts set out above lead to only one inescapable conclusion and that being that proper funding for the U.S. Forest Service must be provided without further delay if we are to achieve any of our national goals for housing and, at the same time, prevent the wholesale destruction of our national forests. The bill now before the Congress, H.R. 12025, the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act of 1969 is the most logical answer to this need, and I intend to give it my support.

However, I also feel that in the present act there are not adequate safeguards to preserve the fish, wildlife, and recreational values of our national forest lands. Even though the argument will be presented that the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act provides adequate safeguards, I believe that with the strong emphasis on timber yield which is found in the National Forest Conservation and Management Act, this provision of the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act would be effectively emasculated. Also, I have found through experience with the Department of Agriculture that recreational and fish and wildlife values often do not hold predominance when the Department is considering any special project.

Therefore, I plan to offer an amendment which would require that before sections 6 and 7 of this act could be implemented in any national forest, the Secretary of Agriculture must consult with the Secretary of the Interior and the head of the agencies exercising administration over wildlife resources of the particular State involved. This consultation would at least give conservation interests an avenue through which to present their views to the Secretary of Agriculture before any action is begun.

I find that the idea of consultation and cooperation between the different Government agencies in the field of conservation has been reaffirmed many times by the Congress. Specifically, I would like to bring to your attention the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1934, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, the land and water conservation fund, the National Trails Act, and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. All of these acts require consultation and coordination by the different Government departments in order to preserve and protect the recreational and wildlife interests of our natural resources. With these precedents in mind, I feel that my amendment would strengthen the conservation part of this bill.

BUSINESS DEALINGS WITH THE SOVIET UNION

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, we hope to begin hearings this year on the

question of American export control policy. Recently we passed an extension of the Export Control Act, in which we liberalized our trade dealings among our businessmen and the Communist bloc countries.

I would like to take this occasion to insert following my remarks, for the benefit of my colleagues, a column which was prepared for the February 9 edition of *Barron's*, written by Mr. Robert Hessen, which deals with the subject matter of the degree to which American technology has been exported to the Soviet Union and its satellites, with no resulting benefit to this country. I invite this column to the attention of my colleagues.

The column is as follows:

CAPITALIST DUPES: THE STORY OF U.S. BUSINESS DEALINGS WITH THE SOVIET UNION

(NOTE.—The accompanying article was written by Robert Hessen, author of the widely circulated "Campus or Battleground?" (*Barron's*, May 20, 1968), and an assistant professor at the Graduate School of Business, Columbia University. It first appeared in the January 1970 issue of *The Objectivist*, a monthly magazine edited by Ayn Rand.)

In recent years we have witnessed the spectacle of a number of American businessmen scurrying to Eastern Europe, sniffing the scent of Soviet rubles. Their action was paralleled by British and Canadian businessmen eager to supply machinery and food to Red China and Castro's Cuba. The men who pursue such policies evade the fact that, two generations ago, similar action by Western businessmen saved the Soviet Union from self-destruction, and helped to strengthen the dictatorship whose unchanging goal is our annihilation.

The massive aid which Western businessmen have given the Soviet regime is recounted and thoroughly documented in an important new book, *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development, 1917 to 1930* by Professor Antony C. Sutton, who is a Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution of Stanford University. With meticulous scholarship, Dr. Sutton demonstrates the overwhelming economic ineptitude of the Soviets, and their total dependence on Western technology. His documentation exposes the crude falsehood of Soviet propaganda claims.

The official line propagated by Soviet spokesmen (and repeated by their Western sympathizers) declares that, when the Soviets seized power in 1918, they inherited an empty cupboard, which they then transformed into a cornucopia. Dr. Sutton shows that the truth was the exact opposite: the Soviets seized an economy that was industrialized to a significant extent and proceeded to plunge it into chaos.

Between 1918 and 1922, the Soviet government attempted to run the country on the basis of "socialist self-sufficiency." The result, Dr. Sutton shows, was a breakdown of the economy. The Bolsheviks' seizure of power caused a mass exodus of foreign engineers and technicians—and the flight of comparably skilled Russians, either into exile abroad or to the countryside, where food was easier to obtain. Men of ability were replaced by men of unquestioned Party loyalty: industrial managers were chosen on the basis of ideological orthodoxy rather than of managerial talent. Throughout Soviet industry, incompetents soared to the heights of power.

By 1922, as a result of strict adherence to socialist policies, the Soviet economy reached a state of "catastrophic collapse." Following Marx' dictum that money is a capitalistic tool of exploitation unnecessary in a socialist society, the Soviets deliberately inflated the ruble in order to wipe out its value. They succeeded—and crippled the

country in the process. The inflation triggered a decline toward a primitive barter economy; people would not exchange goods for paper money of steadily decreasing value.

Socialist dogma also subverted industrial methods. As an example, Dr. Sutton cites the case of a Soviet steel mill built in contemptuous defiance of all concern for costs. The mill used raw materials which had to be transported a distance of 1,250 miles. Engineers and economists complained that this was uneconomical, but they were ignored. The official Party line proclaimed that transportation cost should not determine the location of factories in a socialist society; cost-consciousness, it declared, is a capitalistic concept.

By means of an industry-by-industry survey, Dr. Sutton shows that, in the early years of the Soviet regime, output fell precipitously throughout the country. Virtually the only exceptions were a few foreign-owned firms that had been temporarily exempted from nationalization, because the Soviets did not feel competent to operate the highly complex factories involved.

To revive their crippled economy, the Soviets desperately needed Western machinery and Western technicians. To finance imports, they were exporting food, even at a time when starvation was sweeping Russia. It was American "missions of mercy" that helped the Soviet dictatorship to survive. Dr. Sutton cites the following example: "The Soviets were loading a boat with Ukrainian wheat for export to Germany, while alongside was a boat from the United States unloading American wheat for the famine areas to the north of the Ukraine."

In 1921, Lenin conceded that the Soviet system could avert total collapse only by relaxing economic controls and by obtaining assistance from Western businessmen. He decreed a "New Economic Policy," a temporary repeal of certain controls, which permitted retailing, wholesaling and small manufacturing concerns to return to private ownership. Lenin would not, however, relinquish control over what he called the "commanding heights" of the economy, which included foreign trade, mining, transportation and heavy industry.

Dr. Sutton describes in detail the Soviet program of economic "concessions," which was designed to enlist the services of foreign companies and thus to use the latest Western technology in the development of the "commanding heights." A concession involved a contract by which the Soviet union authorized a foreign company to organize, equip and operate a specified economic enterprise; the company did not acquire any ownership rights, but it was free (at least, on paper) to earn a surplus or profit for a specified number of years, after which all the assets of the concession were to become Soviet property.

Other studies of Russia have noted the existence of these concessions, but have dismissed them as economically insignificant. Dr. Sutton emphatically disagrees with such an assessment; he proves that major scholarly contribution of his book lies in the fact that he has assembled a vast amount of data about concessions from widely scattered sources, and has shown that these concessions played an indispensable role in Soviet economic development.

Thus, contrary to their propaganda claims of self-sufficiency, the Soviets were forced to appeal to the technology and talents of capitalism to save their system. If Western governments and Western businessmen had continued the policy of political ostracism and economic boycott begun in 1918, the Soviet economy would have collapsed. Dr. Sutton does not draw this latter conclusion explicitly, but the evidence he presents makes it inescapable.

In turning to the West for aid, the Soviets were not, of course, abandoning their long-range dedication to socialism or to world-

revolution. On the basis of a careful study of Soviet political writings in this early period, Dr. Sutton concludes: "The pleas to the Party faithful to accept foreign capitalists and engineers give the clue that Communist intent was to absorb capital, skills, and technology, and then, 'when the lemon was sucked dry,' to discard it." To the shame of the West, the Soviet strategy succeeded, as Dr. Sutton illustrates in his discussion of the oil and coal industries.

In 1900, Russia had been the world's largest producer of crude oil. When the Soviets took over the oil fields of the Caucasus, they acquired an asset that could have become a major source of exports. Instead, the oil fields were all but destroyed. As a result of negligent operations, writes Dr. Sutton, "water percolated into the wells, and the flow of crude oil became first a mixture of oil and water and finally a flow of oily water." Left to themselves, the Soviets would have been in the same position as primitive savages living in an industrial era, staring helplessly at the works of modern technology, finding their incantations useless to raise oil from the ground. But they were not left to themselves. An American firm operating on concession, International Barnsdall Corp., sent technicians and a massive quantity of modern oil-drilling equipment to the Caucasus, and restored the Russian oil fields to normal operations.

A similar development occurred in the case of coal. Russia's most productive coal fields were in the Donetz Basin, which in 1910 produced three-fourths of Russia's total coal output. Yet, under Soviet operation, coal production fell sharply from 1917 through the mid-Twenties. The situation became so bad that, in 1921-23, coal had to be imported into the region from England and America. This, Dr. Sutton observes, was "truly a case of 'carrying coals to Newcastle.'" Once again, it was an American firm (Stuart, James & Cooke, Inc.) that bailed out the Bolsheviks. It reorganized Russian coal mines in accordance with the latest American mining methods, thus providing the Soviets with a productive and profitable enterprise.

In his discussion of the Soviet electrical industry, Dr. Sutton draws a conclusion which is equally applicable to other industries: "All technological progress resulted from a transfer from West to East. Further, rather than just restoring and modernizing the pre-revolutionary plants, the foreign associates introduced the latest innovations from Western laboratories—sometimes before they had been utilized in the Western country of origin." Clearly, the Soviets drew enormous benefits from their dealings with Western business firms.

What did the Western companies get in return? In terms of paper promises, profits; in fact, expulsion and expropriation. Dr. Sutton describes several Soviet methods employed to expel Western companies from Russia once they had finished the desired task: the Soviets encouraged crippling labor strikes, they accused foreign firms of bribing Soviet officials, they trumped up charges of economic espionage. One of the most successful methods consisted of raising taxes to the point where the foreign enterprise would be forced to run at a loss; then, when the company closed its doors, it was seized without compensation.

Perhaps the most flagrant example of Soviet duplicity cited by Dr. Sutton involves the concession rights to manganese mining. In 1913, Russia produced 52% of the world's supply of manganese, but production fell to zero in 1920, and reached only 25% of capacity in 1924. The Soviets granted a concession to a group of German companies, and then unilaterally changed the terms of the agreement. When the Germans protested, the Soviets simply nationalized the companies' assets, and proceeded to negotiate a new con-

cession with W. Averell Harriman, who represented an American syndicate. Dr. Sutton quotes a British observer who recognized that the Soviet motive in negotiating this new concession was primarily political: to establish "the fact that a big American company had taken the properties which belonged to foreign concerns . . . thereby recognizing the rights of the Soviet government to nationalize property."

Harriman in turn soon became Soviet prey. His agreement with the Soviets was signed in 1925; after only a year of full-time operations, manganese output climbed to half of the prewar total. A year later, the Soviets announced their plan to expropriate Harriman's \$4 million investment. In a rare offer to compensate a victim of expropriation, they offered Harriman long-term bonds—but only on the condition that he would "arrange a commercial loan for the Soviet authorities to develop the manganese industry." As Dr. Sutton notes, Harriman's acceptance of this offer was a double victory for the Soviets; first, in agreeing to take their long-term bonds, a leading American businessman was sanctioning and granting validity to Soviet paper promises; second, after Harriman had arranged a commercial loan for the Soviets, they "went about Europe bragging they could borrow money from Harriman . . . therefore their credit must be good."

Harriman's policy was of far-reaching benefit to the Soviets; other American businessmen played a similar role in building up the Russian economy. Not all American companies were willing to play such a role, not even a majority, but the list does include a number of giants, among them Singer Sewing Machine Co., General Electric, Westinghouse, DuPont, Ford and RCA. Nor did American businessmen have a monopoly on what, at best, was short-sighted stupidity. The examples provided by Dr. Sutton show that the Americans had keen competition from their British, German, French, Swedish and Italian counterparts.

In the closing pages of his book, Dr. Sutton writes: "One surprising conclusion from this study has been that organizations which are often thought to be somewhat socialist in character, such as cooperatives and trade unions, have consistently refused to have anything to do with the Soviet Union in the matter of credits, aid, trade, or technical assistance. . . . On the other hand, the industrial and financial elements in all Western countries have, in the final analysis, provided more assistance for the growth of the Soviet Union than any other group."

While Dr. Sutton proves this point conclusively, he does not attempt to explain why so many Western businessmen were willing to deal with a ruthless dictatorship that was, and is, openly dedicated to the destruction of capitalism. He offers evidence that a few Western businessmen were secret Soviet sympathizers; "their contribution," he writes, "was to lead the way and instill confidence in the Soviet government in the hope that other businessmen would follow." This, however, does not explain the behavior of the majority of the businessmen involved. What does explain it? The following is my own explanation, consistent with the evidence provided by Dr. Sutton:

The businessmen who cooperated with the Soviets regarded themselves as "practical men," as "realists." They acted on the premise that ideas (particularly political philosophy and morality) are irrelevant to business dealings. They treated communist ideology as "just words" that need not affect their working relationship with the Soviet government. Their contemptuous indifference to ideas forced them to act in a "pragmatic," range-of-the-moment manner; their occasional attempts to justify their actions were a grab bag of evasions, rationalizations and empty slogans. Some chose to declare

that Soviet Russia was, or easily could become, a congenial member of the family of nations. Some asserted that Western trade and friendship would somehow induce the Soviet leaders to abandon their dictatorship and renounce their plans for world-revolution. Others claimed to believe that somehow "the people" would overthrow their Soviet rulers and establish a parliamentary regime. Such was the deliberate blindness of these so-called "practical men."

They paid for it. As Dr. Sutton shows, some firms signed concession agreements to invest new sums and build new plants in Russia in the hope of recovering property which the Soviets had previously expropriated. They ignored the possibility of being expropriated a second time—a fate that actually befell Singer, Westinghouse and International Harvester. Other firms, lured by exceedingly lucrative profit "guarantees," evaded the possibility that the Soviets would seize their factories many years before the expiration of the concession term. The result of such evasions was that many firms lost millions of dollars. It was a loss they had richly deserved.

No other book has demonstrated so thoroughly the Soviets' economic ineptitude or the West's role in saving and strengthening the Soviet regime. This is a segment of history that ought to be better known, and the coverage needs to be extended beyond the early years of the Soviets. The present volume, although self-contained, covers only the years from 1917 to 1930. Fortunately, it is the first of three volumes; the next two, scheduled for publication in 1970 and 1971, will carry Dr. Sutton's analysis of Western aid to Soviet Russia up to 1945 and 1960 respectively. When completed, the series will undoubtedly rank as the foremost scholarly work in the field.

