A. William L. Slayton, the American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Smathers, Merrigan & O'Keefe, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Horse Council, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250. E. (9) $140.30.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,118.60.

A. Gary A. Soucie, 30 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Friends of the Earth, 30 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $75.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $150.

A. Mrs. Annalee Stewart, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Stroock & Stroock & Lavan, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,507.06.

A. Philip F. Stroupe, American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475.

A. G. Don Sullivan, American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Carnegie Corporation of New York, 437 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,259.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. John M. Olin, Box B, Alton, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Credit Co., Post Office Box 4081, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $481.62.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Travelers Corp., One Tower Square, Hartford, Conn.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Evert S. Thomas, Jr., 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,107.70. E. (9) $650.99.

A. John P. Tracey, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $50.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Assns., Inc., 66 East 34th St., New York City.
E. (9) $1,182.70.

A. Charles R. Van Horn, C&O–B&O Railroads, 17th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., and Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., Charles & Baltimore Streets, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $2,292. E. (9) $575.

A. John M. Vansant, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 916 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.
E. (9) $1,949.92.

A. Volume Footwear Retailers of America, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $348.19.

A. Thomas G. Walters, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Que Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2884.80. E. (9) $2954.07.

A. James A. Warren, 5500 Prospect Place, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Rea Express, 219 E. 42nd Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $150.

A. Terrell M. Wertz, The American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,210. E. (9) $98.75.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Computer Time Sharing Services Section of the Association of Data Processing Service Organizations, Inc., 551 5th Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Taos Pueblo, Taos, N. Mex.
E. (9) $3.70.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., No. 400, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,218.75. E. (9) $40.08.

A. Youth Franchise Coalition, 1525 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Youth Franchise Coalition, 1525 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $343.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SEVEN PILLARS OF WISDOM—FOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, Prof. George D. Brabson of the law school at Ohio Northern University, Ohio, recently gave an address on the subject of the responsibilities of college presidents. I think it is a very thought-provoking statement and worthy of consideration by every Member of Congress. It is entitled "Seven Pillars of Wisdom for College Presidents" and the text of the speech is as follows:

SEVEN PILLARS OF WISDOM—FOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

(By George D. Brabson)

Somehow or other a lot of my fellow college Presidents seem to have the idea that the running of a college or university is a matter of their personal prerogative; that they have been put into office by a Board of Regents to take charge of a "Student Family", which they can handle more or less as indulgent Fathers; that their principal responsibilities are to keep the lid on, smooth out ruffled feathers and patch up the family quarrels in any old fashion just so they can report back to their Boards and Alumni that "all is well at dear old Siwash"—thanks to the Presidential diligence and to their skillful qualifications as "peacemakers."

I have a different concept of a college president. I don't think of him as a "Pater Familias" at all. I think of him first of all as a Public Trustee. To him has been committed a Public Institution—a place of learning which the State has placed in trust, and without which the State, or the Public if you choose, can neither make progress nor prosper. As such Trustee his first and primary obligation is to maintain that Institution in the interest of the Public—not in the interest of any particular body of students that happens to be there at any one time. His duty transcends that, and inheres to the benefit and interest of all the Public—the welfare of the people as a whole . . .

In the second place, as a Public Trustee the duties of a college President cannot be carried out by reference to his personal feelings and desires. He has no right to set up rules that reflect his personal tastes and judgments. These should be determined by reference to the welfare, the safety and the benefits to be derived by the Public, which establishes, pays for, and maintains such institutions directly or indirectly. The college President should have no axes to grind in such matters, and should refrain from allowing his personal views to dominate his judgments and his actions.

Lest it be contended that many of our colleges are privately owned or endowed and hence not public "public institutions"—it must be noted at once that any educational institution which opens its doors to the public for patronage; which is granted immunity from property taxation; and which receives donations and contributions free of income tax liability, must of necessity take on the characteristics of a public institution. Why? Because it exists by reason of the benefaction and consent of the State, directly or indirectly conferred on it.

In the third place, the college president should not allow the whims and demands of a "passing body" of students to establish the policies and rules by which the students are to be governed over the long period of the institution's lifetime. What one passing body of students may want in 1969 may become anathema to the body of students passing through in 1975. The wants of any passing body of students should always be subservient to the wishes and needs of the people as a whole, for whom the process of educa-

tion was established, and whom it must serve if we are to continue as an enlightened nation. Hence it is the voice of the people themselves which should govern in such matters.

In the fourth place, it is a primary responsibility of a college president to protect and preserve the physical plant and facilities of his institution for the use and benefit of all the oncoming generations who are also entitled to have them. This is a trust as valid and as sacred as any committed to him. Unless the people can rest assured that the physical buildings, the equipment, the valuable libraries and documents, the laboratory devices and apparatus that have been paid for by the common people with years of labor and taxation are to be preserved from petty vandalism by hoodlums, the people will rise up and refuse to rebuild such institutions. The public is long suffering, but its patience is not endless, as many defeated bond issues have proven recently.

Some advocates of campus violence have tried recently to minimize the cost and extent of such vandalism by saying that "after all buildings and equipment are only so much bricks and mortar, and can be replaced while student lives cannot." All this may be very true of buildings but not of libraries and priceless documents. And no matter what the property may be that defense does not excuse the useless destruction and defilement of public property devoted to the most important function of our public life—the people's education. Regardless of how this problem is looked at the ultimate truth remains that college campuses are not for burning—unless we want to go back to savagery and pillage as our mode of living.

In the fifth place, the confrontation and cowing of the officials of a college or university by students by force of sheer numbers is neither a democratic process nor a legitimate means of communication, and is not to be tolerated. One President I know was called out at his campus residence at ten o'clock at night, and found a delegation of over one hundred students carrying written "non-negotiable demands" which they insisted that he accept and sign that evening, or they would proceed to take over his office and "sack the place."

There is an answer to such nonsense which any college President can and should employ, which for want of a better name we may refer to as the "Brabson Plan." It is simply this:

Yes, of course, meetings with the students may be held at any reasonable time and place to hear and discuss any complaint or grievance they care to present; and remedial measures must be given first order to preference so long as they are within the bounds of the President's duties as a Public Trustee.

But in carrying on such meetings and discussions each side must have equal numerical representation. For every student present at such meetings the President shall have one person representing the interests of the public. One man—one Vote—so to speak. It is neither fair nor democratic that an official holding office in the public trust should be overwhelmed with the sheer force of numbers, no matter what the occasion . . .

In the sixth place, one of a President's primary duties is to see to it that civil peace and order are maintained on the campus, so that the great body of students who come to pursue serious studies may do so. No real study or education can be achieved in an atmosphere of violence and the fear of bodily harm. Dissent should always be allowed and welcomed whenever it is genuine and honestly felt. But the number of dissidents, small or large, should not be permitted to disrupt the conduct of an educational institution, no matter what the issues are. Any institutional policy or rule may be made the subject of communication and consultation, conferences and genuine investigations by appropriate groups and committees. It should not be presented as a non-negotiable demand—to the sound of trampling feet and broken windows . . .

Seventh and finally, student dissent and protest is one thing—but student insurrection and insubordination against all forms of authority is something else. There are legitimate grievances which can be brought against almost any of our universities and colleges. Outmoded curriculums; pedantic methods of teaching; loss of student identity; hidebound grading systems; teacher tenure that favors the few—these are just some of the many legitimate ones.

The correction of such grievances must be undertaken and accomplished. But not through insubordination and violence, such as has taken place at Columbia, Cornell, Kent State of Ohio, and so on. The real problem is not lack of communication but a want of willingness to conciliate, and that on both sides of the fence. Conciliation does not mean a surrender of the rights of the public, nor does it mean to surrender the rights of the students.

Conciliation means setting up in advance the standards by which the rights and the duties and responsibilities of all the various groups are to be maintained. So far our colleges and universities have failed miserably in this respect, and as a result nobody really knows what the respective rights and responsibilities of students, of faculty and even of the public really are.

To find out and establish what those things should be is the first task of a college or university President . . .

GLOBAL EARTH DAY

HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, there is a proclamation being circulated around Congress by John McConnell of WE, Inc., calling for observance of a global Earth Day on March 21, which is the vernal equinox.

The proclamation, to which I have added my signature, reflects sensitivity to humanity and respect for all forms of life. I hope the proclamation, which has been signed already by former Secretary John Gardner, Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, Margaret Mead, David Brower, and several members of the United Nations, will promote real efforts toward solving some of the problems of this planet. If man is to put himself on a trajectory toward ecological health and peace, he still has far to go. This is at least a start.

I ask unanimous consent to place the proclamation in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

BY THE PEOPLE OF EARTH, FOR THE PEOPLE OF EARTH

EARTH DAY PROCLAMATION

Whereas; A new world view is emerging; through the eyes of our Astronauts and Cosmonauts we now see our beautiful blue planet as a home for all people, and

Whereas; Planet Earth is facing a grave crisis which only the people of Earth can resolve, and the delicate balances of nature, essential for our survival, can only be saved through a global effort, involving all of us, and

Whereas; In our shortsightedness we have failed to make provisions for the poor, as well as the rich, to inherit the Earth, and our new enlightenment requires that the disinherited be given a just stake in the Earth and its future—their enthusiastic cooperation is essential if we are to succeed in the great task of Earth renewal, and

Whereas; World equality in economics as well as politics would remove a basic cause of war, and neither Socialism, Communism nor Capitalism in their present forms have realized the potentials of Man for a just society; nor educated Man in the ways of peace and creative love, and

Whereas; Through voluntary action individuals can join with one another in building the Earth in harmony with nature, and promote support thereof by private and government agencies, and

Whereas; Individuals and groups may follow different methods and programs in Earthkeeping and Earthbuilding, nevertheless by constant friendly communication with other groups and daily meditation on the meaning of peace and good will they will tend more and more to be creative, sensitive, experimental, and flexible in resolving differences with others, and

Whereas; An international Earth day each year can provide a special time to draw people together in appreciation of their mutual home, Planet Earth, and bring a global feeling of community through realization of our deepening desire for life, freedom and love, and our mutual dependence on each other,

Be it therefore resolved; That each signer of this People Proclamation will seek to help change Man's terrible course toward catastrophe by searching for activities and projects which in the best judgment of the individual signer will: peacefully end the scourge of war;

Provide an opportunity for the children of the disinherited poor to obtain their rightful inheritance in the Earth;

Redirect the energies of industry and society from progress through products . . . to progress through harmony with Earth's natural systems for improving the quality of life.

That each signer will (his own conscience being his judge) measure his commitment by how much time and money he gives to these purposes, and realizing the great urgency of the task, he will give freely of his time and money to activities and programs he believes will best further these Earth renewal purposes. (At least nine percent of the world's present income is going to activities that support war and spread pollution. Ten percent can tip the balance for healthy peaceful progress.)

Furthermore, each signer will support and observe Earth day on March 21st . . . (Vernal Equinox—when night and day are equal throughout the Earth) with reflection and actions that will encourage a new respect for Earth with its great potentials for fulfilling Man's highest dreams; and on this day will join at 1900 Universal Time in a global Earth Hour—a silent hour for peace . . .

ASSOCIATED BUILDERS AND CONTRACTORS PASS SEVERAL RESOLUTIONS CONCERNING THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, at their convention several weeks ago, the Associated Builders and Contractors passed several resolutions concerning matters of interest in the construction industry.

They believe these expressions of opinion will be of interest to most Members of Congress and have asked me to include the text of the resolutions in the RECORD. I am happy to do so at this time:

RESOLUTIONS

BLOUGH COMMITTEE CONTRIBUTES TO AMERICAN WELFARE

The so-called Blough Committee, otherwise known as the Anti-Inflation Users Conference, has made valuable contribution to the economic welfare of the United States for instituting a campaign to draw public attention to the disastrous inflation in construction.

Through education and persuasion, the Committee has awakened industrial leaders to their contribution to the inflationary spiral. It has pointed out the usefulness of open shop competition with the monopolies of the building trades unions in various sections of the nation. It has attempted through practical assistance in collective bargaining to improve the technical stance of unionized management vis a vis labor.

We, therefore, congratulate Mr. Blough and his Committee on their important efforts in this field and pledge full assistance of the Associated Builders and Contractors in restoring competition to the industry for the benefit of the nation as a whole.

ON VIOLENCE—ON CAMPUS AND OFF

Recently Senator Margaret Smith warned that extremism and nihilism on the college campus and elsewhere could lead to repression of Americans in a fashion dangerous to the liberties of our nation.

Mrs. Smith declared, "Extremism bent upon polarization of our people is increasingly forcing upon the American people the narrow choice between anarchy and repression.

"And make no mistake about it, if that narrow choice has to be made, the American people, even if with reluctance and misgiving, will choose repression.

"For an overwhelming majority of Americans believe that: Trespass is trespass—whether on the campus or off . . . Violence is violence—whether on the campus or off . . . Arson is arson—whether on the campus or off . . . Killing is killing—whether on the campus or off."

All four of these types of criminality have been manifest from time to time in the construction industry, and we applaud the declaration of Senator Smith and express the hope that the American people will take due note of the importance of rectifying this situation.

ON DISCRIMINATION AGAINST OPEN SHOP APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS

Whereas, the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training of the Department of Labor has, in revision of Circular 66–67, destroyed the roadblocks to independent apprenticeship training programs so that they no longer need seek permission to Join Union-Management Programs to begin operations.

And, whereas, this action has been already of great benefit to Merit Shop groups such as the Associated Builders and Contractors,

We call upon the Bureau to broaden its stand against discrimination in this field and demand that State Apprenticeship Councils which still require independent programs be set up only with the sufferance of Joint Union-Management Councils cease such discrimination.

We urge the Bureau to enter into discussions with the offending State Councils and if the discrimination does not cease, to withdraw certification of existing state programs.

ON NEED FOR INCREASED PRODUCTIVITY IN THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

For several years the President's Council of Economic Advisers has called national attention to the fact that productivity in the construction industry is lagging substantially behind its rising cost.

There is no question that outlandish settlements in collective bargaining in the unionized section of the industry have played an important part in this lag. We urge, therefore, every effort be made to curb union monopoly where it is the root cause of inflation.

But the burden does not rest upon the shoulders of labor alone. It is also incumbent upon management in all phases of the construction industry to strive to improve our industry technologically and in job site production so that the tremendous needs of our nation for the construction product may be met at a price the would-be owner can afford.

We urge, therefore, that our members in their daily approach to the problems of management join hands in every effort to move our industry ahead to meet the challenge that the nation has posed.

ON 8(E)

Despite constant inflation in the construction industry due in large part to exorbitant wage increases resulting from collective bargaining, the immunities of the building trades unions in law continue to be disregarded by the U.S. Congress.

Of all the immunities, that of the exemption to the so-called Hot Cargo Act in 8(e) of the National Labor Relations Act continues to afford special privileges that lead to monopoly in the industry.

The section which permits preclusive contracts cutting off the opportunity of union firms to work with Merit Shop firms and vice versa is on the major contributions to this monopoly.

The section likewise buttresses the unions' efforts to boycott important time and money saving products and methods in the industry. Its interpretation by the courts has led to the privilege to boycott in order to retain or regain site tasks that are technologically obsolete.

We, therefore, call upon the Congress once more to repeal this pernicious section of the law as a first step in restoring competition in the construction industry as a curb upon inflation.

THE DAVIS-BACON ACT MUST BE REPEALED

It is fitting that in American history, once-important laws designed to remedy a public ill have constantly been repealed when they have outlived their usefulness. Such is the case with the Davis-Bacon Act.

The Davis-Bacon Act was passed in a time of national turmoil and depression when a day's labor stood between many a man and starvation. When the economic conditions which gave birth to this act were eliminated, the building trades unions, abetted by national administrations allied politically with the unions, seized hold upon the act to create a monstrous bureaucratic technique in wage determinations that has wasted billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

For the whole of American industry except construction, the Fair Labor Standards Act has for quite some time laid the ground floor under wage rates for most Americans. Even here, there are many economists who contend that this act has tended to the hurt of the downtrodden and least capable persons in our community.

But the wage rates set under the Fair Labor Standards Act are picayune compared to the so-called "prevailing wages," set under the Davis-Bacon Act.

There is general agreement in management that the Davis-Bacon Act has long outlived its usefulness. It is costly and disruptive to the construction industry. We therefore call upon the Congress of the United States to repeal the Act forthwith and save the taxpayers of this nation untold sums on Federal and federally-aided projects.

FLOCK OF EAGLES

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying about eagles. It goes something like this—"Eagles don't flock together; you find them one at a time".

But, today, when you "Follow the Eagle" of U.S. savings bonds—when you buy them regularly through the "Payroll Plan," where you work, or the "Bond-A-Month" plan, where you bank—you are sure to find a flock of security nested up in your name sooner than you think.

Better still, the interest paid on all savings bonds is now at the improved rate of 5½ percent, when held to maturity, and retroactive to June 1, 1970.

By action of the Congress and signing by the President, all bonds bought before and after that date now earn interest at the more compatible rate, starting with the first semiannual interest period, beginning on or after June 1, 1970.

When I was a youngster in grade school in Melvin, Ill., all of us in our class were impressed by the big picture on the wall behind the teacher's desk. It showed General Washington crossing the Delaware on Christmas night, 1778.

You remember how his rowboats braved the ice floats moving swiftly downstream; how he rallied his troops, landed them safely on the other side, and licked the Hessians at Trenton.

In contrast to what we know of modern military movements, Washington's own field reports show that the passage was made by 2,400 men, 18 cannon, and 40 rounds of ammunition per man.

As we approach our Bicentennial, there are national leaders in the George Washington tradition who bring a special kind of modern-day meaning of "Minute Men" to the Treasury and its Savings Bonds Division. They are the volunteers in business, industry, and labor so vital to the promotion of the pro-bonds.

They are patriots like B. R. Dorsey, president, Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, 1971 Chairman of the U.S. Industrial Payroll Savings Committee; George Meany, president, AFL–CIO, Chairman of the National Labor Committee for Savings Bonds; Douglas R. Smith, chairman and president, National Savings and Trust Co., Washington, Chairman of the Savings Bonds Committee of the American Bankers Association.

Listen with me to their words of wisdom, as they "Take Stock in America" in promoting the 1971 campaign. Douglas Smith says:

The Savings Bonds Program is the best tool that the Government has to help the individual citizen establish identity with his Government. By buying Bonds, each citizen will help to control the unbridled inflation that has been so rampant in our economy for the past several years. It will also have the effect of spreading the debt of this great country out among a greater portion of its citizens

George Meany says:

The Payroll Savings Plan is the easiest, most convenient way of regularly saving money for most wage and salary workers. We of the AFL–CIO have an important stake in the program. Wage and salary workers are the major buyers of U.S. Savings Bonds. We are proud of our association with the Bond program, from its very beginning, and we will do our part to expand it.

B. R. Dorsey says:

The Payroll Savings Plan is the best self-defense against inflation. It is invaluable in helping the employee to develop a systematic saving program. With the new rate increase, Savings Bonds are a better-than-ever purchase for the employee who wants to improve his stake in the future.

Keeping alive the tenets of the "Father of our Country," we are proving that free people remain superior to controlled people. We are demonstrating that America is leading the way to final victory against the enemies of freedom.

Free people speak, sing, pray, cheer with feeling, with meaning, because they know faith and hope. They know what it means to work, fight, and save for the future that is free.

We are signing up for freedom and a "Flock of Eagles," when we participate in the payroll savings plan, where we work; when we buy via the bond-a-month plan, where we bank.

RETIREMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE MARSH OF VIRGINIA

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial which appeared in the Daily Progress, Charlottesville, Va., on Sunday, December 20, 1970, concerning the able Virginia Congressman JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

Mr. Gilbert Haile is the editor of the editorial page for the Daily Progress and Lindsay Mount is publisher.

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

MR. MARSH RETIRES

We are glad that Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr., took time out Thursday in a speech to the Senate to praise the record of Rep. John O. Marsh, who is retiring after eight years representing the 7th Congressional District. Mr. Marsh's record is one deserving of praise.

"I have found," said Sen. Byrd, "in talking with his colleagues in the House and those members of the Senate who knew him that he is held in the highest esteem by his colleagues here in Washington.

"I want to commend him, for the excellent service he has rendered the people of my Congressional district. I commend Congressman Marsh on the outstanding and efficient work he has done in representing the people of the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia.

Sen. Robert J. Dole, a Kansas Republican, also had some nice things to say about Mr. Marsh, with whom he served in the House.

Jack Marsh "is an outstanding American," said Sen. Dole.

For reasons best known to himself, Mr. Marsh decided not to seek reelection this year for the House seat he had held for eight years. The decision not to seek reelection was a severe blow to the 7th District which grew accustomed during the years to the splendid representation and effective service it obtained from Mr. Marsh.

It is only right and proper that Mr. Marsh be recognized for his outstanding work as 7th District representative and that he be given a sincere, "well done."

MINORITY VIEWS ON DOUGLAS IMPEACHMENT INVESTIGATION

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, in order to fill requests for my minority views in the Douglas impeachment investigation, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD these views:

MINORITY VIEWS

I dissent. The Subcommittee assembled a very large array of documents pertinent to the charges and then, without taking a word of testimony under oath, finds no cause for action. The Committee's report undertakes to dispose of the charges on the basis of its own interpretation of the documentation without testing any of it in the crucible of cross examination. The Subcommittee was content to place its own interpretation on the documentary evidence which had been garnered *ex parte* and concluded to pursue the matter no further. Clearly, by disposing of the charges at this time, the special Subcommittee is passing judgment before all the evidence is in. In my view, the report should not dispose of the charges pending against Justice Douglas but rather should reflect the status of the investigation to this point.

The report contains a chapter on the Concepts of Impeachment. At the same time, it takes the position that it is unnecessary to choose among the concepts mentioned because it finds no impeachable offense under any. It is evident, therefore, that while a discussion of the theory of impeachment is interesting, it is unnecessary to a resolution of the case as the Subcommittee views it. This chapter on Concepts is nothing more than dicta under the circumstances. Certainly the Subcommittee should not even indirectly narrow the power of the House to impeach through a recitation of two or three theories and a very apparent choice of one over the others, while at the same time asserting that no choice is necessary. The Subcommittee's report adopts the view that a Federal judge cannot be impeached unless he is found to have committed a crime, or a serious indiscretion in his judicially connected activities. Although it is purely dicta, inclusion of this chapter in the report may be mischievous since it might unjustifiably restrict the scope of further investigation.

The Subcommittee's report, which is called a final report, addresses itself only to the question of impeachment. Admittedly no investigation has been undertaken to determine whether some of the Justice's activities, if not impeachable, seem so improper as to merit congressional censure or other official criticism by the House. There is considerable precedent for censure or other official rebuke even though a particular activity, while improper, was found not impeachable. This Subcommittee, however, did not investigate with the thoroughness requisite for judging questionable activities short of impeachment. The majority concludes that it finds no grounds for impeachment and stops there. In my opinion, it should have pursued the matter further.

Illustrative of this point is the Dr. Abdulrahman incident. Here was an immigration case where a Kurd whose visas had expired was ordered deported back to his own country. He appealed the order of deportation. Justice Douglas wrote the Commissioner of Immigration, saying that he did not know Dr. Abdulrahman personally but did know the condition of the Kurds in that country and gave his opinion that the man would be subjected to persecution if he were returned. The position of the Immigration Service was that there were Kurds in the Government of that country, and with Kurds in the Government, the fear of a law-abiding subject against persecution may have been baseless. Subsequent general legislation which passed the Congress provided the legal authority under which Dr. Abdulrahman could remain in the United States and it became unnecessary for him to pursue his appeal. Someone must have asked Justice Douglas to intercede for Dr. Abdulrahman, who according to the Justice was unknown to him. And the Justice did intercede. Who was so uninformed as to believe it proper for a Justice of the Supreme Court to lend his name and influence in a matter which could reach his court; and why did the Justice accede to such a request or pressure? The Subcommittee doesn't know the answer to either of these questions. It hasn't pursued either of them. And if it had considered its authority to inquire into the propriety of activities which it thought not to be impeachable, the Subcommittee would have inquired further into this incident, to leave no stone unturned.

The documentary evidence which the Subcommittee accumulated on the question of whether the Judge was practicing law is sufficiently persuasive on that issue to have indicated a more exhaustive investigation, including testimony under oath. It is evident that Mr. Parvin asked Justice Douglas for legal advice. Whether the Justice utterly renounced those requests for legal advice is debatable. I am not sure that he succeeded in convincing Mr. Parvin that he was not a legal counselor in matters affecting the Parvin Foundation. Nor am I satisfied that the Justice did not permit himself to be used as a legal advisor by President Juan Bosch with respect to an agreement between the Dominican Republic and the Swiss Consortium, Overseas Industrial Construction. Many people would take issue with the statement in the report that it did not amount to a practice of law, since the Justice gave Bosch the same kind of advice a lawyer gives. He gave advice as to the legal effect and deficiencies of a proposed contractual agreement.

In my view, a Justice of the Supreme Court must avoid even the appearance of impropriety. I conceive the function of the Subcommittee to have been broad enough to include an investigation into improper conduct in its search for impeachable conduct. The decision not to do so, and to conclude the inquiry at this point is a mistake, in my judgment.

I would have the Subcommittee file a second interim report with the Judiciary Committee, setting forth the status of the inquiry to date and conceding frankly that the task is incomplete, the evidence is not all in.

EDWARD HUTCHINSON.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

A TIME FOR DECISION

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress was in recess prior to the November elections, the Director of Langley Research Center, Mr. Edgar M. Cortright, delivered a most timely and intensely interesting address, "A Time For Decision" at the National Space Club Luncheon, National Press Club, Washington, D.C.

Have you ever asked yourself, "Where do we go from here?" Mr. Cortright's intriguing address has some of the answers.

I am pleased to include it in the RECORD so that those who may not have seen it will have the opportunity to read it.

The address follows:

A TIME FOR DECISION

(Address by Edgar M. Cortright)

Several years ago I read an article with the provocative substitle, "I'm 45 Years Old and Trying to Decide What to be When I Grow Up." I also read a book titled, "The Revolt of the Middle-Aged Man," which, by the way, my teen-aged daughter picked up for me. Both dealt with the concerns of men who have reached the middle years with some level of achievement—at some personal cost—and who begin to wonder, as Peggy Lee would vocalize "Is That all There Is?" Perhaps some of you have been there?

Have you ever tried to draw an analogy between nations and individuals? It's quite revealing.

Nations are, of course, comprised of many individuals. National attitudes are reflected in the news media by relatively few; and national policy set by still fewer. So the psychology of individuals and the psychology of nations do relate in both an apparent and a real sense.

Suppose those titles had read, "I'm 200 Years Old and Trying to Decide What to be When I Grow Up," and "The Revolt of the Middle-Aged Land." Would that ring a bell?

What are some of the symptoms of the middle-aged man in either quandry or revolt? According to these sources:

(1) He questions the value of the goals he has tried so hard to achieve;

(2) He feels guilty about the cost to his family and his personal life;

(3) He searches frantically for a new way of life in order to:

(a) Make up for past neglects;

(b) Renew himself with new goals;

(4) He worries about being "over the hill;"

(5) He may become timid, indecisive, and ineffectual;

(6) He fears the future.

Now how about the middle-aged land?

(1) Are we not questioning most of our national goals of the past two generations?

(2) Do we not feel guilty about the cost of these goals to some of our "family?"

(3) Are we not searching frantically for a new way of life to right all past ways and to challenge the coming generations?

(4) Are we not starting to worry about being "over the hill?"

(5) Do we not show signs of becoming timid, indecisive, and ineffectual?

(6) And how many of us fear the future rather than looking forward to it?

Am I being too dramatic? A year ago I would have thought so. Today I'm not so sure.

My hypothesis is, of course, very simple. At the peak of our national manhood, in our middle years as a nation, we are showing signs of coming unglued. And if we don't do something about it we could be in for a lot of trouble in the future.

To press the analogy just one step further—what do we do about the middle-age neurosis? Most importantly we must come to terms with reality; we must make some positive decisions for the future. Facing reality means answering these questions—among others:

(1) What are we?

(2) What would we like to be?

(3) What are our practical constraints?

(4) What legacy should we leave our youth?

These are not simple questions, but some oversimplified answers might be these:

(1) We are a rich and powerful country, with the highest standard of living, the most advanced technology, and the greatest capacity to do good works of any nation in the world.

We are also a nation with some egg on our face. We have many problems that need solving—and many people who need help.

But our strengths overshadow our weaknesses, and our successes overshadow our failures, and this is the base we build on.

(2) I think the vast majority of people want to be what we have been—the vocal minority notwithstanding: energetic and industrious, progressive, innovative, inquisitive, courageous, compassionate, and generous. Free people. Leaders.

At the same time we want our country to be better than it has been. The problems of our poor, our cities, our air, and our water must be attended to. But need we become "dropouts" from the world society in which we live in order to work these problems?

(3) And what about the practical constraints? Even if we wanted to drop out of technological competition and become completely preoccupied with what we have come to call "social problems," could we really do so? Our global environment is competitive and belligerent. We must remain preeminent in technology in order to be competitive both commercially and militarily. Without preeminence in both areas we could become the victims of power blocs of one type or another. We could lose the standard of living we have attained, let alone improve it. The survival of the fittest is a natural law which still applies.

(4) I think we should feel less guilty about the fact that this country has some serious domestic problems to solve. Our legacy to our children must necessarily include many such unsolved problems. But, more importantly, it must provide a basically strong system from which to operate, and as many of the tools to do so as we can provide. Then with challenging long-range goals and a can-do attitude the next generation can take care of its own future. And I for one think they can do it.

Now if these answers really constitute "facing reality" by this country, we are then led to the last step in the process—decision making. It is here that we can make or break ourselves. And because of the perilous and controversial nature of the decisions which face us today, there is a natural reluctance to face up to them. But make them we must—because failure to make a decision for one reason or another is usually tantamount to a negative decision. All of us in positions of leadership should expect to be measured by the timeliness and effectiveness of our decisions.

As I read the mood of the country, the majority favor evolution not revolution. But we may expect the great debate over national priorities to rage on for some years. This calls for what I term "interim" or "holding" decisions, decisions which tentatively direct our national energies into those channels which seem best for the future but which do not attempt radical surgery. They do not constitute final positions on our priorities forever more. But they let us build on the past—for the future—in a way that the country can adjust to. While this may not be the most daring approach to our problems, it is an eminently practical one.

Now each element of the federal government has its role to play in this process. And while my assessment of the situation has been very broad, to say the least, as a member of NASA management I feel qualified to be specific about aeronautical and space matters. It so happens that this is an extremely important and sensitive area at this time. For, unfortunately, some have chosen to create a false issue over technology in general and aerospace technology in particular. Let's call the issue, "Technology vs. Mankind." Let's call it false because, despite some unwanted side effects, technology remains our servant and not our master.

We in NASA recognize that our program no longer enjoys the number one priority but is now but one of a number of priority areas competing for scarce funds. But we also recognize that our program, in addition to its intrinsic value, sets the pace for much of the technological development of this country and promises to do so for the foreseeable future. (What other candidates are there?) We do not believe that we could long survive and prosper without this preeminent technological position.

Therefore, we have to stand and fight off the stampede by other groups to acquire funds now being channeled into our national technology through NASA and the Department of Defense. It is a veritable "run on the bank." The withdrawal slips carry such catch terms as relevancy, poverty, pollution, and housing, and are designed to shame us into sacrificing our space program and national technology in the name of "humanity."

Like most thinking Americans I have worried a lot about humanity. My first reaction was to retrench as gracefully as possible and to make do with less. But I don't feel obliged to sit passively by and see progress of a decade of dedicated national effort squandered for some worthy but nebulous goals which are yet to be translated into hard programs. It amazes me to see the casual detachment of some who would do just that. I would reverse the logic and say—in the name of humanity we should maintain our national technology.

We in NASA are paid to advise the Administration as to what future opportunities lie before us in aeronautics and space—and what these opportunities mean to the technological strength of this nation in the decade ahead. We are doing just that. After careful deliberation NASA has developed a sound and progressive program for the 1970's, but one which is restrained to the realities of our fiscal posture. You may be sure that we are doing our best to persuade the Administration as to its worth. We think the chances of support are good. The President has already evidenced his understanding of the importance of the space program to our national technology, and the majority of congressmen have been providing solid support for many years. This takes just as much vision and guts these days as it did in 1958—perhaps more—but I think it's there. We'll soon know.

Let me say a few words about the program we have developed. The program calls for:

1. *The continued exploration of the Moon.* Four more Apollo flights are scheduled, two in 1970 and two in 1972. The last three of these will have an expanded capability to allow access to more difficult landing sites, longer durations on the lunar surface, a larger payload, and the use of a roving vehicle to aid in the exploration of the lunar surface.

Two additional missions, in 1974, were recently deleted. We came to the decision to cancel these missions reluctantly because it curtails by two the number of scientifically important regions of the Moon that we will be able to explore in the Apollo program, and means that manned exploration of the Moon by the United States will be suspended in 1972. Resumption of lunar exploration in the 1980's will depend on and be one of the principal uses of space nuclear propulsion using the NERVA engine now under development. This engine, of course, will also provide us with the capability to conduct other high energy missions and is an important element in the integrated long-term plan for the future.

2. *The exploration of the planets.* Programs now underway include the Mariner Mars 1971 orbiter missions, the 1973 Venus-Mercury mission, launches of small Pioneer spacecraft to Jupiter in 1972 and 1973, and the major Viking project for unmanned landing missions to Mars to be launched in 1975. Under current planning, work will soon begin on "Grand Tour" missions to explore the outer planets to take advantage of the rare launch opportunities for such missions that will occur later in the 1970's. These will include missions to Jupiter, Saturn and Pluto launched in 1976 and 1977 and missions launched in 1979 to Jupiter, Uranus, and Neptune.

. . . *and the universe.* The principal new feature of our space science programs during the 1970's will be the development of a new High Energy Astronomy Observatory (HEAO) to obtain high quality data on X-ray, gamma-ray, and cosmic-ray sources in space. In addition, studies will begin on future HEAO satellites and large space telescopes to be carried into space by the space shuttle in the last half of the decade. The HEAO and large space telescope projects have a top priority for the exploration of the universe beyond the planets.

3. *A substantial reduction in the cost of space operations.* Because it is reusable, the space shuttle will have an operating cost substantially lower than the cost of current systems. I think the shuttle will revolutionize our use of space in ways that we cannot even imagine today. Because it will be cheaper to carry payloads into orbit, because it will be possible to bring them back, because it will be possible to try out some experiments without the absolute assurance that they will work, we will do things in space that we would not even consider doing today. The space shuttle will be used for manned and man-tended experiments and to place unmanned scientific, weather, Earth resources and other satellites in Earth orbit and bring them back to Earth for repair and ruse. In the future, the space shuttle will also transport men, supplies, and scientific equipment to and from space stations.

In addition, the space shuttle may well be the precursor of very high speed transportation from place to place on Earth.

4. *An extension in man's capability to live and work in space.* The Skylab project, now in advanced stages of development, is directed at this goal. Skylab will extend man's exposure to the space environment to 56 days, will perform an important manned solar astronomy experiment, and will extend those carried out in the unmanned ERTS program. After its launch in late 1972 and three revisit missions through the first half of 1973, no further manned missions using Apollo hardware are planned. The space shuttle/space station will be our next steps to extend further man's capability to live and work in space. The space station, working with the shuttle, will be our next project for long duration utilization of man's capabilities in space. However, we will not proceed with the space station development as quickly as with the space shuttle.

5. *A speedup of the practical applications of our space technology.* This is the area where we can make a direct contribution to our domestic problems, where we are making use of space and space techniques to help us directly here on Earth. In Earth resources, we are developing a capability to make ecological surveys from space. Survey can be made in geography and cartography, in agriculture and forestry, geology, hydrology, and oceanography. We can update maps and provide information for land use planning; we can take an inventory of wheat or corn or cotton, and at the same time determine the health of our crops; we can help locate our natural resources; can predict floods, and help locate good commercial fishing grounds. All of these things have been done experimentally, and hold great promise for the future. The ERTS A and B program will move ahead in concert with aircraft-borne and ground research, and manner experiments in Skylab, to provide a sound experimental basis for future decisions on possible operational systems optimizing the use of space, aircraft, and ground-based sensors. We will continue to work closely with the other interested agencies. In communications, the ATS F and G programs will proceed as planned with the wide range of communications and other applications technology experiments. We are planning a cooperative experimental applications satellite with Canada (CAS–C), with important experiments at very high frequencies whose use may help space communications avoid or reduce serious frequency congestion in the future.

In meteorology, programs underway include the Nimbus experimental satellites and the two synchronous meteorological satellites which are planned for launch in 1972 and 1973 to permit continuous observation of major weather systems. Future steps include the development of a third generation operational weather satellite system, the TIROS N, to provide improved methods of obtaining quantitative environmental data to improve the capability of ESSA's National Operational Meteorological Research Program (GARP), an international cooperative research program designed to increase the understanding of the general circulation of the atmosphere.

6. *Greater international cooperation.* In each of the areas discussed before we have given special attention to the identification and pursuit of opportunities for international cooperation in space. The space shuttle project is of special importance for future international cooperation. With the approval of the President, and working closely with the State Dept., NASA has launched a major effort during the past year to escalate substantially the level of international participation in the major space programs of the 1970's. The focus of this effort, and the area in which foreign countries, particularly in Europe, have expressed the greatest interest is the space station/shuttle system. At the present time, after the first formal Government-level discussions in Washington in September 1970, Europe is considering the nature and degree of participation, including financial participation, they wish to propose.

7. *An expanded aeronautics program.* During the past decade aeronautical research and development in this country has not received adequate attention. The situation must change rapidly if we are to retain our position as master builders of the world's aircraft.

Civil aviation has aggressively capitalized on the existing research bank, and by outengineering the competition has led the world in high-speed long-range transportation. About 75% of the world's jet transports are made in the USA. This has become a major factor in our balance of trade and its importance is destined to grow as explosively as the world's population itself. But the research bank needs replenishing, and at least three major opportunities cry for attention.

a. V/STOL transports.

b. Sonic transports.

c. SST's.

And beyond these the hypersonic transport is a possibility for opening up Asia to rapid and efficient transportation.

NASA, in concert with the Department of Transportation and the Department of Defense is preparing an experimental airplane program to facilitate the early introduction of practical V/STOL aircraft into the commercial system. We have chosen the externally blown flap and augmentor wing jet STOL airplanes for initial attention. Jet VTOL aircraft will come later.

These machines will require advanced avionics and ground facilities to make them economically viable. They offer real promise for alleviating the inconvenience and hazards of airport congestion. We envision a combination of V/STOL and high-speed ground transportation as offering the best hope for continued mobility as the megopolis continues to spread.

We are also preparing a program to develop an Advanced Technology Experimental Transport using Whitcomb's supercritical aerodynamic concepts to explore the problems of efficient cruise at Mach numbers approaching one. We feel that this will be the next step beyond the current jumbo jets for transcontinental flight, but that the concept is sufficiently risky to require a research airplane. These aircraft would cruise about 100 mph faster than current jets and, if they are successfully developed, will no doubt dominate the market for the 1980's.

We are convinced that a return to the experimental airplane concept is in the national interest and we will try to convince our bosses of this.

A NASA research airplane in the SST category is not required since a prototype SST is already under development. I feel strongly that a commercial SST is a certainty. What is uncertain is who will build and sell it. I feel equally certain that most of us will one day fly in it at competitive fares and will rejoice in its speed and comfort. By 1980, 30 million people will fly the Atlantic each year. Many should be flying on SST's. Because we had the courage to pioneer new aircraft types in the past we now can travel cheaper by air than we could 20 years ago—despite inflation. By 1980, nearly half a billion Americans will buy airline tickets each year—and most of them will be ordinary people enjoying their new-found freedom to see the world. Modern transport aircraft are not "rich men's toys" as some would hold, but the way everyone travels over long distances.

And what about military aircraft. I would personally strongly support a return to the prototype or "fly-before-long" concept as producing the best aircraft. And in this field, to be second is to be last. We at Langley have carried out extensive studies of foreign military aircraft configurations. They are good. They are very good. The Soviets, for example, have aeronautical facilities that probably excel over ours, according to Gen. Ferguson. Their aircraft show a skillful use of these facilities by design teams that are kept sharp by a steady stream of prototype aircraft. NASA will continue to dedicate about half its aeronautical effort to assisting the Armed Services in holding their own against such formidable competition.

Time is running short for this talk and for some of the national decisions I have addressed. I think that the fields of aero-

nautics and space have a case, a compelling case, even in these days of relevancy. They are in fact very relevant, indeed. It's our job to speak up and say so. For, after all, it's our country, too.

OBSERVATIONS ABOUT OUR POW PROBLEMS

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Philip W. Porter, retired editor of the Cleveland, Ohio, Plain-Dealer, writing in the Chagrin Valley, Ohio, Herald Sun, has made some very cogent observations about our prisoner of war problems. I believe his comments will be useful to others, and so I insert them in the RECORD at this point:

OBSERVATIONS ABOUT OUR POW PROBLEMS

(By Philip W. Porter)

Much has been written and spoken about the plight of more than 1,000 American prisoners held by the North Vietnamese and the frustrations of their wives and children, who in many cases don't even know if their men are alive or dead. For those involved it's a nagging personal tragedy, seemingly insoluble as long as fighting continues and beyond that. For those not personally involved, but who wish to help, it's time for some realistic thinking.

Despite newspaper campaigns, appealing to the Hanoi government to be humane is totally futile. Hanoi has shown all along that it intends to use the prisoners for propaganda and cares nothing about them as individual humans.

Their rationale is that these men, mostly shotdown aviators, has no business flying military aircraft over their country, that they were intruders participating in a civil war between Vietnamese. So, in their view, the Geneva Convention on fair, proper treatment of war prisoners does not apply.

Most ordinary Americans, I fear, have not the slightest idea what the Geneva Convention is (they may even believe it is a gathering of delegates in Switzerland). Actually it is an agreement, signed years ago by many presumably responsible, civilized nations with the International Red Cross, defining mutual responsibilities of warring nations to care for prisoners and the specific rights of prisoners to receive this care. (What? You say responsible, civilized nations don't make war? Well, idealistic chums, they've been making war for thousands of years and are likely to continue, so come down out of the clouds.)

Under this agreement, all prisoners are supposed to be given food, lodging and medical care equivalent to that of the soldiers who captured them, to receive regular mail and special packages of food, clothing, medicine, vitamins, tobacco, etc. from their families and the Red Cross. Their own nation is supposed to receive, via Red Cross, a complete, accurate list of the captured men, so relatives will know they are alive.

All soldiers of warring nations have been briefed on this since time immemorial. And during World Wars I and II, the Convention was observed. Conditions varied from prison camp to prison camp (as told graphically in such post-war novels as The Bridge Over the River Kwai, Slaughterhouse Five etc).. But families back home knew their men were held and identified.

The families of men held prisoner now in North Vietnam do not know this. The wives might adjust stoically to death, but not to uncertainty. That's what is so tragic about the present situation. Some wives have seen photos of men who look like their husbands. Some have occasionally received cryptic letters, but they remain uncertain.

The North Vietnamese, though they agreed to the Geneva Convention, have released no authentic lists, have given no guarantees to the Red Cross, won't let the Red Cross inspect POW camps. They have refused to talk to such well-meaning idealists as Texas millionnaire H. Ross Perot, who last Christmas flew a chartered plane full of prisoners' wives to Indochina, hoping to get some firm information. The only Americans Hanoi will talk to are our anti-war activists.

The realization that the North Vietnamese do not intend to loosen up and become human, despite the de-escalation of the war, was what motivated the recent surprise raid by our troops on a POW camp, a daring feat which unhappily accomplished nothing, since the prisoners had previously moved out. At least it served notice that we do not intend to let the present impasse last forever.

In view of all this, it is particularly galling to learn that the much-publicized Prof. Sidney Peck, the busy peacenik demonstrator from Case-WRU, was recently in Hanoi and was given a batch of letters, presumably from POWs. Hanoi does not give information or letters to the United States Government, but it gives them to such as Prof. Peck.

Can you imagine antiwar protesters (there were plenty before Pearl Harbor) slipping easily into Germany during World War II, getting the red carpet treatment and coming back with such material? They would have been jugged for treason the moment they set foot in the U.S., if they were ever allowed to leave Germany.

Hitler was a monster, but the Germans did abide by the Geneva Convention and dealt with the Red Cross. Hanoi, on the contrary, makes its own rules. They have no more intention of relenting on prisoners than they have of engaging in serious discussion at the so-called peace talks in Paris. They are simply fighting a war of nerves with us, waiting for us to quit, using prisoners as pawns.

It was a miserable mistake, a colossal blunder, for us to have gone into Vietnam in force, taking over their war, an undeclared land war, largely guerrilla, in far-off Asia. We are now pulling out gradually. But while we are withdrawing, we must face the grim fact that the enemy, being Oriental, thinks in terms of decades rather than months, and pays no attention to the western ideals of fair play, dignity of human life or truth in government statements.

Despite newspaper and magazine urgings, and the assent of our state department, it's an exercise in futility to write to Hanoi about our POWs. It may relieve your conscience but it will score no points. It will be regarded by Hanoi as a sign of weakness and internal dissension.

Think about the prisoners the next time you see misguided kids and adults who should know better waving Viet Cong flags as they parade and demonstrate with obscenities. We are all fed up with the war, but it's disgusting to applaud or appease those who are using our prisoners of war as pawns for propaganda.

THE BEAUTY OF CHRISTMAS

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, it is heartwarming to observe in the rush of the Christmas holiday time those sensitive and understanding thoughts such as were expressed in a message which I recently received from the Moline, Ill., Forum of the American GI Forum of the United States. Written by a wonderful constituent, Maria Solis, the message puts in understandable human terms, the beauty of Christmas. In order to share this message, I include it as follows:

THE BEAUTY OF CHRISTMAS

(Written by Maria Solis)

The beauty of Christmas is—
These passing days and days to come, all with significance.
It's the Christ Child being born, in the hearts of man.
It's the joy of preparing and the feeling we get.
It's the sun in the morning, casting out its brilliant light;
It's the stars in the sky ever so bright;
It's youth in all its splendor;
It's the beauty of the rosebud;
It is the exchange of giving the gift of friendship and of love, in sharing of our happiness;
It is the spirit and its glow coming from within, with love from the soul, it's the beauty of this light that should be a never ending glow.
That is "The Beauty of Christmas".

PLIGHT OF JEWS IN THE U.S.S.R.