A book published a few years ago, *East Minus West Equals Zero* by Werner Keller, presented the same basic thesis. It was ignored in academic circles, allegedly on the grounds that Mr. Keller is a journalist, rather than a professional scholar, and that he relied almost exclusively on secondary sources. Neither excuse can be employed to attack Dr. Sutton's work. Dr. Sutton is an economist and an historian of technology; his book is based on research in six languages; this research included a study of Soviet periodicals and trade journals, U.S. State Department archives (which contain economic reports on Russia from our embassies abroad), and the captured German Foreign Office records (which contain similar economic reports).

The thoroughness of Dr. Sutton's documentation is the outstanding virtue of his book. He analyzes the Soviet economy on an industry-by-industry basis, and includes an extensive amount of technological detail. While this makes his book invaluable to scholars, it may present some difficulty to the general reader. Nevertheless, the book will reward the general reader's patience, for it is a storehouse of information not available anywhere else.

If you know any businessmen who mouth today's liberal line, claiming that no harm can come from economic relations with Soviet Russia, Red China or Cuba, urge them to read this book. It illustrates why actions which are profoundly immoral are also profoundly impractical, and it makes clear why, if America ever perishes, the coroner's verdict will read: Suicide.

STREAM CHANNELIZATION

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this Congress, I sent to each Mem-

ber of this body a copy of an article which I wrote for *Field & Stream* magazine regarding the adverse effect channelization of our streams and rivers by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture has on the wildlife resources of our country.

Today, I am introducing legislation which, it is hoped, will minimize the problem. Specifically, I am seeking to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act so as to permit the Secretary of the Interior to object in writing to the head of any agency sponsoring a project involving streambed alterations if he fears that serious damage would result to the stream's ecology. My amendment would then require a conference between the Secretary, or his designate, and the Secretary of the Interior, or his designate, for the purpose of seeking a mutually agreeable method of carrying out the project. In the event that no mutually acceptable method of carrying out the project can be agreed upon, the controversy shall be transmitted to the Congress for its resolution of the differences presented.

Section 2 of my bill would require that in computing cost-benefit ratios while in the planning stage of a project, the term "cost" shall include the net gain or loss to the wildlife and recreational use of the land and water, the cost to be jointly determined by the Secretary of the Interior and the head of the agency exercising administration over the particular State concerned.

The third section of my legislation would prohibit channelization or channel deepening within any project until the Secretary of the Interior has completed a study which investigates the potential damage to the ecology and the environment of the project areas and concludes that there are not other economically justifiable and technically feasible techniques which could be employed.

I am hopeful that this matter will receive prompt action by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRESIDENT'S CABINET TASK FORCE ON OIL IMPORTS CREATES CONCERN

(Mr. SHRIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the *Record* and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, recent disclosures over probable recommendations of the President's Cabinet Task Force on Oil Imports has created deep concern and uncertainty among the Nation's independent oil producers. They are justifiably alarmed over the possibility that present mandatory import controls will be replaced by a variable tariff system.

The implementation of a tariff system could result in unretrievable damage to the domestic oil and gas industry, and thereby endanger our national security. This Nation should not be placed in the position of relying upon foreign sources for its domestic supplies; and this is what could happen under a tariff system.

The tariff system would result in in-

creased oil imports, and thereby reduce the incentives needed for domestic exploration for new sources of supply. Such a condition could set in motion forces that would cause the destruction of the domestic oil-producing industry, and compel the United States to depend on foreign nations for oil.

This would be a great blow to our Nation, and to oil-producing States such as Kansas. Thousands of jobs are at stake. Tax revenues in 32 States which produce oil and gas would be sharply reduced, with a substantial adjustment in State tax structures and loss of school tax revenues.

In recent months, I have communicated and visited with the Secretary of Labor who is Chairman of the President's Cabinet task force regarding the impact of the tariff system on our national security and the independent producers. I have joined with my colleagues from other oil-producing States in expressing deep concern over any change in the program which would result in increased oil imports.

On January 31, 1970, I wrote to the President in regard to the protests and strong reactions from independent producers in Kansas, and outlining the damages which the reported tariff system would have upon our national security and this vital industry.

I hope the President, after careful study of the task force recommendations, will allay the doubts and fears by the continuation of the present mandatory control program which, on the whole, has fulfilled its objectives.

Following is the text of my letter to the President:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1970.
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am again writing in regard to the reported recommendations of your Cabinet Task Force on Oil Imports. Many of the recommendations and proposed changes in the mandatory oil import program have reached the press. Although Members of Congress have not yet been briefed on those recommendations, we are receiving protests and strong reactions from our constituents.

The reported tariff system would probably result in the closing of thousands of oil wells, most of them owned by small and independent operators. This would be disastrous to the State of Kansas. It would drive out of work thousands of individuals who directly or indirectly owe their livelihood to the petroleum industry.

Exchanging the present oil import controls for a tariff system would have even graver implications for our national security. The tariff system would result in increased oil imports and thereby reduce the incentives needed for domestic exploration for new sources of supply. Such a condition could set in motion forces that would cause the destruction of the domestic oil producing industry, and compel the United States to depend on foreign nations for oil.

Mr. President, I am seriously concerned about the reported recommendations of the Task Force because they will damage seriously the second largest industry of Kansas, and do long-range damage to our national security. I would appreciate information on

how these recommendations have evolved, and what actions you may take.

Sincerely,

GARNER E. SHRIVER,
Member of Congress.

CASTRO AND THE AMERICAS

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the *Record* and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Freedom Academy at Korea's Freedom Center is the only one of its kind in the free world. The academy, under the direction of Dr. Jose Hernandez of the Philippines and secretary general of the World Anti-Communist League, is dedicated to study and instruction in Communist psychopolitical warfare and the means to combat it. The academy draws students and professional participants from countries in free Asia and other parts of the free world.

The annual students' seminar at the academy has developed into another successful undertaking of this unique institution. Last November the seminar was devoted to the subject of the so-called people's war. Two of the lectures delivered by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University treated of the operations of Fidel Castro in the Americas. The viewpoints developed in these lectures, particularly their organic analysis relating Castroism to Communist developments in Asia, Eastern Europe, and elsewhere and the conversion of Cuba into a critical Russian base, make for some profitable reading and thought. The concrete measures proposed for coping with this growing Russian menace in the Western Hemisphere deserve studied attention and consideration.

I commend the reading of the two lectures on "Castro and the Americas" to my colleagues, along with a description of both the recent seminar and the Korean Freedom Center:

CASTRO AND THE AMERICAS
(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

"I must keep Cuba armed with the most modern equipment so that the United States and some of the Latin American nations can be restrained until the moment that we are able to launch our continental plans"—so spoke Fidel Castro to his confidants early in the 60's, as reported by his sister Juanita.¹ This insistent statement in itself reveals the intricate nature and scope of our subject. "Armed with the most modern equipment" and "our continental plans" are the key phrases in this declaration of intention. They indicate the subordinate and dependent character of what is frequently dubbed Castroism and clearly suggest a broader framework of analysis only by which this phenomenon of the so-called and mislabeled "peoples' war" in the Western Hemisphere can be intelligently understood and combatted.

Before we construct this framework of analysis, let us at the very outset debunk certain lingering myths surrounding the essentially reactionary revolution staged by Castro. Duped by propaganda emanating from Havana and other sources, there still are uncounted citizens of varying intelligence in the Free World who believe that Castroism is merely a socio-economic, revo-

¹Footnotes at end of article.

lutionary phenomenon aimed at social justice and economic betterment. These people in their incorrigible naïveté are perennial fodder for any well-executed propaganda. At the turn of the 60's, they were preceded by countless others, including leaders and writers, who hailed Castroism as another agrarian reform movement, only to be disillusioned by events in a year or two. The repeated lessons of history, from Lenin's "land, bread and peace" to Mao's characterized "agrarian reformers" to Ho Chi Minh's fabrications, are never learned by too many, and thus find a field for repetition in new geographical contexts, as in the case of Cuba.

Another dangerous myth, enunciated even by a former American Secretary of State, is poised on the geographical size of Cuba and views Castroism as merely the hollow squeal of a pygmy. A relatively small island, with a small population and meager resources and capacity—so the barren argument goes—need Cuba be feared by such large states as the United States, Brazil, Argentina and others in the Americas? Castro has said, "If we train but 300 men to act as group leaders in each country, we will have enough to explode the Socialist Revolution volcano in Latin America." With some sense of confidence, he went on to say "If to this we add the militant and/or nonmilitant Marxists-Leninists in all Latin America who will act as a fifth column as well as the other elements which through contagion, economic or social frustration, political ambition, either left or right, are conditioned to join an insurrectional movement, Soviet rockets will not be needed in the takeover of the entire continent."² A hollow threat? Never for those who know how Lenin started, as well as Mao, Ho, Tito and numerous other Red leaders, trained and skilled in psycho-political warfare. And for the past ten years the methodical, empirical unfolding of this threat, even on the terrain of the supposedly "mightiest nation in the world," has supplied more than sufficient evidence of the network and real bases underlying it.

Other myths obscuring the reality of Castroism and its fundamental bases of support portray the Castro episode as just another in the species of Latin American revolts against a previously corrupt and dictatorial regime, or just another Latin American expression against Yankee imperialism, or a costly Russian adventure in the Western Hemisphere that Moscow would sooner discard. The ramifications of these myths are extensive and sometimes emerge in the most unlikely circumstances when a rational attempt is made to place Castro and his operations in true perspective. For example, some of these myths are strongly implied by positions taken today that "Demonstrations and rebellions today in Latin America are not led by Communists nor encouraged by Russia" or that "The principal threat to the United States in Latin America is not communism but a form of Nasserism which tends to grow in Latin American republics" or "To continue to assist the Latin American military means to encourage insurrection rather than to insure stability" or "The most radical elements are not the Communists, but the priests."³

The persistence and untoward circulation of these myths show to some extent the difficulties facing us in projecting the true meaning and significance of Castro in the Americas. As always, the sources of these myths are naïve interpretations, ignorance, and propaganda agitation. In the Americas, there is no doubt that the vast majority of knowledgeable as well as just plain working people view Castro and all that he represents with anathema and rightful disdain. In the United States, the Congress, the President

and both major parties have by one expression or another reflected this general view. Through the Organization of American States the governments of the Latin American countries have expressed the same sentiment. Mexico, which has maintained relations with Cuba, likewise cannot be said to favor the totalitarianism that prevails on that betrayed island. So, when one speaks of peoples generally, the environment is foreign and inconducive to the goals and aspirations of the Castroist instrumentality.

A "people's war" on either of the American continents and under the leadership of a Castro or an allied native of a given country is a fantasy. It would be like putting an acorn into a pot of butter and expecting the growth of an oak tree. This is not the context of the problem and the real threat. What is the context—providing us with the only intelligible framework of analysis—is that ultimately determined by the Russian presence and direction, enforced either directly or through proxies and agents. This contextualization of the problem is not new. It was seen in Eastern Europe and Asia, and it is in formative process in the Middle East and in the Western Hemisphere. The geography changes, but the determining power and techniques remain substantially the same.

THE RUSSIAN DETERMINANT

Let us now recall Castro's two key phrases, "armed with the most modern equipment" and "our continental plans." Plainly, whether Castro uttered these words or not, both logic and fact dictate that he, his horde and sympathizers, and the island are completely incapable alone of realizing the objectives implicit in these two phrases. For these, Castro and his so-called revolutionaries are thoroughly and essentially dependent on external sources, and in politico-economic reality the sole, determining source is Moscow. All of which, despite Castro's disenchanting approaches toward Red China, leads up to the working structure and main props of our analytical framework for Castro's operations in the Americas.

With no natural, popular environment in the hemisphere for a "people's war" or "wars of national liberation" or "more Vietnams," the only course open for Castro to produce these fraudulent conflicts is that of professional revolutionism. As in so many other cases in other parts of the world, this course involves the whole panoply of psycho-political warfare which Moscow is in the best position to supply. This course, as one American official puts it, is a "determined campaign of subversion which is now being waged against the responsible governments of Latin America."⁴ And the tools are Castroist or Castro-bred; the determinator and manipulator is the Russian subsidizer. It is Moscow that arms and has armed Castro "with the most modern equipment," and he who pays the piper, determines the tunes to be played in what is quite accurately described as "our continental plans," with emphasis placed on "our." Beyond arms and other necessary equipment, Moscow pours into the faltering Cuban economy some one million dollars a day in staking out its investment for future operations in the hemisphere.

This vital point on the Russian determinant cannot be too strongly emphasized. All too often one finds regional experts and specialists so engrossed with their specialty that the whole picture—if you will, the forest in relation to its component trees—is somehow missed, or at best distorted. Transient and successive events of subversive Castro operations are noted with equal transiency, but all too frequently they are left isolated and unrelated to the steadily evolving pattern of interrelated events, patterns which have been repeated time and time again in other quarters of the world. With these lapses, characteristic myths then seep in, confusion spreads, and the antici-

pated net gain devolves to the unremitting Red aggressors. This sequence itself is an integral part of the aggressors' strategy for the long haul, and it is remarkable how consistently they succeed at it.

At this juncture, permit me to interject a few similarities from this highly important part of the world in order to make my unifying and cohesive point perfectly clear. Here in Korea, for example, you and I know all that has transpired since 1950. If, however, with political foresight combined with overwhelming military power we had properly checked the Russian presence and influence, there wouldn't have been a Red Korean army trained and equipped by the Russians; there wouldn't have been a diplomatically staged Korea in partition, and today a far more formidable bastion of freedom would exist on this soil. In the case of Red China, the basic Russian contribution extends over decades, despite intermittent parties' rifts. In the case of totalitarian North Vietnam, the Russian stamp was long imprinted on the genocidal Ho Chi Minh, and Moscow's heavy contribution in material support to Hanoi is a chief, if not the paramount, factor in the prolongation of the war there. The fundamental Russian hand, backed up and reinforced by an imperial power far surpassing that of any combination of Red states, is played with conditioned finesse in other parts of Asia, too. With comparable dexterity, so it is being played in the Americas, utilizing and manipulating Castro and his betrayed Cuba as instruments and tools in the unfolding continental plans.

Thus, to complete this basic framework of analysis and interpretation, within the time allowed here, let us for our full perspective, as against just an operational insight, note the many dominant elements entering into this framework. For those, like myself, who argue that the basic enemy to the Free World is Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, it is important to cite the historical fact that imperial Russian interest in the Western Hemisphere did not commence with Khrushchev and Cuba. As its expanding interest in Asia, it goes all the way back to Alexander I in the early 19th century, an interest which in part contributed to the Monroe Doctrine. What Alexander failed to achieve, not to mention subsequent Tsars, the momentary Red Tsar, Khrushchev, succeeded in gaining a foothold in the Western Hemisphere.