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, we are receiving ominous reports that the Soviet Union is planning a mass political trial of a large group of Jewish people. During the past 6 months, the KGB is reported to have arrested 34 Jews in an apparent attempt to quell expressions of discontent by those who object to their government's intransigence and unwillingness to grant exit permits to thousands of their fellow Jews desiring to join their relatives in Israel. The possibility of such trials taking place harkens back to the dark days of Stalin's infamous "show trials" of 1936–40 when thousands of Jews and other Russian people were executed by the NKVD.

In order to discourage a tragic recurrence of such "liquidations," freedom-loving people in the United States and around the world are demonstrating their grave concern over the persecution of Russian Jewry. I recently received a letter from Mr. Lawrence Goldberg, chairman of the Jewish Community Relations Council serving San Francisco and Marin Counties, which protests current anti-Semitic actions by the Soviet Government and lists some 300 names of Bay Area citizens who have publicly expressed their deep concern.

Because the United Nations is the best existing avenue of protest, I have requested that our Department of State relay Mr. Goldberg's communication to our United Nations delegation for use by the Human Rights Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our citizens, in both public and private life, to speak out against this blatant discrimination in order that the weight of world opinion be brought to bear on the Soviet Government.

LOUIS E. DRAGO

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, to have known Louis E. Drago, late National Executive Committeeman from the State of New York of the American Legion was to have known a distinguished, dedicated public servant, and American. He was, until his death, my friend and adviser on veterans affairs and I was fortunate to have his sound, courageous, and foresighted counsel and the benefit of his broad and constructive criticism and thinking. He was a good man, truly great and unselfishly dedicated to the cause of the American Legion—and one who was proud to be a Legionnaire—added distinguished luster to the world "veteran." For he was always of, with, and for the veteran, his widow and children. It is worthy, therefore, that his life and character compiled with the assistance of his devoted friend and Legion Adjutant, Stephen C. Sanzillo, be spread for those interested in the cause of good government to read and study.

LOUIS E. DRAGO: SEPTEMBER 6, 1897—NOVEMBER 27, 1970

Louis E. Drago was born in Brooklyn, New York, on September 6, 1897, and resided there his entire life. He graduated from P.S. 85 and also from Jamaica High School in Queens. He received his Bachelor of Arts Degree from Cornell University in 1920 and his Bachelor of Laws in 1922 and was admitted to the practice of law in the State of New York in 1924. Here he specialized in the practice of criminal law until 1942 when he was appointed as Secretary to Justice Michael F. Walsh, Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York. Following Justice Walsh's death, he was appointed Secretary to Justice Anthony J. DiGiovanna, President of the Board of Justices of the Supreme Court in Kings County of the State of New York from which position he retired in 1967 to resume the practice of law.

On May 15, 1918, he left his studies at Cornell University and enlisted as a private in World War I with the 79th Division at Camp Meade, Maryland. On August 25, 1918, after attending the 4th Officers' Training Camp he was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant of the United States Infantry. He was honorably discharged from the military services on April 23, 1919, to return to Cornell.

In 1925, he joined the Brooklyn Post No. 500 of the King County American Legion where he served on various committees until he transferred to the J. W. Person Post No. 14 in the same county and of which he was a member when he died. In 1939–40–41, he was elected Commander of the Post.

He commenced his long service in the Kings County American Legion in 1939, serving as Chairman of the Oratorical Contest. Here he served on many committees both as a member and as chairman, among them being Public Relations, Legal, Children's Camp, Waste Collection, Publicity, Armistice Ball, Re-Employment of World War II Veterans, Distinguished Guests, National Commander's Dinner, Welfare, Hospitalization, Judge Advocate, Americanism, Resolutions, County Convention, House, Poppy, Charters, County Band, Budget and a Delegate to the County, State and National Convention since 1942. In 1945 he was elected, without opposition, as Commander of the Kings County American Legion.

In the State of New York, he became active in 1945, serving on several committees and being chairman of the State Membership Committee for 3 years. His work was outstanding to the degree that he was elected State Commander in 1950, which was followed in 1957, by his unanimous election as National Executive Committeeman from New York State in which post he represented the entire 230,000 American Legionnaires in New York State at the National level. On the National scene, he was chairman of the National Committee Advisory Council, Chairman of Committee on Committees, Liaison on the National Convention Committee and received many testimonials from Past National Commanders attributing much of their successes to Mr. Drago's good counsel. He was given a pen by President Lyndon B. Johnson upon the occasion of the President signing the eligibility amendments to the Legion charter permitting Vietnam Veterans to apply for membership.

During World War II, he served as Appeal Agent for the United States Selective Service System attached to Local Draft Board No. 134, Brooklyn, N.Y.

In 1947, he received the Certificate of Merit from B'nai B'rith for contribution to better racial understanding and interfaith relationship and also selected by that organization as one of the outstanding leaders in the interfaith movement.

Following World War I, he married Martha E. Groce, of Greer, S.C., from which union came one daughter, June. She married Lawrence O'Keefe and has two daughters. Also surviving is his brother, Charles Drago, Judge of the Criminal Court of the City of New York.

American Legion Services were held at the O. B. Davis Funeral Home in Port Jefferson Station, Long Island, with hundreds of Legionnaires and friends making the long trip in very rainy weather. The J. W. Person Post No. 14 conducted the services. Rev. Alfred C. Thompson, Kings County Chaplain, gave the prayer. There were short remarks from Department of N.Y. Commander Raymond T. Wellington, 2nd District Commander, N.Y., George P. Gaffney and Kings County Commander S. Harry Rosenfeld. Peter J. Danzilo, Sr., Mr. Drago's oldest friend in the American Legion, gave the eulogy.

He was buried at the Pinelawn National Cemetary. A full Honor Guard, consisting of a U.S. Marine Major, two Marines, two Navymen and two Armymen as pallbearers. A regulation Firing Squad fired the traditional three volleys and a bugler sounded "Taps." Mrs. Drago was presented with the American flag by the Marine Major.

Rev. Alfred C. Thompson, Kings County Chaplain, gave the Commital prayer.

I shall pass thru this world but once;
Any good that I can do, any kindness that I can show to any human being;
Let me do it now, let me not defer it, or neglect it,
For I shall not pass this way again.

STEPHEN C. SANZILLO,
County Adjutant.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM L. DAWSON

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the late William Levi Dawson was one of the most able and respected Members of this body. He was elected to the 78th and succeeding Congresses. His tenure covered nearly 28 years of distinguished service.

Bill Dawson's successful career should be an inspiration for all to emulate. Born in the State of Georgia, he graduated from Albany, Ga., normal school, and Fisk University in Nashville. Later he graduated from Northwestern University Law School. He was first lieutenant during World War I, and saw service in Europe.

Returning to Chicago he practiced law, served as a city alderman, before being elected to the Congress.

Mr. Dawson came to Congress when I did. I observed him through the years. He always played the role of a gentleman, attentive to any who had occasion to deal with him, and exercised constructive influence.

I extend to Mrs. Dawson and other members of the family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

BISHOP MYERS AND THE PERIPHERAL CANAL

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, it is understandable and commendable when church officials take notice and act on issues of social importance.

Recently, in my State of California, the Episcopal bishop of the diocese of California, the Right Reverend C. Kilmer Myers, announced his concern regarding a major water transfer project in our State and the prime conveyance facility of that project—the proposed Peripheral Canal.

Bishop Myers then received correspondence from State officials telling him, in effect, "Stick to the affairs of theology and leave the water matters to us."

Mr. Speaker, Bishop Myers responded to those officials in a most noteworthy and informative manner.

I would like at this time to place his letter to Mr. William Gianelli, director of the California Department of Water Resources, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

DECEMBER 7, 1970.

DEAR MR. GIANELLI: I am sorry that various commitments have kept me from an earlier reply to your letter of November 10th, in which you comment on my concern over the plans for building the Peripheral Canal.

I can readily understand the basis for your belief in the wisdom of the state's decision to proceed with construction of the canal and I agree with you that many of the benefits from the water projects which you enumerated are indeed a matter of reality.

It was a source of some distress, however, to note your doubts as to the competence and the propriety of the Episcopal Church—and, by implication, my scientific expertise—to deal with such technological affairs as the Peripheral Canal. A suggestion that "water projects are not the Bishop's business" seems implicit, if not indeed explicit, in your comments.

I would be the last to deny your unstated but unmistakable judgment that I am not a scientist of any professional competence and therefore not qualified to evaluate the ecological consequences of building the canal. But I believe that you overlooked the fact that I *am* the repository of scientific

anxiety and that I speak, not for myself, but on behalf of countless scientists of incontestable qualifications who remain unconvinced by arguments that the Peripheral Canal will in no way result in the stagnation of San Francisco Bay resulting from a reduction in fresh water outflows from the Delta.

As Bishop of California, I have a broad canvas of spiritual duty to the communicants of our Church, who represent, as I am sure you will appreciate, many and differing points of view on many issues. If the Church is to be relevant to the society it serves, it must not confine itself, as some of its critics suggest, to liturgy and canon law or such other matters of philosophical controversy or dispute of interest primarily to professional churchmen. Our involvement in these issues, admittedly, can and now well may be, a source of discomfort for the laity. But my duty extends to consideration of the quality of our daily lives—the daily lives of the totality of our society, both within and without the Episcopal Church, and as the Bishop, I cannot remain silent in the face of what appears to me to be a clear and present danger to them and their children to come, either within or without the immediate flock of my denominational responsibility.

In discharging that duty, I have asked a number of recognized scientists, educators, physicians and people from other professions, disciplines and occupations to advise me on all manner of the problems facing us today.

One of the most important of the many challenges confronting the society of which we are a part in the years ahead is that of healing the environment, so much of which has been ravaged and laid waste by those who sincerely but mistakenly believe that man can subdue the earth. Foremost among concerns to environmentalists in the Bay Area is the growing realization that as yet there are no firm, final, unamendable guarantees that the Peripheral Canal will not interfere with the flow regime of the Delta in such a fashion that the result will be a prolonged, artificial drought—a drought which, in turn, will lead to stagnation of the Bay; tidal action alone is insufficient for the essential flushing action to keep it clean.

This has been and is the basis for my conviction that we must seek a reconsideration of this project. Ecologists call for better and more convincing proofs or guarantees that construction of the canal will bring about no detrimental effect on the ecology of both the Delta and the Bay.

I am convinced that these Californians are justified in feeling less than sanguine about the consequences of the canal.

Actually, the concern which I express is to be understood as an appeal to proceed no further with construction of the canal until adequate guarantees of fresh water outflow can be made to the satisfaction not merely of those conservationists who contest your policy—not out of subjective economic consideration but, rather, out of selfless concern for the environment—but for the millions of this and future generations who will be the legatees of our decision at this point in time. My doubts—which are their doubts—do not constitute, by any standard, an intransigent opposition to the canal as such. I, and they, ask only that the project be reexamined—and in concert with the ecologists as well as the engineers.

This could be done by submitting the Peripheral Canal issue to an impartial survey and reevaluation by an independent research agency or organization; such a study would necessarily include, as a guarantee of impartiality, comprehensive input from both proponents and opponents of the project. Likewise, full consideration would be given to the ecological impact on San Francisco Bay, the consequences of increased urbanization in the Los Angeles region and, among other things, the economic effect of the actual construction of the canal.

This same study would also properly include a determination of the means for separating responsibility for environmental impact studies from the Department of Water Resources, possibility by transfer of this aspect of the matter to an independent commission—there are many environmentalists today who feel that there is an inherent danger and inconsistency in a policy which charges the purveyor of water to assume the concomitant responsibility for evaluation of the effect of its impoundment and transfer on the environment.

In short they feel, and I agree, that the agency that sells the water should not at the same time be the custodian of this precious resource or the arbiter of its beneficial use.

Our water resources represent a matter of abiding and immediate concern and anxiety to countless Californians. The enclosed letter from David Seckler is typical of the many letters that I am now receiving and which reflect their common doubts about the Peripheral Canal. In identity, the writers range through all occupations and professions, from agricultural specialist to economist; Mr. Seckler's letter is only one of many I could offer as examples.

As the Bishop of the Diocese of California, I am interested in all life and I know that you, as an Episcopalian, share my concern. As Christians, we are responsible for the whole of God's creation, which explains why the 121st Convention of the Episcopal Diocese of California, on November 6th of this year, with my concurrence, adopted a resolution seeking a complete, competent and independent study of the project.

Also, as the Bishop of California, I should like to express my appreciation for your own concern in writing to me and opening a dialogue which, I am sure, has for its purpose the ultimate resolution of this problem for the greatest good of the land and people of our great State.

Faithfully yours,

C. KILMER MYERS,
Bishop of California.

PENNSYLVANIA—FUTURE BATTLEGROUND OF THE GYPSY MOTH

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the gypsy moth is on the rampage and bringing tremendous destruction to the forests of northeastern United States.

The gypsy moth causes severe losses because it is a leaf eater. Gypsy moths are voracious feeders and defoliate trees in a remarkably short period of time. Many of the trees so attacked expire because they cannot stand this defoliation.

The State of Pennsylvania is particularly vulnerable to the gypsy moth because it has an abundance of those tree species upon which the gypsy moth thrives; that is oak, birch, basswood, alder, willow, and poplar.

The gypsy moth has been combatted either through biological controls or via the use of chemicals.

Biological controls take the form of parasites and predators that feed on the gypsy moth, and these have been used with some success in various New England areas. Sterilization of male moths is also in its experimental stage, but to date this approach has not proved too successful. Biological controls are a long-range aspect.

With respect to chemicals, a lead arsenate spray has proved reasonably effective in helping to control gypsy moth populations, but the most effective chemical control agent has been DDT. DDT has, however, been condemned as a harmful chemical, and it has been discontinued in gypsy moth control since back in the early 1960's. Since then, the gypsy moth has had a foliage feast in the State of Pennsylvania, and it is expected that unless something is done to check this pest, the forests of Pennsylvania will be in a critical state by 1972.

What is needed to keep the forests of the northeast free from being eaten up by the gypsy moth is a research breakthrough.

In the meantime, we have a crtical problem of the present, and because biological controls are considered a "long range" prospect for control, we are going to have to place particular emphasis on chemicals for short range controls. In this, chemicals like DDT will have to be appraised totally, not only for the harm they could bring to our environment, if any, but for the good that they already have demonstrated themselves capable.

The Pennsylvania Forestry Association has recently issued a publication entitled Pennsylvania—Future Battleground of the Gypsy Moth. Because this article is timely and vividly portrays the hazard of the gypsy moth in relation to the forests of Pennsylvania, I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and recommend it to the attention of all those who have a deep concern over those dangers which confront our environment:

PENNSYLVANIA—FUTURE BATTLEGROUND OF THE GYPSY MOTH

(By James O. Nichols)

The time is rapidly approaching when Pennsylvanians concerned with the conservation of our forests will become directly involved in the fight against the destructive gypsy moth (*Porthetria dispar* L.). Within the next few years, this insect is expected to become one of the major problems faced by everyone engaged in forestry practices in the state's oak region. While this may sound like an "alarmist" attitude, let's take a minute to look at the history of this creature, why it is considered so destructive, and the present dilemma that we now find ourselves in.

The gypsy moth is an invader, having been brought to Massachusetts 101 years ago by a French scientist conducting laboratory experiments. Some of the caterpillars (larvae) escaped, and within 20 years the problem became serious. Effective control work was accomplished in Massachusetts from 1890 to 1900 and then dropped when it was thought that the threat was no longer important. Spread of the moth continued, however, and surviving insects increased enormously during the next five years. All of New England, New York, and New Jersey were found to be infested by 1922, and in 1932 an infestation covering 400 square miles was discovered in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania. The rate of spread southwestward would have been much faster had not prevailing winds been against it.

Gypsy moth caterpillars are readily separated from all other insects. They are hairy, grow to about two inches long, generally grayish in color peppered with numerous

small and darker spots, and have three light stripes down the body. Its most distinguishing characteristic is two rows of colored spots along the back, the first five pairs being blue and the remaining six pairs a brick-red color.

They begin hatching after a period of warm weather in late April, but in cool spots, such as northern slopes and in northern counties, hatching may be delayed until mid- or late-May. Most of the feeding is done at night. They are voracious feeders, each larva capable of devouring three or four oak leaves per day during the latter half of its 10-week life span. About three-quarters of all foliage eaten is consumed in the last larval stage, which occurs from mid-June to mid-July. When food becomes scarce they do considerable wandering.

Experience and research has shown that many trees die after two years of heavy defoliation, and after three years 50 per cent or more of an oak stand may be lost. Most pines, spruce, and hemlock will die after one complete stripping of foliage. The insect population may also collapse after three years of outbreak conditions, due to the actions of disease on starving caterpillars, but by then the damage is done.

The larva then enters the pupal stage for transformation to the adult moth. Pupal cases are reddish-brown in color, about one inch long, and may be attached to almost any object. Adult emergence is usually at its height in mid-July, and they are found until late August. The moths do not feed, their only function being one of reproduction. The male moth is brown in color with a wingspread of one and one-half inches, and has dark arrowhead markings on the forewings. It is a strong flier. The female is nearly white with black markings, is much larger than the male, and has a wingspread of two or two and one-half inches. She is heavily laden with eggs and thus is unable to fly.

Egg laying occurs soon after the moths mate. Each female lays an oval mass an inch or more long, containing 300 to 800 eggs, and then covers them with buff-colored hairs. These eggs may be found almost anywhere, usually close to where the mature larva crawled to pupate. The insect remains in the egg stage until the following spring, and exposed eggs can withstand winter temperatures down to approximately —20 degrees F. Anywhere from 500 to 2,000 egg clusters per acre will result in heavy defoliation.

Most of our common defoliating insects favor one or two species, or families of trees; but the gypsy moth has a wide range of hosts. Destructive population buildups occur in forest areas where tree species are 20 per cent or more oak, birch, basswood, alder, willow or poplar. In such cases, associated species usually are also heavily defoliated, including such common trees as the maples, beech, hickory, black cherry, hemlock, larch, and all species of pine and spruce. It will not normally feed on arborvitae, ash, black locust, catalpa, dogwood, grapevines, hackberry, holly, honey-locust, horsechestnut, sycamore, walnut, yellow poplar, and a few other plants.

In Pennsylvania, where the oaks predominate on approximately 10 million acres, or nearly 60 per cent of the forest area, the gypsy moth has built up to explosive levels within five years after a few insects became established. One of its favorite breeding grounds is ridge tops where chestnut oak and white oak are the primary species. From these places, wind currents can pick up and carry sufficient numbers of young larvae to defoliate shade and ornamental trees at least 10 miles away. The buildup rate is much slower in northern hardwood stands where oak is a minor component, and the potential for damage in these areas is lessened. This is one reason the problem has not been as great in New England as it has been, or will be, in eastern New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and further south. Another reason is that climates south of New England will be more favorable to the insect. Consequently, most observers believe that the battle against the gypsy moth is just beginning.

From its initial discovery here, both Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture and U.S. Department of Agriculture officials have waged a constant battle to keep the moth from spreading. During the Depression years, literally thousands of WPA and CCC workers were employed to treat infestations by laboriously spraying woodlands with lead arsenate. Other methods used then, and still in use today, consisted of creosoting egg masses in the winter months when they are easily seen, placing sticky bands on trees to trap caterpillars, and killing caterpillars that congregate under burlap tied around trees. These tactics largely prevented serious defoliation and widespread dispersal of the pest.

The use of DDT in aircraft sprayers began in 1944. DDT proved to be extremely effective when applied at the rate of one pound per acre. It remained on the trees long enough to kill larvae that hatched over prolonged periods. DDT is now a dead issue, since it was discontinued in gypsy moth control after 1963. It should be pointed out, however, that in the 20 years of its use in Pennsylvania, no detectable larvae survived a single aerial treatment on 1,180,000 acres. In other words, no area was sprayed more than once in the 20-year period. There were hundreds of workers and observers who scoured the treated woodlands, but no one ever came up with a surviving larva or a new egg mass.

The demise of DDT has produced predictable results. For 30 years the insect was confined almost entirely to the six northeastern counties of Wayne, Pike, Monroe, Lackawanna, Luzerne, and Carbon, plus a relatively small area in Bucks County. In the last seven years the moth has spread to every county east of the Susquehanna River and to eight counties west of the River, as far as Centre County. Parts of Delaware and Maryland have also become infested within the last two years.

The natural direction of spread is expected to be southwestward, down the ridge and valley areas of Pennsylvania and into West Virginia. Quarantines are in effect, but they only serve to protect against long-distance spread, and all infested shipments or carriers of egg clusters cannot be spotted. Last year, camping trailers and mobile homes, carrying egg masses from the Northeast, were intercepted in various parts of the nation.

The primary insecticide used during these seven years has been carbaryl (Sevin). It is a non-persistent material and good enough to kill 90 per cent or more of the gypsy moth larvae. But because it is not persistent, and the gypsy moth may hatch over a one-month period, infestations should be treated two or three times to obtain results comparable to DDT.

This, of course, results in higher costs at a time when funds are hard to obtain; and it also tends to increase the amount of public criticism. A disturbing factor is that insects surviving 1969 treatments with carbaryl in Schuylkill County are increasing at a fast enough rate to again cause heavy defoliation by 1972. Consequently, everyone realizes that pesticides are not a cure-all but a temporary stop-gap.

The factors of high treatment costs, lack of funds, lack of an insecticide as good as DDT, the general inadequacy of biological control methods, public attacks on chemical control programs, and the general anti-pesticide attitude of recent years, have all played a part in the dilemma we find ourselves in today. Prior to last year, the largest areas severely defoliated in the state were 30 acres in 1957 and 60 acres in 1968. An 800-acre defoliated area was found on the Blue Mountain range in Monroe County in 1969. It was not treated. Results were predictable, and 8,000 acres were stripped in the area this year. In 1971, the defoliation will continue on a geometric progression. The insect can now be found virtually everywhere in Monroe, Pike, Schuylkill, and Carbon counties. The insect population explosion in these counties will probably occur in 1972. We are running about three or four years behind New York and New Jersey, states where several hundred thousand acres have been defoliated in the last few years.

The gypsy moth has always received considerable publicity, so much so in fact that some people believe any tree defoliator is a gypsy moth. Actually, 99 percent or more of our residents have never seen one to date. Until a few years ago, the policy in the Department of Agriculture was to treat about a mile around any observed or trapped moth, in order to knock out any possible infestation before it could build up. (Infestations are detected by the use of sex-attractant traps placed at periodic intervals.) Complaints began to mount because the public could not understand why extensive acreage was being treated when there was no defoliation and the residents could not find any insects. Whether the method was good or bad policy has long been debated, but it served to delay the ultimate problem that we face today.

Research scientists have been trying for over 60 years to find a biological answer to the moth, importing from Europe and rearing by the millions various parasites and predators. These undoubtedly have had some effect in New England where the insect appears to be gradually assuming the status of a native, but still important, pest. The parasite releases have yet to work to any significant extent in New York, New Jersey, or Pennsylvania. Millions of dollars have also been spent on trying to perfect other methods of control, including sterilizing male moths, releasing sex-attractant baits to confuse males, and spraying with a polyhedral virus disease that afflicts the caterpillars. These to date have not proven successful. Research is now expected to accelerate through the efforts of the National Gypsy Moth Advisory Council, which was organized last year. A research breakthrough is clearly needed.

Many biologists tend to downgrade the impact of the moth, since in the long run it will unquestionably be desirable to have standards containing mixtures of species rather than pure oak. The main concern in Pennsylvania, however, is not likely to be the value of forest timber lost, even though it will be considerable. The problem is the impact on people and on investments in trees considerd valuable for other purposes. The oaks in the Pocono resorts do not have much timber value, but they are about the only species present. A million dollar state park may be without visitors; this has happened in other areas. The homeowner in a forested environment who sees his trees die one by one will have to be placated. Wildlife will suffer from reduced acorn production.

The problem confronting pest control officials now is: what to do in the face of exploding populations? It is expected that the wrath incurred in the past from the 5 per cent of the population who has succeeded in curbing pesticide programs will be nothing compared to the outcry of the other 95 percent who want something done. In New Jersey, $100,000 was appropriated for gypsy moth control in 1969; but, due to public pressure, the funds had to be used on biological weapons. This was fine for a long-term project, but there were no biological tools to stop the immediate outbreak and 40,000 acres were completely stripped. This year, again due to public pressure, about

four times as much was spent on chemical programs to prevent a repeat. Meanwhile, over 10,000 oaks died in the Morristown National Historical Park. The opinion of a housewife on Long Island this summer perhaps sums up the feeling of people who find thousands of big caterpillars swarming over their property. She was quoted in the New York Times, "It's a question of survival, the caterpillars or us."

COMMANDO TACTICS TO SAVE THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the December 10, 1970, issue of the Washington Post. The accuracy of the article is, I believe, incidental to the lesson contained therein for, even if the events did not occur as reported, they are not beyond the realm of possibility. I remember reading recently about a concerned citizen in one city who, after calling the pollution-control unit of that city on repeated occasions to complain about smoke issuing from two industrial smokestacks, climbed the stacks during the night and painted a huge "X" on each so that the inspector would not have any trouble locating them—as he apparently had in the past judging from the lack of enforcement of the local pollution ordinances.

These incidents are indicative of a major problem that exists in many areas of pollution control. Laws may be present forbidding the pollution and, indeed, we may go through a pro forma enforcement of those laws but, in all too many instances, the costs to those against whom the laws are directed are so great that political pressures militate against strict enforcement. Hence, the citizen who is tired of seeing black smoke pouring out of an industrial stack, or disturbed by seeing and smelling raw sewage floating down his rivers, may very well become so incensed at the lack of action taken against the offenders—even though punitive measures are available—that he may be motivated to try the self-help method out of sheer frustration.

Such actions—while we might sympathize with the effort—cannot be condoned; but then neither can we condone the lack of enforcement of environmental protection legislation—federally, statewide, or locally. The effort to protect the environment must be pursued in good faith by all parties.

I include the following article, then, to illustrate the frustrations that some of our citizens feel relative to the continued degradation of the environment:

ENVIRONMENTALISTS USE COMMANDO TACTICS IN MIAMI AREA

(By Stanley M. Brown)

MIAMI.—Last April six young Miami residents scaled a six-foot fence, ducked a sleepy night watchman and sneaked into a dimly lit sewage treatment plant, thus launching one of the most unorthodox campaigns yet in the battle to save the environment.

Quickly and silently the black-clad intruders approached six huge waste vats scattered through the building. In each they deposited a bomb filled with dye. Minutes later they regrouped and started making their way out.

Everything went with military precision until the chainlink fence collapsed under the weight of a 250-pound participant, causing the watchman to call police.

Before the raiders could reach their hidden getaway cars, a police cruiser roared up. They fled into a mangrove swamp and hid—swarmed for more than an hour by mosquitoes they dared not slap—until the police finally gave up their search.

By daybreak, after similar raids on two more sewage plants, half the inland canals in the Miami area turned bright yellow. Back at their headquarters, their mission accomplished, Eco-Commando Force 70 issued communique No. 1.

The tiny organization—composed of a few professional men and women, students and blue collar workers—declared that they dyed the waste "to show what happens to sewage dumped in our waterways."

"If the dye is not carried downstream, residents should be warned of dangerously high concentrations of pollutants," their communique said. "Dade county citizens need not worry about this attack—unless their drinking water turns yellow."

The sewage raids got little publicity and were regarded by local officials as nothing more than a not-so-funny prank. But the commandoes, who describe Miami as "the polluted paradise," were far from through.

On Independence day, they struck again—this time with such embarrassing impact that Dade County Sheriff E. Wilson Jurdy was ordered to find the raiders and arrest them. The charges were not specified.

Thousands of July 4th vacationers and tourists who flocked to this area's beaches were startled by red signs that warned: "Danger Polluted. No Swimming. No Fishing. Potentially Dangerous Concentrations of Pathogenic Bacteria Have Been Found at or Near This Location."

In communique No. 2, the commandoes reported dangerous bacteria concentrations had been found by officials at most area beaches, "but the beaches are not closed because it would hurt the tourist trade.

"There is a real health danger to those who dare swim in Miami's water," the communique said. "Infections of cuts and sores are quite likely. Gastro-intestinal upsets are also possible. Less likely, but still possible, are cases of hepatitis, typhoid and other virulent diseases. Fungus infections are another danger."

County Manager Hoke Welch dismissed the beach pollution warning as "contrary to the facts." He would not elaborate.

At this point, the commandoes went deep underground to plan their third mission. Their attorney advised them to disband. They refused and said if captured, "we'll plead self-defense."

On Oct. 22 the commandoes went two miles offshore to the end of the Miami beach sewage outfall pipe. There they dumped 700 sealed beer bottles into the 40 million gallons of raw sewage that daily flows from the pipe. City officials claim the raw sewage is carried far to sea by the Gulf Stream.

Inside each wax-sealed bottle was a note telling where it had been dropped. The commandoes asked the finder to mail two enclosed post cards to the editor of his newspaper and the governor, telling them where the bottle was found and noting "this is where Miami's sewage goes."

So far, over 75 bottles have been found on beaches from nearby Hollywood to 120 miles northward at Vero Beach, "carried by the same wind and water currents that move Miami's raw sewage."

On Nov. 10 the commandoes wrote President Nixon and warned him that the beach in front of his Key Biscayne vacation retreat is "washed by the raw sewage pouring from the ocean outfalls which stud our coastline." They asked the President to join them in a fight against area polluters."

The White House did not respond.

At carefully-arranged meeting recently in a crowded pub, the leaders of Eco-Commando Force 70—they introduced themselves by first names only—frankly admitted they chose a commando-style attack on pollution "for dramatic impact."

"Recognized conservation groups stand up and scream all the time, but they do little good," Bob said. "We can do what the established groups can't or won't do.

"And because we're a secret group, we keep the county and state officialdom jumping," Ed chimed in. "They don't know how many of us there are, or what we're liable to do next. One official guessed there were 100 of us."

"And obviously," Sarah added, "we would like to avoid arrest. We've got careers to protect and extremely limited resources for bail bond and attorney fees."

The leadership corps of the commandoes includes a marine biologist, a micro-biologist, a medical student, a landscape architect, a medical technician, a nurse, a teacher and a print shop owner—all under 30.

"We're an affinity group," Bruce explained. "We met through other groups and have known each other for a long time. We have no set leadership structure. When someone gets an idea, it goes in the pot and if enough of us like it, we do it."

The commandoes say they have a reserve force of 30 raiders they can call upon if needed in a large-scale mission.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, because we live in a time when honest and thoughtful dissent is deliberately misinterpreted as destructive demagogery, AL LOWENSTEIN'S arrival in this House was viewed in some quarters with alarm. His departure should be viewed by us all with regret.

Flamboyant news accounts of his political initiatives preceded him here, and caused many who had never met him to assume he would not be inclined or equipped to engage in orderly debate, or what is accepted here as orderly debate. How wrong they were. He proved both keenly inclined, and superbly equipped. He did not speak very frequently. He did speak eloquently and sensitively to the great questions before the country. And I think I can observe that he earned the respect of those who were persuaded by him and those who were not. Never trivial or vindictive, his high regard for this House was reflected in every word he spoke, as well as his many initiatives to render Congress a more effective instrument of the national will. I will miss him, and in my judgment, the House will too.

VIETNAMIZATION—A GOOD BUY?

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, along with a number of my colleagues, I recently received a letter from Mrs. Bernice Davidson of Oceanside, N.Y., which contains a devastating appraisal of President Nixon's Vietnamization program.

Her letter follows:

OCEANSIDE, N.Y.,
December 7, 1970.

Subject Vietnamization.
Honorable CONGRESSMAN,
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In these days of high prices and high taxes, I would like to pose this question. Are you a careful shopper? If your answer is yes, then I believe you will not buy Vietnamization.

When you're buying a toaster, a car, a house, don't you do a lot of comparison shopping, before you plunk your money down? Naturally the intensity of the shopping would depend largely on the importance and size of your investment.

When you finally decide to buy, doesn't it boil down to whether the item suits your needs, and whether you are getting the best buy for your hard earned cash?

You are now being asked to buy an old worn out war, which hawks and doves agree is rotten, savage, corrupt, unfortunate tragic, etc., etc., and what's more, they agree this war is unwinnable.

This product is now being trotted out and polished up, and placed on the market in a nice new package, and labeled "VIETNAMIZATION". No matter how pretty the package, the stench of death, destruction, and disaster, can't be held under wraps forever.

We've already made a big juicy down payment. When the deal was made, we called it "Guns & Butter". As a good shopper, the question is, did we need it, and did we get our money's worth?

Here's the deal we made:

1—We send half a million American boys to fight.
2—We train one million Vietnamese boys to fight.
3—We buy and train 50,000 other Asian boys to fight.
4—We build and pay for Airports in Thailand for bombing Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.
5—We keep Thieu & Ky in power.

Here's the down payment for the Vietnamese:

1—1,000,000 bodies, by our own count.
2—Hundreds of thousands of men, women & children burned & maimed.
3—Destruction and pollution of cities.
4—Destruction and pollution of the countryside, food crops, & rivers.
5—Millions of homeless refugees.
6—Inflation and corruption.
7—Drugs & prostitution.
8—Inhuman prison conditions.
9—Thousands of political prisoners.
10—Disabled veterans shot at.
11—Presidential runner up in jail.

Here's the down payment we Americans made:

1—50,000 boys, American boys, dead.
2—300,000 American boys, maimed.
3—100 billion dollars spent.
4—Unparalleled inflation.
5—Record unemployment.
6—Deteriorating housing.
7—Deteriorating hospital care at higher prices.
8—Reduced budget for vital research.
9—Reduced federal aid to students.
10—Epidemic of drug problems.
11—Increase in crime.
12—Increasing resistance to the draft.
13—Tens of thousands of desertions.
14—Campus unrest.
15—Massive disunity and dissent.
16—A pervasive and overwhelming feeling of depression, apprehension, suspicion, and a severe case of the blahs.

Most Americans no longer expect to win this war. Yet President Nixon speaks emotionally of not wishing to be the first President to lose a war, which means he still hopes to win this war, by VIETNAMIZATION.

After years of complete control of the air and sea, saturation bombing, napalming, defoliation, and a superiority of manpower, by our own figures, of a ratio of 6 to 1, we have been unable to win this war. At this point, you are expected to believe, that by gradual withdrawal and Vietnamization, we can still hope to win.

We have already bought and paid for "Guns and Butter." Now let's undo the ribbons, and examine the contents of "Vietnamization."

Here's what you get if you buy "Vietnamization":

1—A change in the body count, more Vietnameze and Cambodian bodies, fewer American bodies.
2—We are now obliged to maintain in power, militarest Lon Nol, in addition to Thieu and Ky.
3—We will now be training Cambodians, so that Thieu and Ky can Cambodianize the war.
4—We must retain the system of involuntary servitude, called the draft, so that we can continue to send replacements, for returnees.
5—We will sign a blank check, to pay for all this, and keep on paying until we accomplish the miracle of stablizing the highly unpopular and discredited Thieu and Ky and Lon Nol.
6—When we see the light at the end of the tunnel again, and it's not obscured by the pollution, and the war has come to an honorable end, we can then turn our attention to pursuit of happiness, for those of us who are left.

Sincerely,

BERNICE DAVIDSON.

FISH FARMING ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that most discussions about fish farming usually start with a grin, but the discussion gets serious in a hurry when people realize the potential this relatively new industry has on agriculture and could have on our economy.

As you know, earlier this year, I sponsored the first annual catfish farming seminar in my district and nearly 300 people from throughout Texas attended. This is solid testimony to the local interest in supplementing agriculture income.

Since that meeting last February, I have been working on methods to create Federal participation. Working through the normal process, I have discussed this matter with EDA, SBA plus the Texas Savings and Loan Association and the Texas Bankers Association. Everyone is interested, but no clear-cut program has developed which would spell out Federal participation.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today would be a start in the right direction. I would incorporate two basic features. First, it would place all responsibility for marketing and research, for technical assistance and equipment development under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. Presently, the Department of Interior through the Bureau of Sports Fisheries, and the Department of Commerce through the National Marine Fisheries Services are doing a capable and efficient job. However, Mr. Speaker, the day is not too far off when we will consider fish farming in its rightful place—a genuine livestock industry. Plus, working through USDA, we have the opportunity to avoid costly duplication of Government interests and operation.

Second, this legislation would authorize the Federal Government to make various forms of financial assistance available to the fish farmers throughout the Nation. Under this tentative approach in this legislation, the Government would participate to the extent of 90 percent of the cost of a proposed venture, but would limit the direct loans to 50 percent. The balance of the governmental assistance would come in the form of guarantees.

Already, Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this with my colleague Charles Griffin, who has introduced similar legislation, and we plan to make a concerted bipartisan push the beginning of the next session of Congress.

NATIONAL READING CENTER'S 10 MILLION TUTORS PLAN

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the National Reading Council, it was recently my privilege to attend its second conference held here in Washington.

The morning session, held at the George Truesdell Elementary School, was an especially rewarding experience since it gave us the opportunity to witness first hand a number of outstanding reading programs at the school.

I want personally to commend Truesdell's principal, Mrs. Marjorie Savage, and her staff for the remarkable work they are doing in combating reading problems.

The afternoon session was held at the National Geographic Society, and as always, visiting that wonderful building is a treat in itself.

I was quite impressed during the meeting with details of a Ten Million Tutors Plan which was announced by the council's chairman, Walter W. Straley, as one of the top priorities of the council's working arm, the National Reading Center.

It is an ambitious plan, but there is a great need in this country for millions of tutors to help combat illiteracy and reading deficiencies, and I feel certain that this plan will succeed under the able leadership of the center's executive director, Dr. Donald G. Emery.

The figure of 10 million volunteers for 1-to-1 tutoring is a feasible one since the National Reading Center will request assistance of high school and college students, as well as young and adult volunteers in hundreds of national organizations, many of which are already engaged in volunteer tutor plans.

Emphasis will be placed on parents and others in reading/teaching of the preschool child.

A steering committee will be the guiding force behind the 10 million tutors plan with the assistance of a professional staff furnished by the National Reading Center. Proper training materials will be developed for tutors at all levels. The center also will provide programs for communities willing to participate.

Members of the steering committee for the 10 million tutors plan include: Miss Shirley Campbell, student at Morris College; Mrs. Michael Collins, wife of the Assistant Secretary of State; Walter G. Davis, Director, AFL–CIO Department of Education; Mrs. John Ehrlichman, wife of the special assistant to President Nixon; Mrs. Daniel Flood, wife of the Congressman from Pennsylvania; Mrs. Loretta Hanes, volunteer tutor; Mrs. Patricia Hewitt, of East Moline, Ill.; Mrs. James Hodgson, wife of the Secretary of Labor; Mrs. Henry Jackson, wife of the Senator from Washington; Gary Kelsey, junior at Spingarn High School, District of Columbia, a student tutor; Dr. Sam Lambert, executive director of the National Education Association; Mrs. Robert McNamara, wife of the head of the World Bank; Mrs. Grace MacNeil, president, Girl Scouts of America; Louis Nunez, national director of ASPIRA; Mrs. Elliot Richardson, wife of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; George Rhodes, Assistant Superintendent of District of Columbia Secondary Schools; Mrs. Marjorie Savage, principal, Truesdell School; Mrs. Walter Washington, wife of the mayor of the District of Columbia; Mrs. Grace Watson, Office of Education; and Mrs. Elinor Wolf, Office of Voluntary Action.

I believe that my colleagues will be interested in details of the 10 million tutors plan and I submit excerpts from the draft outlining the plan and an article which appeared in the December 17 edition of the Washington Post:

EXCERPTS FROM DRAFT OF NATIONAL READING CENTER'S TEN MILLION TUTORS PLAN

THE CRISIS IN READING

For many people in this nation the door to the whole world of knowledge, inspiration, self-development, and new insights available through the printed word has never opened. Nothing has replaced reading as the key to learning and yet one out of every four students nationwide has significant reading deficiencies and in large city school systems up to half of the students read below expectations. There are more than three million illiterates in our adult population and it is estimated that five million young job applicants annually require some remedial reading assistance before they can be trained for entry level jobs in business. To break this cycle will not only require the continued interest and work of the nation's schools through developmental reading programs, but also the help of many concerned and thoughtful citizens. A major effort to help remedy the problem is through the effective use of volunteer tutors in reading.

MOVING AGAINST THE CRISIS

The National Reading Council proposes to greatly expand the use of volunteer tutors to aid in improving reading skills throughout the country. Projected, this plan could involve as many as ten million tutors by 1976. While ten million volunteer tutors may at first appear unobtainable, the mobilization of our high school and college youth should contribute a substantial portion of the necessary manpower.

In addition, parents, people in business and many national organizations such as the Office of Voluntary Action, National School Volunteer Program, Inc., and hundreds of local organizations will be called upon to help. The concept of tutoring is not new and for the most part has been successful. Expanding the plan and providing the necessary training and the proper sustained mechanism to effectively use volunteer tutors to help large segments of our population must be strengthened.

A nationwide survey made by the United States Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, indicates a growing interest in activities of an educational nature for volunteer efforts. Authorities indicate paraprofessionals definitely have a role in teaching reading and a one-to-one tutoring arrangement can be effective. All evidence indicates that significant gains in reading accrue even when the "teacher" is neither fully nor professionally trained.

PARENTAL PARTICIPATION

With the importance of parental involvement in mind, the National Reading Council has had a primary goal in the development of materials to provide a range of experiences and situations through which a parent will grow accustomed to working with his child, not strictly in a tutorial function, nor as a surrogate teacher, but with the special enjoyment and pleasure of seeing himself as a resource to the child and in their activities together.

The creation of materials and guides for their use, directed toward the largest possible number of parents, should serve both to improve a child's receptiveness to knowledge and to increase parents' awareness of the signficance of the contribution they can make toward their child's future development. Parents of well over 18 million preschool children are the best motivated group to aid their children in reading readiness so essential to learning to read.

YOUTH TUTORING YOUTH

The recruiting of high school students and even junior high school students as tutors for low achieving elementary school pupils can contribute greatly to the manpower resources needed for successfully meeting the need for ten million tutors.

Research has shown that tutorial programs upgrade the reading skills of not only the pupil, but the tutor as well. There are some 22.3 million young people as a source of tutorial assistance for the large percentage of our 36.6 million elementary school pupils in urgent need for reading remediation. Several current national surveys of youth attitudes and values indicate they are concerned about local social issues and want to become actively involved in helping to resolve them.

STRENGTHENING THE WORK OF THE SCHOOLS

Efforts to increase the use of volunteers in school systems throughout the country must be viewed as supportive to these systems. Volunteers are offered to teachers and other professional educators as a means of releasing such professionals from nonprofessional functions. If volunteers can provide assistance to children with mild to moderate reading debilities, teachers and reading specialists can be freed to engage in essential diagnostic work and remedial programs for children with more severe reading difficulties who require extensive and professional therapy.

THE PROPOSED PROGRAM

The concept of increasing the role of volunteers to help with reading problems of school children and adults is feasible and can be expanded to fill the need for as many as ten million people by 1976. When people better understand the seriousness of reading disabilities in our nation and that they can help, the ranks of tutors will grow rapidly as citizens have always joined together to aid in resolving major social problems.

The plan being developed by the National Reading Council is as follows:

A steering committee has been appointed to help develop the plan in detail and guide it to the implementation stage.

The National Reading Council plans a cooperative effort to help the hundreds of organizations already involved in volunteer tutor work since there is a need for proper training materials and mechanism to sustain the effort. If an organization does not exist now, one or several can be developed in the local community. Materials developed by the National Reading Center will be made readily available to these organizations.

The National Reading Center will gather the existing body of knowledge on reading tutors and evaluate material that may contribute to this effort. Completing this task should not require much time since some work has already been done.

Develop material to be used by parents to provide reading readiness for their preschool children.

Materials will be developed by the National Reading Center to aid a school or a community to organize a volunteer tutor group. This will include how to recruit volunteers, how to administer, how to gain the support of the community and the schools.

An expansion of pre- and in-service training programs will be developed to insure maximum effectiveness of the tutor.

This will include concept films and a workshop program to acquaint volunteers with general tutorial procedures. The film series will be developed to provide immediate training to the more qualified volunteers, and will enable the tutorial effort to start at the earliest possible opportunity.

Wide scale assistance from the nation's colleges and universities will be requested to expedite the implementation of the workshop. This assistance will take the form of providing both personnel to train tutor trainers and facilities in which workshops could be held. A network of such training centers across the country will provide a location in proximity to many thousand potential tutors.

[From the Washington Post, Thursday, December 17, 1970]

TEN MILLION TUTORS SOUGHT

(By Gayle Tunnell)

Ten million volunteer tutors will be found, trained and equipped to work with poor readers on a one-to-one basis over the next six years, the National Reading Council has announced.

The Ten Million Tutors Plan is one of the first concrete proposals to emerge from the Nixon administration's intention to eliminate functional illiteracy among Americans by the end of the decade. The national "Right to Read" effort was announced over a year ago as a high-priority goal.

The plan calls for the National Reading Center, the council's working arm, to coor-

dinate public and private efforts to recruit and train volunteers and to develop appropriate teaching materials for them to use.

Walter W. Straley, chairman of the council, predicted that many of the nation's 18 million parents of pre-school children and 25 million college, high school and junior high students would volunteer "if we find ways to provide motivation, materials and training."

Using students as tutors is particularly appropriate, Straley said, because research shows that the great advantage goes to the tutor, while "the lesser, but still important advantage, goes to the tutee."

Although the volunteer tutoring plan is national in scope, there is special emphasis on District of Columbia schools. Council members spent yesterday morning at Truesdale Elementary School, 8th and Ingraham Sts., N.W., observing urban reading programs.

The National Reading Center hopes to at least double the estimated 250,000 to one million volunteers now at work by 1971, Straley said, reaching the 10-million goal by 1976. He said existing tutoring programs are hampered by a high dropout rate and by the fact that untrained volunteers are unwelcome in some schools.

According to Straley the Ten Million Tutors program could cost $50 million a year once 5 million to 10 million volunteers are involved. Funds would come from local and state, as well as federal, sources.

Organized to coordinate the "Right to Read" effort, the council received $1.5 million in federal funds this year. Straley said he would probably request $3 million next year.

The National Reading Center will work with the President's Office of Voluntary Action to set up 160 volunteer centers across the country and will coordinate tutoring efforts of more than 200 existing public and private organizations.

STRANGE VETO OF THE MANPOWER BILL

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto last week of the Employment and Manpower bill is yet another instance in the continuing series of ill-advised decisions by the administration. During this Congress, we have witnessed the rejection of the Office of Education Appropriations bill, the Hill-Burton Public Health Law Amendments, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill. And now the manpower bill has been vetoed.

When will the White House realize that the American people have demanded that our Nation's priorities be reordered? When will it become convinced that our country's internal problems have to be solved?