Second, as will be shown later in operational application, what should be noted here is the policy view expressed by Brezhnev, the formulator of a revised imperialist Russian version now called the Brezhnev doctrine. Referring to the lesson of the postwar years, he explicitly states, "It teaches in particular that the 'Cold War' and the confrontation of military blocs, the atmosphere of military threats, seriously hamper the activity of revolutionary democratic (i.e. Communist) forces."⁵ With reference to Western Europe, he continues in this vein: "And conversely, the past few years have shown clearly that in conditions of slackened international tension the pointer of the political barometer moves left . . . The increase in the influence of West European Communist parties is most directly correlated with the reduction in tension which has taken place in Europe." This deceptive policy of "peaceful coexistence" bears poignant significance for current Castro operations in the Americas.

For a perceptive understanding of the role of Castro in the Americas we must note, too, the following elements constituting our analytic framework. One is the mythology of communism itself. The myths of communism and the socialist revolution have long been exposed by the captive nations in Central Europe and in the Soviet Union, who have suffered long under the weight of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism buttressing the Red totalitarian apparatus in each syndicated

Footnotes at end of article.

state and "republic." In many areas of Latin America, Castroite propaganda attempts to interweave these myths with Catholic Christianity in the old fashion of an ideologic Trojan horse.

Another element is the "peoples' war" concept which carries as much relevance to Marxism as sociologic capitalism does to totalitarian statism. The spurious concept is, however, relevant to operational Leninism which is deeply rooted in traditional Russian imperial techniques of empire-building. The Tsars of the Russian Empire were always "liberating" other peoples, and the unwanted wars were cast in the names of peoples, whether they were Slavonic peoples in other empires, Orthodox people, or peasant people. Today, the focus is on national peoples in the fraudulent context of "wars of national liberation," the precedent step to nationalization of the means of social livelihood, and the final clamp of tyrannical totalitarianism with a red coat of paint.

Correlated with the "peoples' war" concept is the crucial divide-conquer-and then dominate technique, also an old Russian empire-building technique. The instrumental "peoples' war" concept involves more than one dimension. It is aimed not only at targeted national people in relation to a phantom imperialist exploiter, but equally so against segments of that national people. As employed time and time again, early in this political warfare game, in Eastern Europe and elsewhere, the technique is by now classic for the production of intensive revolutions, or more commonly called civil wars. Thus, the war in Vietnam is no more a civil war than it was in Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia and other parts of the present-day Soviet Union. As in these early cases, and with similar people's war slogans, it is a war triggered by Red aggression from without and backed in the main by Moscow. It is this type of war that Moscow through Castro and other proxies seeks in time to launch on the American continents.

An additional element of importance is this matter of proxy. In recent years the phrase "Russian wars by proxy" has attained currency. So Koreans and Chinese do the fighting in Korea, Vietnamese in Vietnam, Arabs in the Middle East and so forth, with no Russian blood spilled, while Moscow feeds the fires of the phoney "peoples' war," maneuvers into guiding position, and awaits the dividends of native dependency and effective imperial dominance. In line with this repeated pattern, Cubans, Americans, Brazilians, Chileans, Bolivians and others in the Americas may be similarly involved in a "peoples' war by proxy"—proxies of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. Now, here too, a "peoples' war by proxy" is only a contemporary version of the time-tested imperialist Russian borderlands springboard technique, which has been used by Red Moscow in Iran, Iraq and Outer Mongolia and is being used in relation to Red China today. Specifically, in close geographical proximity, Azerbaijani in the USSR are used in relation to those in Iran, Kurds with regard to those in Iraq and so on down the line, all prettied up in terms of a people's aspirations. On our higher technologic and communications plane today oceanic distances are no barrier to the substantial enforcement of the same policy and technique with Cuba as both a part of the Red Russian imperium and a Latin American country and training ground for other Latin Americans in the export of the "peoples' war by proxy."

Capping this whole contextual structure are the final two elements of psycho-political warfare and the captive nation status of Cuba. It is often difficult for citizens of the Free World to view events, developments, and such described elements in meaningful integralistic form, as integral parts of an evolving

whole; in short, as an expanding network causing and being effected by an organic process that has now been in being a little over fifty years. Cuba and what is transpiring in the Americas in terms of professional revolutionism are just recent additions of note in this organic process toward Soviet Russian world domination. And, in this connection, what seems most difficult to convey to free citizens is this thriving reality of professional revolutionism that inspires the process of psycho-political warfare, leading to its consummate goal of a Red takeover and the addition of another nation to the long list of captive nations. When, before American groups, I relate this process and speak about some 6,000 political warfare training schools, probably over 200,000 trained Red professional revolutionaries scattered on all populated continents, about simulated American and other villages in the USSR for future operations in the U.S., about P.R. "sleepers" in the U.S. and elsewhere awaiting patiently the opportunity that contingent events may afford, and the heavy Red resources that are poured into this prime and indispensable weapon, I invariably encounter glares of disbelief and outright rejection, all in the myopic and complacent spirit of "It Can't Happen Here." Well, what history and logic can't teach, costly experience will.

After the Red takeover of Cuba a decade ago, most Cubans were sent behind the Iron Curtain for this specialized training, to so-called universities in Moscow, Prague and elsewhere. Now the training ground, not only for Cubans but also nationals from all countries in the Americas, is this small island in the Caribbean. Based on decades of cumulative experience and systematic course development in masked institutions in the Soviet Union and outside, this expanding training program on the island is subsidized in a variety of ways by the Russians, their syndicated allies in Eastern Europe, and the economic deprivations of the oppressed Cuban nation. This training in the whole gamut of Red psycho-political warfare includes propaganda, infiltration tactics, popular front operations, guerrilla warfare, sabotage, assassination plotting, and the instrumental development of every conceivable means, whether universities, drugs, youthful inexperience, sex blackmail, etc., designed to create disorder, division, and the erosion of legitimate authority. As we shall see, Castro's Cuba is now primarily the convenient and strategic base for Red psycho-political warfare operations in the Americas. Herein lies the real threat of a pygmy leader on a relatively small island, backed, subsidized and controlled.

Finally, it is no wonder that innumerable Cuban refugees and defectors have rightly and accurately characterized present-day Cuba as a Russian colony. Again, one of the closest to puppet Castro, his own sister, has observed in unequivocal terms, "We could see as the days passed how the country was being delivered to Russian imperialism."⁸ Despite geographical distance, with Castro, Cuba has to all intents and purposes slipped behind the Iron Curtain, though we inaccurately speak of a Sugar Curtain. In short, Cuba is the latest addition to the long list of captive nations. To indicate how minds work and experience teaches, I can't but recall a White House call at the end of July, 1961 chastening me for classifying Castro's Cuba as a captive nation in an address I delivered to a Chicago Captive Nations Week rally where about 500 Cuban refugees participated. My explanation along the lines set forth here were to no avail. However, a year later, in his Cuban crisis address to the American nation President Kennedy numbered the Cuban people as a "captive people." Similarly, in his recent address to the American people, President Nixon was in effect saying, we are not prepared to deliver the people of South Viet-

nam as another addition to the long list of captive nations.

THE RUSSIAN CUBAN BASE FOR THE AMERICAS

Turning now to this Russian Cuban Base for the Americas, it is always important to know how a given condition or state of circumstances evolved, at what costs to the population, and toward what dominant ends. An evolutionary development of an object or phenomenon always provides experiential insights that logical analysis alone can never divulge. For example, it often amazes me how relatively few educated people in this world actually know how the Soviet Union came into being, now the main backer of the emotionally unstable Castro. To be sure, it is not my purpose or our goal here to furnish an historical account of the Castro story in Cuba. Others have narrated this far more competently than I can. No, on the stage set by our depicted framework of analysis, it would do well for us to review briefly the highlights of this evolution in terms of more or less acceptable phases of the development. This brief review will suggest some familiar repetitions of history.

For our formal object, it would not be a rigid portrayal to view the Castro story in these phases of development: (1) the pre-takeover phase of guerrilla activity, 1953-59 (2) the Red unmasking and Russian foothold, 1960-63 (3) Castro's vain orientation toward Peking, 1964-68 and (4) the consolidation of the Russian Cuban base, 1968 onward. The first phase, marked by camouflage, perfidy, naive American psychological assistance, guerrilla determination cloaked by idealistic propaganda, and a corroded regime, we can dispose of quickly. Not unlike the perfidious genocidist, Ho Chi Minh, who exploited the genuine foreshadowings of nationalism and human economic aspirations to further his ultimate Red totalitarian objective, Castro made his appeal to these same forces and attracted the help and sympathies of peasants, intellectuals and other strata of Cuban society. While in the Sierra Maestra Mountains he owed the safety of his life and revolution to the peasants who only sought a more livable economic existence. These legitimate forces surrounded the 26th of July Movement, from that date in 1953, when Castro attacked the Moncada Barracks, to the takeover on January 1, 1959. Those who knew Castro from the days at Havana University and elsewhere openly suspected his motives, were left unheard, and in the end were proven right—another old behavioral pattern.

As in so many other historical cases of the Red Cheaters in this century, the second phase initiated the betrayal of Cuba, its people, and Castro's own revolutionary loyalists. His supporting peasants were now, in 1960, "little donkeys" untutored in Marxism; nationalist Cuban veterans of the revolution were suddenly unfit for their military and government positions; and the autonomous status of Havana University was abolished to become a reservoir of totalitarian indoctrination.⁹ With speed and ruthlessness, Communist Party characters began to emerge into leading positions, and names such as "Che Guevara, Lázaro Peña, Blas Roca and others began to occupy the seats of the inner council. As demonstrated in punctuated form two years later, with equal speed plans were laid for a Russian and Red Chinese backing for a psychological propaganda campaign throughout Latin America, for the systematic exploitation of favorable conditions in Latin American countries, particularly Brazil and Venezuela, to foment "the socialist revolution" and eventually, over a ten or fifteen year period, establish a "Union of Socialist Republics of the Americas," for the training in Cuba of thousands of Latin Americans in psycho-political warfare, and for basic exactions in toll and sweat from the now captive Cuban populace to undertake this seemingly grandiose continental program.

⁸Footnotes at end of article.

How swiftly the transformation of Cuba was executed, all the world was able to witness two years hence. What just a few years before was regarded on the world scale as a small island of some seven million people, with a gross national product of over \$2 billion and indigenous beauty and civilized attractions, now suddenly became a crossroad of conflict and military confrontation between the two major nuclear powers in the world. Virtually overnight the new Russian base was converted into a nuclear arsenal with Russian IRBM's placed in a calculated setting for a nuclear blackmail of the United States itself. The outstanding facts of the Bay of Pigs disaster and the subsequent missile crisis in October, 1962 are well known to you. However, for our analytic examination here, the meaning and significance of these two facts deserve special consideration. The first plainly demonstrated the ineptitude of the Kennedy Administration to handle politically and militarily this Cuban problem. This no doubt inspired the Khrushchev adventure later, and with lasting benefits to Moscow's strategy in the Americas. The second event, namely the missile crisis, produced President Kennedy's "assurances against an invasion of Cuba," which the Kremlin to this day interprets as a binding guarantee that the U.S. would neither invade nor permit an invasion of Cuba. What finer sanctuary could one obtain for fomenting trouble and revolution in the professional Leninist sense throughout the Americas!

Clearly now, these notable events of the early 60's laid the foundation for the build-up of Cuba as a Russian base of systematic psycho-political warfare in the Americas. As we turn to the third phase, i.e., Castro's vain and materially futile approach toward Peking, which caused some difficulties for the Russians, there are several prominent aspects to be considered. One, accounting in part for this overt re-direction, the erratic totalitarian leader of Cuba was definitely dissatisfied with Khrushchev's retreat in the face of the American naval blockade. Two, in the following three years, his vocal erraticism was amply demonstrated by his seeming dependence on Peking, which had neither the capability of furnishing the wherewithal for those "continental plans" nor a stability within Red China during the macabre circus of Mao's "cultural revolution." Three, to this day, it is a controversial issue as to whether all the offensive nuclear weapons had been withdrawn from Cuba. And four, the deteriorating economic condition in Cuba during this entire period and the convening of the so-called Tricontinental conference in January, 1966 clearly indicated that the powerful Russian hold on Cuba had not lessened. These last two points require necessary elaboration for they lead to the fourth phase on the firm consolidation of this Russian Cuban base in 1968.

It wasn't until the end of 1961 that Castro orally publicized his concealed motive when he declared "I am a Marxist-Leninist and will be one until the day I die."¹⁰ As in so many other instances, I am sure this Russian tool doesn't understand Marxism-Leninism, which is an ideological squared circle, but the badge of differentiation and ostensible philosophical respectability is nevertheless politically useful. Marxism carries as much weight with the pattern of economic totalitarianism in Cuba as it does in other Red-controlled states, which substantially means zero. As in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, North Korea and other smaller Red states, the economic deterioration of Cuba in this decade is basically the result of totalitarian planning geared to the proverbial "continental plans" of psycho-political warfare and military aggression. Those in the U.S., for example, who glibly speak of mal-adjusted national priorities should study the pattern of any Red state, particularly the

empire-state of the USSR, and by contrast would see day compared to night, even on the scale of satisfied idealism.¹¹

An overburdening bureaucracy, disproportionate armed services, spy networks, concentration camps, political warfare schools, heavy subventions for propaganda, friendship missions and other familiar accoutrements of the Red totalitarian state are not productive factors on the plane of civilized economic values. Rather, they represent individually and collectively a burdensome, costly imposition on the sweat, toil and lives of the underlying captive populace. What has transpired and exists in Russian-controlled Cuba is an old repeated story, going back to the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic in 1917. As elsewhere, Castro's jails and concentration camps are filled with some 85,000 political prisoners, subjected to forced labor and indignities that receive scarcely a whimper in the United Nations and other councils and media of vocal idealism.¹²

Here are some salient facts on Cuba's economic deterioration in the service of Castro's Russian "continental plans." Moscow subsidizes its Cuban base at the rate of \$1 million a day, receiving in return unneeded sugar that costs twice as much to produce than in free economies. Reflecting the state of the economy, the Cuban peso sells for less than three cents in the world market, and to pay for goods purchased from Western Europe or Canada, Castro must pay in hard currency, which for him is in continual short supply. On this small island over a third of a million are in the armed services, including the 250,000 militia. Collective state farms, employing a half a million workers, account for about 70 per cent of agricultural output and, according to plan, would produce about 90 per cent as the remaining 200,000 small private landowners are squeezed out in the next two decades. Sugar still is the main foreign-exchange earning crop, averaging over seven million tons with a goal set for ten million in 1970. Diversification efforts in cattle-raising, rice, grapes, asparagus, etc., have not succeeded as planned, and over these years Cuba still imports more food than it exports.

For the populace at large, life is pretty drab and fear-ridden, given the block spy system and the like. It is no wonder that several airline hijackers have sought an "out" back to the States. By far more prominent is the fact that approximately 400,000 Cubans have fled to the U.S. since 1959, and since December 1, 1965 nearly 158,000 anti-Castro Cubans have been air-lifted to the U.S. at an average American cost of about \$55 million per annum. This questionable policy of indirectly aiding Castro through property confiscations and lessened anti-Castro resistance and rebellion deserves serious reexamination. Nonetheless, under the Maximum Leader's rule, I.D. cards for all were instituted to tighten security surveillance; Catholic schools were abolished, and children attend state schools with their heavy propaganda indoctrination; ration cards are the order of the day, with daily shortages dictating consumption in such terms: three pounds of rice per person per month, three-fourths of a pound of meat per person per week, orange juice only for infants and the sick, three ounces of coffee per person per week, twenty-five gallons of gas for a large automobile, if a Cuban has one, and two new pairs of shoes per year. Night life, which used to be a source of gaiety for the average fun-loving Cuban, is now almost exclusively for foreigners, including the nearly 8,000 Russian military advisors and "technicians." Batista was corrupt, but Castro is corruptibly impoverishing.

A final economic facet of importance to our total analysis is, in addition to the Rus-

Footnotes at end of article.

sian aid, the real political aid given to the totalitarian Castro regime by several Free World trading countries. Britain, Spain, France and Japan as well as others are involved. At the beginning of 1967, Cuba had only about \$50 million in hard currency left, but West European countries saved it from the brink with credit extensions of over \$140 million. Britain and its sale of 900 Leyland buses, French trucks and heavy roadbuilding equipment, Spanish fishing trawlers, trucks and buses, Japanese sugar purchases and details of similar character, in some instances buttressed by five year term credits, are in the aggregate beneficial to Castro Russian plans. Americans resent this trade, but as I once pointed out in an exchange with Senator Fulbright, chairman of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, our allies can come back at us, primarily with reference to Eastern Europe, and soundly point to "the unfortunate consequences of our failure to have provided that kind of cold war institutional framework that would consider not only the trade weapon, but political and other nonmilitary weapons and in the diplomatic area alike."¹³ In the Americas we are not even adequately prepared to cope with the psycho-political threat posed by Castro and his Russian sponsors which was indicated by the faint response in the Americas to the highly significant Tricontinental Conference in Havana in January 1966.

THE RED SUMMIT ON POLITICAL WARFARE

The tricontinental Conference was really a Red summit on political warfare in the Americas. It was publicized as a meeting of representatives of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America, a sort of Banding conference in the Western Hemisphere. In reality, it was a convention of eighty-two Communist Party delegations, the Soviet Union having forty delegates led by Sharaf Rashidov and Red China with thirty-four delegates. Despite the Sino-Russian rift, it is illuminating that all the resolutions of the conference were approved unanimously. One couldn't get better unity than this. Moreover, the declared resolution of the gathering are as clear and explicit as to the Red Kampf as were the pages of Hitler's Mein Kampf. We cannot ever blame the Red totalitarians for informing us of their intentions and programmatic directions, but we must continually blame ourselves for ignoring them until it is almost too late.

In addition to stating its purposes and objectives with maximum candor, the conference was revealing in numerous respects. As just pointed out, in spite of the Sino-Russian conflict, it showed again the power of unity where the common enemy denominator, the U.S., is involved. This summit meeting on insurrectionary planning across two continents underscored the grip the Russians have on the Cuban base, regardless of the many Havana-Moscow squabbles that marked this period. Also, in this so-called appeal to the Third World, the world of the less developed nations, it was interesting to observe the partial non-Russian composition of the USSR delegation, starting with Sharaf Rashidov, a candidate member of the Politburo, as though to impress on others the organic unity of the USSR and the affinity of its less developed nations with the L.D.N. peoples. Furthermore, in the string of peak developments and major highlights of the Castro story—already punctuated by the 1959 takeover, the 1961 Bay of Pigs fiasco, and the 1962 missile crisis—this conference is the next peak development resulting from President Kennedy's guarantee of sanctuary for the Russian base and leading to the next major developments, namely the immediate formation of Castro's Latin American Solidarity Organization (LASO) and the Havana-Moscow accord of 1968.

Clearly, in unmistakable terms, this Red Summit produced a declaration of psycho-political war against all the governments in

the Americas. The underlying problem for the conspiratorial delegates was not what to do, but how to do it—a problem of implementation and timing, not one of resolution and fixed objective. The problem of implementation has been a source of superficial friction between Castro and the Russians. As one Cuban analyst puts it, "for the Russians . . . Castro represents an extremely efficient springboard for the spread of communism to the rest of Latin America and Africa. . . . It is convenient for them to have some influence on the development of Communist governments originated from Cuba. But, as far as the ideology, the ideology that has been advocated for instance by Ché Guevara and by most of the leaders in the Castro government today, is more in line with the Maoist ideas."¹⁴ Let me stress here a vital point that is often overlooked, and this is that Maoist ideas on guerrilla warfare, the countryside tactic and so forth, not new in themselves, are not mutually exclusive to Russian political warfare strategy which, given time and place, readily accommodates them. The fundamental question is timing, a prudent assessment of not only a local or regional or even a continental situation but of a global one and, from this viewpoint, being in a far more critical position than is Mao, Castro or other Red pygmies, the Russian coordinator is right in his pursuit for balanced warfare with maximized opportunities for success.

Now let us observe some of the declarations and resolutions of this Red Summit on psycho-political warfare. Among numerous resolutions, one called for the creation of a continuing Latin American Solidarity Organization "to combat North American imperialism." Another, targeting Colombia, Venezuela and Peru, called "To advance the militant solidarity of the fighters of those countries among each other, and with the countries of the three continents in the great battle for national liberation." As some of you know, the Red Casa Nostra also underwrote political warfare training schools in Havana and Pyongyang in captive North Korea. A long resolution, studded with typical Red jargon on "principles of self-determination, and nonintervention," "liberty and independence," "facism and imperialism," concentrates on the Dominican Republic and condemns "the imperialist government of the United States of America as an aggressor," "the oligarchic governments of Brazil, Paraguay, Nicaragua, Honduras and Costa Rica as accomplices," and "the Organization of American States a prime political instrument of North American imperialism." Other condemnatory resolutions were directed, for example, at the United Nations for ineffectiveness and vacillation and at the Inter-American Peace Force "for being a threat to the sovereignty of the peoples of Latin America and the embodiment of international counter-revolution."

The pitch for all this and more was prodded by the chief of the largest delegation to this Red Appalachia. In his statement the Kremlin's mouthpiece indicated the prime targets when he said "We express our fraternal solidarity with the armed fight for liberty by the patriotic Venezuelans, Peruvians, Colombians and Guatemalans against the lackey imperialism."¹⁵ Using the techniques of accusing others for their exclusive crimes in this respect, he went on to say "The peoples that carry on this heroic struggle against imperialism, in whatever corner of the globe that it takes place, can be certain that the soviet people will always be at their side." No doubt, captive to captive. The climax of the statement is reached in these words: "Our principal enemy is world imperialism, headed by the imperialism of the United States," and the old Russian imperio-colonial ring, "in the world-wide struggle for

liberation." That is liberation into Russian captivity.

As in all such operations with a guaranteed base, the propaganda and organizational tentacles are formed and begin to penetrate the environment of the targeted "enemy," sweeping into their grip a motley assortment of humanity, from gangsters to educated fools, and tearing at every disruptive issue, from Red victory in Vietnam to sex education in primary schools. Castro's LASO was launched for export of revolution throughout the hemisphere, and thousands of agents, including students and black militants, are trained annually for the act. This only formalized and magnified an operation that had been in process since the start of the decade. For example, the criminal Robert F. Williams, who fled arrest on a kidnapping charge in North Carolina, was operating long before this on Radio Havana and through other media. He was continually giving advice to Afro-Americans on revolt tactics, as for instance, "Hand grenades, bazookas, light mortars, rocket launchers, machine guns and ammunition can be bought clandestinely from servicemen, anxious to make a fast dollar . . . Extensive sabotage is possible. Gas tanks on public vehicles can be choked up with sand," and so forth.¹⁶ A tri-Continental Information Center eventually emerged in New York and paraded such sponsors as the baby doctor Benjamin Spock and the so-called communist theoretician Herbert Aptheker. Undoubtedly, a proliferation of such activities will occur as it did thirty years ago, but with one great difference, the immensely greater Cold War resources at the disposal of the Russian center.

Now for the present phase of Russian consolidation of its Cuban base. Those who over the years have demonstrated little perception into Russian cold war strategy and tactics, have recently been sobered up by what they call "the Sovietization of Cuba." You wouldn't know from this brand of thinking that any missile crisis occurred in 1962, and all that that implied in preparation, Russian control and Russian influence. The economic cards of power alone foretold the destiny of Cuba even three years before. Thus the reported pact between Havana and Moscow in 1968 is just the culmination of a trend in basic evidence for an entire decade, regardless of superficial ebbs and flows in Castro-Russian relations.

This significant pact is loaded with political and diplomatic dynamite. First, as disclosed by intelligence and diplomatic Cuban defectors, the Russians are now in full control of the DGI, Castro's Directorate General of Intelligence, and with it Cuba's diplomatic apparatus and *Prensa Latina*, Castro's wire service. Second, the characteristic Russian policy ruse is seen in an attempted combination of Moscow's "peaceful coexistence" strategem on the inter-governmental level and a more recessive and subterranean Castroist political warfare operation on the two continents. After all, neither Khrushchev nor Brezhnev nor Kosygin ever repudiated the "wars of national liberation" or "peoples' wars" technique; in fact, each is on record reasserting it. And, as we have seen, Brezhnev has found the facade of "peaceful coexistence" most conducive to Red penetrations for enkindling such phoney wars. With a vocal de-emphasis of political warfare on the governmental level and greater mechanical efficiency in exporting revolution through indigenous forces on the two continents, the Castro regime, just like the Russian regime in Moscow, can even become acceptable to the U.S. By the same token, easier Russian access to the Latin American countries will be facilitated, too.

According to one important defector, Orlando Castro Hidalgo, a former member of the GDI, the economic leverage exercised by the Russians to obtain all this is to continue supporting Castro's lagging economy with subsidies and 5,000 technicians.¹⁷ Moscow

has also agreed to increase desperately needed petroleum shipments and to purchase more of Cuba's nickel ore output. Also, the Cuban and Russian embassies in Mexico City are mutually coordinating subversive operations in Central America and the Caribbean, while the Paris center of the DGI conducts operations into South America, with active support from the Russian embassies. Another recent defector, Augustin Sanchez Gonzalez, went on leave from his post as chargé d'affaires of Cuba's United Nations mission in Geneva, Switzerland, for a visit to Cuba, returned, and defected. What he saw was a "total domination" of his Cuba by the USSR. He publicly charged that Castro "is making of Cuba merely another colony of imperial Russia." He also observed, "While the common people lack food, medicine, adequate clothing and shoes, the wealth of Cuba continues to flow abroad in a vain effort to subvert the Latin American continent."¹⁸ Such accounts only repeat what others have attested to years ago. As in the mountainous cases of refugees and defectors from Eastern Europe and Red Asia, the question is how many does it take to impress these truths on the still free peoples? Red propaganda concerning Vietnam has demonstrated how easily people can be misled despite the testimonies of tens of thousands who have experienced Red totalitarian tyranny and have witnessed the worst cases of terrorism and genocide. But, then, is it true, as Sanchez says, that Castro's effort is "vain" to subvert the Latin American continent?

"OUR CONTINENTAL PLANS" IN EXECUTION

For the process of psycho-political warfare and its outcomes, implied predictions in adjectives such as vain, promising, successful, etc. are always academic and experientially amateurish. The process rests heavily on emergent contingencies and a capability to capitalize on them. A linear cause and effect development is not the essence of this process, and from Lenin down to Castro the chance moment was always crucial. No one can predict the eventuation of the chance moment, but they who work toward it, whatever its form or character, and have developed a capability to harness it stand the best chance of winning, regardless of numerous costly dry-run rehearsals and probing tests. Time, patience, methodical organizational build-up, and professional revolutionary training are the essential ingredients of this capability. The Americas have deep-seated problems as any other area, ranging from affluent indifference to overpopulation, and trained professional revolutionaries can easily tap them through a variety of means, whether instigated agitation, front association or outright leadership. Cumulative causation is what counts, and then the anticipated chance.

Castro was in a sense right when years ago he spoke of "our continental plans"—but not his and his associates, rather the Russians and his.¹⁹ The overall framework is set and moulded, and if the Red pygmy in his emotional tantrums were to balk it, I'm certain that somewhere along the line he would not again see the light of day. Much content of specific subversive and other events has already been recorded, and there assuredly will be considerably more in the years ahead, with proliferating consequences and points of impact in a constantly fluctuating environment. In short, if one grasps the framework set forth here, all that is substantially required for the period ahead is to systematically catalog by case method the empirical evidence of the execution of "our continental plans." Here let us recount some selected specific cases that from this point of time may be regarded as "failures," but from the viewpoint of a longer time dimension may prove to be experimental cases that were necessary for the final results. We don't ever want to place

Footnotes at end of article.

ourselves in the position of saying "My mind is made up; don't confuse me with the facts."

The conditions in Latin America vary in character and degree from country to country, and the Red totalitarians will naturally concentrate on the weakest one. Overall, these conditions for social ferment and unrest include a rapid population growth, structural economic imbalances, income maldistribution, single export staples, lack of transport and communications, inadequate agrarian land ownership, illiteracy, and governmental instability. Regardless of marked improvements, the Cuban-trained P.R. will always agitate for easily idealized objectives on higher points and levels of scale. This is even being done in the developed economy of the U.S. where over-exaggerated poverty, the immaturity of youth, naive pacifism magnified racism and Vietnam frustrations are being methodically exploited. In short, the prevalence of problems is extensive, and thus the field for manipulation is unbounded, depending on popular awareness, security alertness, and national will.