At this point, I would like to place in the RECORD an editorial concerning this latest administration veto which appeared on December 18 in the Washington Post for the consideration of the Membership:

STRANGE VETO OF THE MANPOWER BILL

President Nixon's veto of the employment and manpower bill is a strange sequel to his pull-together appeal in his news conference last Friday. At that time he said that, with the election over, he has a responsibility "to work with those men and those women elected by the people in 1970" and that he hoped Democrats and Republicans would work with him on future programs. But his veto probably kills a bill on which there was a large measure of compromise—a bill designed to aid the economic recovery in which he is so much interested.

The President rests his case on two chief complaints about the bill. First, he contends that, as finally passed, it would perpetuate and increase the "narrow categorical programs" which he wished to abolish in favor of "a single, broadly defined manpower program." Second, he says the bill is "completely unacceptable" because 44 per cent of the funds authorized would go for "deadend jobs in the public sector." The "WPA-type jobs," he says, would not expand individual opportunity but would "relegate large numbers of workers to permanent subsidized employment."

If these objections rested on solid ground, a veto would appear to be justified. But the President's view of the bill differs sharply from that of its sponsors. Instead of creating more uncoordinated programs, sponsors of the bill say, it would achieve about two-thirds of the consolidation the President requested. One estimate is that the bill would reduce the number of sponsors of manpower programs from 10,000 to possibly 400. The Senate refused to go all the way with the administration's proposed merger of manpower training programs under the authority of the states and cities, because it believed that there is still room for some innovative or demonstrative training programs on the federal level. It is difficult to find justification of the veto in this relatively minor deviation from the White House view.

Far more serious is the fear that the bill would subsidize make work of the type that was discredited during the great depression. But Congress built in substantial safeguards against any reversion to WPA days. The basic purpose of this section of the bill is to provide training for persons who could be usefully placed in state and local governmental jobs that are now filled. Many of these jobs are in hospitals, public recreation, sanitation service and so forth. In the past the unemployed have been trained for a great variety of jobs, but many have found nothing to do at the end of their training. Congress proposed to provide funds so that they could get some actual work experience in the public service, with the expectation that most of them would then graduate into private employment.

The Senate refused to compel a fixed quota of the trainees to move out of public jobs within a specified period. But it wrote several safeguards into the bill. The Secretary of Labor could reject any state or municipal plan lacking provisions for upgrading trainees and helping them to move on to better jobs. The bill as passed would also require an annual review of the situation, with power in the secretary to cut off funds for any program that might lapse into the WPA pattern.

Some of the language in the veto message raises a serious question as to whether the President fully understands what Congress was trying to do. It is a pity that he did not further scrutinize the bill with the help of Senator Javits or the U.S. Conference of Mayors, whose spokesmen were clamoring to be heard. Rumor has it that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity were also eager to have the bill signed.

If Congress fails to pass the bill over the President's veto, it seems probable that the controversy will flare up again in the tense political atmosphere of 1972 when the present Manpower Training Act expires. The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has indicated that it will have no time for manpower legislation in the 1971 session. An upset of this veto could in the end be an advantage to the President as well as to the unemployed who are looking for additional training and opportunities.

PLANNERS MUST RECOGNIZE THE NEEDS OF THE WEST

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker—

It has been said railroads built the West. It now can be said they should save the West. They will not if Washington planners do not recognize the needs of the West.

The words quoted above are from an editorial published recently in the McClatchy Press in California following the initial announcement regarding designation of a preliminary rail passenger system.

I feel very strongly that the system as now conceived fails to recognize the needs of some 35 million people living in the Pacific Coast States which represents one of the fastest growing areas in this Nation.

Though the preliminary system does have spokes eminating from a Chicago hub to Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Houston, and New Orleans, there is no rim on this western portion of the wheel. I have today urged Secretary Volpe to repair this oversight with a letter which follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 21, 1970.

Hon. JOHN A. VOLPE,
Secretary of Transportation, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In connection with the establishment of a basic national rail passenger system recently authorized by the 91st Congress, you set your goal as establishing a balanced surface and air transportation system for this Nation. I applaud this goal heartily.

I would concur completely in your statement: "I believe that Americans will ride the railroads in increasing numbers if they are given good, fast, clean, safe and efficient service between metropolitan centers. I also believe that we need rail passenger service, or else the congestion on our highways and in our airways will become intolerable."

The preliminary national rail passenger system set forth by you as a result of the legislation establishing the National Rail Passenger Service Corporation is, I believe, just that: "preliminary". I recognize that the initial system you designated is indeed a starting point and I would call upon you to expand this system prior to the time that you implement it after receiving the necessary comments.

The system now designated reaches approximately 105 million Americans according to your statement. I feel that necessary steps must also be taken to reach a substantial number of those omitted from your first proposal. Additionally, I feel that those 105 million to whom you refer are in many ways not adequately served.

Might I point out that a passenger desiring to go by rail from Houston to Los Angeles, for instance, can only do this by way of Chicago. To carry this further, the person going from Los Angeles to San Francisco or Seattle, again, can only do this by way of Chicago.

I would therefore suggest very emphatically that the broken spoke in your transportation wheel be mended and that the system be modified prior to its implementation to include service from New Orleans to Los Angeles by way of Houston, if you desire,

and service from San Diego to Los Angeles, San Francisco and Seattle.

Rails, as you well know, historically have played a tremendous role in the development of the West and our existing railroads are among the best in our Nation.

I would like to quote an editorial from the McClatchy Newspaper in California which, I believe, sums up the situation very well:

"It has been said railroads built the West. It now can be said they should save the West. They will not if Washington planners do not recognize the needs of the West."

Mr. Secretary, in conclusion, may I urge you to recognize the needs of the West and to expand the basic transportation system now before it is put into effect in order to provide the service to the millions of people residing in the Pacific Coast states, people whose needs were ignored in the original proposal.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD T. (BIZZ) JOHNSON,
Member of Congress.

Additionally, I would like to share with my colleagues some of the comments made by two of the leading newspapers of California, the McClatchy Press which publishes the Sacramento, Modesto, and Fresno Bees, and the Los Angeles Times.

I insert at this point first, the editorial from the Bee, and second, the comments from the Los Angeles Times:

NATIONAL RAIL NETWORK SHOULD INCLUDE BETTER SERVICE TO GROWING WEST COAST

The proposed national network of through-passenger railway service announced by Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe in Washington has a glaring omission. It does not include a north-south route on the West Coast, and of the 16 lines proposed 13 are oriented in the East and only three are suggested for the West.

Because the plan is just in the beginning stage it is important the north-south connection and Western interests be protected before it is too late. The route is needed now and will be even more necessary as the population and commerce in the West continue to grow.

The newly created national rail passenger corporation to administer the nation's passenger railroads should take into consideration the needs of the West as well as those of the East and Midwest.

Volpe has designated connections between San Francisco and Chicago, Los Angeles and Chicago and Seattle and Chicago. This is commendable, of course, but it does not take care of the need for routes from, say, San Diego to Seattle. Commerce on the West Coast does not go just one way—west-east.

There is another factor overlooked so far in Volpe's recommendations. It has not been decided whether to place Sacramento on the east-west line. It would be nothing short of criminal to bypass the Capital City of California in any new passenger railway proposal and to neglect the urgent needs of the valley cities.

Fortunately, California and other Western states congressmen have started a concerted effort to persuade the Nixon administration to pay more attention to this area.

Rep. John E. Moss of the 3rd, Sacramento County, District, a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which worked on the basic legislation intending to provide better rail passenger service, plans to place Western interests before Volpe.

Rep. Lionel Van Deerlin of San Diego pointed out in a House talk more than 40 million persons a year travel the corridor from San Diego and Los Angeles alone. Certainly this should be evidence enough to convince Volpe of the need for north-south considerations.

It has been said railroads built the West. It now can be said they should save the West. They will not if Washington planners do not recognize the needs of the West.

U.S. RAILROAD PLAN IS NOT ENOUGH

The proposal by Congress and the Administration to save what's left of the nation's rail passenger service may be too late. It certainly is too little.

As announced this week, the plan could have an adverse effect upon existing north-south service in California and along the entire West Coast. Los Angeles-Chicago and San Francisco-Chicago are the sole California routes initially included in the government-sponsored network.

Only 14 major U.S. cities would be linked by passenger lines in the system to be operated by a quasi-public corporation known as Railpax. More than half of the 366 passenger trains now in operation had to be dropped from the badly under-funded proposal.

"I wish the system could be bigger, more all-encompassing," said Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe. But to salvage diminishing passenger service and help deficit-ridden railroads, Congress provided a mere $40 million in grants plus another $300 million in loans and loan guarantees.

In contrast to the billions spent on subsidizing motor vehicle and air traffic, the money allocated to save passenger trains seems ridiculously low.

It can be argued that the railroads are primarily to blame for their loss of passengers. Since carrying freight is far more profitable, rail companies have allowed service on passenger trains to deteriorate or have abandoned the trains altogether.

The passenger train, though, is far too valuable a national resource to be allowed to die, particularly at a time when intercity airliners are crowding the skies and their passengers are jamming surface routes to and from airports. And intercity highways are also becoming increasingly crowded.

Trains can move people at comparable cost, with less air pollution, and more directly from downtown to downtown than can aircraft.

The Metroliner operating between New York and Washington is an example of fast, comfortable service that has generated ever-increasing patronage.

High-speed trains operating in the heavily traveled corridor between Los Angeles and San Francisco would certainly have passenger appeal. But under the initial Railpax plan, no provision is made for them or even for preserving the existing service.

Under the legislation enacted this year, railroads would be able to unload their passenger service by "buying" into Railpax, the National Railroad Passenger Corp., according to a formula based upon their passenger service deficits. An estimated $200 million, helped out by federal loans, would thus be raised to allow Railpax to purchase the railroads' equipment and to operate the limited number of routes.

Other intercity and interstate routes serving California were not included, a Transportation Department spokesman told The Times, "because the service wouldn't make money . . . not even reach a break-even point over a five-year period."

Yet there are a total of 7,483 miles of railroad track in California, and the Southern Pacific's commuter service along the San Francisco Peninsula carries almost 5.5 million passengers annually.

At least one member of the California Public Utilities Commission deplores the threatened extinction of rail passenger traffic within the state. "We must do everything possible," A. W. Gatov told The Times, "to maintain existing rail facilities so that mass transportation can effectively replace the motor vehicle monopoly of surface travel."

The Times concurs.

We believe that Congress must invest more money in preserving and improving rail passenger service, if we are to achieve a rational transportation policy for the nation.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM G. COLMAN—AN OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would not want this session of the Congress to end without expressing my great admiration and appreciation of William G. Colman's outstanding service as executive director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Bill Colman served in this capacity from the time the ACIR began functioning, shortly after its creation by the Congress through Public Law 86-380 in late 1959, until his retirement early this year.

Under Bill's leadership during these first 10 years, ACIR developed from a fledgling organization into a widely respected agency whose excellent research and policy guidance has had a marked effect on all levels of government—Federal, State, and local.

When he was selected by the commission to direct its operations, Bill Colman had already distinguished himself in several public service careers.

Immediately before and after active service with the U.S. Navy in World War II, Bill established and administered personnel systems for the State governments of Missouri, Louisiana, and Oregon. Next Bill turned his talents to our foreign aid programs and served successively as public administration adviser to the Greek Government, a deputy director in the Economic Cooperation Administration, and acting chief of the ECA Mission to Korea.

Following a period of executive service with the Federal Civil Defense Administration and later with the Office of Defense Mobilization, in 1954 Colman became assistant director of research for the Kestnbaum commission. That temporary body, officially named the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, was established by Congress, at President Eisenhower's request, to make the first official comprehensive study of our Federal system since the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

After the Kestnbaum commission completed its assignment in 1955, Bill went to the National Science Foundation as a consultant. He was the executive assistant to the NSF director when ACIR in effect drafted him to head up the new organization.

As a member of the ACIR selection committee set up to screen candidates and nominate a director, I can testify that in the course of interviewing many highly qualified candidates, the committee was most favorably impressed not only with Bill Colman's impressive background, but also with his great potential.

Our good judgment as well as our good fortune in recruiting him was more than

vindicated by Bill's imaginative and skillful performance. Retirement from Federal employment, as those who know him would expect, has not meant the traditional rocking chair for Bill. As a consultant to public and nonprofit organizations, a university lecturer, and a member of the Montgomery County School Board, I am certain that he works at least as many hours as before "retirement." I am most pleased that the public has not lost his valuable services, and I wish Bill Colman well in all of his future undertakings.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point the resolution which was adopted by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations at its December 19, 1969, meeting in recognition of Bill Colman's many contributions and devoted service.

WILLIAM G. COLMAN

Whereas Bill Colman has been the first and only Executive Director during the ACIR's ten year existence; and

Whereas in this period the American federal system has undergone turmoil unparalleled in the past 100 years, challenging the fledgling ACIR in a manner that could never have been foreseen by its Congressional fathers but testifying to the wisdom of their bringing this organization into being at this critical time; and

Whereas the ACIR in these formative years has met this challenge with considerable success as measured by:

The volume and excellence of its published reports,

The number of its policy recommendations put into effect by Federal, State, and local governments,

The relevance of those reports and recommendations to the critical issues of the day,

The rising demand for advice and consultation by Commission members and staff, and

The complimentary references to the Commission's work by governmental officials, mass media, learned journals, and public commentators of all varieties; and

Whereas this enviable reputation is testimony to the high caliber of Commission members past and, in all modesty, present and their dedication to the mission of the Commission, to the moral and financial support of the Federal Executive Branch and the Congress, and to the unwavering loyalty, attention, and understanding of the national associations of State and local officials; and

Whereas every governmental commission leans heavily on its staff for assistance and support in the day-to-day pursuit of its objectives and rises or falls to considerable extent on the quality of its staff; and

Whereas Bill Colman has served this Commission superbly by recruiting, molding, and directing the ACIR staff with a unique combination of energy, inspirational leadership, unrivaled knowledge of Federal, State, and local governments, imaginative approaches to intergovernmental issues, uncanny sensitivity to the multitude of personal and political forces that shape this complex field, and unsurpassed skill and pungency with the spoken and written word; and

Whereas Bill has built warm personal friendships with many Commission members, present and past over the years; and

Whereas—to our regret—Bill has elected to retire from government service at the end of this year;

Now therefore be it resolved that the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations wholeheartedly commends and thanks Bill Colman for a job superbly done over the past ten years in setting this organization firmly on course, extends to him its profound wish for continuing success in whatever career he chooses to follow hereafter, and hopes that as ex-Executive Director he will continue to give the Commission the benefit of his wisdom, counsel and friendship as the circumstances permit, which we hope will be often.

Done at Washington, D.C., this 19th day of December, 1969.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION, DECEMBER 19, 1969

Robert E. Merriam, Chairman.

Richard G. Lugar, Vice Chairman.

From the United States Senate: Sam J. Ervin, Jr., North Carolina; Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota; Edmund S. Muskie, Maine.

From the United States House of Representatives: Florence P. Dwyer, New Jersey; L. H. Fountain, North Carolina; Al Ullman, Oregon.

From the Federal Executive Branch: Robert H. Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Robert P. Mayo, Director of the Bureau of the Budget; George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Governors: Buford Ellington, Tennessee; Warren E. Hearnes, Missouri; Nelson A. Rockefeller, New York; Raymond P. Shafer, Pennsylvania.

State Legislators: Senator W. Russell Arrington, Illinois; Senator B. Mahlon Brown, Nevada; Senator Robert P. Knowles, Wisconsin.

County Officials: John F. Dever, Middlesex County, Massachusetts; Edwin G. Michaelian, Westchester County, New York; Lawrence K. Roos, St. Louis County, Missouri.

Mayors: C. Beverly Briley, Nashville, Tennessee; Richard G. Lugar, Indianapolis, Indiana; Jack Meltester, San Leandro, California; William F. Walsh, Syracuse, New York.

Public Members: Howard H. Callaway, Georgia; Dorothy I. Cline, New Mexico; Robert E. Merriam, Illinois.

THE RIGHT TO LIFE

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Thomas J. Watson, Jr., chairman of the board of IBM in the following article recalls his opposition to national health insurance some 21 years ago and gives sound arguments in behalf of this program today:

REMARKS BY THOMAS J. WATSON, JR.

I have become increasingly appalled to read of a country which during the past two decades has dropped from seventh in the world to sixteenth in the prevention of infant mortality; in female life expectancy from sixth to eighth; in male life expectancy from tenth to twenty-fourth; and which has bought itself this unenviable trend by spending more of its gross national product for medical care—$1 out of every $14—than any other country on the face of the earth.

The country I am talking about is our own U.S.A., the home of the free, the home of the brave, and the home of a decrepit, inefficient, high-priced system of medical care.

I know experts disagree over our precise international standings. I realize that medical problems here and abroad are not identical. I know American medicine has scored many brilliant triumphs.

But on the evidence, we are clearly moving in the wrong direction; failing to fulfill adequately for all our people the first right set down in the Declaration of Independence—the right to life.

How do we extend coverage for medical bills to everyone? By stretching the umbrella of private health insurance which still doesn't come close to covering Americans today? No. We need a far more thoroughgoing reform.

That brings us up against an old taboo "socialized medicine." I completely believe in the American free enterprise system. But when the system fails to produce I think we should not flinch from looking to some sort of government intervention.

That, in American medicine today, means some new form of national health insurance.

What must we do to restore that right?

First, as the Carnegie Commission said in October, we have to beef up our arsenal: Train more doctors, more nurses, more paramedics; bail our medical and dental schools out of their deep financial troubles; break ground for new hospitals and clinics; in a word, spend more money.

Second, we must have better management, better organization, more efficiency.

I find it shocking to read of legal roadblocks against comprehensive prepaid group practice, which has repeatedly delivered better care at lower costs; of slums without a doctor; of highly trained medical corpsmen who, if they want to enter medicine as a civilian career, find just one job open to them—hospital orderly.

We cannot continue to live with facts like these.

Third, we must put health care within reach of every American.

Under our present system, the poor—especially the non-white poor—suffer by far the most. Non-whites have a life expectancy six years shorter than whites; twice the whites' infant mortality.

Twenty-one years ago President Truman urged a national health system. In 1949, as a dyed-in-the-wool free enterpriser, I accepted the argument, that we didn't need it. But I cannot accept that argument in 1970.

A variety of health insurance bills have been introduced in the Congress. But no comprehensive plan appears to be moving very fast. We do not need national health insurance as a political football in 1972. We need a new national health insurance law. I hope the Administration will put this at the top of its priority list for 1971.

To get that legislation, the partisans of varying plans—in the Congress, the American Medical Association, the A.F.L.-C.I.O.—must get together. To speed such compromise, I believe all of us as citizens should start now to build a bonfire of persuasion—to speak out, to demand change, and not stop until we get the legislation we need.

We can take pride in our system of universal public education, social security, and work laws.

The time has now arrived for us to have a system of universal public medicine to do for us what the Scandinavian and British systems have done for those countries: Put them medically at the top of the world.

We must bring the fullness of American medical care to all the American people. As the greatest nation in the world I believe we can do no less.

Thomas J. Watson Jr. is chairman of the board of International Business Machines. These remarks are excerpted from a speech delivered in Rochester, Minn., on the Mayo Foundation's Industry Day.

THE SPEAKER'S MOTHER, MARY ELLEN, "HAD EVERY INFLUENCE ON ME"

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the Members of the Congress a very well written article that appeared in the Sun-

day Star here in Washington D.C., by Donnie Radcliffe, Star staff writer.

The article follows:

THE SPEAKER'S MOTHER, MARY ELLEN, "HAD EVERY INFLUENCE ON ME"

"The Speaker is the hub of the whole Congress, not just the House. It's hard to beat him on anything."

Rep. Carl Albert, D-Okla, Majority Leader.

(By Donnie Radcliffe)

House Speaker John W. McCormack insisted on no bodyguards during the 14 months he was separated from the Presidency by only Lyndon Johnson's heartbeat.

His reason: not inflated bravery but concern for the Constitution's sacred division of power.

"I was Speaker of the House of Representatives and under the Constitution occupied the No. 1 legislative position. While I was next in line of succession, if I permitted the Executive branch to give me protection I was by indirection, at least, enabling the Executive branch to absorb to some extent the Legislative branch of government."

The 78-year-old Massachusetts Democrat remembered the incident vividly as he reminisced at his desk on the eve of retirement after 42 years in the House.

ARTFUL DEVICE

"It was an artful device," he said, "but it was correct, too."

He racalled how the day after President John F. Kennedy's assassination he telephoned the heads of the Secret Service and Federal Bureau of Investigation demanding that they call off their men who, as an aide put it, "had come out the walls" the moment the news had reached Washington.

The night of the shooting Mrs. McCormack reported to the Speaker she thought there were federal agents next door to their suite in the Washington Hotel.

The following morning, noticing the neighboring door ajar, the tall, white-haired McCormack looked in, saw three men and dispensing with the customary amenities asked them point blank if they were with the Secret Service or FBI.

They told him they were, one with the FBI and two with the Secret Service.

"I said 'I don't want any protection' and they said they had to, they were ordered."

To McCormack's quick mind, there was nothing in the law providing protection to the President and Vice President that said the Speaker had to be protected as well.

"If I had been Vice President," he said, throwing up his hands, "I would have had to obey."

"When he leaves the speakership, it will be the end of an era," a colleague once said. "Lyndon Johnson will be the last President born in a log cabin and McCormack will be the last Speaker who didn't attend high school."

Born in South Boston 79 years ago tomorrow, John William McCormack was one of 12 children (nine died at an early age). He was 13 years old when his stonemason father Joseph McCormack died.

They lived in the poor Irish Catholic community of Bay View, paying $1.50 a week rent—"we couldn't pay more, we couldn't get anything less."

With his father gone, John became head of the family earning $3.50 a week as an errand boy for a curb exchange stockbroker. On Sundays, he and his brothers Edward ("Knocko") and Daniel earned $8-$10 a week delivering newspapers.

"It enabled that wonderful mother of ours to keep us together."

Mary Ellen McCormack "had every influence on me—she still does today." As neighborhood confidante and adviser, his mother was "better educated probably than most of the others" who lived around them.

"She implanted in me character which is so important in the life of every individual."

Even as a youngster, John McCormack was an avid student of government. The day he obtained his first library card was a milestone in his life.

"I'd attend all kinds of rallies, some were violent demonstrations against women's suffrage." And the "strong, wild utterances" against giving women the vote perplexed him.

"I'd go back and look at that wonderful mother of mine and I'd say 'who dares tell me my dear mother couldn't vote better than most men in the community?' That settled the question for me when I was 13 years old."

To a youngster surrounded by poverty "the challenge was there" if only on the printed pages of Horatio Alger and Dick and Frank Meriwell.

"In those days novels were five cents apiece. I couldn't buy a five-cent novel so I used to swap second-hand ones. And I wouldn't swap a novel unless I got a Dick or Frank Merriwell that I hadn't read."

Horatio Alger was "inspirational—he overcomes great difficulty"—and even today John McCormack believes that such books should be "a must through the period of puberty and adolescence."

"It's the small matters that constitute turning points in the lives of so many persons," McCormack continued, lighting up a cigar. "Something happens at the time, you don't attach any significance to it, but as years go by you realize . . ."

For John McCormack, with only a grammar school education, the "turning point" was a job offering 50 cents more a week as errand boy in a law office.

"If the stockbroker's office had offered me $4 a week, I'd have stayed there. I'd probably have been a court officer or something, active in politics, you know. But the broker's office failed about a year later."

At $4 a week in Will T. Way's law firm, McCormack began studying law—"hard? yes, tough? yes"—in the way lawyers often were trained.

"I was determined to give that dear mother of mine the living she was entitled to—that was part of my stimulation, ever-carrying-on determination to attain my ambition."

At the age of 21, by then making $7 a week, he passed the bar.

"Two members of the feminine sex have played vitally important parts in my life—my dear mother and Mrs. McCormack, my wife," said the Speaker.

In 1920, young McMormack married Harriet Joyce of South Boston, a petite, blue-eyed lass whose "rich contralto voice—just like an organ"—had won her a contract with the Metropolitan Opera Co.

It was love at first sight—"no question about it"—when they met at a friend's house. And though he professes not to know how he did it, he persuaded her to give up her career to marry him.

Now ill in Providence Hospital where he is with her every evening, Mrs. McCormack has never been far from his side in their 50 years of marriage.

They did not go in for socializing, appearing at receptions and dinners only on rare occasions during their 42 years in Washington.

"Mrs. McCormack and I have led the life that we believe in, that we both wanted," said McCormack whose lifelong abstinence from alcoholic beverages is another Washington wonder.

"I have a fixed policy throughout my entire life that I never take a drink before 9 o'clock," he said he told a friend who offered him a drink a few years ago.

"After pausing a little, I smilingly said 'And after that it's too late.' The friend started to smile and I said to myself 'John, why didn't you think of this before?' "

The McCormacks' secret to a successful marriage was "no secret."

"We have always remained sweethearts."

He has depended upon her for companionship, encouragement and even, at times, advice.

"Not that I'm vain or anything," he told the photographer as he pulled out his comb, "but Mrs. McCormack says when you have your picture taken 'comb your hair'."

Proud of his wife's talents both as a painter and a singer, he said she sometimes sang to him when they were alone, including a particular favorite, "Mighty Like a Rose."

While the rest of official Washington might be party-hopping at night, the McCormacks would be keeping each other company.

She might watch television and he would write "sometimes 5, 10 or as many as 20" handwritten letters, something he called "a controlling influence on my nervousness to work—the nervousness of inactivity."

The first two years I was in the House, while I participated in some debates, I more or less devoted my time to watching the older members perform . . . I was the beneficiary of John Garner and Sam Rayburn and I didn't know they were noticing me."

From the Massachusetts legislature where he served in both houses, McCormack came to Washington in 1928 to fill an unexpired term of the late Rep. James A. Gallivan and the next regular term.

"I studied the rules of the House—I've been studying them ever since, matter of fact."

He did not limit himself to that and remembers well his first speech in February, 1929, urging repeal of the National Origins Clause which finally was repealed 40 years later.

The Democratic leadership had been watching the freshman congressman from Massachusetts.

"As we do—the leadership—now observe new members and form an opinion as to the type of members they are, whether they are just going to be one who plays to the public or take their work seriously, and whether they are going to contribute in a team manner to party action or not."

Fledgling Congressman McCormack asked John Nance Garner, about to become speaker, to help him get on the Judiciary Committee and was told—to his surprise—that the leadership had him earmarked for Ways and Means.

So he reminded Garner, politely of course, that "you have to be elected to Ways and Means in a Democratic caucus."

He wasn't asking for any commitment, he said, but if Garner would just "sort of blow your nose at me, I'll get the hint."

Garner told him to get the head of the Massachusetts delegation to send out letters of support to all the members, and "I knew that I had gotten more than his nose blown at me."

It led, of course, to lifelong friendships ("We were more than just colleagues") with Garner, later the vice president, and Sam Rayburn, McCormack's predecessor as speaker.

Rayburn's Texas delegation had been the first to vote unanimously for McCormack in his bid for Ways and Means and McCormack became the first Democrat ever elected to that powerful committee with only one full term of service.

"I don't mind being a candidate," the Speaker continued, "but when I'm a candidate I want to win."

McCormack only lost one election during his 50 years in politics, that one in 1926 when he tried to win the Democratic nomination for Congress away from Incumbent Jim Gallivan.

The idea that he had run only a token race, not really expecting to win, may still rankle him.

"I wasn't one of those who run to take a licking or two in order to win later on," he said.

Once in Congress, he rose from freshman legislator to Democratic whip, majority leader and in 1962, speaker.

"I was a Democrat, I supported Democratic measures . . ." was the credo he built his career upon.

A year ago, after published reports that his administrative assistant Martin Sweig and a New York lawyer Nathan Voloshen had used McCormack's office for unauthorized purposes, McCormack characteristically announced he would seek re-election.

But those close to him said he had decided a year or so earlier that he would not run in 1970. He announced his change of mind earlier this year "when the timing was right in Massachusetts," according to an aide.

"Mr. Speaker," interrupted an aide, "they're almost finished in the well, sir."

McCormack snubbed his cigar in an ashtry, bounded out of his swivel chair and strode across the room, pausing beneath the crystal chandelier that reportedly once hung in the White House but whose tinkling on breezy days annoyed Theodore Roosevelt so much that he ordered it removed.

"I don't like the word 'reminisce,'" McCormack kiddingly scolded, the now-familiar scowl wrinkling his forehead. "I'm still looking to the future."

Then disappearing through the door, the 45th speaker of the House, the first Roman Catholic in that post and the first in history ever to retire from it, thundered:

"Fifty cents a week—amazing!"

A DAY WE TURNED OUR BACKS

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been justifiably outraged over the inexcusable action that took place on the Coast Guard cutter *Vigilant*. People of all ideologies can concur that America must forever remain a bastion of freedom, with her arms open to the oppressed who cry out. I believe the following editorial sums up the matter very succinctly:

A DAY WE TURNED OUR BACKS

President Nixon was reported to have been "outraged" over the conduct of those who permitted a would-be Lithuanian defector to be forcibly removed by Soviet seamen from a U.S. Coast Guard cutter Nov. 23.

There was little in the official reports on the incident yesterday from the two governmental agencies involved to mollify either the President or any American citizen proud of our nation's history and traditions—of the very fact that America was colonized and founded as a sanctuary for those fleeing from Old World political oppression and persecution.

The incident occurred as the U.S. Coast Guard cutter Vigilant and a Soviet trawler were moored together off New England. A luckless Lithuanian radio operator aboard the Russian vessel, Simas Kudirka, 35, leaped aboard the Vigilant and begged for political asylum.

Several hours later, incredibly, Soviet seamen were permitted to come aboard the U.S. ship, search out the hiding Kudirka, and—according to witnesses—beat, kick and drag him back to the Soviet trawler. U.S. Coast Guardsmen reportedly stood by without interfering, despite the man's pleas on bended knees for help.

The gist of one official report yesterday, from Secretary John A. Volpe of the Transportation Department—which administers the Coast Guard—was that "before this incident the Coast Guard had not received from the State Department guidance as to general policy with regard to defectors."

The official State Department report based most of its own defense on alleged confusion over just what was taking place aboard the Vigilant, and when. The State Department report did acknowledge that some time after being notified the incident was in progress it in turn informed the Coast Guard "that the possible defector should not be encouraged and noted the possibility of a possible provocation."

What, if anything, the official explanations have explained remains a mystery.

Why any American, particularly a military officer—as Secretary Volpe suggests—should require "guidance as to general policy" on whether to unhesitatingly grant at least temporary asylum to a man pleading for a chance at freedom, is an even deeper mystery.

"Mother of Exiles" is the name Emma Lazarus gave to the Statue of Liberty in her famous sonnet, and it fits. Through the years, the United States has welcomed thousands of foreigners fleeing persecution in their native lands. Most recently, they have included thousands upon thousands of refugees fleeing persecution in Nazi Germany, Communist Hungary and Fidel Castro's Cuba.

If America means anything to oppressed people the world over, it means that somewhere in this world—although perhaps practicably unreachable—a place does exist where hope and freedom awaits them.

Simas Kudirka dared to reach out for that promise and had it in his grasp, only to see it wrenched back again through the indifference and inaction of a simpering bureaucracy whose apparent first concern was to caution against "a possible provocation" and whose last concern apparently was the history and tradition of a proud nation which once was able to boast to the entire world that it was the land of the free and the home of the brave.

PRIDE OF COMMUNITY

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, there are many ways in which we can contribute to the welfare of our Nation, and the continuance of our democratic way of life, and not the least of them is by buying U.S. savings bonds.

A very good friend of mine, now deceased, who was an outstanding citizen of our community came to this country from Denmark, worked hard and became a financial success. His one complaint to me during the war was that Americans did not buy enough savings bonds and, that in order to sell them, the Government had to pay interest on the money. He felt that our democratic form of government was the responsibility of all of the people and that we should all share in its support.

He was right but, fortunately, the Government does not demand this sacrifice of us and it does pay interest on the money we lend it.

I would like to include, as a part of these remarks, the following statement, which points up the importance of purchasing savings bonds:

PRIDE OF COMMUNITY

Abraham Lincoln said—"I like to see a person proud of the community in which he lives. And I also like to see someone living in such a way that his community is proud of him."

There is a long honor roll of distinguished volunteers who power the public-service programs of the American society. And, when the subject is U.S. Savings Bonds, volunteers are first to tell you that, as good Americans—"The Most We Can Buy Is The Least We Can Do!"

Most of us are proud that we are Americans. We like to brag about being "100-percent Americans". But, these are times for greater pride, extra effort—if we are to preserve our rights to enjoy the fruits of freedom.

When it comes to supporting and preserving a stable economy, there's no more certain way than signing up for the Payroll Savings Plan, where you work, or the Bond-A-Month Plan, where you bank.

What better proof of the brag about being top-side citizens. We might even wind up convincing ourselves that we're "100-plus-percent Americans"—the plus being the percentage that we put into Savings Bonds.

Of course, they are our own hedge against inflation—as they also aid the government in its management of our fiscal affairs. Plus—and a big one—the safety and security with which they help to stabilize our personal and family future.

Volunteers may feel that they are walking in the footsteps of the "Minute Men", who long ago earned a place of high honor in our history. In the war for our independence, they were the patriots who were ready to rise to arms—at a moment's notice—to defend their homes and their fledgling freedom.

Today, modern "Minute Men" maintain a special meaning for the Department of the Treasury and its Savings Bonds Program. They are the volunteers—like the valiant leaders of banking, business, labor, media and the professions in my great state of California—who promote and increase the sale of U.S. Savings Bonds.

I salute their enlightened self-interest and their distinguished public service. I encourage citizens of my state and every state to add to their brag about being "100-percent Americans".

The very act of becoming volunteers demonstrates Lincoln's concept of pride in community. The respect returned for jobs well done is pride expressed by the community in its volunteers. The roll is long; the record is clear!

And, remember—no one ever gets back one penny less than the amount that he puts into U.S. Savings Bonds. Where else can you find that kind of guarantee, with interest? And the interest is now 5½ percent—when held to maturity of 5 years and 10 months—when the half percent is added as a bonus for your prudence.

DRUG ABUSE

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with the House the recent initiative of a St. Louis teen magazine to deal with drug abuse in our area.

During the past few months, Prom magazine, which is published by Miller Publications of St. Louis, has featured a monthly series illustrating the disastrous effects that drugs have had on several St. Louis young men and women,

Julian H. Miller II, publisher of Prom magazine, outlined the intent of this series in a recent editorial. He stated:

Many teenagers will accept and respect the facts that they receive from adults who are qualified to advise or inform young people about drugs. But some people, especially those who are rebellious or inclined toward drugs will not pay attention to "adult advice" from the so-called Establishment.

Who will they pay attention to? Mostly, they will pay attention only to other young people who were, themselves, rebellious and who actually have used drugs, because they can "identify" with those people. They realize that those young people know the good and the bad about drugs, from their own real "personal experiences". And if those writers can, in addition, be local students or drop-outs or recent graduates from our own St. Louis Area schools, writing under their real names and pictures, that is the most "relevant" of all—and that is what most local young people say they want to read, concerning the possible specific dangers of using and abusing certain drugs, and of getting further involved in the "drug culture".

Also, most young people want to read it privately, alone or with friends, not face it in a public lecture where "peer pressure" makes it difficult to accept or admit or react affirmatively.

I commend this outstanding publication to my colleagues, and I offer for insertion in the RECORD the following personal accounts of Miss Helen Petty and Mr. Tom McGowan, two young St. Louis Countians:

MY 6 MONTHS IN JAIL IN ST. LOUIS

(By Helen Petty)

(NOTE.—Helen Petty went to a junior high school in Affton and to O'Fallon Technical High School in St. Louis but she dropped out in her junior year "because I was doing drugs and lost interest in school". After several years of "problems", including illnesses and arrests, Helen entered Forest Park Community College.)

I started on drugs when I was 14. I didn't really plan to, I mean I didn't go looking for them, but they found me. A boy I knew who was older, he was 15, was selling amphetaamines, uppers, to kids.

The first time I took anything it was not because I decided to "do drugs" it was just because I wanted to stay up all night with some people who were having a party, so I took two bennies. They really didn't do anything to me but then the next time, I started on dexedrine capsules, and they kept me "up" for a pretty long time. I got into the habit and kept on taking dexies and whites (bennies) and other amphetamines for years.

At first, the main trouble I would have from the uppers was that whenever I would stop I would be pretty tired and would sleep all the time and you get kind of crabby.

I LOST 30 POUNDS

But when I ran into the real problem was when I started shooting meth-amphetamine, speed. I lost 30 pounds and I was down to 80 pounds when I got busted. But after a while your body becomes accustomed to it, and instead of feeling "up" and running around, your exhaustion replaces the effect of the high, which is a real bummer, and I slept constantly. It was hard to get up and eat. You can't even make it out of bed and everything's in sort of a haze, a real rundown feeling. It's hard to believe but I used to fall asleep like right in the middle of a sentence.

The only thing that finally got me off amphetamines was when I got busted, and that was a year ago, in November 1969.

FORGED PRESCRIPTIONS

It happened because the huge amounts of amphetamine which I was using were hard to get so, you know, you start trying the forged prescription bit.

A girlfriend of mine from Olivette and myself went to pick up a refill on a phony prescription that I had gotten about two weeks before. It was at a discount store on Page, in Pagedale. We went into the store to pick it up and the County Police were there and they busted us for attempting to obtain a stimulant drug by fraud, because it was a fraudulent prescription.

The police took my girlfriend and me to the County Police station in Clayton and we were booked and searched and put in the holdover for 20 hours. They found pills in the bottom of my purse. I had a prescription for them but I didn't have it with me and they weren't in a prescription bottle. They charged me with illegal possession of a stimulant drug.

The next day my mother got me out on bond in the county, but a week later I was busted again—this time it was in the City of St. Louis—with a boy who graduated from Ladue High School and who was going to Forest Park Community College.

He had telephoned our "prescription" to a drugstore down in South St. Louis and then we went down there and I went in, paid for the prescription, walked outside, then I saw a police car. It was unmarked but I realized who it was and I threw the stuff away, but I didn't get it far enough away. I jumped in our car and I told the boy to drive off, but the police car blocked us and arrested us. The druggist had telephoned the police because he didn't believe it was a "doctor" who phoned it in.

"ILLEGAL POSSESSION"

So they had us for illegal possession of a drug. I was taken downtown to Central Booking and then they put me in the St. Louis city jail. My mother wouldn't go the bond, not because she couldn't afford it or anything like that, but she figured if I got out again I would probably run off to California—and she was probably right. She didn't want me to go to California at that time because I was on bond, and if I ran off, that would be "jumping bond", and she would lose her property that she had put up for my bond. So she let me stay there, in the St. Louis Municipal Jail, downtown on 14th Street.

I stayed there for six months, and let me tell you that was an "experience" you never forget.

THREE-YEAR PROBATION

After the six months in jail, I was granted probation and they let me out on May 15, 1970, and I am now on three-year probation. That means I have to report once a month for three years to the State Board of Probation and Parole downtown where I talk to my probation officer about an hour every month. I have to tell him what I have been doing and it's all kind of a hassle.

Maybe some kids wonder what jail is really like for a girl. Well it's pretty frightening. You get in there and you come upstairs on the elevator, and that's it—maximum security.

All the women are kept on the 6th floor and when you get there you enter this cage. Well there's really two rooms in the cage. One is the bedroom and when I was there, there were 28 girls and women and we all slept in the one room which was the bedroom. But every morning they woke us up at 6 a.m. and by 6:30 a.m. we all had to be out of the bedroom and into the other room. They locked the bedroom door at 6:30 a.m. so you can't go back into it until night. All day the 28 of us sat in the one room. They had tables and chairs and that's all. You can't really call it a "room" because, you know, it was more like a cage. It looked like a cage with wire mesh walls and you couldn't get near any windows at any time because they were high and separated by a catwalk, for security.

There was nothing but chairs and tables. You just sit there all day long. There was no privacy at all. There were open toilets right there, with just a little curtain.

You have absolutely nothing to do but sit at the tables, and you almost go crazy just sitting there. They've got books but they're mostly, I don't know, from about 1930. Religious novels and things like that. Nobody up there reads at all. Maybe you write a letter or you have a newspaper.

WILD FEMALES SCREAMING

There were just too many people in too close quarters and that caused tension and a lot of fights.

The fights there are really unbelievable. You will be sitting there and all of a sudden you'd hear crash, bang, and when you turn around you see one girl hitting another one with a chair or a pitcher. And some of those girls, you know, are pretty strong and rough. And then it would be mass hysteria, a bunch of wild females screaming. They said it was worse on the men's floor below and at the workhouse—they had stabbings and things like that.

And there's stealing. It's jail money and that's the only kind of money you are allowed to have. It's made of plastic and you can use it once a day when they come up to the cage with things like toothpaste.

Some of those women have been in jails or prisons all their lives. They started when they were teenagers, and some of them don't know anything else. Some of them are really weird and it looked like some of them should be in mental hospitals. It was unbelievable. People kicking the habit all around you, and other people just ignoring it because they are so used to it because they have been in jail before.

TERRIBLY LONELY

I guess really the worst part about being in jail for me was how I felt terribly lonely and all alone in the world, although surrounded by constant noise and strange people. I just can't describe the feeling and when I try to think back about it, it just seems like it was another world, but I can't forget it because they could put me in the penitentiary for years if I violate my probation.

At first I cried most of the time. You're so lost. You're completely uprooted and, you know, you are in such a strange environment. You haven't got anything in common with anyone else in there and you don't even have your own clothes or anything. For the first three months I used to just sit and cry—it seemed like all day and most of the night. Just totally lost.

Then after the first few weeks you get kind of resentful like "What do they think they're doing, putting me in here".

During my six months in jail, the only time I had any contact at all with the regular world was every Thursday, for a few minutes, when my mother came to visit me. She was the only visitor I ever had because you are not allowed to have any visitors except a parent or brother or sister.

And those weren't really what you would call visits. I could hardly see her because prisoners are not allowed outside of the cage, and visitors naturally are not allowed in. So you could only see her through this little glass plate that's in the wire screen wall and there was a tiny wood grill that you try to talk through. You can't see your visitor very well through all that, and there is no privacy.

I WAS HYSTERICAL

The first few Thursdays when my mother came to visit I kept screaming "get me out of here". I was hysterical and I was so scared I was shaking. The other women prisoners just laughed or ignored me, like they saw the same thing before.

When my mother saw me like that the first few weeks, she cried. I guess it really

hurt her to see me in jail, and it used to break her up when I screamed and begged her to get me out. But she knew she couldn't do it because she knew I would skip town and bust my bond and then I could get sent off to a penitentiary for a long time.

The saddest case in jail was a pregnant girl who was 7½ months and she was kicking a habit. She had been on methadone because of heroin addiction. Her husband was downstairs in the men's part of the jail, a habitual criminal, being sent away for eight years. And here she is, stuck in City Jail, waiting to finish a 90-day sentence for something, and her baby was due in a month or two, and she is kicking a habit. I got out before she was due, so I don't know what happened to her.

CHRISTMAS IN JAIL

The saddest day for me during my six months in jail was Christmas Day last year. What happened on Christmas? Nothing. That's what made it so sad.

You knew it was Christmas—because you had a calendar on the wall and there were newspapers. And also you could hear the special church bells from a few blocks away at some church downtown.

But in our little cage, there was no party, no nothing.

Oh yeah, they did give us each something for Christmas—an apple.

It was really depressing, you know.

We used to have three meals a day but on holidays and Sundays we only had two meals, because the people who worked in the kitchen had a shorter shift on Sundays and holidays.

Some of the girls in jail with me said there were bugs and roaches in other jails they'd been in, and they said they used to find hair and stuff like that in the food but I didn't see anything that bad here.

BEANS, BEANS, BEANS

The food is all pretty bad compared to what you are used to at home or even school. It's always the same and it's pretty watered down. They're on a small budget. They constantly gave us some sort of beans, at least once every day, like baked beans, lima beans, butter beans, red beans, black-eyed-peas, barbeque beans, bean soup, chile beans.

The coffee is black, no cream, no sugar. They never serve milk. You could buy milk when the commissary comes up once a day if you have enough money, but you can't buy sugar.

There isn't any hot water in the sinks. The only hot water is in the shower. There was no privacy in the shower except it had a sort of curtain like the toilets.

One thing that kids or anybody who's never been in jail don't seem to realize is the fact that you can never go outside. You're up on the sixth floor of the City Jail, and you're not going off the sixth floor. There's no way. You never go out. That's for security. There's just people, and mostly the kind of people you don't want to be with.

THEIR SIDELINES

And they are all "recruiting" for their sidelines. The hustlers want to teach you how to be a hustler and the shoplifters want to teach you how to shoplift and the pushers want to teach you how to deal. I must have gotten more "contacts" in City Jail than I did in two years on the street.

Some girl kept talking to me about burglarizing. She wanted me to be a burglar with her when we got out.

When you go into jail, if you were used to being pampered around home like by your mother—forget it. Nobody pays any attention to you or what you want.

And there is lesbianism in jails, and that causes more fights.

And you're not allowed to have your own clothing at all. You just wear this little green thing. They're old, and some of them are almost worn out and they have holes in them and usually they hang down to the floor.

And any boy with long hair who gets into jail, he better be ready to fight. Sometimes we used to even hear it at night, we were on the sixth floor, and the men were on the fifth and below.

LONG HAIR

A boy with long hair who goes to any jail is probably going to be in fights or have a lot of trouble. Most men in jail are either hardened criminals or at least they are rough characters and tough. A long-hair boy will come in and they will say or think instantly "Oh, isn't he pretty!" And there are homosexual attempts in jails all over the country. The old-timers get the "hippie boys" and they try to "make hippie girls out of them".

I knew a boy who was in a jail when I was home and he had long blond hair and he wrote me a letter that said "I'm really having some problems here from the older men. They haven't done anything yet, but it's really getting heavy. They do everything but write me mash notes". Long blond hair, you know, like they were "just crazy about him". In city jail where I was, so far as I know, the guards didn't allow anything bad to really happen, but I've heard that it can happen anyplace.

As I look back, I guess the way that drugs put me into jail was, when I first got into speed, and then stayed on it, I didn't want to stop because I would be suffering from severe lethargy where you feel like you can't move or you can't do this and you can't do that without speed so you want to keep getting high, so you have to keep getting the drugs some way. And on the streets around St. Louis or most cities I guess, speed is getting more dangerous because you never know what you're really getting. So you want to get the speed from drugstores, and that's how you get into the forged prescription bit, and that's what put me in jail.

Some kids weren't even that lucky, they did get speed on the streets or from pushers who don't care, and that's where it's getting more and more dangerous. A lot of street dope nowadays is cut with dangerous things and some of them can kill you or wreck you.