Bolivia, as we all know, was a testing ground for a Castro-type operation. The non-Cuban Ernesto Ché Guevara, supposedly a guerrilla warfare expert, chose this ground and was killed by the Bolivian army in October 1967. The propaganda rumblings over this event extended to black militants in the U.S. who, in addressing themselves a couple of months before to "fellow comrade Ché," stated "The African-Americans inside the United States have a great deal of admiration for you. We eagerly await your writings in order to read them, digest them and plan our tactics based on them."²⁰ For the Russians this must have been a complete waste. Bolivian government forces have also captured a guerrilla leader, Felix Melgar Antelo, trained in Cuba and quite informative as to Russian-Cuban operations out of Havana and through Russian embassies in Uruguay, Colombia and Mexico. Typical of other Latin American countries, as concerns instability in government, Bolivia underwent a unique social revolution in 1952, a military coup in 1964, and another one in 1969 under General Alfredo Ovando. Economic problems in further nationalization of resources, as the Gulf oil fields, transportation and marketing plague the present regime.

Another terrorist target has been Brazil, the sometimes tottering keystone of South America. Psychologically, it must be borne in mind that aside from injected Leninist or Maoist doctrine, Castro, a Latin American, in part pictures himself as the proverbial Latin American leader operating now, by proxy, out of the mountains for social justice. However, there is a vast difference between the revolutionaries of the past in this area and the professional ones of the present under Russian guidance. The difference is between national independence with social justice and captivity in the extended Soviet Russian Empire without it. Brazil, too, has had many revolutions and just a few years ago was on the brink of a Red takeover. Early in the decade of the 60's, Castro had his eye on this large nation when he was reported to have said, "This continental action must begin with the two countries where the conditions are the most favorable, i.e. Venezuela and Brazil. It will take about 10 or 15 years to get all of the other nations into the fold."²¹

This year Brazilian forces uncovered a training center on the Paraguay-Brazil border with a band trained in Cuba and possessing a powerful radio station in direct contact with Havana. The case of the kidnapping of U.S. Ambassador C. Burke Elbrick in Rio de Janeiro this past September is also significant. Thirteen of the fifteen Brazilian prisoners traded for the life of the ambassador

asked to go to Cuba upon their arrival in Mexico City. The largest nation in Latin America, Brazil has its outstanding problems of insufficient capital, vast unexploited resources, inflation, structural economic imbalance, and communications deficiencies.

In the adjacent northern countries of Venezuela and Colombia, the pattern of psycho-political warfare has been substantially the same, involving propaganda, the exploitation of students, terrorism, bank holdups, police station and barrack raids, building burning, assassinations and other activities reminiscent of the banditry of Stalin and the early Russian Bolsheviks. As reported early this year, the Colombian government had "discovered an international Communist subversive plot which extends to Mexico, Bolivia, Peru, Venezuela, Brazil and Colombia."²² The story was confirmed by the Venezuelan government. This and other reports disclosed that at the end of December, 1968, "70 guerrilla delegates from five countries met in the Andes Mountains along the Venezuelan-Colombian border to 'integrate' their activities in a continental war of subversion and terror." Three Russian KGB agents were present, one identified as B. Tarasov. The urban riots in five Colombian cities last January were one result of this meeting, developing a labor dispute over bus fires into a wave of terror.

From our viewpoint, in all of this it is quintessential to constantly focus our attention on the guiding and integrating Russian hand. According to Colombian, Venezuelan and other intelligence sources, Moscow is pouring in some one million dollars for this guerrilla integration program; it has appointed Tiro Fijo, a politburo member of the Soviet-controlled Colombian Communist Party as the chief of the combined Colombian and Venezuelan guerrilla forces; it has its security members in Russian embassies aid in the planning and staging of riots, as two had in Bogota; it has embassy couriers traveling regularly from Havana to Mexico City to deliver funds to Castroite couriers for guerrilla distribution in South America, and one was apprehended at the El Dorado airport in Bogota with U.S. \$100,000 and Russian plans for intensified urban and rural guerrilla activity in Colombia, Venezuela, Bolivia and Panama. One could go on and on with this kind of authentic, detailed reporting, but it won't help in the least if we have no overall conception, with valid concepts, of what is transpiring in the Americas. Within our framework of analysis, these and many other evidences point clearly to the Russian command over a united continental guerrilla force precipitating more Vietnams at the doorstep of American power.

In Argentina, Castro-supported Red activity is directed at the Catholic Church, "recognized to be revolutionary and reformist," the workers, professors, and the campesinos or small farmers, and, as reported by an outstanding organ, the professional revolutionists have moved ahead on all these fronts.²³ In Chile, three years ago President Eduardo Frei himself acknowledged the inspiration given by the Tricontinental Conference to the illegal mines strikes in his country. The confiscation of the Anaconda Copper mines, the drift toward Red-supported nationalization, and reports of a resumption of Chilean trade with Cuba next year and in defiance of the OAS embargo are some indications of the trend in that country. The cases of Guatemala has a history in Red revolutionism, and in this decade the guerrilla warfare in the country's eastern region has been under the dominance of the pro-Russian F.A.R. (Rebel Armed Forces) faction. Its future importance is underscored by both the Tricontinental Conference and Russian command over the integrated guerrilla forces. The case of the Dominican Republic, which received special attention at the conference, is by no means closed. The Red takeover attempt in 1965,

which displayed for all to see a remarkable unity of action among Moscow, Peking and Havana, was a near success that undoubtedly will serve future plans.

Panama, too, has been fertile ground for riot and demonstration agitation. As President Robles himself had to admit in 1966, Red agitators under Tricon instructions capitalized on and aggravated the riots. A consummate, mediate objective of Red political warfare in that area is the panamaization of the Canal and its tragic strategic consequences for the U.S.²⁴ Among the many minacious strikes planned against the U.S., Puerto Rico is being sought as a center of Red agitation. One of the tricon resolutions contains this drive: "Puerto Rico remains occupied by U.S. imperialism, which not only denies her the right of independence, but has converted it into an enormous military base that includes atomic weapons. From it the U.S. Government organizes interventionist actions in Latin American countries. We express solidarity with the struggle of the Puerto Rican people and call for the abolition of neo-colonialism there." The same, time-worn propaganda times for an area that has free and open elections and the independentista movement is minuscule.

WHAT TO DO?

Finally, what to do about this growing Russian-Castro threat in the Americas? This subject merits a lecture in its own right. However, for our conclusion, a few, broad guidelines and recommendations are in order:

1. Through every possible medium, the achievement of a popular understanding of the analytic framework outlined here, with prime emphasis on the Russian-Castro complex.

2. U.S. reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine against Red intervention in the Western Hemisphere.

3. Concentrating on the immediate base, a forthright U.S. and OAS declaration directed at the captive Cuban people that no permanent Red captivity will be visited upon them.

4. Programmatic action for the elimination of this Soviet Russian-Castro base by Cubans, entailing a recognized free Cuban government-in-exile, recruitment and training of exiles for infiltration into Cuba and the build-up of national resistance for the genuine liberation of a captive nation.

5. American leadership in the tightening of the economic boycott of Cuba and the elimination of Free World economic contributions to this Russian base.

6. Inadequate by itself, the launching of a hemispheric economic plan, short on misleading economic promises but long on rational aid, trade and development encompassing the use of multilateral inter-American agencies, easier financing of Latin American exports, and guarantees of investments against confiscatory nationalization.

7. Military assistance to all members of OAS for insuring the extinction of so-called indigenous Red revolutionaries and progressive stability of the respective nations; and

8. The establishment of a Freedom Academy in the U.S. for the learning of the strategy and tactics of Red psycho-political warfare, a governmental institution not only for Americans but also patriotic citizens of other Free World countries.

Most of these points are not new. They have been advocated by different people for a decade and even more. What would be new is to do what should have been done long ago, as those who had the vision and foresight advocated. The free Koreans are to be congratulated for not only having foresight but also acting upon it by establishing this Freedom Center for the study of Red psycho-political warfare. And, strangely enough, this type of warfare is as old as the hills. In contemporary times, originating in Moscow, it has fooled some of the people all of the time

Footnotes at end of article.

and all the people some of the time, but it can't fool all the people all the time.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Juanita Castro. Address to Los Angeles World Affairs Council, California, February 8, 1965.

² "Cuba and Fidel Castro," *Congressional Record*, U.S. Congress, February 19, 1965, p. 3136.

³ Paul Bethel. "Liberals Call For U.S. Pull-Back in Latin America," *Human Events*, September 13, 1969.

⁴ Honorable Strom Thurmond. "Soviet Support of Guerrilla Actions in Latin America," *Congressional Record*, September 9, 1969, p. 24930.

⁵ Leonid Brezhnev. Address, Karlov Vary, Czechoslovakia, April 24, 1967.

⁶ See Lev E. Dobriansky, *Lands and Nations in the U.S.S.R.*, The National War College, Washington, D.C., 1958.

⁷ See Lev E. Dobriansky, *The Vulnerable Russians*, New York, Second Printing, 1967. Chapter XII.

⁸ Juanita Castro, "I Accuse My Brother Fidel," *Free Front*, Manila, Philippines, October-November 1964, p. 17.

⁹ Ernesto E. Blanco, *Testimony, Extent of Subversion in Campus Disorders*, Committee on Judiciary, United States Senate, June 19, 1969, pp. 6-12.

¹⁰ UPI, Address in Havana, December 2, 1961.

¹¹ For these contrasts see L. E. Dobriansky, *Communist Economic Systems*, The New Catholic Encyclopedia reprint, 1966.

¹² Hon. Thomas J. Dodd. "Castro's Concentration Camp Regime," *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, September 30, 1969, p. 27592.

¹³ *East-West Trade*, Hearings. U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 1965, pp. 102-103.

¹⁴ Ernesto E. Blanco. *Testimony*. Op. cit. p. 19.

¹⁵ Sharaf Rashidov. Statement of U.S.S.R. delegate. *Politica*, February 1, 1966.

¹⁶ Robert F. Williams. *The Crusader*, Havana, May-June 1964.

¹⁷ "Cuba More Sovietized," *Christian Science Monitor*, July 16, 1969.

¹⁸ "Cuban Visit Disenchanted," *The Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., September 31, 1969.

¹⁹ A good account of the overall strategy is in Wolfgang W. Berner "Soviet Strategy Toward Cuba, Latin America and the Third World," *Bulletin*, Institute for the Study of the USSR, Munich, July, 1968 pp. 3-12.

²⁰ "When the United States has 50 Viet Nams Inside and 50 Outside," *Granma*, Havana, August 13, 1967.

²¹ *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, vol. 111, pt. 3, p. 3217.

²² *El Tiempo*, Bogota, Colombia, January 12, 1969.

²³ *La Prensa*, Buenos Aires, Argentina, July 11, 1969.

²⁴ For a complete discussion see *Isthmian Canal Policy Questions*, U.S. House of Representatives, 1966, p. 523.

SEMINAR: "THE (SO-CALLED) PEOPLE'S WAR"—FREEDOM CENTER, SEOUL, KOREA, NOVEMBER 20-25, 1969

THE LECTURERS

Keynote Speaker: Tai Whan Shin, Minister, National Unification Board.

Dr. Stefan T. Possony, "The Background of People's Wars."

Prof. Kwan Ching Wang, "China's Experience."

Prof. Dong Won Lim, "Vietnam and Korea—A Study of Strategies of Terror."

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, "Castro and the Americas."

Rev. Fr. Raymond J. de Jaegher, "Guerrillas in the United States."

Special Lecturer: Lt. Gen. Chae Myung Shin.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Possony

1939—Advisor to the French Air Ministry. 1946-1961—Lecturer, Graduate School, Georgetown University and Special Advisor to the U.S. Air Force at the Pentagon.

1961—Director of International Studies at the Hoover Institute on War, Revolution and Peace.

Wang

Graduated at: Kwang-tung University, The National War College, Advisor to the Chinese Ambassador to Korea. Professor of the Chinese Cultural College. Secretary and Information Department Director of the KMT (The Chinese National Party).

Lim

Graduated at: The Korean Military Academy, Seoul National University, U.S. Army Special Warfare School. Asst. Professor, Korean Military Academy. Lecturer, Korean National Defense College. Lt. Col. Republic of Korea Army. To-date—Commandant, ROK Army Special Warfare Training School.

Dobriansky

1942-1948—Instructor, New York University.

1957-1958—Professor, National War College.

1960-date—Professor, Georgetown University.

Awards: Hungarian Freedom Fighter Award in 1965.

Listed in: Who's Who in America. Who Knows—and What. Director of American Scholars.

de Jaegher

1919—Obtained the M.A. in Theology at Louvain University, Belgium.

1931—Ordained in China (Diocese of Ankwo), Professor, the Major Seminary of Su-anhwa.

1937-1943—Under the Chinese Communists.

1945-1949—Relief and Anti-Communist Works in Peiping.

PUBLISHED WORKS

Possony

"The Geography of Intellect." "Lenin the Compulsive Revolutionary." "American Security Council on Strategy and Military Affairs." (Editor.)

Lectured on: Communism, Strategy, and International Affairs throughout the United States and Europe.

Wang

"A Criticism on Materialistic Dialectics." "A Comparative Study of Logic and Materialistic Dialectics." "The Reality of the 'People's Commune'." "A Thorough Survey of the Chinese Communists in 1967 and 1968."

Lim

"Communist Revolutionary Warfare and Counter-Insurgency." "Countering Communist Guerrilla Warfare."

Dobriansky

"Veblenism A New Critique." "The Great Pretense." "The Crimes of Khrushchev." "Europe's Freedom Fighters Taras Shevchenko." "Peace and Freedom Through Cold War Victory." "Essays on Liberty." "Nations, Peoples and Countries in the USSR." "Captive Nations Week, Red Nightmare." "The Vulnerable Russians."

de Jaegher

"The Enemy Within Peking's Red Guards" in collaboration with Dr. Stephen C. Y. Pan.

Founded: Free Pacific Association, Two High Schools, A Free Pacific News Agency, A Free Pacific Magazine, A Daily Paper "The New Vietnam" (In Chinese).

WHY THIS SEMINAR

The Free World has been witness in recent years to the so-called People's Wars of Lib-

eration. This term, a Communist concoction, is a fancy name for a criminal act.

Let us look at the record.

Wherever the Communists have set foot, they have stayed and the people whom they promised and pledged to liberate have become slaves of their Communist "liberators."

Now, what is the real meaning of a "People's War" as the Communists understand it?

Is a "People's War" really the result of the collective vote of the people?

Or is a "People's War" the will and desire only of the Communist directorate?

Does a "People's War" always succeed, as the Communists assert, or can it be thwarted by free peoples determined to remain free?

What is the true nature of a "People's War"?

Is it true that a "People's War" brings in its wake terrorism, pillage, murder, the destruction of sacred places, and the massacre of innocent women and children?

The Free World must know the answers to these questions. Otherwise, it will continue to drift into the orbit of the Communists through the constant and universal bombardment of the air by deceptive Communist propaganda.

This is the reason for holding the present Seminar on "The People's War."