BLOOD-POISONING

Like plain baking soda. It burns your veins out. I had a friend that had to have all the main veins in his arm removed because somebody sold him speed cut with something and he shot it. He woke up one morning and he looked at his arm and it was all red streaks and yellow and purple. They took him to the hospital and it was blood-poisoning and they thought they would have to amputate his arm to save his life, but they were lucky and all they had to do was cut out the main veins in his arm. He lost his job because he can't work because he can't use his right arm anymore. He was a boy from U. City High School and he lived on Delmar.

I guess instead of talking about other people I should tell you how I cut myself up.

I was sitting at home and I looked down at my leg and I saw a little animal stick its head out from under my skin. I was really hallucinating and this animal looked so horrible that I got to chopping at with a cuticle clippers and I cut through all the layers of my skin until I cut the main nerve and then I stopped because it was like suddenly sticking your finger in an electric light socket, only it was more painful, and that was the only thing that stopped me. It was so much of a shock and there was so much blood all over me that I panicked and I thought I was starting to die.

When you hallucinate on acid you sort of know you're hallucinating. But here I was shooting all this speed and thinking I didn't feel it.

BLOOD ALL OVER ME

Well anyway about that time my mother came into my room and she almost fainted from seeing blood all over me. She screamed "What are you doing?" and I remember I just said "Well I have to do something with my hands".

Most parents just can't bring themselves to believe that things are happening to "their" child. A needle is just something that is just not supposed to be in upper middle class homes. I know parents who have a million dollars, and their son is carrying a little kit around. It's pretty strange.

I used to get violent once in a while. Like one time I destroyed all the furniture in my room. That's the way it was, I would go up and down on an emotional scale. Like one day I would have a terrible temper and I would just destroy things, like I would throw things around and cut up things and beat on things with a hammer. Other days I would just sit in my room and cry.

STEPPENWOLF

Once I was absolutely convinced that Johnny who was with Steppenwolf at that time, was downstairs in our house. He was their lead guitar on their first two records. I woke up my mother and I accused her of hiding Johnny someplace in the house. I was really out of it.

I know a lot of speed freaks who have turned on to junk, heroin. Some of them left the city because they couldn't find any "good heroin" here. And I know a couple of 17-year-old kids now that are always asking me "Do you know where I can cop any heroin?"

People don't realize it, but that's going to be the big thing. Heroin. You can only do speed so long and then you get burned out. Your emotional thing is kaput, you can't take it any more. Like it must have been at least two months after I stopped doing speed before I could turn the lights out at night and sleep in a dark room. Because speed makes you so paranoid and you see such ugly things on speed that when the lights are out you get scared. A friend of mine who was 25—when he first stopped doing speed I used to have to walk with him on dark streets, and he's a big man, six feet two, but he was paranoid.

He is doing heroin now. With heroin you keep getting higher. It's a constant rush, which is usually the big thing in shooting any kind of dope. I know some kids around St. Louis who are starting to shoot herion and they say "Wow this is really nice" but they have never been into places where they have seen people kicking the habit, like I saw them in City Jail where they used to have buckets by their bed to throw up in, and I used to help take blankets off other beds and pile them on the junkies but they were still freezing cold and miserable than you ever saw anybody in your life.

But that is the real thing that people around St. Louis are going to have to watch out for. Their kids are going to start doing heroin because you can do speed or acid for only so long, then it starts getting ugly and it's no fun anymore. You get emotionally burned out.

HARD TO DESCRIBE

I don't know what it is. I've been through it and it is still hard to describe, whether it's psychological or mental, you just can't take it anymore on just acid or speed. You start to get off and all you get is mad and upset and, you know, and so what are you going to do? You want to keep shooting, so you want to shoot something that calms you down and makes you feel better, and there seems to be easier connections now than there was a couple of years ago for heroin.

When you first do heroin it makes you feel kind of healthy, or at least you think you are. At first you don't have any bad symtoms, until you finally do get strung out. I know a boy who lives in Ladue who is doing

heroin now. I also know an 18-year-old boy who was supposed to start Washington U. this year, but he's so strung out and hung up that he couldn't.

All my teeth are bad, from speed. Speed settles in your gums a lot of the time. Sometimes your cheeks are sunken in. Last month I saw a kid I used to know and now all his teeth are black, every one of them, from speed.

That time I went to jail, when I got there they thought I was a juvenile, you know, a little girl, because I was so skinny, all skin and bones because I had lost 30 pounds so I had to wear little girl's clothes. It's no fun to be in that kind of physical condition.

NO "PREACH"

I haven't said anything yet about marijuana, which most kids call grass or pot or weed, because the publisher of Prom Magazine said he wouldn't let me "preach" or put down grass in this story. He said I could only write my personal experience or my personal observations of my friends' experiences.

So I won't express any "opinion" about "Does grass lead to harder drugs, or can kids start on grass and just stay on grass and not anything else?"

But there is one "personal experience" which I observed about grass and which I don't think anybody else has written about, in any of these Prom stories, so I will.

It's about a friend of mine named Eddie who has been on grass for three years and he's never done any other drugs to any extent—he tried them, but he never cared for them, so he just stayed on grass.

IF EDDIE STOPS SMOKING

He smokes grass every day and if he stops it, he gets irritable and has temper tantrums. So he just keeps on smoking grass, and like he says, it keeps him really calm and tranquil and peaceful. He gets so "calm" he falls down in the street, but if he quits smoking it, all of a sudden he becomes a bunch of nerves, and at the slightest noise, he jumps.

I checked it out with a friend of mine who is a medical student. He showed me a doctors' magazine which had a story about "weed psychosis" in India and Lebanon where people have been smoking grass and hash for years and they have a common condition which they call "weed psychosis". The doctors in India are studying it now and they report that some people's minds and personalities are affected by it if they stay on it long enough. It is not habit-forming in the physical sense of the word. They say they get a mental dependence on it, you know, psychological or emotional dependence. Like "I can't go out tonight without blowing some grass, I'm too nervous". That's what Eddie goes through all the time.

The only time I know of that it was ever a big problem in this country was a year or two ago, right after they made that big fuss at the Mexican border, and that kept a lot of grass from coming into this country from Mexico, so they were really short on good grass in some places, and that's when some people found out they suddenly didn't have enough and they had that sort of problem.

"WEED PSYCHOSIS"

Anyway, ""weed psychosis" is much more common in India because, you know, they've been smoking it there for a long time. The story I read from the doctor in India said that emotionally it seems to do things to you when you stop smoking it if you have been on it a long time. He said a lot of them became "emotionally unstable".

I don't expect many St. Louis kids to believe that, because they probably never read any reports from India, and they probably don't have any older friends or parents who have been blowing grass for many years.

That's really all I know about grass, except the common things that everybody knows.

I suppose some kids or even some parents might say "Well what's wrong with staying tranquilized all the time?" Well, if you can be sure you will have a lifetime supply of grass, and if you don't mind the thought of being "tranquilized" all your life, I guess that's your privilege—but who wants to have that dependence, you know.

Sooner or later in the United States you are going to run into the problem. Like my friend Eddie with his "weed psychosis". He is so "tranquilized" now he can't even work, except to sell dope.

Even when more people hear about "weed psychosis" it probably won't change their habits because people always say, you know, "It won't happen to me". Yeah, right, "It can't happen here", like Frank Zappa says.

Well, there isn't much more I can write, and I wasn't even supposed to write this much. But there is one more thing I want to say. It's sort of obvious, but some kids don't seem to be aware of it because it hasn't happened to them or anybody they know personally.

"SUSPICION"

I mean that in St. Louis and I guess most other cities they've got this new thing, like The Task Force, that goes city and county and everywhere and they've got the Metropolitan Police and you're not going to be able to outrun them. And you're going to see for yourself, like I did, how policemen and the courts aren't too sympathetic to dopers and pushers. Even if your stuff "belongs to somebody else" or even if they only pick you up on "suspicion".

I thought I wouldn't get caught—like "jail" used to be in my mind like a far-flung thing that couldn't possibly happen to me.

But it did. And suddenly there I was in jail with those gray walls and the graffiti and the locks on the doors and getting finger-printed and the matrons searching me and the whole bit. And you could cry all you want, and you probably will, and they couldn't care less. They are getting very hard-nosed and they are getting more efficient all the time by using every modern idea to track down dope and dopers before they hurt themselves or somebody else.

Excuse me if that sounded like "preaching". I just meant it like, you know, just telling you about my "personal experience" of 6 months in jail.

I don't think you would like it.

Not even a little.

WHAT I SAW IN VIETNAM

(By Tom McGowan)

(NOTE.—After grade school in Ferguson at St. John And James, Tom McGowan went to C.B.C. for three years, then transferred to Clayton High School, where he graduated in June, 1966. At Clayton his special interests were journalism, debating and dramatics. He entered St. Louis University as a freshman but, half-way during his freshman year, "I started doing drugs and I got strung out and I couldn't study so I quit college". Later Tom was drafted and was in the Army in Vietnam until January, 1970. Now a sophomore at Forest Park Community College, Tom is active in Veterans For Peace and also in the Student Forum, which brings speakers to the college campus. His favorite pastime is music, especially acid rock and blues.)

When you're a teenager, you're superinsecure, and acid can really blow your brains, because it's a mind drug that goes into the inner head and it exaggerates your subconscious and it blows up your problems and it can make you panic. In other words, it can blast your head right into a psycho ward. That's what somebody told me in high school, and I soon found out they were right.

My first trip was a wild one. It was when I was a freshman in college. I was 18 but most of the guys I bummed with around town were older and more "experienced". I guess I was really naive about drugs. I didn't know much, and I cared less.

MY FIRST TRIP

One day some guy turned my roommate on. I thought it was just like another kind of drunk. The next week the "friend" offered to turn me on for 5 bucks. I expected to just get super-drunk. It was my first trip and I rushed for four straight hours. Wow! It hit my mind so hard I thought I was losing my head. It exaggerated my problems so big I started to panic. I thought I could feel the electrons shooting around in my head at super-speed until I almost freaked out completely. Luckily there were people there in the room who knew from experience how to relate to me, so that helped a little.

Teenagers just are not mature enough to be able to handle acid. Anyway, now I wouldn't touch a tab of acid with a 10-foot pole any more, because like somebody wrote in Prom last month, and it's true, most acid today is cut with strychnine or speed, and it's getting worse on the street all the time, and you just don't know what you're getting any more.

Speed isn't any better. And that's my understatement of the year. Speed made my metabolism rise and it made my heart pound four times faster. I know a guy, Joe, he got a collapsed lung and a heart murmur from speed, and the doctor says that one more shot will kill him.

HIT BY A CAR

My friend Harry and I used to do dope together before he split to California. He weighed 160 pounds then, but he has been speeding and now he is down to 92 pounds. His old friends don't recognize him any more. His wife was stoned and got hit by a car and broke a couple of bones and was in the hospital a long time. They hate each other now and it's mostly because their lives have been screwed up by speed.

My own first hit of speed was when I spent all night in a rock quarry with some kids. I dropped two orange wedges (acid and STP) and I tripped all night long. At 4:30 a.m. I did my first hit of speed. Speed gives you a super sense of security at first while you are rushing, but when you come down you get really paranoid. I suddenly thought I was being surrounded by pigs and I started "climbing up" in the rock quarry but I actually fell off the ledge and landed 30 feet below. I couldn't walk, partly from physical hurt but mostly from paranoia and panic. I was lucky I didn't land on my head.

YOU'RE A "SPEED FREAK"

Heroin is a physical thing, you can't get off, because you are physically addicted. Speed is a mental thing, it makes you a mental cripple, you just don't care about anything else except dope. You just want another hit of speed and then you're a "speed freak" and you don't want to get off it. You don't realize what it's doing to you, and you don't even care if you die. A couple of the kids that I went to high school with, they were normal healthy guys, and now they are 90-pound wonders . . . you wonder how they can even walk, they are all skin and bones and they look horrible, and you can't even say anything to them. They know it's bad, and they know they are wrecked, but they don't care. When they see you, they don't just say "Hi"—They say "Hi, got any speed?". Speed-freak chicks are even worse than the guys. It's even harder to get a girl off speed than a guy, so she is always hustling and shoplifting. They are never hungry and they don't realize it, so they just keep wasting away. Their arms are full of holes from shooting, and most of the speed-freaks I ever knew got hepatitis (liver disease) from dirty needles.

HE KILLED HIMSELF

Before I get to what I want to tell you about Vietnam, I want to sort of mention my

good buddy Ed who died. It was from his first hit of acid. Ed's brother had moved in with some other freaks. They were highly intelligent and were digging a lot of poetry and the intellectual thing. Ed was only 16 and the other guys were a few years older, but one of them turned him on to LSD—his first "experience". He stayed high for four days and he didn't come down—it just built up and he stayed peaked out for four days. The acid itself may have worn off but his head kept him up there, and finally he just couldn't take it any longer, being that stoned—and he killed himself. He shot himself in the chest with their .22.

But the main thing that I want to tell you about is what I saw in Vietnam. Mr. Miller of Prom Magazine told me "no preaching, no opinions, just write whatever you know, that you saw with your own eyes in Vietnam". So here goes:

I was in the Army in Vietnam last year. My outfit was the 25th Infantry Division operating around Cu Chi and also around Dau Tieng. Our battalion was operating in the jungles and near a big rubber plantation. The first time the North Vietnamese hit us we really got beat up—we lost 14 killed and about 100 wounded. I was the oldest guy in the squad who was not hit, so suddenly I became the Squad Leader. By the time the year was over, I was one of only five guys out of the 150 that went through our platoon that didn't get killed or wounded.

There was mud up to your knees and you sweated in temperatures over 100° during the day and 40° at night. You would dig yourself a hole and crawl in, and you would sweat cold sweat for fear of a mortar round might land there and kill you. Real bullets don't sound like you hear them on TV shows. They really make a cracking sound, like a tiny sonic boom.

In case you never knew it, getting shot at is the scariest thing in the whole damn world. You hit the ground, but there's nothing else you can do—except sweat, and maybe pray, and just be totally scared.

DRUGS IN VIETNAM

Drugs in Vietnam? Of course there are—all over the place. But there's one thing that people in the U.S. don't seem to realize—the Vietnamese themselves don't smoke pot. Some Vietnamese men smoke opium, and some of their women eat beetle nut, which is a mild narcotic and which makes their teeth and gums turn black.

I smoked three different kinds of marijuana while I was in Vietnam. First there's Laotian grass, which is #1, the best. Then there is Cambodian grass, which is #2, then Vietnamese grass, #3. To the uninitiated, there really isn't that much difference between the three and they are all so strong—it can knock you on your rear. A couple of hits and you're stoned. A couple of more hits and you're really stoned. A couple of more hits and you are totally zonked. Mentally you really feel euphoria. You don't give a damn what's going on, friend or enemy. Physically, you just can't move. Your orientation is off, your balance is off.

PLAIN GARBAGE

Heroin is available in drugstores in Vietnamese cities and towns. It all has French or Japanese labels. Vietnam has no such thing as a Food and Drug Administration—the dope they sell you in drugstores could be pure dishwater and you wouldn't know it. The speed and acid you buy on the streets is just plain garbage—the worst in the world. There was one GI who shot what must have been straight rat poison. We found his body in an apartment and he must have been dead for several days—I had to carry him out, he smelled awful. I know of several guys who died from O.D. (overdose).

You can say that grass makes you feel good and calm and tranquil and peaceful and all that . . . but that's just another way of saying that when you're smoking pot, you get *so* relaxed that nothing really counts and you just don't care what happens to you—and out there in the boonies in Vietnam, that can be fatal.

Like there was this guy and he was out in the jungle on foot patrol, and he was stoned on pot—and now he's missing a leg—the leg that stepped on a booby trap, because he "forgot" to watch for them.

Then I had a buddy named Fred from Dallas, Texas, and he was out there and he got shot at. At first they missed him, but he was stoned and so confused that he just stood there—he didn't hit the ground like he should have—until he was shot in the stomach and that knocked him down.

Two of our guys, one from Kentucky and one from Minnesota, were blowing grass before they went out on patrol. They got super-careless and walked right into our own ambush—a mine which shoots out hundreds of pellets. The pellets blew about 15 holes into each of their bodies—Kentucky died on the spot. Minnesota was still alive when we pulled him in, but he died that night.

Once I swallowed some opium pellets. They are black and hard like licorice and you don't feel anything until like the next day when they finally dissolve in your stomach. Well, the day after I swallowed them we happened to be in a huge fire-fight with the Viet Cong and all of a sudden I felt myself getting off, and I was running in the fight but I felt like I was only going in slow motion, and I had one hell of a time handling myself. I thought I saw bullets coming only like 10 miles an hour—at me! I didn't get hit, but that was just dumb luck.

TRACKS IN HIS ARM

For a while I worked out of Saigon as a security guard, riding gun jeeps. We followed the MP patrols to defend them. We found one MP dead from O.D.'ing heroin, with tracks in his arm.

Then there was my buddy George from Chicago. This is one I will never forget because it all happened right in front of my eyes, just a little ways off. He was stoned on grass and so he forgot to set the timing and the head space on his 50-caliber machine gun and that caused the round to backfire and it blew up all over him and put pieces of shrapnel into his face and body. It was awful.

Then there was Old Mellow Pete from Brooklyn. He was riding an APC (Armored Personnel Carrier). He hit a mine and was blown off. He wasn't really hurt but he got right up and, because he was stoned, he walked the wrong way, right toward the enemy, and he got part of his face shot off.

HIT BY AN RPG

Even the medics—you would think they would know better from studying about medicine and drugs—but there was this medic who hit up on morphine in a bunker under fire in Dau Tieng. The area was overrun with Viet Cong. The bunker was hit by a RPG (rocket-propelled grenade) and three guys in the bunker were hit. One guy was dead instantly but the other two lay there wounded, but the medic was like he just didn't care, he just sat there stoned. You wouldn't believe this, but it was our guys and I know it happened—the two wounded guys were laying there hurt and bleeding and needing help, but the medic just sat there stoned from the morphine—and he was doing another hit when the Special Forces arrived at the bunker and found him. He got court-martialed and I never heard any more about him.

I gotta tell you about Buckwheat, that's what everybody called him, from North Carolina. He was with the artillery at a forward fire base and he was on opium. He stole a company truck and went barreling down the road right toward the Viet Cong. We sent a helicopter to look for him. The copter found the truck, wrecked. Three days later we advanced and went through that area and we found Buckwheat dead, naked, cuts all over his body, and his throat slit all the way from ear to ear. It almost made me vomit. We found out that after Buckwheat had wrecked the truck, he tried to steal a bicycle from a gook and that's when the North Vietnamese captured him and tortured him before they killed him.

In Saigon, some guys turned on to pot just in defiance, because they were "against war". Then pot led them into the general dope culture—the pot pushers often have hard stuff and are only too glad to sell it to you for a profit, or just to turn you on for kicks. On the streets of Saigon, they'll sell you anything in the whole wide world—and cheap.

ME?

Me? Yeah, I've been the whole route and, after all I've seen, drugs don't just bore me, they scare the hell out of me. Teenagers, including me when I was one, have to be nuts to get into drugs. Drugs do a massive assault on your head, and no teenager can handle that, because your head is just developing—and it still is, even when you're older—but especially when you're young.

Drugs will warp your personality, because they will change you in ways that you can't control and don't want, and you'll never be yourself again—I mean, not really yourself, not what you intended to be, and not what you could've been and should've been.

You're thinking about starting into drugs?

If you do drugs, you will know a lot about drugs—and nothing about anything else.

And you will stay that way.

You may never come back.

You got "big problems"? Who doesn't? Everybody does, at every age in life. You got problems with your parents? You think you're the only one?

You got problems? Face them, and try to solve them. If you can't solve them, at least maybe you can soften them a little by talking them over with somebody. And if you can't even soften them, then learn to live with them, like everybody else does. Be a man. Don't chicken out, or you won't be worth a damn to yourself or to anybody else, ever.

PRAGUE DUNS REFUGEES ABROAD FOR LEGAL FEES ON DEFECTIONS

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, although many of us are aware of the 1968 unrest in Czechoslovakia, I suspect that many of us are not aware of the shakedown that is occuring under the guise of judicial proceedings directed against refugees who fled Czechoslovakia after the Soviet invasion.

For that reason, I bring to the attention of the House the following article from the New York Times, of December 16, 1970, by Tad Szulc, which describes a warped and distorted sense of justice as well as the mockery that is made of due process behind the Iron Curtain. The extortion and the blackmail resorted to in this new form of international piracy should be the subject of discussion in every international forum concerned with human rights. The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 16, 1970]

PRAGUE DUNS REFUGEES ABROAD FOR LEGAL FEES ON DEFECTIONS

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON, December 15.—Many Czechoslovak refugees in the United States, Canada and Western Europe, who fled their country after the Soviet-led invasion in 1968, are being advised from Prague that they face criminal proceedings for "illegal" presence abroad.

Letters from "legal advisory centers" in Prague also inform them that they must make a "down payment" in foreign currency within five days to assure their "legal defense," or the fees will be collected from the refugees' "nearest relatives" in Czechoslovakia.

The payments range from about $70 to $100, and are to be credited to the Prague regional lawyer's union at an official Czechoslovak bank.

There are estimated to be 8,000 Czechoslovak refugees in the United States, 12,000 in Canada and 50,000 in other Western countries.

United States officials said that even if a relatively small number of the refugees agreed to the "down payments" and later the full trial costs, the money would represent a source of badly needed foreign exchange for the Czechoslovak Government.

State Department officials said they had been consulted by several persons who have received letters from Czechoslovakia. The officials said they could offer no assistance or advice since the matter was between a foreign Government and its nationals abroad.

Czechoslovak citizens here and elsewhere began receiving in October the notifications of action pending against them. On Nov. 13, the Prague evening newspaper Vecerni Praha reported that courts were dealing with "hundreds of cases" of illegal departures and illegal stays abroad.

The letters to the refugees inform them that under the provisions of Section 109 of the Czechoslovak penal code. "You can be tried in absentia and may be sentenced to prison for terms of six months to five years, to corrective measures and to confiscation of property."

Those aiding other Czechoslovak citizens to leave the country without permission are subject to prison terms of from 3 to 10 years. A virtual ban on foreign travel was imposed early in 1969.

In most cases, the property of refugees, including apartments and vehicles, has already been confiscated through administrative procedures.

A letter from the "legal advisory centers," signed by individual lawyers, tells a refugee that "since you have not chosen a defense counsel, I have been nominated to represent you."

A letter asks a refugee "to let me know if any circumstances exist which, as your lawyer, I could use for your defense in these proceedings. Especially, let me know whether you submitted an appeal asking for permission to prolong your stay abroad, or whether such an appeal is under consideration by the authorities."

The letters do not say what the final cost of "legal defense" will be, but it is understood that it may go up to $140. The exact number of refugees involved was not known.

Spokesmen for refugee groups here and in Canada said that in many cases the citizens abroad may be willing to pay for "legal defense" to avoid financial or other reprisals against relatives at home. In Canada, refugee groups have advised refugees not to reply to the letter, but to ask Canadian Government authorities to intercede with the Prague Government.

NEW RESIDENT HAS PRAISE FOR INDIANAPOLIS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following letter to the editor of the Indianapolis Star from that paper on November 18, 1970, written by Dr. Richard K. Curtis, is certainly worthy of inclusion in the RECORD. No one can accuse Dr. Curtis of being a part of anyone's public relations firm; he has merely told it as he saw it:

PROFESSOR WHO MOVED FROM OHIO GIVES VIEWS ON INDIANAPOLIS

(By Richard Curtis, Ph. D.)

In the 1880's Matthew Arnold, British poet and critic, made a tour of this country, visiting numerous cities. Most of these, he concluded, "are so unfinished; they are like a new quarter still in the builders' hands." Life in America had "the capital defect: of being so uninteresting, so without savour and without depth." The one notable exception: Indianapolis.

Unlike Arnold, I am a native-born American, who has lived in a number of large cities including Worcester, Memphis, Providence, Chicago, St. Paul-Minneapolis, and Kansas City. It is safe to say that in the four months since I moved my family here from Ohio we have been singularly impressed with Indianapolis.

I wonder if those who caustically refer to it as "Naptown" are not themselves napping and not noting many of the extras Indianapolis has going for it:

1. It is a relatively clean city, with anti-pollution controls apparently enforced.

2. Numerous four-lane highways connect the hub with the outer belt lines permitting us to move rapidly through the city.

3. Wherever we look we see police squad cars, helping to maintain law and order.

4. Far from deteriorating, like most cities, the downtown is undergoing a metamorphosis, with a skyline to vie with any city.

5. The Uni-Gov form of management, a brilliant pioneering effort, not only provides taxes for rehabilitating the inner city, but remains surprisingly responsive to the needs of individual citizens. Last February my wife and daughter, on a visit to the city, were shopping on the circle when they were jostled by several youth, apparently just getting out of high school. I noted this in a letter to the paper, and in a day or so received a letter of apology from the chief of police, with the assurance that additional men were being stationed there at that time to prevent recurrences. Again, when the road by our new home fell into disrepair I notified the street department and within two days they were out to fix it.

6. The symphony orchestra and the new art museum are just a few of the cultural delights of the city. And who is to overlook the Pacers, champions of the ABA last year?

7. Higher education is being consolidated with the new IUPUI, making for what should be an excellent public university, with all of the attendant benefits this can confer on a growing city.

8. Most important, there is a genuine warmth of friendship and concern among the people of Indianapolis. Neighbors and colleagues alike, as well as members of various churches we have visited, have all contributed to the feeling we have that this is, even after 90 years, a city on the move.

POLITICAL OBSCENITY

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following column by John Roche, On Political Obscenity, appeared in the Boston Sunday Advertiser of November 29:

ON POLITICAL OBSCENITY

(By John Roche)

Though I donated three years of my life to the Army of the United States, I was never a model soldier. The problem was that I was born with a caustic wit (known to first sergeants as a "wise xxxxxx"), a flash temper, and absolutely no taste for witless routine. This combination made my life somewhat lively both for me and my long-suffering commanding officers until a smart colonel worked out a modus vivendi: I did all of his work and he protected me from the courts-martial that were invariably looming somewhere in the background. It was a good political arrangement: When he got his eagles, he even had me promoted to staff sergeant.

I put this in the record just to make it clear that the operation of the United States Army in World War II never impressed me with its efficiency, and with sufficient encouragement there are stories I can tell that might lead one to think that Japanese war bonds were not as big a risk as is often supposed. None of my stories, however, can hold a candle to those narrated by Edmund Love in his neglected little classic, "War Is a Private Affair," so I will pass on to the point of this reminiscence: that I doubt if anybody ever matched my record as an anti-militarist.

Yet last week I got up and walked out of a movie, "Catch 22," feeling a strong need to find a bathroom and retch—and an equally strong compulsion to find the producer and break his jaw. Never having read the book, I went to the show anticipating a "humorous" satire on the Air Force's role in Italy during World War II. I will never know how the movie ended, but by my standards it was rapidly moving toward a triumph of political obscenity.

Indeed, fully recognizing that I am something of an ideological nut, I found this film far more obscene than any of the silly sex stuff—"I Am Swedish" (boring), "The Dykes of Copenhagen," etc.—because it took the worst tragedy that has ever hit mankind, the war against Nazi Germany, and turned it into an episode from "The Godfather." It was just a racket.

The audience, largely composed of teenagers and people of college age, seemed to think the whole bit was hilarious. The Luftwaffe and the 15th Air Force as components in a criminal syndicate! What a great idea! They were practically rolling in the aisles. And as I looked at them and listened to their giggles while the establishment took another one in the chops, I went into a slow burn.

High school and college friends of mine went off to fight in what Winston Churchill miscalled "the soft underbelly" of Festung Europa. A good dozen of them are still there in the military cemeteries outside of Monte Cassino, Salerno, and Anzio. I emerged intact from my unheroic war—they have been dead a quarter of a century. And they fought and died to help destroy a monstrous brand of totalitarianism—not as "soldiers" in a Mafia family war.

No sense of humor, Roche? Well, maybe so. But I'm glad I left when I did. The way that "satire" was shaping up, the final scene might well have shown that Auschwitz was

just an advertising venture sponsored by an enterprising gas company. And I might well be in jail for felonious assault.

JAMES A. FARLEY

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, James A. Farley predicts that the Democratic Party will recapture the White House in 1972. Ordinarily, a statement of this sort would be overlooked. But James A. Farley is no ordinary man, as you, Mr. Speaker, are well aware. He is Mr. Democrat and has had his finger on the political pulsebeat of the Democratic Party and the Nation for half a century. When Mr. Farley speaks, people sit up and listen. That is Ernest Cuneo with Mr. Farley. In it, Mr. Farley calls the shots as he sees them, poking here, jabbing there, but predicting a bright future for loyal party workers. I insert in the RECORD, the following article by Mr. Cuneo which appeared recently in the Paterson News.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) News, Dec. 8, 1970]

FARLEY RAPS THE NEW LEFT

(By Ernest Cuneo)

WASHINGTON.—Rested from his conspicuous absence as a vigorous campaigner in the recent New York election, pink-cheeked James A. Farley, Mr. Democrat himself, sniffed like a war horse scenting the battle-breeze of 1972. "My labors this fall were not strenuous," he drily observed "since I limited my endeavors to candidates who supported the Democratic ticket for mayor in 1969."

When man bites dog, that's news; when James A. Farley criticizes Democrats, that's bigger news.

"I felt, and I feel," he continued, "that those who are of limited loyalty to the Democratic Party when they are not candidates, have small call on party loyalty when they themselves demand its support when they are aspirants."

"I was happy to inform them of this when they made inquiry after I went to Europe before the primaries last June," he said, and it was apparent that he was very happy indeed to convey this information to the supplicants.

"I predict," said the famous predictor, "that the Democratic Party will elect its candidate in 1972. I predict this because the Democratic Party is rapidly reuniting. The noisy New Left has discovered that it does not speak for the rank-and-file Democrats.

"They are not the only ones who have mistaken the waves on the surface for the deep 1932, a most distinguished governor, a candidate for the nomination and a man of presidential timbre, Gov. Albert Ritchie of Maryland, received one of the greatest personal ovations it has ever been my good fortune to witness.

"Standing by him on the balcony, I was proud of the way my party registers its approval of men of worth in its ranks," the sage twinkled, "and I was glad to agree with the governor that the enthusiasm was as spontaneous as it was boundless.

'However, when Governor Ritchie asked me my opinion on his nomination, I frankly told him that it was a pity that he did not have the votes to go with the ovation, since I had already tied them up for my candidate, Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt of New York.

"Now, of course, fellows like Senators Harold Hughes of Iowa, George McGovern of South Dakota, and Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota, put on quite a noisy roadshow, but when it comes down to actual votes, they have no real national foundation in the party. But unlike Governor Ritchie and other Democratic regulars, they were unwilling to abide by the decision of the party in 1968.

"Along with Sen. Edward Kennedy, California's Jesse Unruh and a few of the professionals masquerading as Democrats, such as John Kenneth Galbraith and his associates, they succeeded in splitting the Democratic Party enough in August to defeat the Humphrey-Muskie ticket in November. The American people, in general, and the regular Democratic Party members in particular, resent these rule-or-ruin tactics.

"Jesse Unruh was defeated by Gov. Donald Reagan, but he actually lost his 1970 election at Chicago in 1968. By the same token, the Reform Democrats and the Liberal Party in New York lost the 1970 election to Gov. Nelson Rockefeller when they refused to support the Democratic nominee for mayor of New York City in 1969."

Tactful pressure elicited that the urbane prophet reserved his penetrating snort (and he has one of the most famed snorts in American politics) for the presidential candidacy of Mayor John V. Lindsay.

"Can you imagine the party of Presidents Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy and Johnson giving its nomination to a Republican reject who failed to win his own party primary in 1969, after four years in office? Can you imagine the Democratic Party giving its presidential nomination to a Republican castoff at City Hall?

"Why," said the Grassy Point Giant, answering his own question, "nobody but the City Hall syncophants could drum up such a preposterous idea. The mayor is a victim of the heady incense supplied by the small claque he finds it necessary to surround himself with."

"Besides," beamed the most loyal of the Democrats, 'for 1972, the Democrats, as usual, have developed a whole forest of presidential timber.' Farley's face glowed with the satisfaction of a dedicated conservationist rapturously gazing at a vast expanse of towering timber. "I could name a dozen," he boomed, "all Democrats. Like Senators Ed Muskie and Henry 'Scoop' Jackson. Those two stand out like giant redwoods."

Regarding their chances of being elected in 1972, said Big Jim: 'As President Truman said to me in 1948, 'when the American people realize what's going on, they are going to kick the Democrats back into office.' The Democrats are going to receive a swift kick in the pants which will send them flying into the White House in 1972. It could be phrased with more polish, I suppose, but I prefer the facts unvarnished."

The former Democratic national chairman beamed, the perfect picture of a man confident of a swift beatific kick in the pants. Suddenly his huge trim 82-year-old figure sprang from his chair. "Want to walk with me?" he asked briskly.

"No, I don't," was the answer. 'You walk too fast."

SILVER SPRING NON-COM KILLED IN ACTION

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, S. Sgt. Donald J. Golden, a courageous young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I should like to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD.

SILVER SPRING NON-COM KILLED IN ACTION

The Army announced today that a sergeant from Silver Spring was killed in Vietnam yesterday.

The soldier was identified as Staff Sgt. Donald L. Golden, whose wife, Mrs. Kim H. J. Golden, lives in the 1900 block Rosemary Hills Drive in Silver Spring.

The Pentagon said Sergeant Golden had been killed in action.

CRASH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM FOR RETURNING VETERANS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Mayor James H. J. Tate convened a special task force which met with him in Philadelphia on Friday, December 18, 1970, to develop a crash employment program for returning veterans.

Attending the conference were S. W. Melidosian, director of the Veterans' Administration Center in Philadelphia; Terrell Whitsitt, regional manpower administrator, U.S. Department of Labor; Charles P. Connolly, district manager, Pennsylvania State Employment Service; Joseph Dolan, area supervisor, Department of Labor's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training; Milton Sharon, regional director of the Federal Civil Service Office; plus the chairman and members of the Philadelphia Veterans Advisory Commission.

At the same time, Mayor Tate deplored the action of President Nixon in vetoing a bill which would have provided "tremendous help" in alleviating the Nation's growing unemployment problem.

We are launching this veterans employment program because of the need, and we expect to work closely with the national Jobs for Veterans program which is being organized under White House auspices.

Mayor Tate said:

We have a special obligation to the more than one million servicemen and women who complete their military service each year and return to civilian life, most of them seeking to enter the civilian labor market.

Accordingly, it is all the more regrettable that the President has seen fit to veto the $9.3 billion manpower bill which would have been tremendously helpful in alleviating the unemployment not only of veterans but of many civilians throughout our economy.

The mayor stated that jobs for returning veterans will be given the highest priority, and he announced that the task force will formulate an immediate action program to supplement existing activities already in effect by the various agencies represented at the meeting.

Once we have defined our action program, we will call upon all elements of the employer community in the Philadelphia area to make the strongest possible commitment to assist us in finding meaningful job opportunities for our returning veterans, he said.

The Philadelphia Veterans Advisory Commission chairman is Casper J. Knight, and the other commission members are Francis J. Lederer, Stanley Lewandowski, Leon Goldberg, Peter Galante, councilman Edward Cantor, and councilman Thomas McIntosh. The executive director of the commission is William Gormley.

RENEWAL OF THRIFT

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, history hangs, has always hung on the most delicate of threads—like Caesar and the Ides of March; the Greeks bearing gifts to the Trojans; Italy and the "Risorgimento" or new arising.

It was the rebirth or renewal of life, youth, vigor, zest which the Renaissance returned to man. With it came unheralded promise of giant strides in human progress yet to come—like the invention of printing and the discovery of America.

I like to look ahead and believe that we are poised on a new perimeter of great discovery. Perhaps we should more rightly call it rediscovery.

We are going to learn anew what it takes to work together, to achieve together—for the good of the common cause; for rights of the individual.

America won its freedom, fought for its right to survive, scaled the pinnacle of world progress—now faces up to challenges to its conscience and convictions.

Together, we are indivisibly concerned with the future, since there is where we will spend the rest of our lives. Together, we must gather and stand firm for the good that has made us great. Together, we must rally and attack the bad that wants to divide, to downgrade, to destroy.

And what of the future to which we are committed and our stamina to survive it? Finances are a factor—yours, mine, the Nation's. We must save, if we are to have. We must have, if we are to exist. The word is savings.

We can save best for and live best in the future, when we learn the happy habit of putting something away for a later day via U.S. savings bonds—the stable, safe, sure, sensible way to save.

You can buy them conveniently through the payroll plan, where you work; the bond-a-month plan, where you bank. And, where we work and bank, we must come together with a union of thoughts and deeds that echo the desires and needs of our respective communities of interest.

Of course, there is no better togetherness than the old-fashioned congregation of thrift. As we save, so do we pave the future with the best intentions of security—our own, the family, the Nation.

No one ever gets back one penny less than the amount that he puts into U.S. savings bonds. Where else can you find that kind of guarantee, with interest? And the interest is now 5½ percent—when held to maturity of 5 years and 10 months—when the half percent is added as a bonus for your prudence.

The security of the economy, local, State, Nation, is of one increasing purpose, the welfare of each and every citizen. So, I urge the people of my great State of Virginia to initiate their own renewal of thrift; I encourage them to buy and hold U.S. savings bonds.

DON'T WORRY ABOUT YOUTH

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Lansing, Ill., Journal consistently emphasizes the positive development in the communities it serves. It is in this spirit that this publication in a front-page editorial Thursday, December 17, commented on the essay of Steven Marz of Lansing and the essay which he had submitted in the VFW Voice of Democracy Contest.

I insert in the RECORD, at this point, the article and Steven's essay:

DON'T WORRY ABOUT YOUTH

(By James Alvord)

Steven Marz is a young man with a big future. He is a member of a vast portion of today's youth that you don't hear too much about nowadays.

A 17-year old senior at Marian Catholic, Steve is a National Merit Honor Scholar, ranked 12th in his graduating class of more than 300. He lives with his parents at 17726 Roy St. in Lansing. It's a pretty proud household lately, as Steve just won a $50 Saving Bond in a VFW Voice of Democracy Contest at Marian.

At this point, Steve plans to become an English teacher and is considering Valparaiso, Michigan State and Northern Illinois for his future education.

From here, Steve will present his essay in a district contest, followed hopefully by state and then national competition.

Steve's essay, reprinted reflects a solid understanding of what this country of ours is all about. Read it . . . we are never too old to learn.

FREEDOM, OUR HERITAGE

"In America" is a song from the musical West Side Story. Its lyrics tell the audience that America is the land of opportunity, that only in America can people really be free. Oh, how true are those words!

How many countries allow all citizens to voice their opinions? In how many countries does the average family own its own home, two cars, and several appliances?

In America, underground newspapers like *The Seed* can flourish, suffering no government censorship. What censorship the other media undergoes is not politic, but only censorship of that which is in bad taste—violence and obscenity. American elections are truly free, with several different parties running their candidates. Could the SDS, the John Birch Society, the NAACP, and the Ku Klux Klan all exist in the same city anywhere else in the world?

Most people do not seem to realize the great freedom Americans possess. Ask the bra-burning, screaming women's liberation militant if she feels that she is free. Or ask the long-haired radical tossing molotov cocktails into courtrooms.

They have had this freedom handed to them with no labor on their part. They don't have to suffer to keep their freedom as their ancestors did to win it.

Imagine an SDS member aboard a ship bearing Pilgrims to the New World. He is the one cursing because there is no food, or because the woman next to him is violently retching after eating a raw rat for her dinner.

Or picture a women's liberation leader as a Pilgrim woman. She is the one who cries at the sight of the barren land, who runs screaming from the friendly Indians, who can't take the lack of luxuries.

Can you see these two in the Civil War? He is the soldier who runs from battle and she is the nurse who can't stand the sight of blood. He is the slave who doesn't work when he is set free, who won't even try to be a free man. She is the woman who breaks down at the sight of her burned down plantation.

In both World Wars, he is the deserter, the coward who tired of trenches, bloodshed, and gunfire. She is the woman back home who kills herself when she learns that her husband has been shot down, leaving her alone with two small children and no money.

Yes, I can just imagine these two fighting to maintain our freedom, or going on when all appears hopeless. Yet they are the ones who now shout for more freedom.

They can't realize that it is our heritage and our duty not to belittle what is left to us in a sacred trust and we must fight to maintain it, not in draft-dodging and bomb-throwing, not in bra-burning and name-calling. We of America have too much to lose to just throw it away on the whim of a radical. The heritage of freedom presented to us by our ancestors is the most unique in this world.

THE GREAT SPY SCARE

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following lead editorial from the December 21, 1970 Indianapolis Star puts a recent matter into much-needed perspective.

THE GREAT SPY SCARE

Reports of spying by United States military intelligence agencies on politicians, church figures, commentators, reporters, lawyers and other civilians have brought widespread reactions of indignation.

But there is no validity whatever to the claim there is "no place in a free society" for domestic intelligence operations to detect subversion that could impair or destroy U.S. military organizations. There decidedly is a place for such operations in a free society—if that society is to remain free.

A strong case can be made against having domestic surveillance of this type conducted by the military branches themselves. Such information gathering should be directed by a civilian agency. In our opinion it should be in the hands of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Accordingly we hope that President Richard M. Nixon, as commander-in-chief, orders the armed forces to cease and desist from domestic investigation of civilians.

At the same time, we hope that the hue and cry raised over military intelligence surveillance of civilians does not blind intelligent and responsible Americans to the need for maintaining a highly effective operation for countering subversion against the U.S. armed forces.

The dismantling of the U.S. military estab-

lishment by any means available is an avowed goal of international Communist organizations and their fronts and fellow-traveler groups in the U.S. Since enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950 these groups have waged unceasing assaults on that act, on all U.S. security investigative committees and agencies, and all state and municipal anti-subversive laws and agencies.

The current furor over domestic spying by the military should not be allowed to play into the hands of forces genuinely intent on destroying the U.S.

REPORT THAT SHOCKED NATION

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the great fiascos of my time was the Presidential Commission that went astray recently, the President's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography.

Last Friday, I sponsored a House resolution to denounce the Commission's report. That is the least that we can do in order to assure that none adopts the mistaken impression that the report has validity in law.

At the time the Commission report was issued earlier, I submitted for the RECORD the text of the excellent minority report. I also sponsored appropriate legislation to carry out a major recommendation of the minority: The putting into law of a clear definition of obscenity.

Mr. Speaker, a member of the Commission, Charles H. Keating, Jr., who concurred in the minority report, has written his views for the January 1971 issue of the Reader's Digest. Mr. Keating is a Cincinnati, Ohio, attorney who has appeared as amicus curiae in the prosecution of numerous obscenity cases.

Following is the text of Mr. Keating's article in the Digest:

THE REPORT THAT SHOCKED THE NATION

(By Charles H. Keating, Jr.)

(A much-distressed member of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography examines the panel majority's bizarre proposal for handling the pornography problem.)

At a Los Angeles bar, men stare intently at a brightly lighted stage. There a young man and woman dance briefly, disrobe, then engage in sexual intercourse.

A woman in Putney, Vt., opens her mail to discover a slick brochure advertising "8-mm. color films." The ad has ten explicit color photographs of naked men engaging in homosexual acts, a woman entwined with two men, and naked men and women caressing each other. Each film is described in lurid language.

Three blocks from the White House, a 12-year-old boy notices a group of men peering at a window display. He walks over to a storefront filled with magazines depicting male sex organs and naked women with their legs spread apart.

These scenes, unheard of only a few years ago, are now commonplace examples of the ever-worsening pornography that is poisoning our society. Recognizing this peril, Congress in 1967 established the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography. Its task: to study the problem and recommend "means to deal effectively with such traffic in obscenity and pornography."

URGES REPEAL OF ALL LAWS

Incredibly, three years and $2 million later, a majority (12 of the 18 members) of the Commission recommended repealing all laws that restrict obscene materials from adults, and that even children be permitted all but pictorial pornography. In the sweeping words of last September's majority report: "The Commission does not believe that a sufficient social justification exists for the retention or enactment of broad legislation prohibiting the consensual distribution of sexual materials to adults." For many of us who have been battling smut, these words are no less than a Magna Carta for pornographers.

To understand how such a travesty could come about, one must look at the makeup of the Commission and at the often bizarre manner in which the panel went about its task.

In January 1968, President Johnson named William B. Lockhart, dean of the University of Minnesota Law School, chairman of the Commission. Dean Lockhart's statements over the years opposing anti-obscenity laws clearly showed his permissive approach to pornography. The body of the Commission was made up largely of persons with no law enforcement or legal background in the obscenity field. (All original members were appointed by President Johnson. I was appointed by President Nixon to replace a member who resigned.)

PROCEDURES ARE CITED

As the months passed, incompetence and bias became apparent. Consider these procedures:

1. The Commission conducted meaningless sex experiments of questionable ethical nature. Some 14 tests were conducted to determine individuals' sexual response to various types of erotic material. At Canada's University of Waterloo, the Commission had 56 male students view a series of slides selected for "their pornographic value." Electrodes wired to the students' necks, fingers and heads measured their arousal. At the University of North Carolina, a group of young men were paid $100 each to spend 90 minutes a day for three weeks looking at stag movies and pornographic books and to allow themselves to be checked for their reactions (including a test of their "penile erection") to the smut.

Why was it necessary to conduct dozens of experiments and interviews at taxpayer expense to demonstrate the obvious—that human beings are aroused by erotic materials? And why, at the same time, did the Commission fail to investigate adequately the relationship between obscenity and crime—a task which Congress specifically assigned to it?

2. The Commission held no meaningful public hearings, and by and large reported only scientific "facts" that supported its preconceived notions. After repeated demands for public hearings were turned down, Commissioners Morton A. Hill and Winfrey C. Link (who later filed a scathing minority report, in which I concurred) on their own conducted several ad hoc hearings in cities across the country. Finally, as a result of public pressure, the majority agreed to four days of hearings in Washington and Los Angeles during the waning days of the Commission's life, but there was insufficient time for many concerned citizens to testify.

MISUSED POLL RESULTS

Nonetheless, the Commission report authoritatively states that "a majority of American adults believe that adults should be allowed to read or see any sexual materials they wish." This statement apparently is based upon a Commission-sponsored poll which found that only two percent of Americans viewed pornography as a serious national problem.

But the pollsters had asked what people thought were "the two or three most serious problems facing the country today." Naturally, most people gave such answers as "war," "racial conflict" and "law and order." In contrast, a 1969 Harris Poll showed that 76 percent of Americans want pornographic literature outlawed, and a Gallup Poll found that 85 percent favor tougher anti-smut laws.