WHO MAY ATTEND THIS SEMINAR

Any young man or woman at college level duly certified and recommended by the Chairman or President of any WACL national or associate member is qualified to attend the Seminar.

Any Chapter may send from one to five youth representatives to this Seminar.

The only expense each student will incur is the round-trip plane fare from the Chapter to the Freedom Center, Seoul, Korea, and return.

The Freedom Center will underwrite all expenses of all student-trainees for the duration of the Seminar or from November 20 to 25, 1969. These will include hotel accommodations, teaching aids, stationery, entertainment, transportation, and visits to important places.

It is, therefore, imperative that all registration forms be submitted to the WACL Permanent Secretariat not later than November 1, 1969.

COME TO FREEDOM CENTER (AND THE FREEDOM ACADEMY) SEOUL, KOREA, "FOR THE PRESERVATION OF MAN'S FREEDOM BASED ON AMITY AND JUSTICE"

The only Freedom Academy in the Free World for the Whole World.

The Freedom Center stands on Korean soil to symbolize man's determination to fight for freedom and to preserve it against the malice and the snares of any form of tyranny and cruelty to the mind, the heart, and the body of the human person.

The Freedom Center calls the youth of all lands to come to the Freedom Academy to know and appreciate the meaning of real Freedom.

The Freedom Center—non-political, non-partisan, non-sectarian.

A clearing-house of ideas from all parts of the world set up to establish a new order based on Love and Justice.

A rapidly growing library. People come from everywhere to read or look at graphs, pictures, maps to understand the meaning of Freedom and why they should fight to preserve it.

An Exhibition Hall which contains artifacts of Freedom together with pictorial and documentary evidence of Communist perfidy and treachery.

Lecture Halls where trainees gather to participate in symposia, seminars and institutes to know and love Freedom and Democracy and to learn how to fight all forms of absolutism—especially Communism.

Collects art objects from all over the world.

Welcomes performers of the arts of mankind.

For further particulars write the Director, Freedom Center, Seoul, Korea.

THE FREEDOM CENTER—ITS PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS

Director: Dr. Jose Ma. Hernandez.

I. Education. Seminars, symposia, institutes under the direction of the Freedom Academy for youth representatives from free and uncommitted countries of the world. Short-term courses as well as regular longer courses to train the youth for leadership. Advanced studies for specialists in the arts of peace and freedom. Lecturers, experts, and professors from all parts of the world will teach at the Freedom Academy. Scholarships will be offered to carefully chosen youth leaders from the East and the West.

II. Research. On the story of man's struggle from slavery to Freedom. On the history of men's battles to preserve liberty, justice, and peace. On the comparative arts of mankind for a greater understanding of man and his problems.

III. Cultural Exchanges. Arts of all countries collected and displayed at the Exhibition Hall and other Halls. Visiting groups perform at the amphitheatre—drama, concerts, movies, dances. Informal meetings at Freedom Grill, Golf Driving Range, and Freedom Center Grounds.

PROGRESS REPORT ON H.R. 14557.
A BILL DESIGNED TO RID THE
NATION OF CULM BANKS

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, having introduced H.R. 14557 on October 28 of last year with 24 colleagues as cosponsors, I have been encouraged by the support of legislation to investigate possible uses of solid waste resulting from the mining and processing of coal. I am pleased to bring to the attention of our colleagues two important letters indicating that both industry and labor are fully committed to the bill, its passage, and implementation. The letters are from the presidents of the National Coal Association and the United Mine Workers of America and are reproduced below:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1970.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: The United Mine Workers of America urges immediate action to pass H.R. 14557, a bill which would provide for an investigation of appropriate means to use or remove gob piles and culm banks located in coal producing areas.

Such banks present an economic, an aesthetic and a health hazard to the people of coal mining regions. They inhibit the full development of those regions and detract from the well-being of both the present and future generations of inhabitants.

The United Mine Workers of America in October 1969 addressed a letter to Secretary of Interior Walter J. Hickel urging immediate action on culm banks. We urged the Interior Department to redouble its efforts because the people of the coal mining regions will no longer endure the eyesore of culm banks and the ever present danger that such banks represent to their health and safety.

There is no more urgent need in the area of solid waste disposal than the problem to which your bill, H.R. 14557, is addressed

from the standpoint of the volume of material involved and the economic and social losses incurred. Removal of these banks is the number one national priority.

The appropriate congressional committees should call immediate hearings on this subject and the UMW will appear and present testimony on the need for the program you have outlined.

We congratulate you and the other sponsors of this bill for your foresight and wisdom in introducing it and we offer the full resources of the United Mine Workers of America in any legislative program designed to insure its immediate passage.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. BOYLE.

NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., December 1, 1969.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: The National Coal Association strongly endorses your bill (HR 14557) to investigate means of using or removing the solid wastes resulting from mining and processing coal.

Disposal of solid wastes is a perplexing national problem. Certainly the most desirable solution is to turn wastes to useful purposes. We hope that your bill will result in knowledge that will not only help to dispose of wastes from coal mining but to gain a financial credit from their use to help offset the present high costs of waste handling and disposal.

As you know, the coal industry has long been concerned with the problem of disposing of the rock, shale and other materials which must be removed to reach a coal seam, or which are mined along with the coal and separated from it in coal preparation plants.

For example, Truax-Traer Co., in cooperation with Ohio State University and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, is now conducting research to determine means of preventing stream pollution from deposits of such mining wastes, known as gob piles. Though the project has been under way for only a year, it has found that only the outer few feet of the exposed surface of gob piles reacts with the atmosphere, while the interior remains inert and probably would not contribute to stream pollution.

These preliminary findings lead to some conclusions:

1. Moving gob piles for disposal elsewhere would probably expose new acid-forming material and create additional pollution.
2. If no way is found to utilize the gob piles, the best solution may be to find suitable plants that will thrive on the slopes, converting abandoned gob piles into green hills.

In view of this experience, we hope that the research provided under your bill would include studies on the most effective means of revegetating these waste deposits in cases where they cannot be put to effective use.

We believe this bill will provide effective service to the coal industry and the nation. Your sponsorship of HR 14557 is typical of your continuing interest in the coal industry and in conservation of natural resources.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN F. DUNN.

Chairman ASPINALL of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has requested a report on this measure from the Interior Department and I am confident he will schedule hearings on the matter as soon as a reply has been received and studied.

Today, there are an estimated 1.5 billion tons of refuse in the culm piles that disturb the environment of every mining region. Pennsylvania alone has 800 such hideous landmarks.

H.R. 14557 has been cosponsored by colleagues of both parties from six States. They are: Congressmen FRANK M. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, ROBERT J. CORBETT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, JOHN H. DENT, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, JAMES G. FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, KENNETH J. GRAY, Democrat, of Illinois, ALBERT W. JOHNSON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, JAMES W. KEE, Democrat, of West Virginia, JOSEPH M. McDADDE, Republican, of Pennsylvania, ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, Democrat, of West Virginia, WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, THOMAS E. MORGAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, ARNOLD OLSEN, Democrat, of Montana, CARL D. PERKINS, Democrat, of Kentucky, MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois, FRED B. ROONEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, Democrat, of Illinois, JOHN M. SLACK, Democrat, of West Virginia, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, Democrat, of West Virginia, FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Democrat, of Kentucky, WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, Republican, of Virginia, J. IRVING WHALLEY, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and GUS YATRON, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

I invite the support of everyone who wishes to join in eliminating a most serious blight on the beauty of this land. I believe that Pennsylvania's success in finding uses for materials in coal refuse banks should encourage extensive Federal research such as I have proposed.

While removal of the frightful peaks that defile the horizons of every mining region of every mining State would alone justify Federal involvement, application of the solid wastes to useful purpose is an added inducement to scientific exploration of the problem.

For many years the "red dog" that comes from burning refuse banks has been utilized in roadbuilding. More recently in Pennsylvania recovery of unburned combustible materials has sent to market literally millions of tons of coal that otherwise could be lost forever.

To eliminate entirely the manmade mountains of unsightliness, however, will require discovery of new uses for the other materials that make up these monstrosities. A research team at the Pennsylvania State University is experimenting on the use of material from the culm piles to prevent skidding on icy highways. It is also looking into the possibility of mixing the coal wastes with fertilizer for hydroseeding on deep banks. The Pennsylvania Department of Mines and Mineral Industries is also investigating economic disposal of the refuse banks; including the use of coal-ash slag for producing mineral wool insulating. Such utilization should be ample reason for the Federal Government to join in attacking a problem that has blighted the landscape in all mining areas.

While recovery of germanium, lithium, vanadium, alumina, sulfur, and other contents of the culm piles is not economically attractive at this time, an in-depth study might very well result in cost vindication by combining net

worth of the byproducts and increased land value. The least Congress can do in the interest of esthetic considerations is to enact H.R. 14557. Through it may come the economic answer to a problem which has plagued the land for much too long.

WORDS OF SGT. KEN O. KEOGH AN INSPIRATION TO ALL AMERICANS

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, on November 6, 1969, I joined a number of my colleagues in sponsoring House Resolution 664, a resolution honoring our soldiers in Vietnam. In November, I sent a copy of that resolution, with a covering letter, to those men from Delaware who are currently serving in Vietnam.

On December 3, 1969, I received a letter from Sgt. Ken Keogh, XXXX Mr. Speaker, I believe that Sergeant Keogh's words of patriotism can serve as an inspiration to all Americans, and I insert the text of his letter at this point in the Record:

NOVEMBER 27, 1969.

WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. ROTH: Since I have a few minutes to myself, I thought I would write and thank you for your consideration for the Vietnam veterans. I received your letter a few days ago and was surprised to hear that I, from the state Delaware, was the only one in my unit to receive a letter from his state representative. I guess that goes to prove one of the many reasons behind our state's nickname, The First State.

I would also like to say that I am glad to serve for my country by having to serve a tour of duty in the Republic of Vietnam. As I see it, I'm doing my share to stop oppression, terror and turmoil, and to keep the stain of blood off American soil. What's one small year to give for such a big cause? Liberty and freedom mean a lot to me. I only wish a lot of other people felt the same way and didn't take it for granted. A little more than seven more months and I'll be home for good. I'll be glad I have served my one year and that I have served it proudly. One other thing Mr. Roth, I would like to know how I can go about getting a state flag. I would definitely like to have one.

Well, I guess I've taken up enough of your time and I'd like to thank you once again for your letter.

Sincerely,

SGT. KEN D. KEOGH.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA—NO. 26

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation. In 1967, the United States spent more money on education—\$36,687,000,000—than any other nation. In 1969, this figure was \$40 billion. This expenditure exceeded the entire gross national product of every country in the world except the U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, Japan, West Germany, Israel, France, and Canada.

NOT-SO-SWEET SUGAR

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions in the past I have pointed out the extremely wasteful results of the headlong rush by the Economic Development Administration—EDA—to spew out the taxpayers' money on ill-advised or ill-conceived projects.

A classic example of this tendency to throw away the taxpayers' money is the Maine Sugar Industries project into which tens of millions of the public's money has been poured and which is on the verge of bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, as in other cases, the alleged review of this project made by the EDA to determine whether it could stand on its own feet was apparently little more than a joke.

The EDA said Maine Sugar could go it alone and it has, to date, put up \$12.3 million of the public's money, while the State of Maine is liable for another \$8 million in guaranteed bank loans.

Let me outline a little of the history of this project for those who may be unfamiliar with it.

Maine Sugar Industries—a corporation largely financed by the Federal Government and the State of Maine—is a beet sugar processing plant in northern Maine.

The sponsors of the project wanted to introduce sugar beets in that area as a second crop to help the farmers. In 1963, they put great pressure on both the Commerce and Agriculture Departments, not only to put up money for the project, but also to provide a 33,000-acre sugar beet allotment for the area. They got what they wanted.

After the Commerce Department agreed to finance most of the project, the original processor in the picture—Great Western Sugar—decided it was too risky and backed out. The sponsors of the project hurriedly persuaded Fred H. Vahlsing, Jr., president of Vahlsing, Inc., which had a potato processing plant in Maine, to go into the sugar beet business, although he knew nothing about the processing of sugar beets.

You might think that when an experienced commercial sugar company threw up its hands and left the scene, not only the backers of this project but the Federal officials involved would have thought twice about the risks. You would have been wrong.

The blind determination to obtain this plant was so strong that one of today's most pious and vocal advocates in Congress of antipollution campaigns left no stone unturned until the classification of the stream on which the plant is located was legally changed so that it became little better than an open sewer because of waste discharged into it from the Vahlsing potato plant and, later, its neighboring sugar beet plant.

I understand that the pollution of this once clear and pure fishing stream became so severe that a Canadian town downstream has raised heated objections with the State of Maine for permitting it.

At any rate, this continuing pollution has now cost the taxpayers—at a mini-

mum—\$196,000 in the form of a Federal Water Pollution Control Agency grant to try to clean up the stream.

Pollution aside, Maine farmers never planted anywhere near the number of acres of sugar beets the bureaucratic dreamers in Washington said they could.

So, in 1966, the Federal Government obligingly picked up the \$2.25 million tab for sugarcane processing machinery for this plant in a desperate effort to make the project self-supporting.

This was nothing more than throwing good money after bad, and I am pleased to note that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) has expressed my sentiments on this score on previous occasions.

Last June 16 he spoke of the sorry history of what he described as the "ill-advised Economic Development Administration involvement in this project."

And he observed that his previous judgment "was correct and that Federal financial assistance to this project was not 'preceded by and consistent with sound, long-range economic planning,'" as required by law.

To make a long story short—the upshot of all this money being poured into the venture is that:

Maine Sugar Industries lost \$2.7 million during the 9-month period that ended on July 31, 1969.

It owes \$170,000 to Maine beetgrowers for last year's crop, and \$1.3 million to New York State beetgrowers. The New York Sugar Association is reportedly considering a suit to force payment.

The company is now delinquent on two payments to the First National Bank of Boston on an \$8 million loan guaranteed by the Marine Industrial Building Authority, a State agency.

It owes \$300,000 in back taxes to the town of Easton, Maine.

Two New York banks, Morgan Guaranty and Chase Manhattan, have reportedly refused to advance any more money to either Maine Sugar Industries or Vahlsing, Inc.

At the end of January this year, the situation had become so bad that some employees of the sugar beet plant were laid off for lack of payroll money.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a partial recitation of what has happened as a result of a foolish venture, and the end is not yet in sight.

I am advised that Vahlsing is now endeavoring to lobby for certain changes in the sugar import quotas that would benefit his company. I understand that on December 15, 1969, Vahlsing wrote to Agriculture Secretary Hardin asking him to reallocate sugar beet quotas for Maine, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey in such fashion that his company could benefit. And I understand he has proposed an amendment to the Sugar Act of 1948 to increase the total acreage allotment in States where he has processing plants.