3. The Commission unduly rushed into its final report. Originally, a number of "technical reports" (studies prepared by the 22 staff members plus some 82 outside scientific contractors) were to be considered by four panels drawn from the 18 commissioners. The panels were, in turn, to submit their reports to the full Commission for final recommendations. But not all 70 of the reports for which the Commission forked out the greater part of its $2-million budget were completed in time to be used as a basis for the panel reports. That was bad enough; but then the full Commission went ahead with its recommendations *before* the four panels were able to submit *their* final reports.

Moreover, various technical studies were actually kept from me and other commissioners, despite repeated requests. I was able to obtain them—as well as time to submit a minority report—only by resorting to a lawsuit in federal court. As Sen. John McClellan (D., Ark.) said later: "Never before in the history of Congressionally created Presidential commissions have constitutional rights been so infringed upon that a commission member was compelled to seek judicial relief."

OPPOSITION TO REPORT

The Commission's report has already sparked forceful opposition in Washington. In October, the Senate, in an unprecedented action, overwhelmingly passed a resolution sponsored by Senator McClellan specifically repudiating the majority report on two grounds: (1) that "the findings and recommendations are not supported by the evidence," and (2) that "the Commission has not complied with the mandates of Congress." And President Nixon, having evaluated the report, said, "I categorically reject its morally bankrupt conclusions and major recommendations. So long as I am in the White House, there will be no relaxation of the effort to control and eliminate smut from our national life."

Nevertheless, the wide publicity given to the majority's suggested solutions to the obscenity problem calls for some straight answers.

For example, the Commission claims that "extensive empirical investigation provides no evidence that exposure to or use of explicit sexual materials plays a significant role in the causation of social or individual harms."

My answer is this: although proving cause-and-effect relationships in sociological matters is difficult, common sense tells us that it is ridiculous to imply that pornography has *no* effect. Since the current flood of erotica began in the early 1960s, sex crimes have multiplied. From 1960 through 1969, reported rapes increased 116 percent; arrests for rape went up 56.6 percent; and arrests for prostitution and commercialized vice shot up 60 percent. Such statistics at least appear to reflect some "significant" relationship between crime and pornography.

MAJORITY IGNORED OWN STUDIES

And, in fact, the Commission majority chose to ignore a number of results of its own studies which showed ill effects of smut. One involved 365 men, including prisoners, college students and Roman Catholic seminarians, and concluded: "The data clearly suggest that exposure to considerable pornography at early ages (under 14) plays a role in the development of sexually deviant

life-style." Another Commission-sponsored study, of 464 reformatory inmates, showed again and again a relationship between high exposure to pornography and sexually deviant behavior at a young age.

More than a year before the Commission completed its work, I requested that a thorough study be made of police records to determine whether obscene materials are frequently involved in cases of anti-social sex conduct. Included in my memo were the results of a pilot project undertaken by the Citizens for Decent Literature, which asked police departments in several cities to compile lists of cases where pornographic material was related to sex crimes. Thirty-four such cases were mentioned in my memo; yet the Commission ignored these findings and refused to authorize a broad national study.

Wrong Definition. The Commission also claims that the prevailing view in the Supreme Court, lower federal courts and state courts is that the test of obscenity is: whether to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the "dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interest" and is *"utterly without redeeming social value."*

This interpretation, which would make it virtually impossible to find anything obscene, was an important factor in the majority vote to legalize pornography. But it is flatly untrue. The controlling test for obscenity was spelled out in 1957 by the Supreme Court's landmark decision in the case of *Roth v. United States*. Declaring that the First Amendment guarantees of free speech have never applied to obscene material, the Court held that "obscenity is not within the area of constitutionally protected speech or press."

WHAT THE COURT SAID

The Court went on to state that material is obscene when "to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material, taken as a whole, appeals to prurient interest." *The Court did not say that the material must be "utterly without redeeming social value."* What the Court did say in this regard was: "Implicit in the history of the First Amendment is the rejection of obscenity as utterly without redeeming social importance." Clearly this was not part of the Court's *definition* of obscenity.

Up to You. Amid the public confusion over this admittedly complex legal question, what can be done? I made two principal recommendations in my minority report.

First: Action against obscenity at the community level should continue vigorously. We should insist that pornographers be arrested, prosecuted and jailed.

Second: Congress should enact a law that would prevent the U.S. Supreme Court from overturning an obscenity conviction simply because it does not agree with a determination of obscenity in a lower court. It is a long-established principle that the Supreme Court's role is to *review* law; it is not a fact-finding court.

Such legislation, which follows the intent of a bill sponsored by the late Sen. Everett M. Dirksen (S. 1077, still before Congress), would "free juries of local citizens to make the final determination as to whether a book, magazine or movie is obscene." At the same time, it would effectively refute the flagrantly biased findings of a handful of men who foisted their ideas on the Commission's majority report.

The issue is squarely up to the public. Citizens can sit back, do nothing and let the moral bankruptcy continue. Or they can join the crusade to stop the flood of pornography—at this time when there is such desperate need for enlightened, intelligent control of the poisons that threaten us and the generations to follow.

SOVIET JEWISH POLITICAL PRISONERS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the world must continue to be reminded of the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union. The forms of persecution vary from time to time but the theme is, sadly, consistent: Soviet Jews are subjected regularly to political persecution and repression, are forbidden to teach, practice, preserve, and perpetuate their religion and culture and are forbidden to escape this anti-Jewish campaign by emigrating to Israel.

The American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry recently held a rally in Washington in conjunction with the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington. The conference is composed of the 27 major national Jewish organizations in the United States. I was extremely pleased to note the variety of distinguished Americans who participated in this rally. They included: The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean, Washington National Cathedral; Bishop Stephen Gill Spottswood, president of the board, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican of New York; Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat of Connecticut; Senator RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Republican of Pennsylvania; Myer Feldman, former White House counsel and noted lawyer; Dr. David R. Hunter, deputy director general, National Council of Churches; Jerry Wurf, vice president, AFL–CIO and president, American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees; and Elihu Davison, steering committee, Baltimore-Washington Union of Jewish Students.

So that my colleagues can be kept fully informed on this important issue which will continue to abrade American-Soviet relations until the Soviet anti-Jewish campaign ends, I include below a current background report on "Soviet Jewish Political Prisoners" prepared by the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry:

SOVIET JEWISH POLITICAL PRISONERS: BACKGROUND REPORT

Thirty-four Soviet Jews, arrested and held incommunicado within the past six months in Leningrad, Riga, Kishinev and Tbilisi, face the imminent prospect of political trials that can lead to life imprisonment, and even the death penalty.

The weight of evidence, filtered out to the outside world by close relatives and friends, leaves little room for doubt that regardless of the legal specifications that may be brought at the trials their trust will be anti-Jewish.

In the larger context of recent Soviet policy, it is clear that the immediate purpose of the arrests and any accompanying trials is to stifle the voices of the scores of Jews who, in the last year, have undertaken to struggle to leave the USSR for Israel, where they can maintain their Jewish identity. The long-range objective may be to crush a larger-scale renascent Jewish national consciousness among many thousands of Soviet Jews.

All the available information leads to the conclusion that last spring a high-level policy decision was made to initiate a nationally coordinated, concerted secret police (KGB) action against militant Jews which used entrapment and provocation and involved large-scale searches and seizures, confiscation of printed matter, interrogations and, ultimately, forced confessions that can be used as incriminating evidence in public trials.

The known facts are these:

At 8:30 A.M. on June 15, 1970, nine Riga Jews were apprehended at Leningrad's Smolny Airport as they were walking from the terminal to an airplane. That afternoon, *Vecherny Leningrad*, the main afternoon paper, carried a brief announcement of the action, indicating that those arrested had planned to hijack the plane out of the country. The same item appeared the next day in *Leningradskaya Pravda*, the main morning newspaper.

As a matter of policy the Soviet press rarely publishes crime news, and even then it is not until long after the event. The fact that these papers carried this report within less than twenty-four hours suggests that they were alerted in advance. The fact that the Jews were arrested while walking on the ground is a sure sign of the KGB's advance information and planning.

The probability of a meticulously coordinated police provocation is enhanced even further by the virtual simultaneity of other actions that day.

At about the same hour of the arrests at Smolny Airport, eight Leningrad Jews were arrested in scattered places—at work, at home, on assignment some distance from the city, and even on vacation as far away as Odessa. Within a few hours searches were carried out in dozens of homes in Moscow, Leningrad, Riga and Kharkov; scores of people were detained for questioning and then released. Since June there have been more arrests in Tbilisi, Kishinev, Riga and again in Leningrad, bringing the number of Jewish political prisoners at this date to thirty-six, including two sentenced prior to the new arrests.

The man in charge of "the Leningrad case," involving at least the prisoners from Riga and Leningrad itself, is the chief city prosecutor, S. Ye. Soloviov, well known to local Jews as an anti-Semite.

In 1961 he served as a judge in the city's criminal court, and presided over two notorious trials involving Jews. In one case, he handed down a series of death sentences for alleged economic crimes to a group of Jews. In another, he sentenced Leningrad synagogue leaders, including an 84-year-old man, to lengthy prison terms on charges of subversion. The charges were due to the defendants' determined efforts in behalf of Jewish religious observances, and their active contacts with synagogue leaders in other cities.

I

The new arrests and the ominous possibility of trials must be understood within the larger context of official policy, as reflected in the massive winter propaganda campaign against Israel during January–March 1970. What began as a concerted nationwide chorus of condemnation of Israeli policies swiftly degenerated into a general anti-Jewish campaign. Publications in the thousands all over the country, through articles, editorials, pamphlets, letters to the editor, and caricatures, assumed an anti-Semitic tone and character.

The campaign itself was an expanded, but more intensified, version of the Soviet propaganda line that now views Judaism as the ideological progenitor of Zionism, and Zionism as the equivalent of Nazism. The whole amalgam is a key element in the doctrine of

"International Zionism" as the Jewish ally and servant of Western imperialism—an updated and refurbished adaptation of the discredited Tsarist "Protocols of the Elders of Zion."

A number of Jews, both prominent and obscure, were pressed into service in this campaign, to proclaim their loyalty to the Soviet Union, to reiterate official apologetics about Soviet Jewry, to sign attacks on Israel and world Jewry, and to brand as betrayal any desire to leave for Israel. The apex was reached at a Moscow press conference on March 4, when 52 prominent Jews were brought together by the Foreign Ministry to speak to the world and, indirectly, to Soviet Jews.

What must have shocked the authorities, however, was the instantaneous reaction of dozens of Soviet Jews, as individuals and in groups, in Moscow, Leningrad, Riga and elsewhere, repudiating the assertions of the "house-broken" Jews and their right to speak for all of Soviet Jewry. It was very likely in reaction to this unprecedented audacity that the regime decided to intensify anti-Jewish pressures.

Of course, the authorities have been aware for some time of the growing frustration and resentment of many Soviet Jews at the discrimination they face in higher education and employment, the widespread anti-Jewish propaganda, the hostility they and their children frequently encounter in the streets, at school or at work, and, not least, at the deprivation of their cultural and religious rights, foreclosing the possibility of perpetuating their heritage and maintaining their group identity.

Furious with official anti-Semitism, and inspired by the spiritual self-regeneration which Israel represents to them, a rising generation of young Soviet Jews rejects this situation as intolerable. Tens of thousands have applied for exit permits to emigrate to Israel, With few exceptions, their applications have repeatedly been turned down.

Several hundred of the more daring have circulated appeals and open letters addressed to the Soviet leadership, to the UN Human Rights Commission, to UN Secretary General U Thant, to the International Red Cross, and also to President Richard Nixon and Israel Premier Golda Meir. In effect, they have appealed to public opinion and to the conscience of the world. Such letters have been written by individuals and by groups in every major city.

This wholly unanticipated upsurge of pride and national consciousness has manifestly so upset the regime that it has resorted to severely repressive measures. The striving for Jewish national identity has begun to be treated like a criminal or anti-social act, with procedures of intimidation used against many who applied for exit permits, including interrogation by the KGB, expulsion from the Party, suspension from the university, discharge from employment, and general social hostility at work.

II

But, what of the imminence of a trial of those arrested since June?

In order to better understand what may happen, it must be borne in mind that there are basically two separate groups involved in "the Leningrad case."

We know precious little about their fate. No indictment has been issued. The prisoners have been kept incommunicado. Relatives, friends and even potential defense counsel have been forbidden to visit them, and they have evidently been under the tensive interrogation. Since we have no precise idea of how they will be charged, it is only possible to speculate on the circumstances in which they will be tried, and the penalties they are likely to incur.

According to law, conspiracy to hijack an airplane is considered treason and is therefore subject to the death penalty. Even knowledge of such a plan and failure to report it can be subsumed under a charge of anti-Soviet activity and entails life imprisonment. Attempted hijacking can be treated as a plot to damage or steal State property, and may also entail the death penalty.

About the Riga group, relatives and friends living abroad but in the closest feasible contact at home believe that the Riga Jews were entrapped by someone in their midst.

We have learned, in a letter from the wives, mothers and sisters of eight of the Leningrad group, that police interrogators informed the women that the prisoners confessed to "anti-Soviet activity" and the attempted hijacking of a plane. The women made it clear that they believe these were forced confessions.

Forced confessions raise the ominous spectre of show trials. Such staged trials, using forced confessions as decisive evidence, are no innovation in Soviet law and public life, even though they have been in disuse in the last few years. This sad tradition goes back to the early 1920's and culminates, of course, in Stalin's notorious Great Purges of 1936–40, with their anti-Jewish component.

For Soviet Jews, this form of terror as an anti-Semitic expression began in earnest only after World War II, in the last five years of Stalin's death, known to them as "the Black Years." Those years witnessed a series of grim experiences: a massive anti-Semitic campaign of propaganda and purge against "unmasked cosmopolitans" (a thinly veiled and well-understood euphemism for Jewish intellectuals, large numbers of whom publicly "confessed" their sins); the liquidation of Jewish cultural institutions and the arrest and execution of hundreds of Jewish cultural leaders; a series of anti-Semitic show trials, replete with confessions, of the top leadership of Communist parties in the Soviet satellites, especially the infamous "Slansky trial" in Czechoslovakia, plotted by Stalin in 1952.

The wave of terror culminated with the announcement, in January 1953, of an alleged "plot" by which Soviet Jewish doctors had murdered, or were planning to murder, Soviet political leaders at the behest of an international Jewish conspiracy in league with Western imperialism—a charge that is closely akin to the present Soviet trilogy of Judaism—Zionism—Nazism! Only the death of Stalin, in March 1953, ended what most observers believed was going to be a vast new purge, with an emphasis on trials and the deportation of Jews.

It is also essential to recall the experience and the lessons of the more recent widespread economic crimes campaign of 1961–64. This was another of those nationally coordinated enterprises which the police authorities stage so well. All of the institutions of Soviet power were used to expose and eradicate those accused of alleged large-scale economic offenses, such as theft of State property, embezzlement, dealing in foreign currency, counterfeiting, and bribery.

The Communist Party apparatus, the Komsomol (Young Communist League), the militia, the secret police, the regular police, local prosecutors and courts, and the national and regional press were brought into service. Crude propaganda material, overtly anti-Jewish, blanketed the country and mass trials were staged in which the accused invariably confessed and were given stiff penalties.

For the purposes of this campaign, the death penalty was reinstituted after a lapse of many years. Of the several hundred executed, more than fifty per cent were Jews, who constitute just over one per cent of the total population. Just six years ago the International Commission of Jurists, in a meticulously detailed study, pointed up the anti-Semitic taint of the campaign. Certain Soviet jurists themselves, in a moment of criticism, noted its legal excesses.

More immediately and directly relevant to our present concern is the case of Boris Kochubiyevsky, the first of the Soviet Jewish political prisoners—a 33-year-old electronics engineer from Kiev, in the Ukraine.

Kochubiyevsky was arrested in December 1968, and five months later he was tried and sentenced to three years of forced labor for "anti-Soviet slander." His "slander" consisted of a public defense of Israel in June 1967, and his public assertion in September 1968 that Babi Yar—the ravine outside Kiev where the Nazis slaughtered scores of thousands of Jews in 1941—was a tragedy for the Jewish people. Also included were his statements, in a November 1968 letter to the Soviet leadership, that it was impossible for him to live as a Jew in the USSR since there are no Jewish educational, cultural or communal institutions, and that he consequently wanted to go to Israel.

In short, the accusations against Kochubiyevsky were essentially identical with the regime's real grievances against its present Jewish prisoners. His trial is now being viewed as a harbinger of gloom for additional trials, and as a foreboding precedent.

In the Kochubiyevsky case, *Khronika*, the generally reliable "Chronicle of Current Events" disseminated by the Soviet democratic underground, reported segments of the trial transcript as well as reports by persons present at the trial which painted the following picture.

Some proscution witnesses were provocateurs. Several repudiated the testimony they gave at the preliminary hearings; one admitted to having given his testimony while drunk; others said they testified under pressure from the KGB interrogators. The general public was kept away.

Not even friends or relatives were permitted inside the courtroom. At the same time, the KGB packed the courtroom with its own members, as well as with citizens who were mobilized and instructed to act hostile to the defense. Witnesses were sent out of the court immediately after their testimony, which is against Soviet legal procedures. The judge acted like a prosecutor, indulging in remarks that were hostile to the defense in tone and substance, and generally permitted anti-Semitic and hooligan behavior in his court. At the same time the defense counsel assumed the role of assistant prosecutor, not only accepting the basic validity of the charges against his client but actually indicating his disbelief of Kochubiyevsky's own defense.

It is, of course, entirely conceivable that Soviet authorities will attempt to underplay or even avoid, in any direct way, the essentially anti-Jewish, political character of the new case. Very likely apprehensive about protests in the outside world over a mass anti-Jewish trial, they may seek to divert attention to the narrow legal question of a hijacking plot through an emphasis on forced confessions. This would serve them especially well at a period when much of the civilized world has gone through a period of shock with regard to airplane hijackings.

But regardless of how the trial is conducted, and how Soviet propaganda handles it, it will be difficult to shift the focus from the fact that people are on trial for their convictions, and that Jews are being persecuted as Jews. The defendants had no desire to attack, change, subvert or overthrow the Soviet system. On the contrary, their only desire was to leave that system altogether, and to exercise their elementary human right to leave their country of origin and to settle in Israel, which they now regard as their ancestral homeland and as the sole place where they can live as Jews.

The materials confiscated from those interrogated and arrested demonstrate conclusively that this will be a Jewish case. Among the items seized were Hebrew grammars, Jewish history books, open letters of appeal for help to leave, postal cards from

Israel, and Jewish encyclopedias. In short, as some have written, everything with the words "Jew," "Jewish," "Judaism" was confiscated.

Within days after the June 15 action a young Leningrad Jew, Viktor Boguslavsky, wrote an impassioned letter pleading the innocence of his friends. He noted that "A lively interest in the fate of one's people and love for one's people cannot be considered an offense. Their only crime was that they were born Jews and they sought to remain Jews."

In July, Viktor Boguslavsky was arrested.

TRIED AND SENTENCED

(Ukrainian SSR)

Boris L. Kochubiyevsky: 34 years old. Engineer. Married. One child: a year-old daughter. Former address: Kiev, Ukraine SSR. Charged with anti-Soviet slander December 1968. Sentenced May 1969 to three years at hard labor.

Lilya A. Ontman: Married; family includes a sister and an adopted child. Former address: Chernovitz, Ukraine SSR. Charged with anti-Soviet slander. Sentenced January 1970 to two and a half years in prison.

AWAITING TRIAL (WITH ARREST DATES INDICATED*)

(Georgian SSR)

Abraham Danilashvili; June 1970.*

Biniamin Dzhaneshvili: June 1970.*

(Leningrad, Russian SFSR)

Vladimir Osherovich Mogilever: June 15, 1970;* 30 years old. Engineer. Wife: Yulia Issaevna Mogilever. One child: a two-year-old son. Address: Ul. Telmana D. 36, korp. 1, kv. 209.

David Iserovich Chernoglaz: June 15, 1970;* 30 years old. Agronomist. Wife: Berta Petrovna Veinger. One child: an eight-month-old infant. Address: Pr. Maklina D. 26, kv. 25.

Grigory Ilya Butman: June 15, 1970;* 37 years old. Engineer. Wife: Yeva Shmulevna Butman. One child: a four-year-old daughter. Address: Vitebsky pr. D. 23, korp. 4, kv. 33.

Lassal Kaminsky: June 15, 1970*, 40 years old. Engineer. Wife: Serfima Mayerovna Kaminsky. Two children: ten and seventeen. Address: Ul. Vosstaniya D. 6, kv. 4.

Lev Leibovich Korenblit: June 15, 1970*; 48 years old. Mathematician. Wife: Reveka Moiseyevna Korenblit. One child: a daughter. Address: UL Vereiskaya D. 12, kv, 10.

Solomon Dreizner: June 15, 1970*; 38 years old. Engineer. Married: wife hospitalized. One child: a five-month-old son. Address: 19 Olega Koshevogo, Apt. 23.

Anatoly Moiseyevich Goldfield: June 15, 1970*; 24 years old. Engineer, Unmarried. Mother: Liya Samsonovna Shimanovich. Address: Pr. Shaumyan D. 58, kv. 18.

Lev Naumovich Yagman: June 15, 1970*; 30 years old. Wife: Musya Khaim-Leibovna Yagman. Two children: 2 and 6 years old. Address: Ul. Karbysheva D. 6, korp. 1, kv. 80.

Viktor David Boguslavsky: July 12, 1970*; 30 years old. Unmarried. Mother hospitalized. Address: Pr. Shaumyana 47, apt. 25.

Hillel Zalmanovich Shur: September 5, 1970*; 34 years old. Marital status unknown. Sister: Kreina Zalmanovna Shur. Address: Ul. Zhukovskogo D. 20, kv. 20.

Viktor Shilbans: November 16, 1970*; 28 years old. Physician. Married.

Mikhail Korenblit: November 16, 1970*; Brother of Lev Korenblit.

(Riga, Latvian SSR)

Leib G. Khanokh: June 15, 1970*; 26 years old. Address: 21 Milisnas Street.

Meri Mendelevich Khanokh: June 15, 1970*; 20 years old. Wife of Leib G. Khanokh. Same address.

Yosif M. Mendelevich: June 15, 1970*; 23 years old. Brother of Mary M. Khanokh. Address: 176/44 Lenin Street.

Edvard Kuznetsov: June 15, 1970*; Address: 45 Vaidenbaum Street, apt. 22.

Silva Zalmanson Kuznetsov: June 15, 1970*; Wife of Edvard Kuznetsov. Same address.

Isak Zalmanson: June 15, 1970*; 26 years old. Brother of Silva Z. Kuznetsov. Same address.

Wolf Zalmanson: June 15, 1970*; 31 years old. Brother and Isak Zalmanson and Silva Kuznetzov. Same address.

Anatoly A. Altman: June 15, 1970*; 38 years old.

Boris Pestner: June 15, 1970*.

Mendel Bodnia; July 1970*; 33 years old. Wife: Zelda Bodnia. Address: Shkolnaya Street 7, apt. 2.

Arkady Shpilberg: August 4, 1970*; 32 years old. Engineer. Wife: Margarita Mikhailovna Shpilberg. One child: a daughter, Address: Lenina Street 205, apt. 6.

Boris Maftsier: August 4, 1970*; 23 years old. Wife: Genia Moiseyevna Maftsier. Address: Siltsiema Street 15, korp. 5, apt. 61.

Ruth Aleksandrovich; October 7, 1970*; 23 years old. Nurse. Address: Suvorova Street 16, apt. 20.

Mikhail Shepshelovich: October 16, 1970*; 27 years old. Address: Yuglas Street 5, apt. 42.

(Kishinev, Moldavian SSR)

Aleksander Galperin: July 24, 1970*; 24 years old. Unmarried. Mother: Makhlia Yefimovna Galperina. Address: 37, Ul. Tesbashevskaya 11–13.

Arkady Voloshin: August 15, 1970*; Address: Ul. Kievskaya 41, kv. 5.

Gari Kirshner: August 15, 1970*.

David Rabinovich: August 15, 1970*.

Abraham Trakhtenberg: August 15, 1970*.

Semeon Abramovich Levit: November, 1970*; Address: Ul. Svoboda 8.

SMOKING IN COMMERCIAL AIRPLANES: SOME COMMENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, as a nonsmoker, I am personally offended by the tobacco odors that invariably envelope airline passengers such as myself. I have expressed my views on this matter to the presidents of the airlines that I utilize, and their responses follow—identical language was used in the letters to Eastern and TWA. A relevant article from the December 17, 1970, Christian Science Monitor also follows:

SEPTEMBER 8, 1970.

Mr. GEORGE A. SPATER,
President, American Airlines,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. SPATER: As a frequent passenger on your airlines, I write to voice an objection and make an inquiry.

My objection is to smoke-filled airplanes. I have never quite understood why the nonsmoking passenger must always defer to the smoking passenger and why the airlines operate on the assumption that most passengers prefer smoke-filled airplanes.

I have spent long periods of time on airplanes with burning, watery eyes, stale air, and a nauseated stomach.

When the planes are "stacked-up," smokers smoke more and conditions become even more unbearable.

After departing from the airplane, often with several hours of work ahead, I feel that I have been in a cigarette factory and my clothes and person carry the aroma (to use a polite word) for hours afterwards.

Several of my colleagues in the Congress have introduced bills to prevent smoking in commercial airplanes and I am tempted to follow their lead.

I thought, however, that it would be proper for me first to give you a chance to state your position.

I am anxious to know the thinking of your airline on this matter. Do you consider it a problem? Are you reassessing present policy? Are you seeking solutions? If so, what alternatives are you considering? What would the attitude of your airline be toward legislation to ban smoking from commercial airlines?

I look forward to your response.

With warm regards.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Member of Congress.

AMERICAN AIRLINES,
New York, N.Y., September 22, 1970.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: I am most interested in your comments on smoking aboard aircraft. I don't smoke myself and find it personally annoying to be forced to endure the smoke of others.

American Airlines most certainly does consider smoking aboard aircraft to be a problem, and not only because of my personal preference. We are reassessing our policy and seeking solutions.

We have worked with aircraft manufacturers to obtain better cabin air-conditioning and feel we are making progress. In our present fleet, the entire cabin air content is replaced each two to four minutes. In our newest aircraft, the 747, we provide separate sections of the cabin for smokers and nonsmokers. We expect to do the same on our new fleet of DC–10s which we expect to comprise the bulk of our fleet on high density markets within two years.

If we can solve this problem with better cabin air circulation and separate compartments for smokers, I would prefer to do it that way since I don't like to try to impose my own notions on others.

We are keeping up to date on surveys being made by manufacturers and federal agencies and have asked our medical department to review allegations that in-flight smoking can be a hazard to the health of non-smoking passengers. Our findings to date indicate the problem is one of discomfort or annoyance rather than of health.

With many thanks for giving us the benefit of your views and a chance to comment.

Sincerely,

GEORGE A. SPATER.

EASTERN AIR LINES INC.,
New York, N.Y., October 2, 1970.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: This is in reply to your thoughtful letter of September 8 in reference to smoking on airline aircraft.

During 1969, Eastern received 61 letters from passengers expressing reactions ranging from annoyance to outrage as a result of smoking by fellow passengers. A few of those letters expressed the view that this exposure to smoking of others might be dangerous, but the majority were focusing on the objectionableness of the smoke and, as you say, "the aroma." Obviously, for every passenger who took the time to write, there must have been a good many others who had the same reactions but did not have the time to put them in writing. Thus, the subject is not one that can be dismissed lightly.

On the other hand, the 61 complaints need to be put in proper perspective. During 1969

we carried approximately 21 million passengers and, thus received approximately one written smoking complaint for every 300,000 passengers carried. It is interesting to note, for example, that we received over four times as many complaints about our failure to provide some special diet meal (such as low-calorie, salt-free, etc.) as we did on the smoking problem.

In an effort to keep completely abreast of passenger thinking on this subject, we included "Smoking Aboard Aircraft" as a topic in a recent airline passenger survey which we conducted. One of the questions asked was "Do you feel that the airlines should adopt the policy of not permitting smoking by anyone on a commercial flight? The responses were: "Yes, should adopt a no-smoking policy"—13.4%; "No, should not adopt a no-smoking policy"—78.4%; and "Don't know"—8.2%. Of the sample, 47.7% were smokers, and 52.3% were non-smokers. It was particularly interesting to us to note that, even of the non-smokers, a majority was opposed to adopting a "no-smoking" policy.

Thus, in the absence of some convincing evidence that smoking is actually injurious to the health of our non-smoking passengers, our present position, based on what we believe to be the overwhelming desires of our passengers, would be to strongly oppose legislation banning smoking on airlines.

This is certainly not to say that we feel that no problem exists, or that we are content to turn our back on it. Each generation of new aircraft has enjoyed significantly improved air circulation systems, markedly increasing the exchange rate of air in the cabin. The manufacturers of our present aircraft would tell you that the individual ventilation nozzle, provided at each seat, is capable of enveloping the passenger in a cone of fresh air which will minimize, if not eliminate, the annoyance of smoke from other passengers. Obviously that is not the case, because we do know that you and many others like you find the smoke levels almost intolerable. For that reason, we are continuing to increase the fresh air exchange rate requirements for new aircraft—with the result that our Lockheed 1011 will achieve a complete change of air in the cabin each 3½ minutes. This exchange will be accomplished laterally, toward the side walls of the cabin, and, thus, achieve maximum efficiency. While I cannot promise that this will totally solve the problem, it should be a substantial step in the right direction.

An interesting sidelight to the possibility of banning smoking from aircraft was the comment we received from smokers that, if smoking were banned, they would simply retire to the lavatories to do their smoking. It isn't difficult to imagine how a few chain-smokers could create problems for the rest of the passengers of an even more serious nature than watering eyes.

We have also considered the possibility of trying to separate the smokers from the non-smokers. Our survey indicated, however, that 70% of our passengers felt that this separation is unnecessary. The separation raises some substantial problems in that it really means that we would have to have four sections in the aircraft—smoking and non-smoking sections in both the first-class and tourist compartments, and possibly reservations for each aircraft for four different types of passengers. We feel that the result would inevitably be a slight loss in utilization of seats which would be of far greater consequence than might be supposed. For example, a 1% reduction in utilization of Eastern's seats during 1970 would almost certainly mean the difference between a profit or a loss for the year, and, all things considered, it appears that an attempt to segregate passengers would probably create more problems and more passenger inconvenience than it could possibly cure. We are still analyzing these possibilities, however, and will continue to do so.

In short, we are dedicated to doing the most possible for all of our passengers, and we are not indifferent toward the smoking problem. We will continue to work on it, and, if you have further thoughts or suggestions, they will be much appreciated.

Sincerely,

F. D. HALL.

TRANS WORLD AIRLINES, INC.,
New York, N.Y., October 22, 1970.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: I must apologize for this delayed response to your letter of September 8 regarding smoking on our aircraft. We share your concern in this matter and do indeed consider it a most serious problem. Since we deal daily with thousands of passengers of different backgrounds and varying tastes, we are ever conscious of the wishes of the travelling public.

As I am sure you are aware, TWA did extensive research into the problems of smoking on aircraft. As a result of this effort, effective June 1 we instituted separate no-smoking and smoking sections on all our aircraft. Specific cabins or rows of seats are designated for each preference, and the passenger makes his selection depending, of course, on the availability of accommodations in the area he chooses. These areas are designated both in first class and in the coach sections. This we found was the best possible system and fair to all passengers. Although what we are doing is not a perfect solution to the problem for people like yourself who object to smoking, I do believe that it is the most sensible compromise a public service organization can make.

We are aware that not all passengers are cooperative in that a few individuals may create a situation which can be disturbing to others who anticipate travelling in an atmosphere conducive to their comfort and pleasure. We are confident we have achieved uniformity of performance by our personnel and that our passengers recognize and accept the plan.

Signs indicating no smoking areas are prominently displayed inside the aircraft to reinforce our request for compliance on the part of our passengers. If a passenger does smoke in a nonsmoking area, our inflight personnel have been instructed to tactfully request that he either refrain from doing so or move to a smoking section.

As with any policy instituted to provide a new service to our customers, there is constant review and evaluation and should indications so dictate, we will initiate changes that correspond more closely to the public's desires. Again, I must emphasize that we are trying to satisfy a wide cross section of the public and we have tried to be fair in maintaining our policy in both classes of travel.

I would like to thank you for writing and also for your frequent travels with TWA. In the event you have any further questions, I will ask Mr. Tribbe to discuss them with you for we are always glad to do what we can in this regard.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

F. C. WISER.

NONSMOKERS PUSH FOR POLLUTION-FREE AIR TRAVEL

(By Keith Saunders)

WASHINGTON.—Nonsmoking airline passengers may yet be protected from the smokers.

True, a United States District Court Judge here has dismissed Ralph Nader's suit charging that smoking is a hazard to flight safety.

But this decision does not get at the question of whether the rights of nonsmokers are violated when they are subjected to cigarette smoke in a closed airplane cabin.

A second suit, in the form of a petition filed with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) by a college professor earlier this year, requested segregation of smokers from nonsmokers on all U.S. airlines.

The FAA petition, as well as Mr. Nader's court action stated that nonsmokers are forced to breathe smoke-contaminated air in the passenger cabin of planes and that this air may be injurious to the health of any nonsmoker. A further charge was that the annoyance and discomfort constituted discrimination.

FAA PROPOSES RULE

Antipollution measures and environmental protection being much in vogue in Washington this year, the FAA responded by publishing an advance notice of a proposed rulemaking applying to smoking on aircraft operated by air carriers, air travel clubs, and operators of commercial or corporate aircraft. The rulemaking may come within six months.

Meanwhile, the government agency had registered its strong disagreement with the assertion in Mr. Nader's petition that smoking poses a serious threat in the passenger cabin and that smoking by flight crew members can adversely affect their performance in the cockpit. It was on this point that it was upheld by Judge Joseph C. Waddy.

The crux of the issue, as FAA sees it, is how best to protect the nonsmokers from tobacco smoke during the time when he is buckled in a seat in a metal cylinder some 20,000 to 30,000 feet above the ground.

FAA Administrator John H. Shaffer therefore is of the opinion that it is highly desirable for the agency to exercise its statutory authority and explore in depth the extent to which exposure to tobacco smoke may be harmful to nonsmokers. The FAA has invited comments from air travelers, crew members, aircraft manufacturers, medical and technical experts, and other interested persons on a number of pertinent questions.

JOINT STUDY INITIATED

In another approach, FAA joined with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Defense in initiating a study to measure the amounts of tobacco contaminants in aircraft in passenger use and to check the efficiency of planes' existing air circulation systems. Data also are being gathered on the number of smokers and nonsmokers aboard flights, personal attitudes toward smoking, and amount and type of tobacco used by smokers.

These studies now are slated for completion by the end of the year, and as soon as they have been evaluated the FAA will be in a position to publish in the Federal Register a notice of rulemaking, allow 30 days for comments, and then issue a formal ruling, probably by late spring.

What form the rule will take is difficult to guess. The evidence almost certainly will suggest that the nonsmoking traveler needs and deserves protection from tobacco contaminants while in flight. It is possible such protection can be provided through improvements in cabin ventilation, but aeronautical engineers are dubious on this score. If they are right, it becomes a matter of whether to segregate smokers from nonsmokers or to prohibit in-flight smoking.

Anticipating the proposed rule, several airlines recently have been testing such separation of smokers and nonsmokers—with inconclusive results to date. It is relatively easy to do this on a plane as large as the Boeing 747. For example, Pan American Airways allocates one of the three economy sections of its 747's and one corner of its main deck first-class section to smokers.

On other jetliners, setting up special sections for smoking passengers, if this is to be really effective, involves installation of movable partitions, and on virtually all exist-

ing planes other than the Boeing 747 this means at least two partitions—one each in the first class and the coach or economy sections.

This adds weight to the airplane, means less mobility for the cabin crews, causes extra work for airline personnel in determining who is to sit where, may complicate the showing of in-flight movies, and inevitably will make many smoking passengers unhappy.

The alternative to this would be to prohibit smoking aboard airliners. The obvious advantage of such a ban are that it would mean (1) fresher air for all passengers, (2) reduced fire hazard, (3) one less item for the flight crew to monitor, and (4) less of a job for the cleaning crews.

What will be the result if smoking on planes is prohibited? How will the nicotine-addicted air traveler take it?

MOST FLIGHTS SHORT

Domestic flights exceeding two hours' duration are the exception, rather than the rule, and millions of smokers uncomplainingly forego smoking for two hours while attending a movie.

In fact, according to the Civil Aeronautics Board, the average domestic airline flight is 384.6 miles—approximately the distance between Washington, D.C., and Dayton, Ohio. This is little more than an hour's flight by jet.

HANUKKAH AND SOVIET JEWRY

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, in December of every year, Jews the world over observe the festival of Hanukkah. This holiday celebrates the first great victory for religious freedom won by the Jews more than 2,000 years ago. It strengthened the belief that religious freedom is the right of every people, and that God desired man to worship Him in freedom.

Over 2,000 years ago, the Palestinian Jews were ruled by a pagan king, who seized their temple in Jerusalem, filling it with idols and forcing Jews to abandon their faith or face death. The stanch Jews, led by Judah Maccabee, defied the tyrant and revolted. After a 3-year battle, and although greatly outnumbered, the Jews succeeded in defeating their enemy and driving him out of Jerusalem.

While cleaning out the regained temple to rededicate it, Judah's men found a single jar of holy oil, enough only to keep the eternal light burning for 1 day. But the jar miraculously burned for 8 days and 8 nights, thereby allowing the temple's priests to prepare enough oil to keep the eternal light burning henceforth.

Judah Maccabee then proclaimed an 8-day holiday in celebration of the rededication of the temple of God. The Hanukkah candles that are lit on the 8 days of the festival symbolize the light of religious freedom to the descendants of Judah Maccabee. Hanukkah means "dedication," and on this holiday many Jews rededicate themselves to the ideals of their faith.

As Hanukkah approaches this year, we are reminded of its significance by the ongoing "trial" of Russian Jews, who are subject to life imprisonment and death for their religious persuasion. The Russian Jews who are facing trial have tried to keep the burning light of their faith lit at all costs. While religious freedom is the right of all people, this right has been abridged in Russia. For the information of my colleagues I will now insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a factsheet on Soviet Jewry, prepared by the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry:

FACT SHEET ON SOVIET JEWRY

Q. How many Jews are there in the Soviet Union?

A. The 1959 official Soviet census recorded 2,268,000. A study released in September, 1969 by the official Soviet government press agency, NOVOSTI, made a projection based on the 1970 census which indicated a total of 3,000,000 Jews. However, other demographic estimates say that the figure may be as much as 3,500,000 on the basis that the 1959 census used faulty census techniques.

Q. Where do they live?

A. According to the last Soviet census, Jews are dispersed throughout 15 Union Republics: 38% of Soviet Jewry live in the Russian Republic; 37% in the Ukraine; 7% in Byelorussia. In the aggregate, well over a million Jews live in four Soviet cities: Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and Odessa. There are sizeable numbers also in Vilna, Kishinev, Minsk, Riga and Tbilisi.

Q. What is the official status of the Jewish community?

A. In a formal sense, there is no Jewish "community" in the Soviet Union.

Soviet Jewry is identified both as a nationality group and as a religious faith. It has a fixed legal status as a nationality, a matter of strict juridical procedure. If both parents are Jewish, the children are listed as Jewish. If one parent is non-Jewish, there is then a choice at age 16, when internal passports are issued.

Among the 108 nationalities in the USSR, Jews rank eleventh in numbers—and the numerical spread from seventh to eleventh place is less than three-quarters of a million.

There is no Jewish religious community although individual synagogues have formal status in Soviet law. As distinguished from nationality, participation in the Jewish religion is, from a legal viewpoint, exclusively a voluntary act.

Q. What is Soviet policy on nationality groups?

A. Soviet ideology, Constitution, law and practice actively encourage nationalities, whether territorially dispersed or concentrated, to perpetuate their group existence through cultural and educational institutions and activities in their own languages. (In the long-run, however, signs indicate that "Russification" may be the objective for most nationalities, especially non-Slavic.)

Q. How has present policy been applied to Soviet Jewry?

A. In the first three decades of the Soviet regime, the state supported a wide network of cultural and educational institutions and activities for Jews in Yiddish, recognized as their official national language. For example, about 850 Yiddish language books were published in editions of several hundred thousand between 1932–39. Before World War II, there were ten permanent Yiddish theatres. As late as 1940, one hundred thousand youngsters were in Yiddish schools.

By 1948 Stalin had destroyed all Jewish communal-cultural institutions including publishing houses and printing presses which had issued a total of 110 publications in the previous three years. The educational system was dismantled. The famed Jewish State Theatre of Moscow was closed in 1949. Yiddish actors, writers, leaders were liquidated.

The essential elements of this policy were continued by Stalin's successors and for eleven years there were no books, publications or theatres.

Q. What is the situation today?

A. There is not a single Yiddish school or a single Yiddish class in the USSR, although Soviet law permits the organization of such classes at the request of ten parents. Intimidation has prevented such efforts.

There are no schools, classes or courses in any language to enable Jews to learn Jewish history, culture, literature or even their recent awful losses during World War II. The martyrdom of Soviet Jews during the Nazi holocaust has been constantly downgraded by Soviet authorities and press.

There is no Jewish publishing house or Jewish book distributing agency, but only occasional token nods toward Yiddish literature. A few classic Yiddish writers, long dead, have been published in small editions and, on occasion, living Jewish writers. In 1964 some book publication was resumed and through 1969 only 15 Yiddish books were issued. Since 1961 there has been a Yiddish literary magazine, *Sovietish Heimland*, originally a bi-monthly and now a monthly. Much of its edition of 16,000, down from its original 25,000, is for export. In a few instances, Yiddish and Hebrew writers, especially pro-left Israelis, have been published in Russian.

There is no Yiddish theatre with a permanent base. There is a small amateur troupe in Vilnius (Vilna), and there are a dozen individual professional performers. There are also a few amateur groups in other smaller cities.

Q. How has Soviet policy been applied to other nationalities?

A. "A comparison with other Soviet nationalities exposes the basic injustices of their (Soviet Jewry) situation, for even the smallest nationality groups in the Soviet Union are given the opportunity to pursue a cultural, social and political life of their own denied to Soviet Jews." *Bertrand Russell*, February 27, 1966.

Examples of nationality groups, smaller in population than Jews, provided educational and cultural facilities in their native tongue, are:

1. In the RSFSR (Russian Republic): Bashkirs, 948,000 population; Maris 498,000; Buryats, 252,000; Kumyks, 135,000; Nenets, 25,000; Koryaks, 6,300. (1960 estimates)

In the Ukraine: Poles 363,000; Moldavians, 239,000; Hungarians, 149,000. (1959 estimates)

2. Case example: The Soviet Germans (Volga Germans), dispersed and repressed by Stalin during and after World War II, were officially rehabilitated by his successors. Volga Germans have been encouraged to develop in less than ten years a complex of German language institutions: schools—publishing houses and book stores—libraries, radio and television broadcasts and stations—theatres—orchestras—and cultural associations. In 1964 alone, 233 German language books were published—a total of 13,015,000 copies. The key to this renaissance of German culture was the vigorous support by Soviet officials.

Q. What is the official policy of the USSR toward religion?

A. Ideologically it is committed to atheism, but formally it accords freedom of religious worship. According to official policy the Party, as distinguished from the State, carries on anti-religious propaganda. The State asserts the principle of equality of religion.

Q. How has this policy been applied to Judaism?

A. The principle of equality has been observed in the breach, insofar as Judaism is concerned. In Soviet society religious centers for various faiths are vital to meeting the various needs of religious groups. Unlike other recognized religious bodies, Judaism is not permitted any central or coordinating

structure; each congregation must function in isolation. Rabbi Yehuda Leib Levin, of Moscow, one of less than a handful of known ordained rabbis functioning in congregations in the European part of the Soviet Union, has been increasingly utilized as a spokesman for religious Soviet Jews. In 1968 and in 1969 he was allowed to visit the United States and Hungary, respectively, the first such actions permitted in decades. He has participated in a few meetings of religious leaders of various faiths and denominations from the several Soviet Republics; but, at age 76, Rabbi Levin is the only rabbi in Moscow and does not represent any official group of religious Jewish communities.

Accordingly, Judaism, *unlike other faiths,*—

Cannot publish periodicals and devotional literature including journals, prayer books and Bibles. After years of world protest, 10,000 prayer books were permitted in 1968 and hundreds were actually distributed.

Cannot produce essential devotional articles such as "Talethim" (prayer shawls) or "Tfilin" (phylacteries);

Cannot have meaningful and official contracts with co-religionists abroad as contrasted to the experience of Protestant, Catholic and Moslem faiths;

Cannot publish (except in isolated instances, especially the "showpiece" Central Synagogue in Moscow) religious calendars, indispensable guides to religious holidays and observances.

Q. Have there been other official pressures applied to Judaism?

A. In contrast to other recognized religions, there are no Yeshivot, rabbinical schools or seminaries functioning at all because of bureaucratic maneuvers such as denial of housing permits to students. Thus, there are no replacements for the few aging rabbis.

The Soviet government allows theological students of many other faiths to study in their own institutions, and in foreign seminaries or religious educational institutions. Judaism is an exception.

Synagogues have been closed in almost systematic fashion as a result of both direct and indirect governmental action. In 1956, there were 450 synagogues in the Soviet Union. In April of 1963, there were under 100; according to non-Soviet sources, there are now about 65 synagogues.

By 1962, restrictions on the public banking and selling of matzoth, indispensable to the observance of Passover, blanketed the country. Only a few years ago the ban was eased in the large Jewish population centers, after widespread protests from outside the country.

Q. What is the USSR policy on anti-Semitism?

A. Soviet ideology condemns anti-Semitism and there are laws against incitement of hatred on religious, national and social groups. There have been a few public pronouncements, from Lenin in 1917 to Premier Kosygin in July, 1965, assailing anti-Semitism. In 1969, PRAVDA and IZVESTIA responded to criticism by denying the existence of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

But there have also been frightening manifestations of anti-Semitism in Soviet practices, even in the post-Stalin years, such as the so-called "economic trials" in the early 60's.

In the guise of anti-religious propaganda, the attacks on Judaism have been virulent, anti-Semitic and racist. While Soviet officials criticized the notorious "Judaism Without Embellishment" by Trofim Kichko, after world-wide public protests, other equally vicious material has continued to be printed by government and Party publishing houses, newspapers and broadcast on State radio.