Mr. Speaker, the present administration has already bent over backward to bail out this ill-conceived project. Interest payments on the EDA loan have been deferred until October of 1971 and principal payments until October 1973.

I can only hope that the taxpayers are not going to be asked to put another red cent into this monumental boon-

doggie and, in light of the past dismal history of this project, I would certainly hope that Secretary Hardin would take no precipitous action on any self-serving request by Vahlising.

FULL FUNDING FOR ESSENTIAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, I introduced H.R. 15729, in which 23 of my colleagues joined. This bill provides supplemental funding for five key programs of the Federal Government's efforts to bring decent housing to all Americans.

I am today reintroducing this supplemental appropriations bill with three more cosponsors: Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mrs. MINK.

The pressing need for these additional funds is clear. This need is pointed out in an article by Leonard Downie, Jr., which appeared in the February 8 edition of the Washington Post. Mr. Downie perceptively analyzes the problems of housing in America, particularly so far as low- and middle-income families are concerned. As he states:

The little housing that has been built has not been available to most of those families statistics show need it most . . .

One of the reasons for the failure to meet the commitment enunciated as long ago as 1949 by the National Housing Act for a "decent home for every American" is the lack of funding. Particularly relevant to H.R. 15729 is Mr. Downie's report that—

Although Congress has passed bold legislation for housing the poor, it has failed to appropriate the money that the Department of Housing and Urban Development says it needs to carry the laws out.

In detailing the innovative approaches created by the housing laws of the 1960's—such as the rent supplement program and the sections 235 and 236 programs—Mr. Downie reports, as I stated in my statement on February 5 upon introduction of H.R. 15729:

All of these opportunities, however, have been encumbered by a meager supply of money from Congress . . . (S) o little money has been appropriated for the programs so far that HUD funds are usually used up within months of becoming available. Disappointed investors are being turned away.

Certainly, there are problems with the Federal housing program, and these problems must be resolved. But equally necessary is sufficient funding.

I am, therefore, pleased that Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mrs. MINK have joined 23 of our colleagues in cosponsoring legislation to provide full funding for fiscal year 1970 for the urban renewal, model cities, rent supplement, section 235 homeownership, and section 236 rental assistance programs.

I also commend Mr. Downie's article to my colleagues as an impressive report on these problems:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 8, 1970]

U.S. EFFORT TO HOUSE POOR HELD FAILURE

(By Leonard Downie, Jr.)

For a decade, the federal government has experimented with subsidizing private business and "nonprofit groups" to build housing for the poor. Congress has provided during the 1960s what everyone believes is the most imaginative legislation possible.

But many congressmen, top Nixon administration housing officials, and an emerging cadre of professionals and volunteers trying to build the housing for the poor agree the job simply is not being done.

Far less housing than Congress planned for "low" and "moderate" income families has been built under the once promising new programs.

The little housing that has been built has not been available to most of those families statistics show need it most. It has gone mostly to the richest of families eligible under government regulations.

Optimistic plans for renovating many of the basically sturdy but rundown houses and apartment buildings of city slums for low-income families have failed to achieve significant results.

This is the case despite the fact the government has a supermarket of subsidies to offer builders of housing for the poor through the Housing Act of 1968, which President Johnson called a "Magna Carta to liberate our cities."

The reasons the experts give for the failures are varied.

Although Congress has passed bold legislation for housing the poor, it has failed to appropriate the money that the Department of Housing and Urban Development says it needs to carry the laws out.

The nationwide credit squeeze and rising mortgage interest rates also have hurt, because most of the government subsidies go to insuring and paying part of the interest on mortgage loans made by private sources for construction or renovation of the housing.

The most costly item, however, the one that keeps rents in the subsidized projects so high that low-income families can't get into them, is land.

"Land control"—the ability to get the land needed for subsidized housing programs at a much lower cost, or with a further federal subsidy—is listed as a "must" need by every expert in housing for the poor, in and out of government.

There has been little overall direction from HUD for private investors and the churches, labor unions and civic associations that form nonprofit or limited profit groups and corporations to build low income housing.

They usually know little about construction, mortgage financing, or the red tape of HUD's Federal Housing Administration. An Urban America, Inc., book of instructions and official forms for such a group to use to process a housing application contains 280 pages and 70 forms.

Even experienced groups with housing experts on their staffs, like Washington's Housing Development Corporation, have run into interminable delays in the FHA process. Delays of one and two years between initial application and the beginning of construction are common.

Part of the delay comes from still another problem plaguing efforts to build housing for the poor: rising construction costs.

They are going up so fast, especially for renovation of existing slum buildings, that FHA, which compares requests to a data bank of costs for past projects, often refuses to approve construction cost estimates of even the most experienced nonprofit housing groups.

FHA has also had difficulty changing from an agency that primarily insured mortgages on safe middle class home investments to one that many expect to take the leadership in the risky redevelopment of the slums.

HUD Secretary George Romney says he knows about all this and wants to do something about it.

He is reorganizing HUD to separate the insurance and housing production functions and to give priority to providing housing for the poor, with emphasis on finding new technology for the task.

A top aide to Romney says HUD is preparing "dramatic and possibly controversial" proposals for still more legislation and changes within HUD designed to refine and operationally improve the pioneering housing laws of the '60s.

Experts like Channing Phillips of Washington's Housing Development Corporation, who work with HUD every day in trying to get the housing built, say they like what they have seen so far of the new direction there.

They fear, however, that the nation lacks the strong commitment to provide decent housing that is necessary to get enough money spent and enough of the old rigid rules made more flexible.

The nation had already made a formal commitment in the 1930s, reinforced by the Housing Act of 1949, to provide "a decent home . . . for every American."

For millions of upward bound white Americans, the promise came true as FHA and its predecessor and sister agencies provided the insurance and other backing for their migration to comfortable homes in the suburbs.

After World War II, to provide a way station for poorer people not yet ready to rent or buy a decent home, the government embarked on building public housing projects. Many have become government-built ghettos for very poor, mostly black tenants. Many units suffer from disrepair and run up losses for the local governments that own them.

The housing laws of the 1960s constitute an entirely new approach. The government would finance indirectly, through FHA mortgage insurance and the paying of interest on mortgages from private investors, the efforts of private businesses and groups to build housing for those too poor for regular FHA programs and not poor enough to qualify for public housing.

The laws were designed to help build and renovate housing for both sale and rental to poor families. The government also was authorized to pay much of the mortgage interest for low-income home buyers and pay part of the monthly rent for low-income tenants.

A nonprofit group or limited dividend corporation can go to HUD with plans to build or refurbish an apartment building or home for a low-income family. If the plans are approved the group can get an FHA guarantee to insure the mortgage and pay some of its interest. The applicant must find a bank or other investor to make the mortgage loan and get the architect, builder and the rest to get the job done.

If the apartment building or house is being rented, the group or corporation keeps ownership of it and is responsible for its maintenance.

Nonprofit groups are expected to break even. And, at the end of the 40-year mortgage, the church or union or neighborhood group would own a building free and clear.

A limited dividend corporation—usually an established builder or a syndicate of investors, put together by a builder—is allowed to make a 6 per cent return on its investment. What makes it more attractive is that investors can deduct depreciation of the finished building from their income at tax time.

Speculative home builders who put up houses that are inexpensive enough can sell them to low-income buyers with the mortgage guaranteed and much of the interest on it paid by the federal government.

Finally, nonprofit groups like Washington's Urban Rehabilitation Corporation (financed by the Catholic archdiocese and overseen up to now by the Rev. Geno Baroni) can take old, rundown houses and get FHA-insured loans to rehabilitate and sell them to low-income buyers.

All of these opportunities, however, have been encumbered by a meager supply of money from Congress and severe restrictions in both the legislation and FHA procedures on how the programs could be carried out.

Donald Reape, a Philadelphia mortgage expert who helps get investors, mortgage money, builders and FHA officials together for subsidized housing projects (in the trade he is called a "packager") says that investors in limited profit corporations are "lined up" waiting for federal funds to get to work.

But so little money has been appropriated for the programs so far that the HUD funds are usually used up within months of becoming available. Disappointed investors are being turned away.

The one problem many of the limited profit companies usually can handle is FHA red tape. The reason is that the builder or real estate expert who puts a limited profit company together has had this experience.

But FHA red tape, lack of technical expertise and scarcity of venture capital all combine to hamper severely what Congress expected to be the other primary source of subsidized housing: nonprofit groups.

"Generally," says Don Reape in Philadelphia, "the nonprofit sponsor has not gotten the job done."

Reape acts as the paid adviser for churches, unions or civic groups that try to build big subsidized apartment buildings. He is paid out of the proceeds of the mortgage loan for the building.

He knows what they don't know about how to find a mortgage lender, a builder and subcontractors; about how to deal with FHA, local officials, zoning boards, and the like.

He places little importance on the Nixon administration's Operation Breakthrough project to find ways to massproduce housing.

"What we need are more funds now," he says, "We must face that."

Small nonprofit groups that want to redo a house or two, or build a very small apartment building, cannot pay a consultant, Reape says, yet they must go through the same complicated, time consuming processing required for big projects that pay consultants' fees.

The usual result, Reape said, is that the small nonprofit group gives up. Or, they proceed naively through projects that wind up in financial disarray when they are finished.

Another arm of the government, the Office of Economic Opportunity, tried to attack the nonprofit problem by funding larger nonprofit groups called "housing development corporations." Washington's HDC, which is now renovating Clifton Terrace, is one of these.

The OEO grants pay for large staffs of experts for these groups, and, along with grants from other sources, provide working capital with which they can acquire property to build on and prepare good initial development plans for FHA.

But even for these groups, the red tape tangle, rising construction costs and shortages of federal subsidies have made the hope of large-scale housing production "a hoax," according to an official of Philadelphia's HDC.

Philadelphia contains more than 15,000 abandoned brick rowhouses, according to official city estimates, an ideal resource for renovation of housing for the poor.

But Philadelphia's HDC has been able to renovate only 30 for sale to low or moderate income families.

The Philadelphia Public Housing Authority, however, was able to bypass FHA red tape and restrictions and, through the offices of HUD that provide public housing assistance, renovate nearly 5,000 of the same "used houses" for rental to public housing tenants.

Washington's HDC has tied up \$400,000 in capital in contracting for buildings for construction and renovation, but thus far has gotten FHA approval for just four of 10 pending projects. Four of those not approved have been pending for more than a year.

Frank DiStefano, an Urban America, Inc., employee who watches the nation's 12 HDCs for OEO, says they still are not being provided with enough operating funds from the government, enough capital from private sources (who would be repaid when a job was finished), or enough expert advice and help from HUD.

Their production of housing has gone "only from nothing to a little," DiStefano says.

He also wants to see construction costs and the prices for acquiring land drop so that the rents charged the tenants can be dropped. These programs are still serving "moderate" income families, and not really "low" income persons, DiStefano complains.

And he joins with several others in the field, including top HUD officials, in calling for a concerted national commitment to provide housing for the poor, a commitment like that which put men on the moon.

"We kept hearing about the promise of these new housing laws," Reape says. "But these people can't live on promises."

RESOLUTION ON THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, with the cosponsorship of 18 of my colleagues, a resolution on the Middle East reading as follows:

Whereas since the Arab-Israeli war of 1967, the announced policy of the United States has been for direct negotiations between the parties as the only road to an effective long-term peace in the Middle East, and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has affirmed its support for that policy in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 and has in effect reaffirmed that position in 1968 and 1969, and

Whereas the Secretary of State in his speech of December 9, 1969, has indicated that the U.S. Government has made certain proposals with regard to an eventual settlement between Israel and Egypt, thus undercutting Israel's bargaining position in any future talks, and eroding the principle that all issues should be resolved in direct talks, and

Whereas the principle has been further eroded by the proposals reportedly made by the U.S. Government with regard to a settlement between Israel and Jordan, and

Whereas the President has recently reaffirmed the necessity of negotiations between the parties, but without repudiating the specific proposals earlier made; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States Government should withdraw the specific proposals made and reaffirm the previous policy of insisting on ne-

gotiations between the parties as the only long-term solution,

(2) the United States should henceforth refrain from attempting to impose a settlement in the Middle East or to bring pressure on the parties to accept any particular set of proposals, and

(3) the United States Government should make available to Israel such military assistance as Israel requires to assure her defense, to offset at least in part the vast amounts of weapons, aircraft and other aid being furnished to the Arab States by the Soviet Union and other powers.

I am delighted that the following Members have joined me in sponsoring this resolution: Messrs. BOLAND, BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Messrs. CONYERS, DULSKI, EDWARDS of California, GIBBONS, HALPERN, HAWKINS, KOCH, OTTINGER, PEPPER, REES, ROSENTHAL, RYAN, SCHEUER, TUNNEY, and WHITEHURST.

The resolution reflects the views on the Middle East which I expressed in some detail in a speech given at the Rochester, N.Y., City Club on January 10, which my colleague Mr. FARBERSTEIN kindly had inserted in the Record on January 22 at pages E223-E225. It is not inconsistent with the joint declaration prepared by Chairman CELLER, which I have signed along with some 240 other Members. But it goes beyond that declaration in repudiating the specific proposals made by the administration last fall. Some of those specific proposals, having to do with terms for a settlement between Israel and the United Arab Republic, were stated in Secretary Rogers' speech of December 9. Others, suggesting guidelines for an Israel-Jordan settlement, were reported by the New York Times on December 21 and 22 and have not been denied—in effect have been confirmed—by the State Department.

These proposals tended to undercut the Israelis' bargaining position in any talks that might actually take place, and were thus inconsistent with the principle that the parties to the dispute must themselves hammer out the terms of settlement.

Since those proposals were made—and attacked by both Israelis and Arabs—the President has reaffirmed the necessity of direct negotiations between the parties before any settlement can be arrived at. The President has also stated that the United States will make available arms to the Israelis needed for Israel's defense. These developments are reassuring. However, there has been no repudiation of the earlier specific proposals, which therefore still stand as the U.S. position. Since these proposals have been rejected by both Arabs and Israelis, the U.S. Government is clearly free to withdraw them, and this should now be done.

WHAT DO WE DO IN VIETNAM?

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vexing problems that faces our Nation is our involvement in Vietnam.

During recent visits to my district I have discussed this matter at great

length with my constituents, for we have lost many of our boys from south Texas, and many more are daily facing the prospect of going there. I have been asked to make statements concerning this matter and this is in essence my stand as I speak in my district.

How we got there or why is now really a moot question. The fact is that we are there. I am not a professional military man—although I have served and have received training in the military in what some people call the old school.