Since the June 1967 Six-Day War in the Middle East, Kichko in "Judaism and Zionism" (1968), Yuri Ivanov in "Beware Zionism" (1969), and other Soviet propagandists have intensified their anti-Jewish output, attempting to debase Jews and Judaism and suggest a world-wide Jewish "conspiracy" against socialism, using medieval stereotypes.

This campaign reached a peak in March of 1970, when mass meetings were organized and prominent Jews, under pressure, publicly denounced Judaism, Zionism and a natural affinity to Israel. In defiance of official displeasure, however, other Soviet Jews countered with petitions to the Soviet Government.

Q. Is there discrimination against Jews?

A. Apparently there is none in housing, nor in various aspects of social life. It also appears that employment opportunities in most fields are generally open, although advancement to highest ranks is almost impossible.

Discrimination against Jews does exist in vital, decision-making sectors of Soviet society, particularly government, political life and in fields involving foreign contact. The quota system at universities, the key to advancement in Soviet society, operates, according to one study, "to the particularly severe disadvantage of the Jewish population."

Q. What is the overall impact of these practices on Soviet Jewry?

A. Despite localized Jewish manifestations, Jewry in Russia is an atomized and isolated community, much of which lives in a state of insecurity. It is a community which, if Soviet policy persists indefinitely, would be doomed to cultural and spiritual extinction.

Q. What has been the effect of these practices on Jewish consciousness?

A. Despite hostile pressures, there are increasing expressions of vigorous and courageous Jewish identification. Examples:

In 1969 Soviet Jews began to assert their Jewish self-expression within the Soviet Union by a series of petitions to the United Nations and to leading Soviet authorities. For example, in November 1969, a dramatic petition to the United Nations was made public from 18 Jewish families in Soviet Georgia where there is still an atmosphere of Jewish belief and piety as well as strong affinity to Israel. These Jews demanded freedom to go to Israel where they would be fulfilled as Jews. Jewish consciousness is evident also in the Caucasus and Central Asia. Early in 1970 additional petitions were divulged at the United Nations from many other Soviet Jews in places as widespread as Moscow, Riga, Kiev, Leningrad and Kharkov.

A remarkable phenomenon in recent years has been that of tens of thousands of young Soviet Jews, who know little Yiddish or Hebrew, gathering to sing and dance outside synagogues in various cities on Simchat Torah. This practice has begun to spread to other festivals.

In those Western areas under Soviet control since World War II, the determination of those with strong Jewish backgrounds to remain Jewish is clearly evident. Hebrew is being taught on a "one-to-one" basis; informal study groups are being conducted.

Individual Jews, such as Boris Kochubiyevsky, have publicly protested, usually on pain of imprisonment. Jews have increasingly sought to leave for Israel or to rejoin broken or scattered families, there or elsewhere. It was estimated in November 1969 that tens of thousands had willingly registered to emigrate, despite the enusing counter-pressures at schools, factories and in local communities.

Nearly 500,000 Soviet Jews officially regard Yiddish as their "mother tongue." Thousands of others consider it a "second language," not listed on census tracts. The Soviet authorities speak of the lack of interest in Yiddish, but despite this thousands of Soviet Jews have jammed the halls for the token Yiddish concerts occasionally permitted.

Q. Can anything be done to change Soviet policy?

A. The voices of concern have been growing. Thousands of champions of human rights throughout the world have protested, despite Soviet denials. Major Communist and Socialist parties, including those in France, Holland, Austria, Britain, the United States and Australia, have publicly reflected their concern as has the Council of Europe, the United States Government and the Socialist International. The American Jewish community, and others, have demonstrated a determination to continue to expose the pattern of discrimination against Soviet Jewry until Soviet policy is reversed. In 1964, the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry was organized. Recently other groups interested in advancing the cause of human rights for Soviet Jews have been formed in several European and Latin American countries.

Q. Have protests and interventions been helpful?

A. There is evidence to indicate that Soviet officials are increasingly concerned about the unfavorable impressions circulating abroad. Only after public protests became widespread did the Soviet Government launch a counter public relations campaign and make new promises and minor concessions. Articles on Soviet Jewry by Novosti Press Agency and in publications such as Soviet Life, aimed almost exclusively for foreign consumption, appear frequently. Other evidences:

Official condemnation in 1964 of Kichko's book;

A lifting of the ban on matzoth;

A few Jewish books in Yiddish or Russian;

A slight easing of emigration restrictions;

A virtual end to the economic crime trials;

The printing of 10,000 prayer books;

Publication of the previously mentioned, Yiddish literary journal, *Sovietish Heimland.*

While this tokenism is welcomed, it still fails to provide the basic cultural and religious instrumentalities essential for Jewish survival. However, it does give hope that ultimately the Soviet Government will act on the demands of an enlightened and outraged public opinion.

LITTLE BIT OF SPACE GOES LONG WAY WITH CONSUMERS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the recent spinoffs of the U.S. space program have brought many good conveniences to the American public that have helped all us good taxpayers in ways which might not seem apparent. William H. Wylie, business editor of the Pittsburgh Press, in a recent article brought many of these unseen advances to our attention:

LITTLE BIT OF SPACE GOES LONG WAY WITH CONSUMERS

(By William H. Wylie)

When the United States got into the space business on a big scale, it had to think small.

That's because in the early years the American space effort was married to a little rocket. Unlike the huge Russian boosters, it wouldn't lift big payloads.

Consequently, American space hardware had to be refined. And this has been a blessing for consumers, especially swingers caught up in the miniature world of transistors.

Those are the little gadgets that do the work of tubes—only much better.

They make it possible to manufacture

pocket-sized radios, tape-recorders and other scaled-down electronic products.

Of course, the space scientists weren't trying to please consumers. But their work produced some highly marketable spinoff.

Often this is forgotten by taxpayers shouldering the $2 billion bill for putting a man on the moon.

Not all the spinoff is pleasure-oriented. Far from it!

Lasers—another outgrowth of space science—are being used to perform delicate eye surgery. Someday they may make operations painless, even bloodless.

Epileptics may be better off because the U.S. decided to go to the moon. Scientists are working on a device which measures brain waves. It is hoped that an epileptic will be able to wear one and it will warn him before an attack occurs.

Less spectacular but possibly more useful are the techniques of system analysis that came out of the space program. They clear the way for a mathematical, logical approach to problem-solving.

Crime detection, housing and social problems are a few urban applications. These issues can be attacked with computers in the same way that space mysteries were solved.

The benefits of weather and communications satellites are more obvious. Not only has the forecaster's batting average improved, but it's possible for Tokyo baseball fans to watch a World Series in New York.

New structural techniques for aircraft that are stronger but lighter have been developed. The space effort also has brought about better wiring, pipes, metals, plastics, paints and insulating materials. Many of these have domestic applications.

More efficient methods of converting salt water to drinking water and new ways of generating electricity are other space discoveries.

Now the glamor is gone and an economy-minded administration in Washington is cutting back on the space program. This has led to unemployment, especially on the West Coast.

Seattle's jobless rolls have climbed to 12 per cent and that city fears 18 per cent by spring. Southern California, Massachusetts and other space-manufacturing areas also have been hit hard.

As unemployment rises, it's apparent how many jobs the space effort created.

Too often when critics decry the cost of Neil Armstrong's moon walk they overlook the beneficial side effects. True, many of these discoveries would have been made in time. But the space program made them available now.

PITTSBURGH ECONOMY BOOSTED BY AIRPORT

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, many elements go into making a geographic area an industrial colossus.

In western Pennsylvania, where Pittsburgh is located, we were fortunate to have great quantities of iron ore and coal in our hills and mountains.

In the late 1800's and the early 20th century, the indigenous citizens were joined by great waves of immigrants from Eastern Europe and other places. These ready pools of labor worked the mines and mills and helped make Pittsburgh and its surrounding communities the steelmaking capital of the world.

In the middle 1940's a great highway, the Pennsylvania Turnpike, was built from one end of our State to the other, linking Pittsburgh with Philadelphia and the eastern seaboard.

This, too, developed Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania and made an already attractive metropolitan area even more so.

But a more recent addition to Pittsburgh, and one which reaped a new type of benefit, was the Greater Pittsburgh Airport.

William Wylie, business editor of the Pittsburgh Press, wrote an article last week which described the impact that the airport has had on Pittsburgh, the Nation's second largest corporate city.

I include Mr. Wylie's article in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

AIRPORT IMPACTS $250 MILLION, 5 PERCENT OF DISTRICT JOBS

(By William H. Wylie)

How much impact does Greater Pittsburgh Airport have on the local economy?

It totals at least $250 million and probably many millions more.

For one thing, employment in the air and travel industries accounts for 5 per cent of the jobs in the Pittsburgh area.

That doesn't count thousands of jobs created by the more than 800 new businesses established here in the late '60s. Many of them were attracted by the airport facilities here.

These are a few of the findings revealed today by the Air Transport Association of America for Airlines Serving Pittsburgh.

The report was disclosed at a Chamber of Commerce breakfast. Cooperating in the airport study were the County Department of Aviation, the Pennsylvania Economy League and the Chamber.

The idea was to tell what Greater Pittsburgh Airport means to Southwestern Pennsylvania and the nearly five million people living here.

Passenger spending was a big item this year. Seven airlines carried nearly six million people in and out of the Moon Twp. complex.

They spent more than $181 million in the Pittsburgh area, the survey said.

Of that figure, hotels got the king-sized portion—$55 million. Restaurants came in for $49 million, retailers picked up $16 million and the balance went for various consumer purchases.

Because of its headquarters role, Pittsburgh is a big drawing card for business travelers. The report pointed out that 23 of the nation's largest corporations are based here—six of them in the billion-dollar-or-more sales category.

The capital investment of Pittsburgh-based companies is estimated at nearly $13 billion, according to the survey.

Nearly 50,000 residents are employed by companies directly involved or related to air transportation. That includes airlines, aviation service firms, hotels, resturants, tourist services and travel agencies. About 4,100 work at the airport. The rest are scattered throughout the area.

These workers earned $228 million this year, the report said. And that doesn't count income from other members of the family. It would be a significant figure because about 38 per cent of the families said a second member worked full or part time.

Commercial carriers pour a lot of money directly into the local economy. Last year they paid $2.9 million in landing fees at Greater Pitt and spent $1.2 million for rental of property of which $525,693 was for space in the airport terminal building.

About $11.3 million was spent for locally-purchased fuel. Approximately $250,000 was paid for local media advertising. And the carriers put out $147,000 for miscellaneous local purchases.

Also, state and local governments collected more than $3 million in taxes from the 5,900 airline and airport employes. These included levies on sales, real estate, gasoline, alcohol, tobacco and auto license plates.

The airport's most dynamic effect is hard to measure. This is its ability to attract new industry or induce existing firms to stay here and expand.

Chrysler Corp. recently completed construction of a parts depot on Route 30, five miles from Greater Pitt. More than 150 people earning $1.1 million annually are employed there.

A survey by the Regional Industrial Development Corp. (RIDC) of Southwestern Pennsylvania showed that 804 companies located here from 1966 to 1968. Each of the 359 manufacturing firms and 445 non-manufacturing companies had 10 or more employes.

Many of these firms said air transportation was influential in their decisions to set up shop in the area.

The survey noted that the Graphic Arts Technical Foundation moved here from New York and Chicago because of the airport. Lerner Shops of New York opened a distribution center here for the same reason. And a computer center established here by the Whittaker Corp. of Los Angeles is a by-product of the airport.

Also, air transportation was reported vital to more than 170 research labs in the district.

Meanwhile, a heavy investment is being made in the airport's future. A $200 million international complex is under construction and during the next five years airlines are expected to spend $10.5 million on capital improvements.

Obviously the airport's economic impact on the community will mushroom in the years ahead.

FARLEY FORESEES MUSKIE VICTORY

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House I include with these remarks a newspaper article by Walter Trohan, quoting my good and respected friend, former Postmaster General James A. Farley, published in the Chicago Tribune of Friday, November 27, 1970:

FARLEY FORESEES MUSKIE VICTORY

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON.—The day after the recent elections, this commentator received a telephone call from the venerable, but sprightly, James A. Farley in which the architect of the long Democratic dominance in Washington said:

"Write this down in your diary or what have you and put it away for two years and then look at it: The Democratic ticket in 1972 will be Sen. Edmund S. Muskie of Maine and Sen. Henry M. [Scoop] Jackson of Washington, and they will defeat Richard M. Nixon and Spiro T. Agnew."

Since I have no other notebook than this column and because Farley is a prophet with honor in his country, take this means of sharing his latest prediction. It is news-

worthy because Sen. George S. McGovern [D., S. D.] is about to jump the gun and be the front runner for the Democratic nomination.

Some may be interested in my reply, which was: "Don't you think the ticket is a bit bottom heavy?" Farley's answer was, "That could be, but just put it down."

I had no intention of being facetious in my remark about the Farley ticket. No one can say I am anti-Muskie, because I was among the first to propose him as a running mate to Hubert H. Humphrey, the 1968 Democratic standard bearer—who is about to return to the Senate, where he may again promote his political fortunes.

However, it is my serious belief that Jackson is one of the most underrated Democrats and one of the best of senators. Few remember he was Democratic national chairman in the campaign that brought John F. Kennedy to the White House. Altho J. F. K. and his various rat packs took Jackson's work for granted generally, they could not have won without him.

Farley made his reputation as a prophet in 1936 when he predicted F. D. R. would carry every state but Vermont and Maine. Some may say that as party chairman he had no choice but to make such a prediction. However, he organized the machinery that won the phenomenal victory.

Since that time, Farley has picked every Democratic nominee except one. In 1960 he favored Lyndon B. Johnson over Kennedy and it can be argued he was picking a winner even when he lost. He missed out on both Dwight D. Eisenhower elections, but he was misled by party loyalty, which seems to be a dying virtue, if it is a virtue.

Finally, I must confess I suggested that it will be most difficult to beat a somebody in the person of Nixon with a comparative nobody in Sen. Muskie. Nixon is bound to grow as time goes on, because he is in the White House, while Muskie is certain to be the target of all aspirants—open and secret—because he is now recognized as the leader.

It is sad but true that both parties stand in the need of leadership. Take away Nixon and Agnew from the Republicans and what have you got? Charity forbids the mention of names.

And take away Muskie and what have the Democrats got? Another collection of names, relatively unknown and certainly untried, except for Humphrey.

If any of us could get a dollar for every man who has dreamed of redecorating the White House we would have a campaign chest that would enable us to challenge Sen. Edward M. [Teddy] Kennedy [D., Mass.] and the family fortune said to be available to promote his ambition.

Many, yea multitudes, call themselves, but only one is chosen.

TOWARD CHANGING OUR GUN LAWS

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I was gratified to see my colleague pass the bill modifying the Ammunition Registration Act yesterday, and I congratulate my distinguished colleague from the State of Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) for sponsoring this bill and moving it through the House.

As we all know, the bill, H.R. 14233, modifies the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by deleting .22-caliber rimfire ammunition from recordkeeping requirements.

This is a sensible piece of legislation, one which I have long felt was necessary. As you all know, this type of ammunition is the most popular among sportsmen and hunters, and it is hardly useful to keep track of all who buy it. Certainly, purchase of this type of ammunition should not automatically brand the buyer as a suspicious character.

Along with previous amendments to the law that deleted shotgun and sportrifle ammunition from the statute, I think this bill is a good step toward eliminating repressive gun registration measures which I have long opposed. I do not believe that law-abiding citizens who target-shoot or hunt for their own pleasure should be restricted from doing so. I support this sensible legislation.

It is my intention to supplement Mr. ULLMAN's good work by working, next sessions, on a bill that will modify other facets of our existing gun laws.

These laws do not constitute Federal gun control as such, contrary to many of the statements made by gun enthusiasts. There is some indication that our present informal records have helped law enforcement people in apprehending criminals.

But overall, there is no indication that crime has dropped significantly because of our present gun laws. In fact, the Justice Department has announced that serious crime rose 10 percent nationally in the first 9 months of this year. While this is a lesser increase than last year, the trend toward increase is clear.

Therefore, I believe the Congress must find other ways of controlling the instruments of crime. I believe that the way to start is to modify existing gun statutes.

RAILPAC PROPOSAL NEGLECTS VITAL AREA IN SOUTHWEST

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the preliminary report on the Transportation Department's plans for creation of a basic national rail passenger system, leaves much to be desired. It exposes a gaping hole in a balanced national system, as contemplated in the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970.

There are two significant omissions:

First. The New Orleans-Houston-San Antonio-Uvalde-Del Rio-El Paso segment of the New Orleans-Los Angeles major eastwest transcontinental route.

Second. A segment which would connect Laredo to San Antonio-Austin-Houston-Chicago route.

The proposed system, which provides for 16 different passenger routes, neglects a very vital area of the Southwest. Texas, for example, one of the six most populous States, would be served by only one of the tentative routes. This is a north-south route which would either pass through the Dallas-Forth Worth area en route to Houston or go further east near Texarkana.

A study of geographical aspects, along with growth trends, makes a compelling case for both the north-south and an east-west route.

Mr. Speaker, the preliminary report points out that it was issued in response to the 1970 act creating the rail passenger system. That act provides for 30 days in which the recommendation may be reviewed. The Secretary of Transportation then has another 30 days to consider such comments and make the final determination of the system.

Guidelines contained in the law calls for modern efficient intercity railroad passenger service as a necessary part of a balanced transportation system.

It must be assumed, of course, that Mr. Volpe will make some changes and additions in the plan, which was rather hastily put together—considering the magnitude of the undertaking.

The Secretary's review should focus attention on the neglected requirements for the Southwest. When that is done, I feel confident the Southwest will receive the treatment it properly deserves.

THE EVIDENCE MOUNTS THAT THE FCC HAS BEEN A LAGGARD

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, since 1966, when it was first brought to my attention that the FCC was still relying on an apportionment of the frequency spectrum which it made in 1949, notwithstanding the tremendous changes which have occurred in the uses and needs for frequency spectrum since that time, I have been carefully following developments in that field.

The most recent issue of a highly qualified publication in the field of communications, Industrial Communications, contains an article about a paper presented to the annual conference of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Vehicular Technology Group in Washington, D.C., earlier this month. The paper was prepared by Mr. Norman Parker, an electronics engineer who in 2 recent years received the "first place" paper award of the IEEE Professional Group on Broadcast and Television Receivers, and who is active in a wide variety of professional groups dealing with television receivers. Because of his illness, the paper was given by Mr. Frihart who for 7 years was in charge of television tuner development by a major television receiver manufacturer, and then for 10 years was manager of Advanced Development Engineering for television receivers for that company, and now serves as director of engineering of the division of the company which produces television receivers. The qualifications of both men with respect to

television receivers are, therefore, most impressive.

Mr. Parker's paper develops the point that TV receiver performance has improved substantialy since the FCC established its UHF channel assignment taboos 18 years ago and what may have been thought necessary in 1952, when little was known about UHF TV receivers, it is no longer applicable.

This is of great interest to me and of grave importance to the public interest because, as Mr. Parker notes, the present UHF TV taboos prohibit the use of up to 18 UHF TV channels for each channel which is being used to provide a television service to the public in a given area. For example, Mr. Parker notes that assigning adjacent channels to the same location would constitute a more efficient utilization plan, in view of the capabilities of present day TV receivers, than maintaining the present 55-mile separation taboo. He states that the 55-mile separation may actually constitute an increased interference situation.

Of even greater importance is his observation that the present capabilities of the better existing television receivers are sufficient to permit every TV assignment to be used with a table of assignments devised to provide signals of the right strength. He notes that such an assignment table would provide, as an additional benefit, for an overwhelming amount of additional educational and local television service. Indeed, under a plan which he develops in his paper, 16 TV channels, comprising 12 VHF and four UHF channels, could be repeated in such a way as to provide 12 local signals at all principal points and a minimum of four signals at all other points, all receivable by existing television receivers.

This would provide a vast improvement in the television service received by the public. A further benefit from such a pattern of assignments, Mr. Parker said, would be sufficient uniformity that the secondary effects guarded against by the UHF TV taboos would not exist and valuable spectrum would not need to be wasted to accommodate them.

As evidence of the capability of today's television receiver to receive such signals, Mr. Parker points to the fact that such a present day receiver can adequately receive and discriminate between adjacent signals when a coaxial cable is connected to the antenna leads in place of the antenna. He points out that today's television receiver has every-channel capability if the incoming signals are of relatively the same magnitude and of an adequate absolute magnitude. This would be the case, he says, under the pattern of assignments he discusses.

Mr. Parker emphasizes a factor many may not realize or remember—that it makes no difference to the TV receiver whether the signals arrive at the antenna terminal of the television receiver off the air or through a cable, provided there are similar signal strengths for adjacent channel signals.

I believe that Mr. Parker's comments go a long way toward confirming information which we have received at a number of hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on the Regulatory Agencies of the Select Committee on Small Business over the last few years. All of this information squarely points the finger of responsibility at the FCC for an almost total failure in the past to update its spectrum allocations and plan of assignments. In view of accumulating evidence on this failure, I intend to pursue the matter vigorously.

I also hope that the newly established Office of Telecommunications Policy which the President has set up to promote effective and innovative use of telecommunications technology, resources, and services will, itself, look into this area in which the FCC has been such a laggard.

I ask consent that the article from Industrial Communications, December 11, 1970, to which I have referred, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks:

TOTAL OF 16 TV CHANNELS COULD PROVIDE UNITED STATES WITH MORE AND BETTER SERVICE FREE 312 MEGACYCLES OF SPECTRUM, IF FCC WOULD CAPITALIZE ON CURRENT RECEIVER CAPABILITIES, MOTOROLA SCIENTIST SAYS; SUGGESTS USE OF 12 VHF, FOUR UHF CHANNELS

If the Federal Communications Commission would concentrate on "co-location of transmitter antennas, equal transmission coverage, and radiating patterns," it could provide the United States with more and better TV service with only 16 assignable channels, and turn the other 312 megacycles of spectrum space marked for television over to other worthwhile purposes, one of the country's leading television receiver design officials reported last week.

The observation was contained in a paper by Motorola, Inc., Staff Scientist Norman Parker outlining a "proposal for the modernization of the UHF television taboos," presented to the annual conference of the Institute of Electrical & Electronics Engineers' Vehicular Technology Group in Washington. The paper was presented, in Mr. Parker's illness, by Neil Frihart, Director of Engineering for the Consumer Products Division of the Chicago electronics manufacturing firm.

The principal thrust of Mr. Parker's paper was that TV receiver performance has improved substantially since the FCC established its UHF channel assignment "taboos" 18 years ago, and what may have been thought necessary in 1952, when "little was known" about UHF TV receivers, he said, is no longer applicable.

With the use of twelve VHF channels and four UHF channels, Mr. Parker said, the Commission could meet "all of the objectives" of its present table of television assignments. The plan he outlined, the Motorola official said, will provide twelve channel choices for the nation's major centers of population, and four or more choices for all locations in between.

The present TV channel assignment "taboos", which prohibit the use of up to eighteen UHF TV channels for each channel that is being used to provide television service to the public in a given area, Mr. Parker said, are unnecessary and could be eliminated entirely. The Motorola scientist observed, in fact, that assigning adjacent channels to the same city would constitute a more efficient signal utilization plan than maintaining the present 55-mile separation taboo. The 55-mile separation, he said, may actually constitute "an increased interference situation."

While such steps as adding an extra coil in the tuner of a TV receiver, or the possible use of an active RF stage, may reduce the need for the TV taboos under the system as it generally stands at the moment, he said, far greater benefit may be obtained "if we devise a way of taking advantage of the present capability of television receivers to discriminate between signals of the proper magnitude. This means simply insuring that the television service received by the people of this country comes from a sufficient number of sufficiently strong signals", he said.

"This can be done", he said. "The present capabilities of the better existing television receivers are sufficiently great to permit every TV channel to be used with a table of television assignments devised to provide signals of the right strength. Such an assignment table would provide, as an additional benefit, for an overwhelming amount of additional educational and local television service. With some modifications, 16 channels comprised of 12 VHF and 4 UHF channels could be repeated in such a way as to provide 12 local signals at all principal points and a minimum of 4 signals at all other points, all receivable by existing television receivers.

"The basis for such a television assignment plan", Mr. Parker said, "would be clusters of television assignments with the signals provided at a relatively uniform level. If the area to be served by this cluster of television assignments is viewed as a hexagon, it is apparent that all points in the hexagon will receive service from all of the transmitters in the cluster. The size of the hexagon would be determined by the distance from the cluster at which the signal level would produce an acceptable signal or better. Beyond the boundaries of that hexagon, additional clusters of similar television facilities would be established. If these hexagons are placed adjacent to each other, then the service available at each vertex of each hexagon will be the sum of all of the service available in each of the three hexagons which have their vertices at that common point.

"Assuming the use of only 16 television channels divided into four groups of four channels each", he said, "it is possible to establish a repetitive use of the 16 channels in which every channel has a protective distance equal to the size of two hexagons. Using, for example, approximately the same co-channel protection presently being used, this would mean a hexagon size of approximately 80 miles, or a service range for each channel of approximately 40 miles. At this distance, high quality television service could be provided with equipment being used today."

"The service provided by such a pattern of assignments", Mr. Parker said, "would be of sufficient uniformity that the secondary effects guarded against by the UHF TV taboos would not exist and valuable spectrum would not need to be wasted to accommodate them."

"If there should be any doubt" about what he is suggesting, he said, "consider the capabilities of the present day television receiver when a coaxial cable is connected to the antenna leads in place of the antenna. A different signal can be transmitted on every channel in that cable and the television receiver can adequately receive and discriminate between such signals.

"Thus, it is clear that today's television receiver has every-channel capability if the incoming signals are of relatively the same magnitude and an adequate absolute magnitude. This would be the case under the pattern of assignments based on the proposed hexagons which have been described. It makes no difference whether the signals arrive at the antenna terminal of the television receiver off the air or through a cable provided there are similar signal strengths for adjacent channels. The receiver will perform equally well in each case."

HEALTH AND SAFETY CLAUSES

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 10, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, America's labor movement has a proud history of innovation in the field of social welfare. The laboring men and women of this country can, indeed, be proud of the leadership taken by their own organizations in social welfare programs of all types.

The Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union, AFL–CIO, is following in that tradition, paradoxically enough, by proposing a program that would seem at first glance to be of benefit only to its members. The OCAW, under the leadership of President A. F. Grospiron, has announced it will seek formation of an employer-employee trust fund to finance research into the nature and removal of on-the-job hazards in the oil industry.

Certainly the union is to be praised for its determination that its members have safe and healthy places in which to work. But that is not all the story. The union has proposed a program that steps out of past practice and past thinking. This alone makes the proposal worthy of intense and dispassionate study.

To my mind, however, the major interest in the OCAW proposal lies in its possible applicability to a problem that afflicts almost all working men and women to some degree—on-the-job health and safety hazards. The practicality of the specific proposal outlined by the OCAW remains a matter of negotiation between it and the oil industry. But the freshness of the idea deserves attention from us all.

The material follows:

HEALTH AND SAFETY CLAUSES

Section 1. The Company shall institute and maintain all reasonable and necessary precautions for safeguarding the health and safety of its employees, and all employees are expected to cooperate in the implementation thereof. Both the Company and the Union recognize their mutual obligations to assist in the prevention, correction and elimination of all unhealthy and unsafe working conditions and practices.

Section 2. There shall be established a joint labor-management Health and Safety Committee, consisting of equal Union and Company representatives, but not less than two each nor more than four each. The Committee shall establish and adopt health and safety rules. It shall hold meetings as often as necessary, but not less than once each month, at a regularly scheduled time and place, for the purpose of jointly considering, inspecting, investigating, and reviewing health and safety conditions and practices and investigating accidents, and for the purpose of jointly and effectively making constructive recommendations with respect thereto, including but not limited to the formulation of changes to eliminate unhealthy and unsafe conditions and practices and to improve existing health and safety conditions and practices. All matters considered and handled by the Committee shall be reduced to writing, and joint minutes of all meetings of the Committee shall be made and maintained. Time spent in connection with the work of the Committee by Union Representatives shall be considered and compensated for as their regularly assigned work.

Either party may, on its own or in cooperation with the other party, arrange for an inspection of facilities by appropriate inspectors of government, independent agencies or the International Union; provided, however, that no request shall be made without fully informing the other party to this agreement, and provided further, that such inspections shall be made in the company of representatives of both labor and management and that all reports, advice, recommendations, opinions, findings, and anything else of pertinence, whether verbal or documentary, shall be made equally to the Union and to the Company.

Section 3. The Company agrees to provide and maintain such health and safety facilities, personal protective devices and in-plant apparatus for detecting and recording potential and actual safety, health and environmental hazards as recommended by the Health and Safety Committee, and the Company agrees further to provide a continuous training program to insure at all times that all employees are adequately trained in maintaining, handling and using such facilities and apparatus.

The Company further agrees to fully disclose, in writing, to each employee, the full identity of all chemical and related substances. Such identification shall include, but not be restricted to, the chemical, drug, biological or pharmaceutical name and/or names, relevant health and safety hazards and precautions, the maximum concentrations of exposures, health and safety precautions to be taken, health and safety symptoms, medical remedies and antidotes.

Section 4. The Company shall provide and maintain adequate medical facilities, competently staffed, and to provide, at no cost to the employee, medical services, including, but not restricted to, physical examinations at a frequency and extent determined from time to time by the joint labor-management Health and Safety Committee, and the Company further agrees to provide to each employee an accurate report of all medical findings and examinations for whatever cause such findings are made.

Section 5. No employee shall be required to perform work that endangers his or any other employee's health or physical safety or under conditions which are in violation of the health and safety rules, or any local, state or federal health or safety laws. An employee's refusal to perform such work shall not warrant or justify any present or future disciplinary action.

Section 6. The Company agrees to contribute $0.0010 for each barrel of crude refined to a special Health and Safety Fund, which shall be established primarily for the purpose of research of health and safety hazards and the elimination thereof in the industry. The Fund is to be administered by a three-member Board, consisting of one representative from the industry, one from the International Union, and the third is to be selected by the industry and Union representatives from the medical or science professions and is to be engaged in this type of research.

TRIBUTE TO ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, ALLARD LOWENSTEIN'S presence here in the 91st Congress has been an important factor for those of us seeking peaceful and significant change in the direction and policies of the United States.

With leaders such as AL LOWENSTEIN there is still hope that such long needed changes are coming.

Of course, it is an extremely long process—and frustrating to the *n*th degree. There are no huge gains, no massive forward strides. Instead, there are the mundane day-to-day struggles carried on by men such as AL LOWENSTEIN, which, hopefully, will accomplish the changes necessary to guarantee a free, just, and equitable society for all mankind.

AL LOWENSTEIN was important. Important because of what he did here in the Congress; important because he was here; important because of what he represents.

ALLARD LOWENSTEIN was a truly national Congressman. He represented all Americans. And he was able to do this while working strenuously for and on behalf of constituents of New York's Fifth Congressional District.

I am glad to have served these past 2 years with Congressman LOWENSTEIN. I look forward to working with him in the future. As a leader and as a man, AL LOWENSTEIN will be missed in the Congress.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM G. COLMAN—AN OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with our distinguished colleague from North Carolina (Mr. FOUNTAIN) in paying a belated but deeply felt tribute to the former Executive Director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Mr. William G. Colman. As one of three Members of the House who serve on the Commission, it had been my great pleasure to have worked with Bill Colman throughout the first 10 years of the Commission's life. I can say without qualification that no individual contributed more to the success of the Commission during these formative years than did Mr. Colman.

Bill Colman served as the Commission's staff director from the day it was established in late 1959 through its 10th anniversary this past year. He retired early this year. He started with an idea and by virtue of his skillful leadership, vast understanding, and devoted service, he left an organization that had earned a unique reputation as a valuable and productive institution of government.

As many of our colleagues know, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations belongs to no one level of government in the United States. It represents all three levels of government—Federal, State, and local—and its members are active officials in all three levels of government: Cabinet officials, Senators, Congressmen, Governors, mayors, State legislators, elected county officials, and private citizens.

Despite the fact that there was no existing precedent for this kind of institution in America, the Commission has flourished. It has grown in terms of public respect, influence on public policy, and in its volume of research and policy studies on some of the most difficult issues confronting the country—even while, as a governmental organization, it has resisted the almost inevitable impulse to grow in size and cost.

To a great extent, this dual accomplishment is a tribute to the leadership of Bill Colman. From the very beginning, Bill Colman's emphasis was on quality rather than on quantity, and he achieved this objective in outstanding fashion. He was largely responsible for recruiting and developing an extremely able staff which more than made up in the excellence of its product what it lacked in size. Completely trusted by Commission members, he helped to steer the Commission's work into crucial areas of public policy considerably in advance of the public attention which makes those areas matters of controversy. Consequently, the in-depth work of analysis and evaluation enabled the Commission to contribute substantially to the solution of policy questions when they reached the point of political decisionmaking.

Bill Colman's contributions to good government, especially in this difficult and disputed area of intergovernmental relations, may never be adequately recorded, for Bill Colman has always been a modest man. But those contributions were many and real. He possessed a masterful grasp of complex subject matter. He had a deep awareness of the different interests and potential conflicts of members representing different points of view. He was a skillful negotiator who helped bring these diverse positions and people together, and in a way that avoided unnecessary dilution of substance. He helped to bring out from all of us the best we had and helped to shape that best into recommendations on which most of us could agree and from which the country could benefit.

I have never met a finer person nor a more effective administrator in Government service than Bill Colman, and I want to record my high regard. Fortunately, Bill Colman's great talents have not been wasted during the 10 months or so since his retirement. As a consultant to numerous public and nonprofit organizations, he has continued to make the kind of contribution to public policy formation that will have lasting and beneficial effects for the country. I thank him for his unfailing and dedicated service to the country. I wish him well in whatever endeavors he pursues in the future.

AFTER 50 YEARS OF SERVICE—A WELL EARNED RETIREMENT FOR HERMAN C. ROSCOE

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as a close friend of Federal employees in Detroit I frequently receive newsletters from the United Federation of Postal Clerks. Their most recent communication to me was a source of great interest as it announced the retirement of Mr. Herman C. Roscoe after over 50 years of dedicated service in the U.S. postal system.

His departure will be noted by great numbers of Detroiters both in and out of the Federal service. At this time, I wish to extend my most sincere congratulations to this dedicated and able public servant, an active citizen in his community, a constituent and a friend, and to extend to him my best wishes for many happy years ahead.

I include the newsletter of the United Federation of Postal Clerks, Detroit Local 295, in the RECORD at this point:

The clerk who remembers penny postal cards is retiring from Detroit postal service on December 31, 1970. That announcement was made today by Herman C. Roscoe, 2969 Oakman Blvd., Detroit, Mich. 48238. Since November 5, 1951, he was assigned to Penobscot Building Station where he leaves a host of satisfied postal patrons.

Research has not established whether he also remembers the half-starved equines that hauled the mail collection rigs to the pick-up letter boxes around the city in the early 1900's. These nags were hired by the Postmaster from Pete Wynn's livery stable in old Cork Town.

He will draw an annuity computed on 50 years and 3 months service, plus retirement credit for 2,951 accumulated sick leave hours. His monthly retirement check will be substantially higher than the original grant enacted into law May 22, 1920, the year he entered the postal service at Cleveland, Ohio. (He transferred to Detroit in 1929.) It provided annuities in amounts from $180 to $720 annually.

Throughout his career he never missed paying monthly dues in to the postal clerks AFL–CIO federation. Further, he never filed a grievance with union officers.

"We are taking note of this fabulous record" stated Ivory Tillman, Jr., President, Detroit Local 295, United Federation of Postal Clerks AFL–CIO. "He will be awarded the traditional beneficence from the union's fund, created for that purpose. Additionally, he will be presented with a 'Certificate of Retirement' now being engrossed in Washington, D.C., national headquarters; also a solid gold retirement pin, both emblematic of the fraternal esteem in which he is held by fellow members. His loyalty to the 'Federation' for a half century, stands as a feat worthy of emulation by all clerks in Detroit post office," President Tillman concluded.

PRESIDENT NIXON AGAIN CAN AGREE THAT TEXAS IS NO. 1

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed mindful of the time-honored tradition of this House by which we refrain from naming names of our colleagues when we are pointing to "errors."

However, I cannot let go unchallenged the grievous error on November 25 when the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE), in a frivilous slip of the tongue, referred to Ohio State as being the No. 1 football team in the Nation.

Although my colleague quotes liberally from such distinguished material as "A Hog on Ice and Other Curious Expressions" and other selected primers, he don't know nothing about football.

Mr. Speaker, this programed myopia, this misguided loyalty was brought to my attention by three of my constituents and I present you their pointed explanation:

Mr. WYLIE and Members of the House:

In reference to the statement as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 25, 1970, Vol. 116, No. 189, p. 10763, we wish the truth known concerning the number one collegiate football team in the nation. According to UPI and AP polls for the weeks of November 15–21, November 22–28, and November 29–December 5, The University of Texas Longhorns are Number 1.

Respectfully,

CHRISTOPHER GUINN,
LARRY JONES,
FREDDIE MARTINEZ,
Students of the University.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that this point is one relevant only to the time in which it was uttered. But it is a point well taken, backed up by the havoc the University of Texas recently dealt to the Arkansas Razorbacks.

For the second consecutive year the University of Texas has been proclaimed the No. 1 football team in America. So far as I know, this has only happened one or two times in the 100 years of football. That is a most unusual accomplishment and it speaks well for every young man who plays for the University of Texas, and I think this accomplishment proves what some sportswriters have failed to note, and that is that the University of Texas is a team organization. Not many of the recent players have gone on to play pro football, but every year for 10 years these Longhorns turn out some of the best teams in the Nation.

Clearly this means that those boys play well together, they operate as a team, and they have great pride in their accomplishments.

The Irish of Notre Dame will be challenging the Longhorns again this year and every sportswriter in America will be watching that game with more interest than any other. It is hard to believe that their superbly played bowl game last year could be exceeded but the challenge is strong, the competition is keen and the desire on both will be at its maximum.

In all of these contests over the Nation, Mr. Speaker, we Americans are proud of our men who can exhibit such preparedness and who can manifest the finest in sportsmanship—the world needs more of this kind of competition.

Behind the glory of the Texas team is Coach Darrell Royal—a great coach and a great connoisseur of country music. Recently the Washington Evening Star ran an article that gives a little insight into this fine athletic leader and gentleman. I insert a reprint of that article as follows:

ALONG WITH FINISHING FIRST: ROYAL TRIES TO BE A GOOD GUY

(By Milton Richman)

Football coaches are human.

Any one of them might feel a little smug or self-satisfied if his team, like Texas, had

been certified No. 1 in the nation and had a winning streak of 30 in a row.

Darrell Royal, whose unbeaten Longhorns are headed for the Cotton Bowl again for another New Year's Day showdown with Notre Dame, whom they beat 21–17 in the same place a year ago, isn't just any coach.

This is the third time in seven years he has had a national champion and when you pin him down and ask "Why you, and not someone else?" he comes up with a thought-provoking answer without conveying the impression he's trying to be unduly modest.

WHY TEXAS?

"The question more accurately put, I think," says Royal, who has coached the Longhorns 14 years, "is why Texas and not some other school? I'm not trying to eat humble pie or sound modest. I think if I were coaching at some other schools I might have been fired two or three times already.

"What I'm saying is that you have to be at the right school; you have to be able to attract the top material, and to do that you have to have the right curriculum, and you have to be lucky. When you have all that you still have to have a good coaching staff like I have.

"You also have to have an alumni who care. We have. You need a college president who cares about the athletic program. We have. You also have to have a Board of Governors who care and we have one. I think even our janitors care."

Royal readily tells you coaching college football has changed radically the past few years and that his philosophy has changed along with it.

"I find I'm coaching less," he said. 'I don't work with circles and X's so much and what I'm doing is spending more and more time in public relations and administration work. I don't have as much time for the technical end of coaching as I used to. I have excellent assistants, men I'm sure are capable of being head coaches in their own right, and they're the ones who handle much of the technical end of it such as the blocking and defense assignments."

Okay then, what specifically does Darrell Royal do to bring a ball club like the Longhorns home in front of everybody else in 1963, 1969, and 1970?

UNDERSTANDS YOUTH

"I think one of my biggest jobs is morale," Royal says. "I'm completely serious about that."

There were no morale problems at Texas this year, according to Royal. The so-called revolution among college football players supposed to occur this season never manifested itself among the Longhorns. Royal doesn't take any bows for that, but maybe he should. He has an understanding attitude about some of the youngsters of today.

"If boys like to wear their hair fuller or their sideburns a little longer, what's wrong with that?" he asked. "That doesn't bother me. What bothers me is if a boy talks back when you tell him to work a little harder or take an extra lap. Then it's a problem."

Did any of his players talk back to him this year?

"I don't recall any," Royal said. "I try to avoid any conflict like that. I don't mean I'm a jelly-fish. I put my foot down when I have to. But I'm careful when and where I do it."

All told the 46-year-old Royal has been coaching nearly half his life. Twenty years. His overall ambition sounds like a modest one but it ranks among the best I've ever heard.

"After I've completed my career and the final ballots are in," Royal said, "I'd like to be remembered as a guy who was fair, who was competent and who was liked. I would much rather be a little less successful and well thought of than the other way around. I wouldn't want to be lonely as an old man."

A BOW TO THE POST OFFICE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we hope to close our deliberations before Christmas Eve, we must keep in mind that the Post Office is still struggling with the tremendous volume of mail that annually invades its facilities.

A very appropriate commentary on our postal service which was certainly motivated by the spirit of Christmas was carried in the December 18 New World, the official publication of the Chicago Catholic archdiocese. I join in the sentiment expressed in this commentary that the Post Office should be complimented for a job well done during Christmas 1970.

A BOW TO THE POST OFFICE

This is the time of year when the Post Office and its many employes, permanent and temporary, are overwhelmed with letters, Christmas cards, packages and, in the case of The New World and other publications, newspapers and magazines.

It is perennially amazing how the mail gets through, in spite of all the problems of transport, volume, and late mailings by many people.

At times the Post Office and its operations are much maligned; but certainly all of them deserve a bow now for their fine work during the Christmas mail deluge. It is a small note, but an important one for The New World. Last week's issue, for instance, was delivered in most subscribers' homes on Friday—even with the massive mailings of Christmas materials the Post Office also had to handle.

And so, a bow to the Post Office and all those who work in the many aspects of its most important function in today's world.

WQED-PITTSBURGH SETS PACE FOR NATIONAL DRUG SERIES

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, WQED-Pittsburgh's special programing, "The Turned-On Crisis," which I had the privilege of calling to the attention of my colleagues in the November 16 RECORD, has resulted in a national war against drug series beginning in February.

I am very proud of WQED's month-long effort which included more than 120 hours of prime-time special programing on drug information, rehabilitation, prevention, and legislation.

WQED was the country's first community educational television station, and has shown that it is still a pacesetter.

The Christian Science Monitor of December 11 describes this crucial new series. The article is included herewith for the attention of my colleagues:

TV AIMS SALVO AT DRUG TRAP

(By Alan Bunce)

NEW YORK.—Television will go to war against drug abuse in the United States with three series—separate but related—to begin in February.

In the medium's most important attack on the problem to date, the Public Broadcasting System will carry eight hour-long programs in prime time over its 200 stations as the first wave of its multilevel "project on drug abuse in your community." Called "The Turned On Crisis," this carefully planned assault places a heavy stressed on the word "your."

TV has aired other specials and documentaries on drugs in the last few years. The TelePrompTer Corporation's closed-circuit "King Heroin" is the most striking recent example.

FOLLOWUP ACTION URGED

But the new project calls not only for the three series but for citizens' followup action wherever they are aired. Local affiliates will produce their own shows to buttress the national campaign. Groups throughout the country are being urged to join stations in the effort, and local governments will be pressed to take specific action as the result of disclosures the TV shows will make.

They are the joint effort of PBS's parent organization, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and Pittsburgh's public TV station WQED, where they were produced.

"The First Dimension" launches the February series with figures as diverse as golfer Arnold Palmer and United States Surgeon General Jesse L. Steinfeld. It's hosted by Emmy Award winner Denise Nichols, whose own show, "Room 222," is currently on ABC–TV.

Other hours range from Off-Broadway's "The Concert"—staged by ex-addicts—through encounter sessions, to big-name rock stars who tell the over-30 group they'd better listen to rock music because that's where the message is. Celebrities like David Susskind and Fred Rogers ("Misterogers" to young viewers) speak out through panel discussions and other formats.

Despite the CPB's image as an "educational" medium, this is curiously its first venture into a broadcast education project. Set up by Congress in 1967, its main job has been to nourish public television through a 15-man board appointed by the president of the United States.

With "The Turned On Crisis" its sights will be fixed on the kind of broad and entrenched social evil which TV—with its vast, varied reach—is so good at challenging.

SCHOOL ANGLE COVERED

Besides the programs starting in February, a six-part series for educators will begin in March, 1971. "Because We Care" aims its message at teachers, school-board members, and anyone else searching for means of arming children against the drug-culture pressures they will be facing.

Then in November, the third series—"Nobody But Yourself"—will offer six 20-minute programs to some of the key figures of the whole campaign: seventh, eighth, and ninth graders. In classrooms throughout the country they will learn about drug abuse, the law, and themselves in dramatic vignettes that show how constructive personal decisions can be made.

But first, plenty of field-testing in the Pittsburgh area will refine the programs' approach and enable the producers to gain the needed subtlety and effectiveness.

PSYCHODRAMA USED

Scanning titles in "The Turned On Crisis" gives a picture of its scope. "High Is Not Very Far Off the Ground" uses psychodrama and debates between youths and adults to probe the issue of "legislating morality."

In "To Keep It You Have to Give It Away," rehabilitation is seen in its many—and often conflicting—forms, while "The Shade of a Toothpick" surveys drug prevention in streets and schools across this nation.

In preview glimpses of certain programs, the camera invaded a sobbing boy's private moments with a psychiatrist, caught shouting confrontations, and revealed other evidence of the issue's acuteness and volatility.

Some results have already been gained. A "mini" town meeting in the WGED test area produced its very first black-white meeting on a nonracial theme, and one woman has already offered her 10-room house as a rehabilitation center.

If that's any sign of the projects potential impact when it begins national coverage the drug trap will be facing a tough opponent.

THE CITY BUDGET

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues a December 11, 1970, editorial of the Pittsburgh Press, noting the accomplishments of the recently submitted city of Pittsburgh budget. It is good to note in a day when governmental costs are increasing that the progressive administration of our good mayor, Peter Flaherty, can provide services to the taxpayers by balancing the budget and not raising taxes.

The editorial follows:

THE CITY BUDGET

To the long-suffering and overburdened taxpayers, the outstanding feature of the 1971 city budget presented by Mayor Peter F. Flaherty to City Council is the fact that he is asking no increase in taxes.

According to the budget, the city will spend more in 1971—$1.6 million more—than it did in 1970. That is understandable in a time of inflation, particularly in view of the salary increases gained by Pittsburgh police and firemen through arbitration awards that prompted the mayor to include a 7 per cent across-the-board pay increase for other city employes.

The city can spend more without taxing more because of a surplus of $2.1 million expected to remain in the treasury at the end of 1970 operations. Meaning, of course, that the taxpayers already have put out the money that will help balance next year's budget.

Most citizens will applaud Mayor Flaherty's feat in reducing the city payroll, in one year, from a high of 7,001 to about 6,100 jobs. For most taxpayers are convinced that any public payroll includes a number of non-essential positions which can be eliminated without harming public services.

Mr. Flaherty confirms that view. He says, candidly, that hundreds of jobs on the payroll were political in their origin, and he promises to continue paring until all unnecessary personnel are weeded out.

Other local governments could profitably emulate this cost-cutting program.

Satisfaction with the budget job done by the mayor does not, however, relieve City Council of its obligation to go over each item and search for further economies.

Council should, for instance, take a close look at that 7 per cent across-the-board pay increase for non-uniformed employes. For the mayor would apply it even to department heads and other upper-bracket employes who got substantial raises only last year.

Mr. Flaherty included in his budget message the reassurance to the people of the city that payroll cuts and other economies will not result in any reduction of vital services.

"We are performing better with less," he says.

If council believes otherwise, it is council's duty to dig into the details and produce any evidence of deterioration of city services.

Unless and until such evidence is brought forth, Mr. Flaherty's budget will stand as a welcome departure from the "tax more, spend more" policies that have marked so many public budgets of recent years.

TRIBUTE TO THE BULL ELEPHANTS

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an organization unique to Capitol Hill known as the Bull Elephants, which is comprised of 800 male assistants to Republican House Members and Senators, plus associates in the Federal Government and business community downtown.

The Bulls meets about once a month to hear distinguished speakers in the Government, communications, media, and political consulting field, as well as to hold seminars on how to increase their political effectiveness and professional abilities. A corollary function to these activities is to promote fellowship between Republican offices.

The late President Dwight D. Eisenhower delivered his last public address before the Bulls in November 1967, and a tape of the talk is on deposit at the Eisenhower Memorial Library. Every member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet spoke before the Bulls at one time or another, as have all but two of President Nixon's so far.

An annual summer event since the Bull Elephants' founding back in 1953 has been the stampede, an all day stag picnic barbeque in the countryside. For the past 4 years the Bulls have invited as their special guests wounded patients of the Vietnam war from the nearby service hospitals at Bethesda and Walter Reed. At each of these stampedes, unknown to one lucky serviceman the Bulls have flown in his wife, arranged a 1-week leave, and paid for hotel and all other accommodations. In recognition of this practice, President Nixon sent the Bulls a telegram at their last stampede saluting them for reassuring the wounded patients "that the people of America are aware of and appreciate their sacrifices."

Under the bylaws of the club an election will be held next month for the steering committee, which represents the same eight geographical regions as our Republican policy committee.

Meanwhile, all Republican Members join me in saluting the outgoing steering committee and other officers for a "job well done" these past 2 years. They are:

Chairman, Hal Eberle—CORBETT of Pennsylvania;

Secretary, Jack Foulk—WYLIE of Ohio;

Treasurer, Jerry James—BELCHER of Oklahoma;

Program director, Don Olson—NELSEN of Minnesota;

Membership chairman, Tony Raymond—Post Office and Civil Service Committee;

Stampede chairman, Sid Hoyt—DEVINE of Ohio;

Board members Monty Winkler—TEAGUE of California; John Watkins—DENNEY of Nebraska; Vern Loen—QUIE of Minnesota; Jim Robinett—HALL of Missouri; Bill Monohan—HORTON of New York; Tom Lankford—minority printer.

GYPSY MOTHS, A NEW THREAT TO CALIFORNIA

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on various occasions I have introduced to the RECORD materials designed to bring to the attention of my colleagues the threat that is being posed by the gypsy moth to the forests of Northeastern United States.

Just recently an article written by Dr. William Hazeltine of Orville, Calif., and entitled "Gypsy Moths, a New Threat to California," reveals that the gypsy moth threat is evident not only in the Northeast but in California as well. In addition, as per the article, gypsy moth eggs "have been found in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Virginia, Texas, and Florida."

Dr. Hazeltine, in his article, touches on a multitude of interesting aspects relating to the gypsy moth threat, including the prospect of a reexamination of the ban on DDT for gypsy moth control. Because this article is timely and meaningful, I introduce it to the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

GYPSY MOTHS, A NEW THREAT TO CALIFORNIA

A plague of Eastern U.S. forests may be moving West. A second group of Gypsy Moth eggs have been found in California by Agriculture Department Inspectors within the past 3 months.

Close inspection and destruction of egg masses is one way to delay the introduction of this pest into new areas. The eggs are laid in clusters and covered with moth scales, so the patch looks like a piece of buff colored chamois skin, about 1 inch long. Anyone who has had trailers or camp equipment in the North East this past summer is urged to make a close inspection for suspicious looking fuzzy clumps of eggs.

The potential damage to California forests and shade trees is fantastic. A year ago, the damage estimate to Eastern forests was set at 2 to 4 million dollars, and in 1970, many areas experienced worm population explosions. Close to 1 million acres are now infested, from New England to New Jersey, and West to Pennsylvania. Eggs have been found in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Virginia, Texas and Florida, as well as California.

The Gypsy Moth Caterpillars feed on a long list of plants, but prefer trees like oak and other hardwoods. As the worms grow, they will feed on evergreens such as pine and fir. Heavy infestations can easily kill trees by repeatedly stripping the leaves. Large areas in the East have dead snags where living trees used to stand.

California appears well suited to the moth's needs. The climate is similar to its native home in France, and there are plenty of trees for food. Oaks, pines and fir trees of the Sierra Nevada foothills, and the Coast mountain ranges should provide plenty of space for this unnecessary pest. High risks to California exist because the Eastern population is so high. There are more chances of eggs being

laid and carried to new areas, simply because there are more eggs being produced by the larger numbers of moths.

The Gypsy Moth was purposely imported into New England from France a hundred years ago. Since its escape about 80 years ago, it has been generally limited to forests of New York and New England. Early controls were applied by hand, and later replaced by area treatment. Control was excellent until environmentalists began telling people DDT was bad. When DDT use was stopped, the explosion began. The female moth does not fly, so spread was slow until rapid transportation began moving the eggs to new areas.

The time to act to protect our environment from this threat is now. It appears to be too late to stop the Eastern infestation but California introduction can be delayed if incoming eggs are found and destroyed. The chances of importation and establishment is directly related to the efforts made to find the eggs.

Work on natural control measure has been in progress for years. Biological control research has been pursued for 60 years, and introduced natural enemies probably have had some effect but pesticides are also necessary for good control. The environmentalists' campaign to get rid of pesticides, such as DDT, looks like the major reason for the present infestation. Before the real consequence of letting the environmentalists dictate policy, we may see more extensive destruction of the same environment, everyone says they want to save.

The public may well have to choose between a little DDT, or a lot of natural environmental degradation. The public may even begin to insist that the questionable evidence for a pesticide ban should be examined.

STRENGTHEN ALLIES—NOT ENEMIES

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. Speaker, Demosthenes, in his "Orations," said:

For in the worst feature of our past lies our best hope of the future—in the fact, that is, that we are in the present plight because you are not doing your duty in any respect; for if you were doing all that you should do, and we were still in this evil case, we could not then even hope for any improvement.

The purpose of foreign policy is to preserve national independence and liberty. The guiding principle for the achievement of these ends of foreign policy is that one strengthens one's own and allied nations and, if possible, weakens present and potential aggressor nations.

This indisputably sound approach to relations between the United States and foreign nations seems to have been either forgotten or discarded by certain people who make our foreign policy. A recent example of behavior which contradicts the first principles of foreign policy is a deal underwritten by the tax supported Export-Import Bank to sell 10 million dollars' worth of locomotives to Algeria.

Algeria is solidly in the enemy camp. The present dictator of that nation, Houart Boumedienne, is a convinced Marxist and devotee of Fidel Castro, who received training in the Soviet Union and Red China. He took over Algeria by a coup in 1965. Since that time Algeria has shown itself to be even more hostile toward the United States, if that is possible, than it was previously.

Algeria is the North African headquarters for over 20 Communist insurgent organizations ranging from the Vietcong, to the Angolan Liberation Front, to the international branch of the Black Panther Party. It is interesting to note that the Black Panthers set up their headquarters in the building which was utilized by the Vietcong prior to moving to more spacious accommodations.

Algeria serves as a basic training center, along with the Soviet Union, Cuba, and Red China, for the various guerrilla organizations set up to overthrow the non-Communist governments of Portuguese Angola, Guinea, Mozambique, Rhodesia, South Africa, and Chad. It supplies guns, ammunition, and cadre to the terrorist operations running out of Tanzania and Zambia. The Soviet Union has poured over $250 million of military equipment into Algeria since 1967; has set up air bases in central Algeria; and utilizes Algerian port facilities for its growing naval armada in the Mediterranean.

In 1967, Algeria broke off diplomatic relations with the United States, and just recently voted, along with the Soviet Union, against a United Nations resolution which called upon all signers of the Geneva Convention of 1949 to abide by its provisions. This resolution was aimed at the North Vietnamese Communists and their continuing barbaric treatment of American prisoners of war.

Why, in the light of these and other obvious manifestations of hostility toward the United States and all free men, was the sale of $10 million worth of locomotives to Algeria approved and financed by a tax-supported institution? The Commerce Department's rationale is that if we did not sell Algeria the locomotives, someone else would, and that this sale would put U.S. suppliers in on the ground floor for further sales to Algeria as it embarks on a $60 million railway expansion project.

Whatever merit the Commerce Department's remarkable arguments may have, this deal obviously goes against the first tenet of sound foreign policy. It strengthens a hostile nation. These locomotives will become part of the Algerian material base which it utilizes to pursue its objectives—the subversion of Africa and the extension of Soviet power.

On the other hand, the United States continues to be a party to the United Nations economic sanctions against the Republic of Rhodesia. Although last March the United States did cast its very first veto in the U.N. Security Council, against using force to overthrow the Rhodesian Government—a promising sign of sanity in an organization which is sometimes referred to as Fantasyland East—we continue to cooperate in the self-defeating sanctions.

Rhodesia is a solidly pro-Western nation. The Rhodesian Prime Minister, Ian Smith, has offered to help the United States resist Communist aggression in Southeast Asia with, in his words "troops, supplies, anything we can spare without leaving our own country wide open to attack." In word and deed Rhodesia has shown itself to be alined with the forces of the free world.

Thus our foreign policy toward Africa in this case is a double contradiction. While we strengthen a hostile nation which provides quarters for the Vietcong representatives, we contribute to the weakening of a friend who has offered to help us in our fight against the enemy in Vietnam.

Your Government officials in Washington are hired to look after your interests and no one else's. What Demosthenes pointed out to the men of Athens holds today for the men of America. We are in our present plight in part because our policymakers are doing things which run directly counter to our national interest, in an attempt to attain peace through appeasement. Demosthenes also admonished his people to beware "lest in striving to be rid of war, you find yourselves slaves."

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in the U.S. Congress in paying tribute to one of the great Americans of today. Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN represents everything that is fine in our Government today. His great contribution to his district, his State, the Nation, and the world for peace and understanding with honor is unsurpassed. PHILIP PHILBIN has given a lifetime of service to our beloved Nation, during World War I, in the service of the late beloved Senator David I. Walsh, as counsel to important Senate committees, as a Member of the U.S. Congress. PHIL PHILBIN with a solid background, All-American football player on one of the great teams of Harvard, a playing participant in one of the Rose Bowl games, a graduate of Columbia Law School. This cultured gentleman, scholar, soldier, statesman never once faltered during his service to his fellow man.

During my entire lifetime I have never had the privilege of meeting a man with greater knowledge about our Government, a person with a complete understanding of the arts, music, and the theater. PHIL PHILBIN has a deep understanding of life, always the gentleman he has carried himself in a manner as to earn for himself the everlasting respect of every responsible person who knew him. Loved by his people, PHIL was always ready and alert to their problems. PHIL PHILBIN could walk with kings, he could mingle with the very poor, but he never lost the common touch.

Yes, one of the outstanding privileges it has been mine to enjoy is his warm friendship, counsel, and advice. He is a true, loyal friend. God bless him in the years ahead. He has enriched the lives of all of us. I include in the RECORD three

articles that were the remarks made by PHILIP PHILBIN that sheds a light on this great man:

JEROME KERN

(By PHILIP J. PHILBIN)

Mr. Speaker, I would feel greatly remiss if I were not to make some reference in the House to the recent and most lamented passing of the great American composer, Jerome Kern, whose sudden and unexpected death shocked and deeply grieved music lovers throughout the world.

Naturally our sympathy and condolences are extended to Mrs. Kern and members of his family for their irreparable loss. But it is the Nation that has sustained by his death a loss that cannot adequately be measured by mere mortal words.

For more than 30 years the charming, sprighty music of Jerome Kern has brought pleasure, relaxation, and uplift to millions of our people. He was a prolific writer of tuneful melodies but always maintained the highest professional standards. There was something truly worthwhile in even his most obscure compositions. He never wrote a tune that did not possess some quality of rhythmic, melodic merit.

As a very young man, I can vividly remember the deep and thrilling impression I received from his music. Throughout the years I have followed his compositions with fidelity because Jerome Kern, more than any modern composer, seemed to me, best to typify, best to exemplify and express in music the spirit of the Nation. His melodies were as broad in range as the country itself and covered as many moods as fit over the human consciousness. Some of his tunes had an ecstatic gayety; some took on the quality of nostalgic American folk songs; while others possessed the sparkle of romance.

Jerome Kern's tunes were unpredictable. They followed a pattern all his own. They were never hackneyed or commonplace. They elevated the spirit and stimulated the senses with a wholesome fervor of the joy of living. His talents in his field were unexcelled by any American composer and, in my opinion, he will rank as one of the greatest composers of popular music of all time. It is little wonder that the immortal Victor Herbert early singled him out to be his successor in writing beautiful music for the American people.

In the life of our country we have had few such talented and gifted artists as Jerome Kern. Perhaps he marks the end of the most romantic period of music in American history, although I hope this will not be the case. I hope that others will take up his task where he left off, but when one thinks of Kern's music, one must admit that there are few contemporary composers approaching his standards. Perhaps Sigmund Romberg, Rudolf Friml, Cole Porter, and Richard Rogers would be the only remaining figures in this school, but when I name them because of the luster and outstanding quality of their work, I do not mean to disparage many other popular composers who are making outstanding contributions to current American music.

From a personal standpoint, I am deeply appreciative of the high standard attained by many contemporary composers and am especially interested in the efforts of my intimate and loyal friend, John Redmond, whose work in the popular field has been so conspicuous and holds out such brilliant promise.

Kern was a modest man, and he never permitted his great professional and financial success to go to his head. He had few close friends, and he worked and lived for his art. He was possessed of the rarest taste and discrimination in securing effective orchestration and staging for his matchless melodies and often worked for hours, days, and weeks to get the effect he desired.

His compositions were universal. It is a long, wide step from the lilting, lovely tunes of Oh Boy and Sonny to the stirring music of Ol' Man River, but to Jerome Kern, greatly gifted soul, it was an easy transition. He wrote about the simple things of everyday life, and that was his appeal to the millions of Americans who found in his melodies and themes some counterpart in their own lives.

Kern never was "high hat," personally or musically. He thoroughly loved music and took just as much satisfaction and pleasure out of his "swing" and "boogie woogie" as he did from his more soulful melodies. In this sense he may be said to have marched along with the times, although I have never thought and do not think that all modern forms of music are necessarily evidence of artistic progress and advancement.

Throughout future years Americans will continue to sing the beautiful, touching songs, the joyous melodies, the appealing tunes which he wrote, and many of his works will be written into the folklore of American music. Songs like Ol' Man River will certainly live as long as American folk music is sung.

Kern wrote many melodies which, like those of his friend and admirer, Victor Herbert, from whom he drew so much inspiration, will enjoy popularity as long as human beings are touched by the beauty, appeal, spirituality, and rapture of music. Rapture is perhaps the word which best describes Jerome Kern's music. It has the power to enthuse, the power of transporting our people away from everyday humdrum, trials, and tribulations and lifting them into the comforting, invigorating spheres of imagination and delight.

I could not here recount the many outstanding works of Jerome Kern, nor can I adequately treat or credit the many lyric writers who collaborated with him to make his songs so remarkable.

In their wide scope, his works embraced a fundamental philosophy, a reverence for eternal verities, contemplation and reflection of things outside mundane existence, an infectious spark of the joy and zest of living, or a profound understanding of human emotions.

Jerome Kern is gone. All that was mortal of him has been assigned to the nameless dust. But we have no doubt that his spirit will live on in his immortal melodies to bring joy and happiness to our people throughout the years, to refresh the lonely and to inspire all those who love good music with some better sense of the true nobility of life.

Jerome David Kern was born on January 27, 1885. At the time his family was living on Sutton Place, in New York City, and it was there that, as a boy barely of school age, his musical career began. First, there were piano lessons for himself and his two brothers from their mother, and later on Jerome, at least, "graduated" to a more professional teacher living nearby. When the boy was 10 the family moved to Newark, N.J., and while at the high school there he played organ for the school assembly in addition to composing music for and helping direct the school shows.

After graduating from high school in Newark in 1902, Kern continued his musical studies at the New York College of Music, where his eminent teachers included Alexander Lambert and Paolo Gallico, and also undertook the study of harmony under a private teacher, Austin Pierce. His real ambition in those days, however, was to complete his musical studies in Europe, according to the prevailing fashion—but here he ran up against the not unusual parental objections, particularly on the part of his father. For a while it looked as though Jerome were fated to become a permanent member of the elder Kern's merchandising concern; but when one of the boy's first deals left the Kerns in not-so-proud possession of 200 pianos instead of only 2, as planned, the father decided that his son might, after all, be better suited for music than for business.

During the next few years Kern made several trips to Europe, studying both in Germany and in England. In between times he held a number of jobs in New York, the first of which was with the Old Lyceum Publishing Co. as a pianist and song plugger at a salary of several dollars a week. Later he became connected with the music-publishing firm of T. B. Harms, in which he eventually came to be vice president. It was at an early pre-swing jam session in a back room at Harms that the aging Victor Herbert is reported to have clapped the budding composer on the shoulder and remarked, "Here is the young man who will inherit my mantle."

The American public's introduction to the future musical heir of Victor Herbert came in 1910, when Kern rewrote and provided the original music for a New York show of thus far dubious merit called Mr. Wix, of Wickham. The result was no masterpiece, but apparently the solid musical foundation and the native melodic gift of the young composer were unmistakable. The critic, Alan Dale, inquired, "Who is this Jerome Kern, whose music towers in an Eiffel way above the average primitive hurdy-gurdy accompaniment of the present-day musical comedy? In 1911 appears the first original Kern score for Broadway, The Red Petticoat, which achieved a mild success; and then, 3 years later, came The Girl From Utah and the first of the true Kern song hits, They Didn't Believe Me.

Perhaps the most famous of the early Kern songs, however, was the Magic Melody in Nobody Home, dating from 1915, when the composer was already well on his way to the top of the musical-comedy ladder. The effect this song had upon thinking musicians, as well as upon the musical public at large, is indicated by the late Carl Engel, one-time chief of the Music Division of the Library of Congress, in an essay on jazz written in 1922. "A young man," writes Engel, "gifted with musical talent and unusual courage, has dared to introduce into his tune a modulation which was nothing extraordinary in itself, but which marked a change, a new regime in American popular music. It was just the thing that the popular composer in the making had been warned against by the wise ones as a thing too "highbrow" for the public to accept. They were the foolish prophets. The public not only liked it; they went mad over it. And well they might; for it was a relief, a liberation * * *, unless I am very much mistaken. The Magic Melody, by Mr. Jerome Kern, was the opening chorus of an epoch."

In 1915, however, Kern was no doubt too busy composing one musical comedy score after another to spend much time thinking about new epochs. That year marked the beginning of probably the greatest decade in the history of American musical comedy, and certainly the most productive decade—for sheer quantity—of Kern's career. During the season of 1917–18 alone he is reported to have had as many as 20 different shows running simultaneously in Europe and America.

With the twenties, which Kern ushered in to the tunes of Sally (with Marilyn Miller), the musical show business reached a climactic era in which shows were judged by the gorgeousness of their girls and the expensiveness of their staging, rather than by the quality of their musical scores, and in which rhythmic jazz motifs left little room for simple melody.

Yet the most successful—certainly the most enduring—musical comedy of the sophisticated twenties was un-Broadwayesque. unsophisticated Showboat, with its Only Make Believe, Why Do I Love You, Ol' Man River, and other songs which live and will continue to live because of their melodic freshness and individuality. In the words of one writer, "Showboat, as finally produced by Ziegfeld at the Ziegfeld Theater on December

27, 1927, was not only revolutionary; it was also a gilt-edged investment. It ran more than a year, grossing about $50,000 a week; was revived for a second successful run (1932); and was sold several times to the movies. If the critics called it our best folk operatta, the audiences called it grand entertainment and were refreshed, rather than upset, by its new treatment of musical-comedy materials." Not only in this country was its effect felt in the musical world; a news report of September 1929 tells of three Vienna opera houses vying for the privilege of presenting Showboat and quotes Viennese critics to the effect that its music must be placed in one line with that of Hindemith and Kranek, celebrated classical composers of rather severe mien. Today, almost 20 years after its initial performance, Showboat is again on the boards in New York and fetching new encomiums from a younger generation of critics. The January 28, 1946, issue of Life, features its new success.

But Showboat, which would have provided a fitting climax to many a composer's career, was only the beginning of a new era for Jerome Kern. In a time of depression which gave little encouragement to art in general and even less to such a luxury article as the musical comedy, Kern brought out new shows which were as successful financially as they were original artistically. The Cat and the Fiddle of 1931 was followed in 1932 by Music in the Air and in 1933 by Roberta. It was the latter show, transferred to the screen, that gave Kern his first big success in Hollywood and inaugurated the last period of his life, in which he came to be associated with Hollywood rather more than with New York. A number of his earlier Broadway hits were filmed, and he composed original scores for new films, such as Swing Time and High, Wide, and Handsome. He and his wife—formerly Eva Leale—settled permanently in Beverly Hills, Calif., and lived in close proximity to the movie colony. It was curiously fitting, nevertheless, that when a cerebral hemorrhage struck him down last November and brought him to his end Kern had just returned to New York to prepare for the current revival of Showboat. Thus, he died on November 11, 1945, close to the scenes of his earliest and greatest triumphs.

In the New York Times of the following day the composer was described as "a small, jovial man with white hair and keen blue eyes behind horn-rimmed glasses," who spoke in sporadic outbursts and had "a tremendous amount of nervous energy." This "nervous energy," in the course of some 40 years, had produced a total of 104 shows for the stage and screen, from which the number of individual "hit" songs alone can hardly be counted. It was an unusual characteristic of Jerome Kern's that almost all of his composing was done for musical comedy. Only in his later years did he compose independent pieces—The Last Time I Saw Paris, a response to the German onslaught; a Portrait for Orchestra; Mark Twain; and a Scenario for Orchestra on Showboat. So far as purely orchestral forms of composition are concerned, Kern felt a diffidence that his few ventures probably did little to overcome. For from having the egomaniacal illusions supposedly characteristic of great composers, he called himself "a musical clothier—nothing more or less," and explained that "I write music to both the situations and the lyrics in plays."

Other critics, however, have refuted the composers' modesty and have not taken quite so pedestrian a view of Jerome Kern's function as a creator. Certainly he is one creative artist who did not have to wait until years after his death before achieving both critical and public recognition. Just as Kern's acumen and taste in collecting rare books had long made good copy for the Sunday supplement journalists, so had his peculiar genius for combining inspired melody with humor, dramatic sincerity, and sound musical workmanship long been talked of by long-haired critics. One of these critics was Robert Simon, who introduced Kern to the select clientele of Modern Music as early as the January-February issue of 1929. In an article focused primarily on the then new Showboat, Simon characterized Kern as "a well-trained, practical musician, who not only knows what a fugue is, but even can write one without hiring a ghost composer," and made the following evaluation, which is even more pertinent today:

"He is fundamentally a sound craftsman, and herein he differs from almost every other composer of musical comedy today. There are many who labor patiently over individual songs, but Kern is virtually the only one who looks on his score as an identity. * * * Many a young man with a retentive ear has succeeded in patterning his efforts after the manner of Kern, only to discover that they did not come to life. * * * Kern, in his way, is as inimitable as Ring Lardner."

Time does not permit me to enumerate or allude to all the compositions of Jerome Kern. They are legion and embrace many subjects covering years of conspicuous effort. However, I think it is most appropriate that we should set forth here a list of his more important works:

LIST OF BETTER-KNOWN WORKS

Musical comedies for the stage: The Girls From Utah (1913); Nobody Home (1915); Very Good, Eddie (1915); Have a Heart (1917); Sally (1920); The Bunch and Judy (1922); Sitting Pretty (1924); Sonny (1925); Showboat (1927); Sweet Adeline (1929); The Cat and the Fiddle (1931); Music in the Air (1932); Roberta (1933).

Musical comedies for the screen: Men of the Sky (1931); I Dream Too Much (1935); Swing Time (1936); When You're in Love (1937); The Joy of Living (1938); You Were Never Lovelier, Cover Girl, and Centennial Summer, yet to be released by Twentieth-Century Fox; and Cavalcade, M-G-M, yet to be released.

For symphonic orchestra: Showboat (Scenario for Orchestra); Portrait for Orchestra (Mark Twain).

Song: The Last Time I Saw Paris.

The American people will be ever indebted to Jerome Kern, whose beautiful melodies illuminated one of the most colorful periods of our history. Posterity will surely honor him because down through the years these melodies will continue to bring enjoyment, fullness, and richness to the lives of our people.

For his assistance in preparing biographical data upon the life and works of Jerome Kern, I am deeply indebted to Mr. William Lichtwanger, of the staff of the Congressional Library.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 4, 1965]

COLE PORTER

(By PHILIP J. PHILBIN)

Mr. Speaker, the entire musical world and popular music lovers everywhere were deeply saddened by the recent passing of one of America's greatest musicmakers—the illustrious Cole Porter.

In the twenties and thirties, creative musical genius seemed to be at its peak. It was a time when the lovely music of Victor Herbert, Jerome Kern, Sigmund Romberg, Rudolph Friml, Vincent Youmans, Franz Lehar, Oscar Strauss, Enmeric Kalhman, Richard Rodgers, Cole Porter, and other colorful writers, was heard in Broadway musicals and throughout the country and the world.

There were countless writers and lyricists in this period producing large numbers of popular songs as well as many fine operettas and musical comedies. The whole country was singing. Music was in the air and in the hearts of the people. Grand opera had the great Caruso and a host of other gifted singers who sang with such eclat and impetuosity that their golden voices literally made the rafters ring and tinkle the Waterford glass crystals in the ceilings of the Nation's opera houses, concert halls, and theaters.

From and of this great, talented, dynamic, music-producing, music-loving generation came Cole Porter. His was not a Horatio Alger career. He was born with a silver spoon in his mouth. He was one of Yale's and Harvard's most favorite sons, the writer of some of the Eli's most rousing football songs.

But he had a musical lyre in his brain, an irrepresible song in his heart, and Park Avenue lyrics in his head. Someone said he was the master of sophisticated melody and urban lyrics which was another way of saying that he wrote love songs for society and the smart set, but woke up to find that he was writing them for all the people, thus giving support to Kipling's premise that "the colonel's lady and Rosie O'Grady are sisters under the skin."

Cole Porter more than held his own among his gifted fellows, who were the greatest musical creative artists of the New York and Hollywood studios. To use the words of the inimitable Swede Nelson, peerless raconteur and musical savant, Porter's songs were "suave, sportive and gay, often profound and always emotional." It could be said that his words were definitively on the emancipated side as measured by the tear jerkers of the gay nineties and the prewar teens. They had a hint of abashed and penitent naughtiness, as a boy calling a name and running, but their piquant flavor caught the country and made Porter one of the truly top men in American and continental popular music.

The sentimentalized lyrics of his "An Old Fashioned Garden" yielded to "You'd Be So Nice to Come Home To" and the world was gay, everybody happy.

Cole Porter went up the ladder fast even though he suffered quite a few disappointments on the way up. But his struggles with the musical entrepreneurs and jealous competitors are for another time. In the song writing business of his day, unlike today when aspiring artists are merely playing a form of Russian roulette against the "establishment" and most of them fall by the wayside, he won his spurs, because he got the chance to show his wares, and they proved fabulously marketable. The public gobbled them up and shouted for more.

I wish I could more fully sketch the life and works of this great man, because I think the American people, whom he served so well, whom he entertained, pleased and at times thrilled and inspired, should pause to recall and pay fitting tribute to this gifted man who wrote some of the greatest popular music of this century. I am sure that others will take the time to portray this appealing story in its completeness and its glory. It is a vital part of our popular musical history and heritage during the past half century.

Porter might well be said to have been a prolific writer. Many of his works never came into real production. But many of them did, and these are the ones that cheered young America and young Europe and brought a sparkling effervescence to the social life of our period.

Of course, a man of this degree of genius had to have some connection with Massachusetts and New England. Born in Peru, Ind., he was educated at famous Worcester Academy in Worcester, Mass., the heart of the Commonwealth, so-called, near my beloved Third District and famous hometown, Clinton, and then at Yale where no doubt the Whiffenpoofs and the Whiffletrees rocked him into a sort of insensitivity to anything weaker than spiritus frumenti. In this climate no doubt his psyche found solid nourishment, and his wits and his tastes were

hammered into a bon vivante diadem shedding sparkling musical thoughts in all directions.

And then the frosting on the cake—Harvard Law School and the Harvard School of Music where Cole rounded out his musical appreciation and techniques, and where he caught a vivid understanding of indifference as practiced on Beacon Hill, the Commonwealth Avenue of his day, and the dedicated salons of Fifth and Park Avenues, where a distracted hauteur prevailed, nor somewhat shaded by the advent of the nouveau riche.

One thing is certain: Cole learned counterpoint at Harvard and harmony, too, for his music exudes the exhilirating sensation of motion and soul-stirring quality of depth.

The Yale "Bull Dog Song" and "Bingo Eli Yale" adorn Porter's composers repertoire—his first offerings—now standard college songs.

Porter was a war hero in World War I and went to the front as a French officer and then studied music in Paris where he enriched his knowledge of life and absorbed European culture.

Soon thereafter his career started to move. "Kitchy Koo of 1919," "Greenwich Village Follies," "Paris," "Wake Up and Dream," "Fifty Million Frenchmen," "The New Yorkers," "Gay Divorcee," "Anything Goes," "Jubilee," "Red, Hot and Blue," "You Never Know," "Leave It To Me," "DuBarry Was a Lady," "Panama Hattie," "Let's Face It," "Something for the Boys," "Mexican Hayride," "The Seven Lively Arts," "Kiss Me Kate," "Out of This World," "Born To Dance," "Rosalie," "Something To Shout About," "Broadway Melody," "You'll Never Get Rich," followed.

His musicals contained many songs everybody came away humming and singing "Let's Do It," "You're the Top," "I Get a Kick Out of You," "What Is This Thing Called Love," "Blow, Gabriel, Blow," "You Do Something To Me," "Begin the Beguine," "You've Got That Thing," "Just One of Those Things," "Love for Sale," "It's DeLovely," "Night and Day," "I've Got You Under My Skin," "Easy To Love," "Anything Goes," "In the Still of the Night," "Rosalie," "My Heart Belongs to Daddy," "Do I Love You, Do I," "You'd Be So Nice to Come Home To," "I Love You," "Don't Fence Me In," "Old Fashioned Garden," "So In Love," "Wunderbar," "Always True to You in My Fashion," "True Love," and many others.

The loss of such a man leaves a great void in the world. For he brought something to the American people and to mankind—something that brought them surcease and joy, that brought them lift and new heart, that made them sing and dance and live with verve and spirit.

Surely this is a great contribution. The world urgently needs more of it, but there will be no more Cole Porters. Such genius is not welcome in the music marts of this modern age. It cannot live. It never gets a chance. It is swept under the mat of the modern music bund operators. Popular taste and preference no longer select America's songs. That function is now performed by the "establishment" which keeps a tight rein on the kind of music America sings. How long will the American people remain supine in the face of this condition? Will we ever have music like Cole Porter's again? Only the American people can answer this question.

One of the best services that the people and the Congress can render to the memory of Cole Porter would be to put an end to the present shocking perversion of American musical tastes.

It will take the determined action of the people and the courageous efforts of the Congress to do it right. But it should and must be done in the interests of our youth and to redeem the labor and contributions of Cole Porter and other composers who shaped our traditional popular music and the great masters who created the world's classical music which we love so much.

Hail and salute to Cole Porter. He had a great life. He did a great deal for the country and the world, because he made life better and brighter for millions of people.

His good deeds and great works will long remain after him. His melodies and words will be sung and repeated for years to come wherever there is youth, as long as stirred memories can bring back the golden days of yesteryear, the smiling faces of dear ones at play, and the soft, insinuating strains of magical music wafted on the gentle breeze of a moonlit night.

Long live the music and the memory of the great Cole Porter. May the angelic choirs welcome and cherish him. And may he find eternal peace in his heavenly home.

To his dear ones, I extend my most sincere and deeply heartfelt symapthy for the truly irreparable loss they have suffered. And I express condolences as well to his close friends, his esteemed brethren, his fellow composers of ASCAP, and the American public, for they too have suffered a great loss in the passing of this great, gifted man of song, Cole Porter.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent, fine, moving editorial on Cole Porter from the columns of the widely famed Boston Herald, which is timely, heartfelt and extremely well done, and also an exceptionally well documented, ably and feelingly written piece from the celebrated Boston Record-American by Boston's outstanding dramatic and music critic and columnist, the brilliant Elliott Norton, who captures precisely the lofty, courageous spirit of Cole Porter and his buoyant personality:

"COLE PORTER

"A Warner Bros. script writer assigned to the task of preparing a screen biography of Cole Porter in 1946 complained to his superiors after combing the studio's file on the songwriter: 'There's no struggle—all along the line."

"In both the economic and the artistic sense the script man was very nearly right. Cole Porter's parents were well-to-do and his grandfather eventually left him a million dollars. He published his first song at the age of 13 and remained a prolific, facile composer until late in life.

"Lucius Beebe once said of Porter: 'It is really the simple things of life which give pleasure to Mr. Porter—half-million-dollar strings of pearls, Isotta motorcars, cases of double bottles of Grand Chamberlain '87, suites at Claridge's, brief trips aboard the *Bremen*, a little grouse shooting.'

"Yet Porter's songs reflected no dilettantism. They were the work of a superlative craftsman distinguished by their melodic originality and the wittiness and worldliness of their lyrics.

"True Porter fans will remember him not only for such great standards as 'Begin the Beguine,' 'Wunderbar' and 'Don't Fence Me In,' but also for literally scores of less famous but no less elegant gems, including 'All Through the Night,' 'Miss Otis Regrets' and 'Ace in the Hole.'

"Cole Porter, now dead at 71, was a giant of American popular music. He leaves a bountiful musical legacy to his countrymen."

"BEST OF PORTER WRITTEN IN ILLNESS

"The best of Cole Porter was joyous, jubilant music, reflecting in melody and in rhythm the spirit and essence of the 1920's and 1930's and, in the best of all his Broadway shows, 'Kiss Me Kate,' the cocky, jaunty optimism of an American generation.

"Porter wrote as he felt. Most of the time, despite many years of a brutal and debilitating illness, he felt good. He lived joyously, celebrating life continuously in the words and music he created for many musical comedies and movies and in a great series of songs.

"As a young man, he was wealthy. During his adult years he was rich. He lived exuberantly as the son of a man of means, as the million-heir of an opulent uncle and as one of the most successful and highly paid song writers of the world. He had sumptuous homes here and abroad, servants, cars, yachts when needed, and enough rich and witty friends to make his life seem, at times, one long celebration.

"At first nights in Boston, he was the only carefree one among the creative artists. The others, librettists like Howard Lindsay and Russell Crouse, who collaborated with him on such shows as 'Anything Goes' and 'Red, Hot and Blue' might be nervous or jittery, or, at the best, tense. Porter was not.

"Even after the accident that crippled him and which was ultimately to make him a recluse, he attended a premiere in the highest of high spirits.

"Having written his songs, he was ready to enjoy the show. He hobbled down the aisle painfully, with aluminum crutches clamped to his arms. Once in his seat, with the curtain up and the orchestra playing, he forgot his pain, forgot conventional modesty, too, and even forgot that he, as the most sophisticated showman of them all, wouldn't be expected to laugh at jokes he had heard many times before.

"He laughed at every funny line, applauded the entrances and exits of the stars he admired, and his own music, too, including the overture. He obviously loved the theater, its excitement and his part in it.

"In the years between 1937 and 1958, Cole Porter wrote the scores of shows like 'Leave It to Me,' 'Kiss Me, Kate.' and 'Can Can,' and such songs as 'My Heart Belongs to Daddy,' which made a star of Mary Martin, and 'I Love Paris in the Springtime.' This despite a riding accident which had smashed almost every bone in his body, which left him a victim of osteomyelitis, and necessitated more than 50 separate operations, in the last of which his right leg was amputated.

"The accident occurred in 1937, when he was thrown by a horse, which then fell on him. Although he seems to have been in constant pain night and day, and would be for most of the rest of his life, he wrote 'Leave It to Me' within a year.

"To make it possible for him to compose, his wife had his piano jacked up on blocks; in that way, they could get his wheelchair under it.

"The late Moss Hart, who went around the world with Porter the year before the accident to gather material for 'Jubilee,' reported afterward that for all his seeming lightheartedness, Cole Porter worked hard at his music. His smiling public personality did not reflect his serious interest in his work.

"He was modest in private conversation, insisting that he could never tell which of his songs would become favorites. What he liked most and what the public most enjoyed were not necessarily the same songs. For the popularity of some numbers, he gave credit to others. 'Begin the Beguine,' which he introduced into 'Jubilee' in Boston after the opening night, attracted little attention at the time. He credited Artie Shaw with making an arrangement and a recording which converted the then forgotten song into a universal favorite.

"His last show, 'Silk Stockings' in 1955, was not his best. There was in his music for that musical comedy little of the magic that had made so many others memorable. After that, he lost interest and lost heart.

"In death, he left behind a great many wonderful songs and one musical play, 'Kiss Me, Kate,' which ranks with the best ever written."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 29, 1959]

THE IMMORTAL VICTOR HERBERT

(By PHILIP J. PHILBIN)

Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 1, marks the 100th anniversary of the beloved American composer and great American, Victor Herbert. It is my understanding that the occasion will be appropriately celebrated by proclamations of mayors of principal cities, nationwide television and radio shows, articles in newspapers throughout the country, and other fitting observances. I desire to bring to the attention of the House on his great birthday the cherished significance of the life, brilliant career, and memorable contributions of this great American.

Victor Herbert was not only one of the most-loved creators of musical works ever to appear on the American scene—he was also fittingly a courageous champion of the rights of his fellow composers to a just return for the public performance for profit of their compositions. Too often we tend to forget that the product of a creator's heart and brain, when made public in the form of a copyrighted work, belongs to the creator and is just as much his property as his house or his automobile. Use of his property for profit by others is deserving of compensation.

I am proud to say that in the United States of America, under our free-enterprise system, in general we respect composers' property rights, and that the U.S. Constitution guarantees every creator protection for his works over a term of years. The majority of the Nation's talented writers of music receive fees from the public performance of their compositions through the oldest and best-known performing right society, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, which Victor Herbert founded in 1914, with the help of John Philip Sousa and other of his eminent contemporaries so very dear to the hearts of the American people.

Born in Dublin, Herbert journeyed to Germany as a small boy and there received his musical education. When he was 15, he chose music as his vocation and the cello as his solo instrument. It was as a cellist that he met his wife, the celebrated German soprano, Therese Forster, and was hired by the Metropolitan Opera to come to the United States with her in 1886.

Herbert was not long in this country before he began establishing a reputation on his own—first as a cellist with some of our leading orchestras, then as an assistant conductor. For 4 years he was leader of the 22d Regiment Band before accepting a post as conductor of the Pittsburgh Symphony.

His years in Pittsburgh brought the orchestra there new stature and enhanced his own reputation as a musical interpreter. By 1904 he had established his own orchestra, which he led for many years in concerts in New York and other cities.

Leading his orchestra, Herbert became an important early recording artist for the Edison and Victor Cos. He was the first to function as an A. & R. man for the Edison organization.

Throughout this period of development in the performance of music, Herbert was composing a variety of musical works—a list that eventually included not only some of the most popular melodies of the twentieth century, but more than 40 operettas, 2 grand operas, orchestral suites, chamber pieces, choral works, and recital pieces for piano, violin, cello, or the voice.

In 1916 he became the first man to compose an American musical score for a full-length motion picture, "The Fall of a Nation." He was working on an orchestral film overture at the time of his death.

As I have stated, Herbert was a leader in helping his fellow composers. Aware for some years that European copyright laws guaranteed a composer the right to payments whenever his works were performed for profit, he became a leader in this country in the fight to protect musical property from unauthorized use. In 1914, largely through his efforts, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers was formed, and Herbert served as a director and vice president until his death 10 years later.

The amazing diversity of Victor Herbert's music accomplishments is little known largely because he is so very well known as the creator of some of the Nation's most popular melodies. Today, on the 100th anniversary of his birth, and 35 years after his death, he remains one of the most listened-to composers of all time. For scarcely an hour goes by without the performance of an immortal Herbert tune, somewhere: "I'm Falling in Love With Someone," "March of the Toys," "Ah, Sweet Mystery of Life," "A Kiss in the Dark," "Indian Summer," "Sweethearts." Without surrendering his professional standards, Herbert had above all the gift of writing music that would capture the sentiments—as well as the ears—of a great song-loving public.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, at the risk of some repetition, to elaborate on some major, but by no means all, great achievements in Victor Herbert's astonishingly brilliant musical and public career. I regret not to be able in the time available to me to cover more of the personal life, famous works, and public as well as musical interests and accomplishments.

There is no danger that Victor Herbert's best melodies will be forgotten by the American people. But there is always danger that Victor Herbert's full significance will fail to be realized at its true worth. As man and musician he rendered inestimable services to his adopted country, and our musical development would be far different from what it is had this genial Irishman not been among us.

Victor was born in Dublin on February 1, 1859, the grandson of Samuel Lover, celebrated Irish author, artist and song writer, and son of Fanny Lover Herbert whose intense and sensitive nature was transmitted to her offspring. Edward Herbert, the boy's father, died when Victor was still a young child, and his widow was immediately concerned about the boy's training and education. It was fortunate that she married again, to a German physician practicing in Stuttgart, Germany. Here Victor grew to young manhood, studying the classics and developing his musical abilities which had revealed themselves when he was still a stripling. His chosen instrument was the violoncello, which he completely mastered, but he also studied composition and was on his way to success as a classical composer long before he ever dreamed of leaving Europe. His early songs, pieces, and suites reveal that rich vein of melody which later made him America's favorite theatrical composer.

Playing in the Stuttgart Court Orchestra he met Therese Foerster, leading soprano of the court opera, and wooed her while acting as her coach and accompanist. When she was offered a contract by the Metropolitan Opera Co. in New York she refused to come unless Victor, her new husband, came too. Consequently, in the early fall of 1886 young Mr. and Mrs. Herbert debarked in New York, full of anticipation for the future which would be as surprising as it was unpredictable.

Herbert immediately established himself as a man of energy, ambition, and independence. He was not long satisfied in being one of the cellists in the Metropolitan Orchestra. He quickly established himself as a teacher, he played in other ensembles, he became a leading spirit in the promotion of chamber music—then tragically rare in New York—he was a conducting protege of Anton Seidl, and he made his influence felt far and wide. No small part of this influence stemmed from the fact that he was the leading cello virtuoso of the day, the peer of any artist in Europe, and certainly the finest in the Western Hemisphere.

A man with Herbert's boundless energy, unique capacity for friendship, and highly developed technical skill could not long remain satisfied with any one job or activity. In 1893 he became the director of Gilmore's Band—officially known as the 22d Regiment Band of the New York National Guard. Herbert was intent upon bringing music and people together, and the band offered him an excellent opportunity. He quickly restored the band to its former prestige and made it the best organization of its kind in America. Its selection for and success in playing at the inauguration of President McKinley in 1897 emphasized the excellence that Herbert brought to this aspect of musicmaking.

Band directing, however, is still not the same thing as symphonic conducting. When the conductorship of the Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra fell vacant in 1898, Herbert was the successful candidate for the position, and for 6 years he distinguished himself as the director of a major symphony orchestra. Not only did he present excellent concerts in the steel city, but he closely rivaled Theodore Thomas in taking symphonic music to scores of communities eager for new artistic experiences. And in so doing he made his remarkable personality known to an ever-widening circle of friends and admirers.

But above all things Herbert was a composer. He possessed the vein of melody already referred to, and he had the skill to dress this melody in sumptuous romantic harmony and sparkling instrumentation. Realizing that the severities of the concert hall left little scope for bringing his music to the people he experimented in 1894 with an operetta, "Prince Ananias," the first of an incredible number of stage productions. While only reasonably successful it initiated his career as an operetta composer which has yet to be surpassed in terms of beauty, artistry, and long range popularity. His first stage masterpiece was the operetta entitled "The Serenade"—1897, followed quickly by two more splendid works, "The Fortune Teller"—1898, and "The Singing Girl"—1899. These productions made clear that a new and powerful musical force was making itself felt in America, and the critics hailed Herbert as the equal of the operetta masters of Europe.

Herbert's deserved success was not unnoticed by jealous enemies. Attacked and slandered in the pages of the old Musical Courier, Herbert fought back and vindicated himself in a way which benefited all composers subjected to similar ill treatment. When the courtroom battle was ended Herbert resumed his creative career, comfortably aware that he had vanished the viciousness of tawdry journalism.

Early in the 20th century Herbert began to produce a bewildering series of operettas which confirmed the impression of earlier years. As he wrote score after score it was impossible that they all be equally meritorious; he wrote too fast for that. Fortunately we measure a great man's work by the best he achieves, not by his failures or indifferent successes.