I have had—and shall continue to have—the opinion that if you become involved in a military conflict you go out and win, using all the resources at your command. This has not been done in the past and it is not being done now. I disagreed with it in the past and I disagree with it now.

I do not trust the Communists and I never shall, so the idea of a negotiated peace, as far as the Communists are concerned, in my humble opinion is a futile effort.

It has not worked in the past and it will not work in the future. They merely change their tactics and their strategy and continue their aims of subjugation of the free peoples of the world—while we abide by our commitments.

Therefore the ultimate question remains, "What do we do in Vietnam?"

There is in my opinion only one person in our country who has all the facts at his disposal. This person is the President of the United States. He and he alone has the facts and the ultimate awesome responsibility to make the decisions which must be made.

We as individuals—and I as a Representative in the Congress—have in turn the responsibility to assist him in these decisions. The only recommendation which I had was not heeded—that we win. Now the only recourse that we have, you and I, is that we support our President, and pray to God that he make the right decisions.

I supported President Johnson, and now I support President Nixon. We cannot—and I surely will not—impose on him timetables or schedules of troop withdrawals. This only plays into the hands of the enemy who has time on their side.

The President—our President—yours and mine, must have a free hand to do what he thinks is best for the good of the country and of mankind. There cannot be any disagreement or difference of opinions as there is with domestic problems or programs—for here we are dealing with an external enemy of our country, who is not interested in priorities or differences in approach. Their main and sole interest is the destruction of our democratic form of Government. Vietnam is but another step or phase in their overall plan.

I therefore disassociate myself from any plan, any group or any individual who would hinder or in any way impede the actions of the President in his attempt to find an honorable solution to this problem.

Again I state, Mr. Speaker, although I do not agree with many of the actions

heretofore taken, I support the President of the United States.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PELLY, for the week of February 16, 1970, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PODELL, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama (at the request of Mr. COUGHLIN), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. VANDER JAGT), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of New York, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FLYNT, for 60 minutes, on February 18.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, for 60 minutes, on February 19.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN, for 60 minutes, on February 23.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MAHON and to include extraneous matter, tables, and charts in connection with his 1-minute speech today, and that these remarks appear in Extensions of Remarks of today's RECORD.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALBERT immediately following the reading of the President's message on environmental pollution today.

Mr. SAYLOR, his remarks in the Committee of the Whole today, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SAYLOR immediately following the President's message today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COUGHLIN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POFF.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. BLACKBURN in three instances.

Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. CONTE in three instances.

Mr. MESKILL in two instances.

Mr. CORMAN in two instances.

Mr. SEBELIUS.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mrs. REID of Illinois.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. HALPERN in three instances.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. SPRINGER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama in two instances.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS in two instances.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. BARRETT.

Mr. BIAGGI in six instances.

Mr. FRASER in six instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in three instances.

Mr. HOWARD in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. RODINO in three instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. DINGELL in three instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.

Mr. PICKLE in three instances.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

Mr. MOORHEAD in six instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. RARICK in two instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in three instances.

Mr. ROONEY of New York in three instances.

Mr. DIGGS.

Mr. KOCH in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA.

Mr. GETTYS.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in four instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.

Mr. BENNETT in two instances.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in four instances.

Mr. DE LA GARZA in four instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. SISK.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2214. An act to exempt potatoes for processing from marketing orders.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VANIK). In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 497 of the 91st Congress, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on February 16 next.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concur-

rent Resolution 497, the House adjourned until Monday, February 16, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as followed:

1627. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior as chairman of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of 45 Stat. 1222 (16 U.S.C. 715b); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1628. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the 22d annual report and financial statements of the operation of the Armory and the 12th annual report and financial statement of the Board's operation of the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 10, Public Law 80-605, as amended and section 10, Public Law 85-300, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1629. A letter from the secretary and member of the board of directors, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, transmitting the audit report of the association for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 14 of Public Law 83-662 (68 Stat. 800); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1630. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize a grant to defray a portion of the cost of expanding the United Nations Headquarters in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1631. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1632. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Clean Air Act so as to extend its duration, provide for national standards of ambient air quality, expedite enforcement of air pollution control standards, authorize regulation of fuels and fuel additives, provide for improved controls over motor vehicle emissions, establish standards applicable to dangerous emissions from stationary sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1633. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Council on Environmental Quality to conduct studies and make recommendations respecting the reclamation and recycling of material from solid wastes, to extend the provisions of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1634. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish an Environmental Financing Authority to assist in the financing of waste treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

1635. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

1636. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.); to the Committee on Public Works.

1637. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to provide financial assistance for the construction of waste treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. To save succeeding generations (Rept. No. 91-837). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15728. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and new loans, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-838). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 14645. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit certain uses of likenesses of the great seal of the United States, and of the seals of the President and Vice President; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-839). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 15807. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act in order to extend the authorizations for such act, to extend the provisions of title II relating to emission standards to vessels, aircraft, and certain additional vehicles, and for other purposes, and to provide for a study of noise and its effects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BEALL of Maryland:

H.R. 15808. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 15 percent increase in annuities and to change the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. GRAY, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. RIVERS, and Mr. UTT):

H.R. 15809. A bill to provide Federal grants to assist elementary and secondary schools to carry on programs to teach moral and ethical principles; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 15810. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DORN (by request):

H.R. 15811. A bill to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to provide for a statutory payment of \$47 per month to a veteran who has lost the use of a lung or kidney as the result of a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15812. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide an increase in the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to certain children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15813. A bill to amend chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a recurring grant of monetary assistance for the purchase of specially equipped automobiles

or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15814. A bill to amend section 110 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the preservation of total disability ratings under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration where such ratings have been in force for 10 years or more; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15815. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a presumption of service connection in the case of veterans suffering from hypertension developing a 10 percent degree of disability within 2 years from the date of discharge or release; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15816. A bill to establish a minimum rate of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected tuberculous disease which has reached a condition of complete arrest; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15817. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of additional compensation provided for certain disabled veterans whose children are attending school; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15818. A bill to amend section 1732 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase the rate of educational assistance allowance paid to certain eligible persons pursuing a full-time program of education under chapter 35 of such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 15819. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 15820. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus personal property to State fish and wildlife agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 15821. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 15822. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 in order to provide that daylight saving time shall be observed in the United States from the first Sunday following Memorial Day to the first Sunday following Labor Day; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 15823. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 15824. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend servicemen's group life insurance protection from 120 to 240 days after discharge; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 15825. A bill to require a review of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin Streams with respect to additional bank protection and erosion control programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 15826. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 15 percent increase in annuities and to change the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 15827. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to require the Secretary of the Army to terminate certain licenses and permits relating to the

disposition of waste materials in the waters of the New York Bight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OTTINGER (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BUTTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. FISH, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 15828. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to require the Secretary of the Army to terminate certain licenses and permits relating to the disposition of waste materials in the waters of the New York Bight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OTTINGER (for himself, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MINISH, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. WIDNALL):

H.R. 15829. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to require the Secretary of the Army to terminate certain licenses and permits relating to the disposition of waste materials in the waters of the New York Bight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 15830. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 15831. A bill to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15832. A bill to authorize the disposal of castor oil from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15833. A bill to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15834. A bill to authorize the disposal of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15835. A bill to authorize the disposal of magnesium from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15836. A bill to authorize the disposal of type A, chemical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15837. A bill to authorize the disposal of type B, chemical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15838. A bill to authorize the disposal of shellac from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15839. A bill to authorize the disposal of tungsten from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15840. A bill to authorize the disposal of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 15841. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the termination of the investment tax credit certain property used for farming purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 15842. A bill to amend section 8c(6) (I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit projects for paid advertising under marketing orders applicable to tomatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 15843. A bill to provide supplemental appropriations to fully fund the "Construction Grants for Waste Treatment Works" program of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for the fiscal year 1970; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mrs. MINK):

H.R. 15844. A bill to provide supplemental appropriations to fully fund the urban renewal, model cities, rent supplement, and low-income homeownership and rental housing assistance programs for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes, including jobs in housing; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 15845. A bill to amend section 302(b) of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 15846. A bill providing that discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or national origin is prohibited; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 15847. A bill to authorize the Council on Environmental Quality to conduct studies and make recommendations respecting the reclamation and recycling of material from solid wastes, to extend the provisions of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 15848. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act so as to extend its duration, provide for the national standards of ambient air quality, expedite enforcement of air pollution control standards, authorize regulation of fuels and fuel additives, provide for improved controls over motor vehicle emissions, establish standards applicable to dangerous emissions from stationary sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 15849. A bill to prohibit the involuntary busing of schoolchildren and to adopt freedom of choice as a national policy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 15850. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to assure adequate consideration of the views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in connection with certain water modification projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 15851. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from requiring any schoolchild to attend a public school other than his neighborhood school; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 15852. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, in order to improve the judicial machinery of military courts-martial by removing defense counsel and jury selection from the control of a military commander who convenes a court-martial and by creating an independent trial command for the purpose of preventing command influence or the appearance of command influence

from adversely affecting the fairness of military judicial proceedings; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15853. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 15854. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 15855. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 15 per centum increase in annuities and to change the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.R. 15856. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 15857. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 15858. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 15 per centum increase in annuities and to change the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 15859. A bill to provide additional office space and staff for Members of Congress representing a certain type of district and to provide a cost-of-living allowance for such additional staff in certain cases; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KEITH, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 15860. A bill to assist in the effective and suitable disposal of passenger cars at the time of the discontinuance of their use on the highways by encouraging the disposal of such cars through persons licensed by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 15861. A bill relating to the policy with respect to the application of certain provisions of Federal law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.J. Res. 1080. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the busing or involuntary assignment of students; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 1081. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appointments of Supreme Court and other Federal judges be required to be reconfirmed every 6 years, to require 5 years' prior judicial experience as a qualification for appointment to the

Supreme Court, and to require retirement of Federal judges at the age of 70 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. KOCH, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H. Con. Res. 503. Concurrent resolution on the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Con. Res. 504. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that "freedom of choice" plans are the most equitable, legal, and feasible method of facilitating title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Con. Res. 505. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the participation of South Africa in the Davis Cup international tennis competition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Res. 830. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MANN:
H. Res. 831. Resolution to create a Select Committee on the Investigation of Pornographic Enterprises; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:
H. Res. 832. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the participation of South Africa in the Davis Cup international tennis competition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZWACH:
H. Res. 833. Resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GUBSER:
H.R. 15862. A bill for the relief of Santo Salvaggio, Anna Collura, and Patrizia C. Collura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:
H.R. 15863. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINN:
H.R. 15864. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Stevenson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:
H.R. 15865. A bill for the relief of Marion Owen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

294. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to overriding the presidential veto of the act making appropriations for health, education, and welfare; to the Committee on Appropriations.

295. Also, General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to increasing the amounts of minimum monthly payments under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

389. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Belle Pickering, New York, N.Y., and others, relative to certain movies regarded as pornographic in content; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

390. Also, petition of Daniel Edlord Leveque, Sheboygan, Wis., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TOPICS: HOW THE ADMINISTRATION CAN CURB INFLATION

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, with rosy forecasts on the "success" of its alleged fight against the Nation's wild inflation flowing from administration spokesmen on a regular basis, I think it is about time we mounted a crusade to reply to the propaganda.

A certain member of the administration has demanded truth in reporting and presentation on Government activities. Let us give it to him and a concerned public.

Every Member of this body knows that there has been no abatement of inflation since the present administration took office. In fact, inflation has grown progressively worse. Prices of everything go up and up. Interest rates go up and up.

The Nation is headed for dire trouble if inflation is not at the very least braked. It appears to me that the administration has no effective anti-inflation program. It is floundering badly and I believe it is about time that the administration started listening to some experts not having membership in the closed corporation setup running the financial and economic affairs of our Nation.

One outside expert that should be listened to is the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg. As we all know Mr. Goldberg has had vast experience in many phases of American life. Let the RECORD show that

during his career in Government, Mr. Goldberg served as Secretary of Labor, Supreme Court Justice, and Ambassador to the United Nations.

In a news column appearing in the New York Times on January 31, 1970, Mr. Goldberg offered some sound advice on how to combat inflation, and I call it to the attention of all by hereby placing the column in the RECORD:

TOPICS: HOW THE ADMINISTRATION CAN CURB INFLATION

(By Arthur J. Goldberg)

I am the last one to deny the utility of clichés to public officials. But a cliché cannot be substituted for a policy. I fear that this may be happening with respect to the Administration's inflation policy.

Its cliché is governmental nonintervention in labor-management affairs. The most applauded statement that can be made to a business or labor audience is: "Let the Government stay out of collective bargaining." But I know from experience that the Government cannot stay out if a dispute impairs our national health, safety or economy.

President Nixon recognized this in 1959, when as Vice President he intervened to help settle the 116-day steel strike. The still unsettled railroad controversy is an example affecting national health and safety. Secretary of Labor Shultz rightly put aside Administration predilections against intervening to help resolve this dispute.

More importantly, the Administration has still to deal realistically with the impact of the sum total of collective bargaining on our inflationary economy. Collective bargaining does not operate in a vacuum. To illustrate, collective bargaining is not responsible for the more than \$30 billion a year of Government expenditures in carrying on the tragic war in Vietnam.

Although collective bargaining may not be the prime cause of inflation, it contributes

to its acceleration. Workers cannot be expected to moderate wage demands at the expense of living standards while prices and profits remain unrestrained. Employers cannot absorb increasing costs arising from collective bargaining without protecting profit margins.

The Administration is concerned about this, but its remedy is fiscal and monetary restraint. This means higher interest rates, tighter credit, a diminution of the money supply, higher taxes, a reduction in governmental expenditures, a substantial budget surplus and higher levels of unemployment.

PRICES, PROFITS, WAGES

I am not reassured by statistics showing that the gross national product is slowing. These figures are accompanied by reports of price increases in key commodities, wage increases and growing lay-offs in important industries. Only this week the Commerce Department reported that food prices went up 2 per cent in January.

The time has come—indeed it is long overdue—to supplement appropriate fiscal and monetary measures by dealing directly with the impact of prices, wages and profits on inflation.

A good beginning for the Administration would be to raise rather than lower its voice about inordinate price and wage increases. "Jawboning" is not always effective, but silence on the part of government is deemed acquiescence. "Guidelines" don't always work but at least remind industry and labor that they also must heed the public interest.

In all candor, however, I doubt that at this late stage "jawboning" and "guidelines" alone will do the job. The Administration will have to deal more directly with the wage, price and profit situation.

Robert Roosa, a perceptive economist and financier, has advocated a wage-price-profit freeze. It would be in the form of a Presidential appeal to maintain all prices, wages and dividends at present levels for a period of, say, six months.