The first great triumph of the new century was "Babes in Toyland," produced in 1903 and still a perennial favorite of the American people. What would musical Christmas today be without "The March of the Toys"? In 1905 "Mademoiselle Modiste" took the country by storm and Fritzi Scheff became Herbert's leading interpreter. This show was sprightly and sparkling, and the languorous "Kiss Me Again" has never lost its persuasive appeal. In 1906 "The Red Mill" began to exert its enchantment; and, after several less popular works, in 1910, "Naughty Marietta" brought new delight to a national audience.

Perhaps the most beautiful of all American operettas, this work remains a high point of America's musical theater. It was richly scored, dramatic in concept and treatment, lavishly colorful, and highly imaginative. The mention of only a few of its excerpts brings fond and precious memories to mind: "Tramp, Tramp, Tramp," "'Neath the Southern Moon," "I'm Falling in Love With Someone," "Ah Sweet Mystery of Life." After this superb score, Herbert's subsequent masterpieces included "The Enchantress," 1911; "Sweethearts," 1913; "The Only Girl," 1914; "The Princess Pat," 1915; and "Eileen," 1917. Interspersed among these and following them were additional ambitious operettas which were almost, if not quite, their equal, the last one deserving special mention being "Orange Blossoms," 1922, with his last immortal melody, "A Kiss in the Dark."

It must be admitted that as Herbert grew older the style of American operetta was changing. The influence of ragtime and noisier, more raucous utterances were in the ascendancy. Herbert's spaciousness and dignity and Old World charm were not as much sought after as they had been. The beauty of his music was identified with a period, and the people who welcomed the newer styles had little patience with what the old master could offer. But the power of this old master resides in the fact that the music of his operettas, if not the productions themselves, is as eloquent today as ever.

Even this brief survey of Herbert's operetta career fails to cover his contribution to American music. He made two important attempts at grand opera. The first was "Natoma"—1911—an ambitious opera based upon the Spanish-Indian life of southern California early in the 19th century. When produced by the Chicago Opera Co. the leading singers were Mary Garden and John McCormack. It remained in the repertoire for 3 years and focused the attention of the country upon the problems of the American opera composer. While not permanently successful, its many pages of excellent music and its chronological importance keep it a landmark in the development of American musical drama. Herbert's second grand opera was "Madeleine"—1914—which was produced by the Metropolitan Opera Co. This was a one-act incident in the life of a French opera singer of the 18th century. Peculiarly enough Herbert here endeavored to write in a style which was neither natural to him nor appreciated by lovers of Italian bel canto. Its revival, if a suitable occasion could be found, would be interesting and worth while.

Important as Victor Herbert was as a composer his services to American music went much further. It should always be remembered that Herbert thought in terms of aiding his colleagues. He wanted composers to receive their just due; he wanted them to have a fair return for their efforts; he opposed the attempts of manufacturers and managers and proprietors to make money from music while the composer remained unpaid. The first opportunity for service in this direction came to Herbert in the early years of this century preceding the adoption of the copyright law of 1909. Campaigning vigorously and tirelessly Herbert, the composers' chief representative, succeeded in obtaining the clause giving musical creators a share in the royalties of phonograph recordings. The amount seemed small, only two cents a side, but it was more than the manufacturers wished to pay.

Without Herbert's great efforts in the struggle the composers might have gained nothing. It is also significant to note here that Herbert himself made no phonograph records until after his triumph was won. With the victory assured he and his celebrated concert orchestra began issuing a series of records which became enormously popular, first for Edison and later for Victor.

The next great opportunity for Herbert to serve his fellow composers occurred with the establishment of ASCP—American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers—in 1913 and 1914. Although the copyright law extended certain exclusive rights to composers it provided no means for enforcement, and a concerted effort had to be made before the full effect of the law could materialize. Herbert and eight enlightened colleagues determined to found a society which would represent the composers struggling to obtain earnings which were—and are—rightfully theirs. Every composer of the present day who profits from performance of his music owes an enormous debt of gratitude to Herbert, the chief and most influential founder of ASCAP.

This triumph was not easily won. Proprietors who used music in their halls and restaurants were opposed to giving the composer a share of their profit. It took 3 years of litigation and finally the august Supreme Court of the United States with Herbert always the key figure in the picture, to place American composers within reach of security and economic independence. Not that they became wealthy overnight—but they achieved a firm position of bargaining power and they found a means of asserting ownership of their own products which was impossible previously. And this they owed to Victor Herbert, the champion of composers' rights.

When Herbert died in New York on May 26, 1924, America lost one of her greatest sons. In addition to his innumerable triumphs as composer and artist he had made a host of friends who loved him dearly, and why not? He was one of the most lovable of men, jovial in his sociability, princely in his generosity, deeply sincere in his relations and activities. He brought happiness to the American people and he added a new meaning to musical integrity. He was enormously productive and he participated in many forms of music-making. His death was the occasion for front page headlines in practically every newspaper of the United States. In his passing the country seemed to realize that it had lost a great man, as indeed it had. A friend of Herbert's and one of the cofounders of ASCAP, Raymond Hubbell, remarked that the death of Herbert was like the disappearance of the sun. He was not the only one that felt this way, but the sun had only seemed to set. Its rays shine on in the warmth of Herbert's music, and his personality will be with us as long as we have the sensitivity to respond to his art and quicken to his name.

I fear it is hardly possible with these feeble words to appraise adequately the work and influence of the noble, gifted Irish-American, Victor Herbert. Passionate lover of and fighter for personal liberty and self-determination, composer of songs and inspiration, courage, and love, warm and loyal in his friendships, vital and vigorous in his work for many fine causes, sympathetic, robust, and warmhearted, few men in his own field have left deeper impress upon his times. Throughout recorded time his immortal melodies will ring down the unbroken channels of history, bringing sweetness, brightness, inspiration, and love to myriads yet unborn. The strains of "Thine Alone," and its kindred will live forever in the hearts of the people. The memory of Victor Herbert will live forever. May he continue to inspire us.

I am much indebted and very thankful to my friend, the distinguished author and writer and learned biographer of Victor Herbert, Dr. Edward W. Waters, for his valued advice and assistance.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 2, 1960]

OSCAR HAMMERSTEIN II

(By PHILIP J. PHILBIN)

Mr. Speaker, the recent passing of Oscar Hammerstein II brought deep sadness and grief to the entire musical world and the Nation.

The world of song indeed was dealt a severe blow with the passing of this great composer whose enduring talents contributed so much to the musical theater. This great loss was registered by a spontaneous outpouring of tributes in the press and over the airwaves.

For many years now the lyrics and librettos of this genius writer, so skillfully interwoven into myriads of unforgettable melodies of the greatest popular composers of our era, have given lift, zest, and happiness to millions and millions of people everywhere.

Oscar Hammerstein knew a material success in his field such as never before had come to any lyricist in the American theater or American music, but he never allowed it to go to his head.

He was a strange blending of the realist and the idealist hardheaded and understanding of what the American people wanted and how to get it to them, and seemingly wedded indissolubly to his dreams of artistic creativity.

Hammerstein was not content to wander in the carefully cultivated fields of the past. He insisted on plowing new ground, on reshaping the patterns of traditional American musical comedy. With his supertalented mate, the great Richard Rodgers, he made skillful use of various creative and stagecraft techniques, and brought superduper, musical extravaganzas to Broadway and Hollywood featuring live, sprightly music and sparkling lyrics, sometimes with an ideological touch, vastly expanded, lavish and costly production setups and stepped up public relations, press agentry, and organizational efficiency.

Early struggles and past reverses forgotten, this sensational team of talent, verve, and high gifts soon made the cash registers at the box office ring, the diskjockeys' turntables spin, and the royalty checks pour in. Nothing in theatrical musical history could measure up to the tremendous success of stage, screen, and music world of this pair of inspired geniuses, Oscar Hammerstein and Richard Rodgers.

Oscar Hammerstein was a business and practical realist as well as a creative and talented idealist. He and Richard Rodgers outstandingly great in their field, demonstrated great skill and ability in setting up and pushing their various productions in the theater as well as other related fields.

Every theatrical offering cannot win public approval. On the whole, however, there was probably no team in American music that recorded so many smashing successes. Their musical plays have been built into the American musical tradition, and their songs are, and will be, sung throughout the country and the world for generations to come.

Hammerstein was most fortuitous in his collaborations and wrote lyrics for real giants of the music world like the incredible Jerome Kern, Sigmund Romberg, Rudolph Friml, and Georges Bizet. Eagerly learning from past and contemporary song and libretto writers, he retained what he thought was good, and then moved on to newer forms of folklore and interpretative pageantry often flavored mildly with social philosophy.

Perhaps one of the most astute things he did was to draw from the rich artistic storehouse of the fabulous, most successful writer, Otto Harbach, whom he greatly admired.

There is no doubt but that Harbach exerted profound influence upon Hammerstein's career, style, and approach; in fact, he once described a winning formula derived from the master Harbach, comparing the elements of a musical play to the ingredients of a fire—logs, kindling, matches, a good fireplace, coming out best when everything worked—"logs crackle, and the bark sputters when the blue and gold flame waves and flies toward the chimney and sends out warmth and good feeling to cheer a room full of people." Then he concluded, with characteristic modesty, things work out "because some plodding, perhaps some very not bril-

liant fellow, knows how to put one log on top of another in just the right way."

That Hammerstein knew how to do this with consummate skill is a demonstrated fact of the American theater. In gifted and versatile ways, he could look across the crowded firelit rooms, see strangers enjoying "enchanted evenings," and start America and the world singing the magical songs which he and Dick Rodgers turned out.

Hammerstein was deeply attached to many public and charitable causes and his spirit of generosity and warm, loyal fellowship prompted him to take deep interest and exert unselfish efforts for fellow writers who were less fortunate than he.

He was a stanch, able, diligent officer and worker for ASCAP, and repeatedly gave of himself to grapple with its problems and to further its broad interests.

In this connection, he came on occasions to Washington, the last of which, I think, was about a year ago when he appeared at a meeting of the House Subcommittee on Judiciary, then considering a bill which would permit songwriting to receive a just share of the fruits of their writing.

As I dwell upon the many works of this great writer and review in my mind some of the great songs he wrote that will be remembered for many, many years to come, I realize how impossible it is for me to express adequate appreciation, let alone do justice, for the works of this superb, creative mind. It will be for others to outline in more specific detail the scope and lofty quality of his magnificent achievements.

Oscar Hammerstein touched deeply into the soul of America. He brought cheer and happiness to millions. He brightened mundane, routine life. He portrayed the homely virtues and he relit the fires of romance, love, and adventure in many hearts. He went his busy, active way with dignity, modesty, humility, and a love of his fellowman.

He strove by all appropriate means, to help provide for creative people of the musical world some measure of economic security, as well as incentives whereby composers and authors might add new works to the glorious repertory of musical Americana. The memory of Oscar Hammerstein II will live in his wonderful songs, which will continue to bring joy and comfort to millions of hearts throughout the world.

The passing of Oscar Hammerstein is something more than a personal loss to his dear ones and a multitude of friends. It is a great and an irreparable loss to the artistic world of letters and music. It leaves an irreplaceable void in a great profession and in the country that can never be filled.

The Nation and the world will deeply mourn this vital, restless spirit who animated his times with the ageless motion of "Old Man River," and the "Sound of Music" and so many other appealing compositions.

To his bereaved family, to his dear friend, Richard Rodgers, and the many close friends who mourn Oscar Hammerstein, I tender my most profound and most heartfelt sympathy.

May the Good Lord maketh his face to shine upon him.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD as part of my remarks articles from the New York Times and Washington Post on Mr. Hammerstein.

The material follows:

"[From the New York Times, Aug. 24, 1960]

"OSCAR HAMMERSTEIN 2D IS DEAD; LIBRETTIST AND PRODUCER WAS 65

"DOYLESTOWN, PA., August 23.—Oscar Hammerstein 2d, the Broadway librettist and producer died early Tuesday of stomach cancer at his home, Highland Farms. His age was 65.

"Mr. Hammerstein had been ill for some time. He underwent abdominal surgery last September.

"DEVELOPED NEW FORM

"In his long career as librettist, lyricist, and producer Mr. Hammerstein played an important role in developing the musical play into an integrated dramatic form as opposed to the previously conventional boy-meets-girl revue.

"When he collaborated at the age of 28 on the musical hit "Wildflower," musical comedy was still following the stereotyped form it had inherited from the 1890's. Mr. Hammerstein believed that musical comedy was a cartoon of natural speech, and sought to write the dialog and lyrics for his shows with a folksy flavor.

"In 'The King and I,' he considered that he had achieved a newer medium in which each song advanced the action. When this show opened in 1951 at the St. James, with Yul Brynner and the late Gertrude Lawrence in the leads, Mr. Hammerstein was 56 years old.

"In the ages between 28 and 56, Mr. Hammerstein scored many notable successes. One of his first was in the collaboration with Jerome Kern on 'Show Boat,' a musical adaptation of an Edna Ferber story. The production, which was to be widely acclaimed as a classic of the American musical theater, opened at the Ziegfeld Theater on December 27, 1927, and had 572 performances. It enjoyed at least four major revivals and was made into a motion picture three times.

"SERVED IN HOLLYWOOD

"Beginning in the 1930's, Mr. Hammerstein spent 10 years in Hollywood writing musical motion pictures. This was a dark period for him, but it ended when he formed a partnership in 1943 with Richard Rogers. When the two turned out the smash hit 'Oklahoma,' for the Theater Guild in 1943 their success was firmly established.

" 'Carousel,' in 1945, was well received when it opened at the Majestic Theater, where it had 890 performances. The musical was based on Ferenc Molnar's 'Liliom.'

"In April 1949, the Rogers and Hammerstein hit 'South Pacific' made its bow at the Majestic. It was produced by the partners in association with Leland Hayward and Joshua Logan.

"This adaptation of James Michener's 'Tales of the South Pacific' won a Pulitzer Prize in 1950, took eight Antoinette Perry awards and received the award of the New York Drama Critics Circle. It starred Mary Martin and the late Ezio Pinza.

" 'South Pacific' and 'Oklahoma!' also have been described by critics as classics of the American theater. Their lyrics and melodies have passed into the country's folkways. In their original engagements, 'Oklahoma!' ran for 2,248 performances, a record for musicals on the American stage; 'South Pacific' for 1,830, and 'The King and I' for 1,244.

Motion pictures were made of 'Oklahoma,' 'Carousel,' 'The King and I' and 'South Pacific.' In 1955 'Oklahoma!' was sent to Paris as part of a 'Salute to France.' At the Brussels World's Fair of 1958 'Carousel' was one of the hits.

"Although three subsequent Rodgers and Hammerstein musicals, "Me and Juliet," "Pipe Dream" and "Flower Drum Song" did not live up to the best of their work, their stature continued to grow.

"Mr. Hammerstein's last collaboration with Mr. Rodgers was "The Sound of Music," starring Miss Martin. It opened on Broadway on November 12, 1959, at the Lunt-Fontanne Theater, where it is still running. In June, Twentieth Century Fox said it paid more than $1,000,000 for the movie rights. The show won five Antoinette Perry awards.

"HIS BEST KNOWN SONGS

"Among the best known songs for which Mr. Hammerstein wrote lyrics were "Rose Marie," "Indian Love Call," "Who?," "One Alone," "Desert Song," "Ol' Man River," "Only Make Believe," "Why Do I Love You?," "Can't Help Lovin' Dat Man" and "Lover Come Back to me."

Others were "Stouthearted Men," "Why Was I Born?," "The Song is You," "I've Told Every Little Star," "When I Grow Too Old to Dream," "The Last Time I Saw Paris" (Motion Picture Academy Award, 1945), "All the Things You Are," "The Surrey With the Fringe on Top" and "People Will Say We're in Love."

"Oscar Hammerstein 2d was part of the three-generation theatrical dynasty that began with his grandfather, Oscar Hammerstein. The first Hammerstein owned and operated the Manhattan Opera House, once a serious rival to the Metropolitan.

"He was also the impressario of a variety house called Hammerstein's Victoria, at Seventh Avenue and Forty-second Street, a highly successful enterprise. He eventually lost his money in unsuccessful attempts to produce opera here and in England.

"William Hammerstein, father of Oscar 2d, achieved fame as a showman independently of Oscar I. William and his brother Arthur were both producers. Despite this background, the theater did not appeal to young Oscar as a career.

"He was born on July 12, 1895, on West 125th Street and attended the Hamilton Institute before entering Columbia. He received a B.A. degree there in 1916 and a law degree 2 years later.

"Mr. Hammerstein worked in a law office for a year at a salary of $15 a week. When summons serving became difficult, he reflected upon his contributions to college theatricals. In 1918, he had written the book and lyrics for "Home James," the varsity show, and had acted a principal comedy role in the production. When his mind turned from law to show business, his uncle Arthur gave him a 1-year apprenticeship in the theater at $20 a week.

"MANAGER FOR ED WYNN SHOW

"In 1918 Mr. Hammerstein was stage manager for an Ed Wynn show called "Sometime." A year later he was general stage manager for Arthur Hammerstein. His first play, a four-act drama, was produced out of town and closed there as a failure. By 1920 he had worked on the books for three musical productions, two in association with Otto Harbach and Frank Mandel. His first real hit was "Wildflower," which opened in 1923.

"Long before his association with Mr. Rodgers, Mr. Hammerstein was writing lyrics for successful works by such composers as Sigmund Romberg, Rudolf Frimb and Vincent Youmans. In 1924 he collaborated on "Rose Marie" and "Sunny." "The Song of the Flame" came in 1925, "Desert Song" in 1926, "Show Boat in 1927 and "New Moon," "Good Boy" and "Rainbow" in 1928.

"The year 1929 found Mr. Hammerstein working on "Madeline" and "Sweet Adeline;" 1931 brought "The Gang's All Here," followed by "Music in the Air" in 1932 and "May Wine" 3 years later. In 1941 his musical "Sunny River" failed in New York.

"By that time Mr. Hammerstein had finished an adaptation for a Negro cast of the opera "Carmen" under the name "Carmen Jones." One day he received a call from Mrs. Rodgers, who told him the Theater Guild wanted to produce a musical based on Lynn Riggs' "Green Grow the Lilacs." Mr. Hammerstein agreed to write the lyrics.

"Thus began what he later called "a perfect partnership" with the composer who had written "The Garrick Gaieties" with the late Lorenz Hart in 1925. Mr. Rodgers was also a Columbia graduate.

"In 1951, Mr. Hammerstein was president of the Authors League of America. In October of that year, Rodgers and Hammerstein staged a new production of "Music in the Air." They were also associated in producing "Annie Get Your Gun," "I Remember Mama," and "The Happy Time." The partners maintained offices at 488 Madison Avenue, but Mr. Hammerstein did most of his work at his farm near Doylestown.

"Mr. Hammerstein's first marriage, to Mirna Finn of the stage, ended in divorce in

1929. They had two children, William Hammerstein, now a producer-director, and Alice (Mrs. Philip Mathias), who followed in her father's path and became a writer of lyrics.

"His second wife was Dorothy Blanchard of Melbourne, Australia, who understudied Beatrice Lillie in "Charlot's Revue" in 1924. They had a son, James.

"A private funeral service for Oscar Hammerstein 2d, the librettist and producer, will be held for the family today at Hartsdale, N.Y.

"A spokesman for the family said yesterday that a memorial service for the friends and associates of Mr. Hammerstein, who was cremated, would be held within 2 weeks.

"Meanwhile, tributes to the talent and personality of the famed lyricist were made by theatrical and civic notables and organizations.

"Richard Rodgers, the longtime collaborator who composed with Mr. Hammerstein much of the memorable music for which the two were famed, yesterday said simply, "I am permanently grieved." Mr. Rodgers' previous collaborator, Lorenz Hart, also died, on November 22, 1943.

"Mary Martin, star of "The Sound of Music," which is still running at the Lunt-Fontanne Theater, said his "gentleness, his kindness, and his greatness of soul" would live forever in the hearts of his friends and "in the memory of the millions whose lives will be enriched by the beauty and the honesty of his words."

"ATKINSON GIVES TRIBUTE

"The former drama critic of the New York Times, Brooks Atkinson, said:

"The theater has lost a giant who was also a man of conscience. The more successful he became, the more humble he was personally. He and Mr. Rodgers created the modern musical theater and we are all indebted to the fine part that he played in it."

"The American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, of which Mr. Hammerstein was a director, closed its offices yesterday and in a statement cited him as a "uniquely talented man; a giant in stature and in his profession."

"Among other organizations paying tribute was the Actors Equity Association, which said "his life's work transcended the boundaries of theater, for justice, tolerance, and fair play pervaded not only his creative works, but his personal relationships as well."

"The Eleanor Roosevelt Cancer Foundation and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, with which he had worked, cited "his deep concern for humanity."

"Mr. Hammerstein's family requested that, in lieu of flowers, contributions be sent to Welcome House, a home for children of Doylestown."

"[From the Washington Post, Aug. 24, 1960]

"THEATER WORLD MOURNS DEATH OF HAMMERSTEIN

"NEW YORK, August 23.—Funeral services will be held Wednesday afternoon for Oscar Hammerstein II. The Broadway librettist and producer died early today of cancer in Doylestown, Pa. He was 65.

"At the request of Mr. Hammerstein's family, the time and place of the private service were not disclosed. Mr. Hammerstein's body was cremated Tuesday morning in Philadelphia, and interment will be in the New York area. A public memorial service will be held within the next 2 weeks.

"While the entertainment world mourned its loss and realized that the last Richard Rodgers-Oscar Hammerstein musical play had been written, Rodgers, Leland Hayward, and Richard Halliday, coproducers with Mr. Hammerstein of "The Sound of Music," decided that a scheduled performance of the Mary Martin musical would be given tonight.

"PERMANENTLY GRIEVED

"Rodgers, the composer whose work with Mr. Hammerstein began in 1942 and became one of the most fruitful collaborations in the history of the American theater, said Tuesday:

"I am permanently grieved."

He and Mr. Hammerstein's family were joined in their grief by hundreds of notables in all walks of life, and by countless spectators who had filled the theaters and seen for themselves Mr. Hammerstein's lyrically optimistic view of life.

"The dearest man I've ever known is gone," Miss Martin said before undertaking her starring role in tonight's performance of "The Sound of Music." In a sense, Miss Martin became the personification of the Rodgers and Hammerstein spirit when she played Nellie Forbush the "cockeyed optimist" of "South Pacific."

"But his gentleness, his kindness, his greatness of soul will live forever," Miss Martin said.

"DIES ON HIS FARM

"Mr. Hammerstein had undergone abdominal surgery while "The Sound of Music" was in preparation last year, and his illness forced him to be inactive during part of the show's rehearsal and tryout period.

"His death came today at 12:30 a.m. at his home, Highland Farms, near Doylestown. Mr. Hammerstein is survived by his wife, Dorothy, his daughter, Alice (Mrs. Philip Mathias), and his sons, William and James. In lieu of flowers, the family said that contributions might be made to Welcome House, the home for orphans of mixed Asiatic parentage in Doylestown. Mr. Hammerstein was president of the organization, in which Mr. Rodgers and Pearl Buck also are active.

"Tributes from Mr. Hammerstein's associates stressed not only the librettist's professional talents, but his personal attributes. Howard Lindsay, the playwright, said Mr. Hammerstein's lyrics revealed his basic qualities of 'simplicity, sincerity, honesty.'

"On the occasion of Gertrude Lawrence's services," Mr. Lindsay recalled, "Mr. Hammerstein said in so many words: 'Mourning does not become the theater. Mourning is a surrender to an illusion that death is final.' "

"In Paris, Joshua Logan, the producer and director who wrote the stage version of 'South Pacific' with Mr. Hammerstein, said:

" 'He is going to be immortal. His songs will never die. There is no question but that Hammerstein will be remembered as long as people sing.'

" 'His death is a great blow to the theater,' said Lawrence Langner, codirector of the Theater Guild. 'He was not only a poet but also a philosopher and a great humanitarian.'

"Until Mr. Hammerstein's death, he and Rodgers were working on several additional songs for the film version of 'State Fair.' They also were discussing a new stage version of 'Allegro,' an earlier Broadway musical.

"Before joining forces with Rodgers, Mr. Hammerstein also collaborated with Jerome Kern, and spent 10 years in Hollywood writing musical motion pictures. He and Rodgers were to have been guests of honor on September 18 at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel at a dinner in support of the Eleanor Roosevelt Cancer Foundation. Proceeds from the dinner were to have been used to establish the Rodgers & Hammerstein Fellowship Fund at the Foundation.

"Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, in a condolence message to Mrs. Hammerstein said, 'The world has lost a great artist who brought happiness to millions.'

"In Washington, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, said the country had suffered a great loss to its theatrical, musical, and artistic life in the death of Mr. Hammerstein. 'He was a wonderful human being,' the Senator said.

"EQUITY SENDS WIRE

"On behalf of Actors Equity, Ralph Bellamy, its president, sent a telegram of condolence to Mrs. Hammerstein in which he said:

" 'We shall always remember him as a great artist, but first we shall remember him as a friend whose loss fills us with sadness.'

"Stanley Adams, president of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, described Mr. Hammerstein as a 'giant in stature and in his profession.' ASCAP offices were closed today in tribute to the lyricist, who became a member of the society in 1923 and had served as a director since 1939.

"Kathy Dunn, a 12-year-old member of 'The Sound of Music' cast, was told of Mr. Hammerstein's death today at Idlewild Airport here after her return from a European seminar of the Felician Nuns.

" 'He was really wonderful and kind,' Kathy said. 'I brought back some holy water for him from Lourdes, and I also had a written blessing for him from Pope John XXIII.' "

USDA CALCULATES CUT IN COTTON INCOME

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was alarmed to learn last month that cost-price pressures on the American farmer continue to accelerate at a very rapid rate.

In fact, during the month ending on November 15, U.S. Department of Agriculture figures show that inflation-recession pressures drove the farm parity ratio to a new 37-year low of 68.

What that means in plain talk is that the farmers are not making enough to keep their heads above water.

Unfortunately, the situation is going to become even worse in the case of the cotton producer if a new and unwarranted provision of the 1971 cotton program is permitted to go into effect.

On December 8 USDA officials announced details of the 1971 program including an important feature changing the basis upon which price support loans are made, and indirectly affecting the manner in which cotton is traded. That regulation—drafted, studied, and approved apparently by the top officials at the U.S. Department of Agriculture—requires that loans be made on a net, rather than gross, weight basis, and it is going to cost the cotton producer approximately $4.25 on every bale of cotton he grows. Unfortunately, USDA's program announcement made no mention of the latter.

Those responsible for the policy recognize that the cotton farmer has already been hit hard by spiraling costs and sagging profits. They should also realize that he cannot afford further cuts in income. Yet USDA has lowered the loan level from 20.25 cents per pound—gross weight plus 45 cents premium for standard micronaire—to 19.50 cents—per pound net weight and no micronaire premium. By using the well-known Government gobbledygook, the USDA administrators have attempted to make

farmers believe that the 1971 loan rate is only 75 cents less than the 1970 rate. In reality, because of discontinuance of the micronaire premium and their decision to go to net weight trading, the loan is reduced 2 cents per pound or $10 per bale. With a crop of 12 million bales—that means a reduction of $120 million in the income of cotton farmers. To make matters worse, it will not mean any savings to the Government.

Basically this new arbitrary regulation establishing the loan on net weight means that farmers will continue paying approximately $4.50 for the bagging and ties used at the gin to package a bale of cotton but that they will not continue to get back any of that expenditure when the cotton is sold. In the past farmers have recouped most of their costs for bagging and ties when the cotton was sold because traditionally cotton has been traded on a gross weight basis.

Consider a hypothetical example: The average bale of cotton weighs 500 pounds gross weight, including about 21 pounds of bagging and ties. It is sold on a gross weight basis. So if cotton is selling for 20.25 cents per pound, that means the farmer will get back about $4.25, or within 25 cents of what he paid originally for the bagging and ties.

The Department of Agriculture has decreed that price support loans are to be made available only on a "net weight" basis. Since the loan in reality establishes the market price, USDA is actually setting the market price for all cotton sold on a net weight basis. Why? Do not we normally pay for the entire weight of everything that we buy including the packaging?

Farmers in my district feel that this new regulation will only cause confusion and dissatisfaction throughout the cotton industry.

Moreover, incredible as it may seem, this scheme was tried several years ago and abandoned because it simply would not work. For 6 years—from 1939 to 1944—USDA required net weight trading but was forced to return to gross weight trading as a means of simplifying the administration of the loan program and to make loan rates and market prices directly comparable. That is USDA's own admission: to simplify the administration of the program.

Obviously if the cotton farmer and the rest of the cotton industry had been willing to convert to net weight trading during the 6-year period when the practice was tried, then cotton would have been traded today on a net weight basis. The real point is that this method of trading was tried and found wanting—and more than likely the same thing will happen again unless the Department of Agriculture reverses its decision.

It is true that most cotton moving in international trade is traded on a net weight basis. Quotations in Liverpool, for example, are made on a net weight basis. However, there are many other differences in international trading of cotton. Why then should USDA require such a change simply for the sake of conformity in international commerce while other differences in international trading of much greater significance remain in effect? Is it merely a case of changing major policy purely for convenience of departmental bookkeepers, while forgetting about the disastrous economic impact on farm income? The cotton farmers in my district will find that to be a very poor explanation for why they must give up $4.25 per bale in income.

In addition, if we convert overnight as the Department of Agriculture proposes, it is going to cost the Government a substantial sum of money. At the moment, approximately 3 million bales of cotton are held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and each one of those bales of cotton was purchased by CCC on a gross weight basis. That means that the Government either owns or has loans outstanding on over 3 million bales of cotton that will automatically decrease in value by about $4.25 once the new regulation goes into effect with an overall loss of approximately $13 million. This loss, of course, must be sustained by the taxpayers.

It is time for the Department of Agriculture to stop preaching economy when it talks to farmers and practicing profligacy in its own operations.

This provision definitely should not be permitted to go into effect. It can only make the farm income situation worse, and it is already bad enough as it is.

BEAT THE PRESS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, following the President's recent press conference, editorialists and columnists alike have commented on the quality of the performance of the press itself. One would assume that after all the lamenting about the infrequency of these events, the press would have been better prepared with the choice and the wording of questions.

I include at this point in the RECORD a column by William Broom, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Ridder Publications and the December 14 Detroit News editorial:

PERFORMANCE OF PRESS NOTHING TO RAVE ABOUT

(By William Broom)

WASHINGTON.—The Washington press corps and the White House have been squabbling again about the frequency and format of the Presidential press conference.

The press had waited four months to confront the President on Dec. 10 and in the last few days before the big event had become quite restive. As a group, the Washington press corps runs somewhat to narcissism. A few of the regulars went so far as to hold a group meeting to discuss ways of improving their questions (which smacks of collusion) and of bringing heavier pressure to bear for more frequent contact with the President.

This is one argument the press can't win. The press can't win because the press itself can't agree on its position. The press is pluralistic and its uneven performance Thursday night exposed the conflicting interests within its ranks. With a national rail strike in progress, there was not a question about it. Although the President grossly failed to answer one-third the questions put to him, no newsman followed up immediately to pry loose a response. At no point were there two questions in a row on the same subject.

In the press' defense, it might be said that in four months of waiting, a lot of questions had piled up demanding answers. Perhaps, but the pattern of questioning seemed no different from the usual, scattershot and disconnected. The Presidential press conference, particularly the live television variety, is more like shooting fish in a barrel than an exercise in meaningful interrogation.

There is no law that says a President must hold press conferences. Most since Theodore Roosevelt have chosen to do so because it is the most effective device Presidents have found to get their side of the story over to the American people. Each President has been free to set his own ground rules and each exercised that choice in different ways, acknowledging a responsibility to inform the public while showing himself to best advantage.

President Nixon revealed that he, too, is dissatisfied with the present situation. He is concerned about over-exposure on television and the equal time doctrine, he said. He offered several alternatives to the present format, said he is open to suggestions, and told reporters they would have to select the participants if news conferences limited in size are held.

The press ought to exercise great caution in any response it makes, or in fact, whether to respond at all to the President's invitation. The American people are the jurors who decide whether the President is leveling with them or not. It is the President's responsibility to be communicative and to his advantage.

If the press determines how often news conferences are held and their format, who will be blamed if the President is judged by the public to be less than candid and uncommunicative—the President or the press? There is a matter of credibility at stake here and it is not solely confined to the President. Nor is there any guarantee of improved press conference content if the press controls them.

As an institution and as a device for producing information that makes the President more understandable and accountable, the Presidential press conference can stand improvement. The press can make its most effective contribution by worrying less about the President's performance and more about its own.

[From the Detroit News, Dec. 14, 1970]

PRESS FLUNKS NIXON QUIZ: JUST PUBLIC SCOLDS

After grumbling and grousing because the President hadn't held a TV news conference in four months, some members of the press last week did everything they could to make Mr. Nixon's televised press conference an irrelevant and unproductive exercise.

Fortunately, Mr. Nixon and the more responsible members of the press prevented it from being that. Still, there was a great deal of valuable presidential, press, public and TV time wasted which could have been used in a manner that would have served viewers better.

With obvious asperity and in some cases what bordered on rudeness, some newsmen spent those valuable few minutes with the President scolding, needling and trying to embarrass him. So intent were they upon this harassment and upon grandstanding for the TV cameras that they neglected to ask one single question about the day's most important story, the railway dispute.

Instead, they wanted to know whether he approved of J. Edgar Hoover's calling

Martin Luther King a liar, whether he has repented since making his public comments on the Manson trial, whether he has really brought the country together or has instead divided it more seriously—whether, figuratively speaking, he has quit beating his wife.

If those old wounds needed at all to be uncovered and rubbed into new rawness, the questioning could have been done with greater finesse and less hostility. The President was, we believe, charitable in making patient answers instead of telling the questioners, as a famous predecessor would have done, to go stand in a corner.

From the standpoint of the conduct of some members of the press, it was one of the worst presidential press conferences since the dawn of television. If last week's conference were to be the pattern of the future, the President would be thoroughly justified in holding such conferences infrequently.

TV press conferences can play an important role in the exposure of the President and his views to the public, which deserves a regular accounting from the highest political officer of the land. If TV performed that service last week, it was despite rather than because of some of the newsmen who participated.

THE NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CELEBRATES ITS SILVER ANNIVERSARY SEASON

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, on the night of January 12, 1971, the Golden State of California will have the great privilege of playing host, in San Diego, to the annual National Basketball Association's all-star game.

While on the face of it, this might seem to be just another basketball game, it is far more than that. To be telecast nationwide by ABC–TV, the game will mark a high point in the NBA's celebration of its silver anniversary.

In its 25 years, professional basketball has set a record of accomplishment which can be admired by any other business enterprise. Under the dynamic leadership of its young, aggressive, and dedicated commissioner, Walter Kennedy, professional basketball has proved itself a worthy companion of America's two other major professional sports—baseball and football. In its early years, limited to old and drafty gymnasiums, the NBA lived on a hand-to-mouth basis and contributed only an occasional evening of entertainment in those few cities where it had been established. But the vision of its individual team owners, men blessed with a rare combination of sports- and civic-mindedness, prevailed.

Today, the NBA operates in 17 major cities, and contributes in almost every instance to the basic economy of those cities. In Los Angeles, for example, it was professional basketball which led to the construction of the Forum, one of the most beautiful sports arenas which exists in our country today. Other similar arenas have gone up, and continue to go up, in city after city, under the economic spur afforded by professional basketball.

The field of professional sports has a unique advantage over other business enterprises. Far from being anonymous, its "workers" are recognized as stars and idols. In every NBA city, basketball clinics have been established, enabling basketball's stars to work directly with aspiring youngsters.

It is through such clinics, and many other civic-minded activities, that many NBA players have an opportunity to return to the game what the NBA and the game itself has given to them. For many of today's great stars were plucked originally from the ghettos, where athletic ability afforded the only relief from the conditions of poverty which turn so many of our disadvantaged youth to lives of crime.

Basketball has for years been giving new hope and actual success to hundreds upon hundreds of such young men. Basketball has provided a major incentive for staying in school, not only for earning a college degree, but also for the chance of joining the professional ranks open to them by the widely expanded National Basketball Association.

The Golden State of California is proud to play host to the NBA All-Star game on January 12 in San Diego. We are proud also to be actively associated with one of America's great sports, with Commissioner Kennedy and his splendid staff, and with all the fine young men who have proved once again that America is still the land of opportunity.

NEWS RELEASE OF DONALD E. JOHNSON, ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am sure that many Members of this body share my feelings of shock and disbelief over the recent testimony of Harvard Sociologist Dr. Charles J. Levy. Appearing before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Dr. Levy made outrageous charges concerning Vietnam veterans who have returned to the United States.

Today Donald E. Johnson, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, has made an excellent statement refuting Dr. Levy's testimony and the spurious means by which he reached his conclusions. Mr. Johnson's statement is comprehensive and certainly deserves the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the news release of Donald E. Johnson, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NEWS RELEASE FROM VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The head of the Veterans Administration today branded recent Congressional testimony by a Harvard University sociologist as demeaning and an insult to the millions of veterans who have served in Vietnam.

Donald E. Johnson, Administrator of Veterans Affairs, took issue with testimony presented earlier this month to the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee by Dr. Charles J. Levy.

"I not only question the broad applicability of his conclusions," Johnson said, "but there is considerable doubt in my mind about the validity of the research on which Dr. Levy's testimony was based."

Dr. Levy's testimony, the Administrator noted, was built around only eight quotations he had selected from taped interviews with just 60 Marine veterans of Vietnam.

The VA chief said Dr. Levy had indicated his findings were typical of Vietnam veterans in general by informing the subcommittee that the 60 men interviewed were "representative of most men in the Armed Services."

The quotations used in Dr. Levy's prepared testimony, Johnson added, tended to show that America's veterans of Vietnam:

(1) Are violence-prone upon return home. "As in Vietnam," the doctor testified, "the targets of their hostility may be those on their side." He then quoted one man telling about splitting his sister's leg with a lamp when she yelled at him, and throwing a portable TV at his mother when she spoke to him. Another man quoted "thought nothing of biting a person's ear off."

(2) Enjoyed maltreating severely disabled South Vietnamese servicemen. The quotation used to demonstrate this point told of Marines throwing a one-legged South Vietnamese ally in need of hospital care out of a truck, and concluded with, "We all had a good laugh bout that."

(3) Were "invariably positive" in their good thoughts about the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese Army enemies, but despised members of the allied South Vietnamese armed forces. Two of the quotations used in this testimony referred to the South Vietnamese as deviates.

(4) Hated their own United States commissioned and non-commissioned officers. Two such officers were deliberately murdered according to the testimony quotations.

"Even if these stories were true," Johnson declared, "it is an insult to infer that they are typical of most of our American veterans of the fighting in Vietnam."

"Saddest of all," he added, "is that such testimony should be given top billing at a hearing convened for the avowed purpose of helping Vietnam veterans in their return to civilian life. I can think of nothing more damaging or less helpful to these veterans than to be pictured in the light of this kind of testimony."

The VA Administrator said the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator Alan Cranston, apparently shared some of this same feeling. He noted that Senator Cranston interrupted Dr. Levy's prepared testimony to say, "I find your statement very shocking and startling and very deeply disturbing. I didn't know what you were going to say until late last night in any detail."

Senator Cranston told the witness he had a great many questions about the interview quotations to determine the extent they were representative of Vietnam veterans, and "to determine how much of it is hearsay and how much it goes beyond hearsay . . ."

"Unfortunately," said Johnson, "most of the media reported only Dr. Levy's prepared-in-advance testimony. Generally unreported were the witness' admissions—mostly under questioning by Senator William B. Saxbe—that his 'typical' veterans were in fact 60 Vietnam Marine veterans from just one neighborhood in one city in America."

The VA Administrator pointed out that the more than 2,500,000 veterans who have served in Vietnam, including 430,000 Marines, entered service from every point in the

United States, and included representatives of every race.

"Yet," he added, "Dr. Levy admitted his interview group came from only one branch of military service, from only one community in the Boston area, and were all white. He also admitted that some in the group were not honorably discharged from military service."

Johnson said he could find no indication in the testimony that Dr. Levy had even tried to substantiate the stories told him by the interview group except for possibly cross-checking individual conversations in the interviews that happened to be on the same subject.

"It is my personal opinion that at least some of those interviewed were telling tall war stories, or even, perhaps, pulling the doctor's leg. Since the sociologist is not a veteran and has never been in Vietnam, so far as I know, he lacked even that much personal background to weigh the authenticity of the tales he was told."

Johnson noted Senator Saxbe's comment at the hearing that, "I have had some experience with sitting around and listening to war stories for 30 years, and it has been my experience that most of them were not true . . ." He asked Dr. Levy, "Doctor do you believe these things they say here?"

Dr. Levy replied, "I don't think that is relevant. I mean the fact is what I am trying to do here is record what these men have told me."

The VA Administrator said that for Dr. Levy to generalize and brand most Vietnam veterans on the basis of his sampling was not only a gross extension of so-called scientific research, but is entirely contrary to the observations of Veterans Administration personnel who have personal contact with thousands of Vietnam servicemen and veterans each day in Vietnam as well as at home.

Noting that he has visited with combat troops in trips to Vietnam; has a son recently returned from combat in Vietnam, and talked with many hundreds of Vietnam veterans in VA programs, Johnson said:

"By every yardstick known to VA people who have regular contact with thousands of Vietnam veterans, these young men are readjusting remarkably well to civil life. All they ask is an equal opportunity to compete without penalty for time out for military service.

"Certainly they should not be additionally handicapped by being labeled as some sort of vicious freaks."

The VA Administrator cited Dr. Levy's testimony that, "The thinking of these veterans seems to be dominated by a fear of their own violence. They therefore tend to withdraw from the outside world."

He then noted that nearly 1,000,000 Vietnam veterans are sufficiently "with" the outside world that they are right now seeking to make up for lost years through education and training under the G.I. Bill.

"Dr. Levy," he suggested, "might look around him on the Harvard campus where nearly 3,000 Vietnam era veterans have gone to school under the G.I. Bill during the last four years.

"He would find that more than 900 Vietnam era veterans are attending Harvard today. It is difficult to associate the term 'withdrawn' with the fact that most of these veterans are studying for careers in such outgoing pursuits as business, teaching, medicine, diplomacy, and the ministry."

Pointing out that Dr. Levy had testified to "an overwhelming need for a boot camp in reverse that will help the men undergo what might be called de-Vietnamization," Johnson said an earlier witness before the Cranston Subcommittee—an associate of Dr. Levy's at the Harvard Medical School—had recommended that all veterans of combat fighting in Vietnam be detained three or four weeks in special camps for "psychosocial detoxification" before being permitted to return home.

"In effect, what these witnesses are saying," the VA chief declared, "is that Vietnam veterans—like mad animals—need to be confined in camp so their fangs can be extracted before they are turned loose on the people who stayed home.

"This type of thinking," he said, "is typical of much you read and hear that Vietnam veterans come home with a killer instinct. I submit that there is not an iota of scientific proof that this is so.

"On the contrary, I would argue that Vietnam veterans, having met military entrance requirements, and having been subjects to disciplined, teamwork living during their tours of duty, are much less likely to commit an act of violence than non-veterans."

Another Dr. Levy recommendation, Johnson said, was that American troops should engage in constructive work in Vietnam as a form of emotional rehabilitation. "Only in this way will each man acquire enough self-regard to again consider himself a 'person'," Dr. Levy testified.

"This makes you wonder," said the VA chief, "if the doctor is even aware that our troops in Vietnam have been engaged in the largest civic action program in the history of our Armed Forces. These 'non-persons' have taken on willingly and voluntarily such compassionate tasks as building or rebuilding huts and churches, feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and caring for the sick."

Added Administrator Johnson:

"It is high time the war critics stopped using our Vietnam veterans as whipping boys in their denunciation of the war in Vietnam. These veterans fought the war bravely and with determination. They neither started nor expanded the conflict.

"In my estimation, our Vietnam veterans are the cream of our young manhood today—and will be the leaders of the nation tomorrow.

"The recognition of this fact should be expressed the nation over, and I, for one, am glad to voice the feeling of pride that exists in American families who have contributed sons, brothers and husbands to the military service of their country."

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S OFFICE IS DERELICT

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, on November 25, along with several members of the House Commerce Committee, I wrote a letter to the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Elmer B. Staats. As of today, I have received no reply from General Staats.

The letter dealt with the diversion of airport trust funds, a subject which several Members in both the Senate and the House have made floor speeches expressing their concern.

In November, there was a charge from several sources that the administration intended to divert some $250 million in funds designated for the airport and airways development trust fund to cover general administrative expenses in the Federal Aviation Agency.

In the letter to General Staats we asked for an opinion as to the propriety and legality of the intended use of the trust fund by the administration.

I would not have been dismayed had General Staats taken a week to reply to our letter, but it has nearly been a month. Not just one Congressman signed this inquiry but several did. This should have been a signal to General Staats that was a substantial amount of desire for a prompt answer.

The fact that we have received no reply makes me suspect the administration is waiting until all transportation appropriations are enacted before commenting on the propriety of their actions in dealing with the trust fund. I suspect they want the money in their pockets before they comment on whether they have the right to have it there.

If this is the case, it is reprehensible, made more so because indirectly the Office of the Comptroller General is involved. If it is not so, the opinion should have been issued. The failure to issue the opinion leaves the House suspicious.

The airways and airport trust fund must not be raided or proliferated. It must not be borrowed against to help out the budget problem of the administration.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, today, as chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Education and Training, I am joining with other members of the task force—Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, and Mr. MICHEL—to introduce the Community College Assistance Act.

The task force has devoted a considerable amount of time and energy to looking at the potential, the needs, and the problems of community colleges. Beginning in the fall of 1969, we met with officials of the U.S. Office of Education to discuss their tentative plans for community college legislation. Later, we visited a number of community college and technical institutes in the Washington area and in our home districts. An informal discussion meeting was held with leaders prominent in the community college area, including Dr. Robert J. Leo, Dallas County Junior College District, Texas; Dr. Albert A. Canfield, chairman of the National Council of State Directors of Community Junior Colleges; William S. Hayes, president of the Alice Lloyd Community College, Kentucky; Ervin L. Harlacher, president, Brookdale Community College, Monmouth County, N.J.; Norvel Smith, president, Merrit College, Oakland, Calif.; and S. V. Martorana, vice chancellor for 2-year colleges, State University of New York. At a breakfast meeting we discussed community colleges with Edmund Gleazer, the executive director of the American Association of Junior Colleges, and Frank Menzel, the government relations officer of the same association. This was followed by further discussions with representatives of the education commission of the States, the

Governors' Conference, the American Council on Education, and the American Association of Junior Colleges.

These activities and additional task force research has convinced us that not only are community colleges growing at a phenomenal rate but they are fulfilling a number of crucial functions in post-secondary education.

During the last few years, a new community college has opened somewhere in the United States once each week, on an average. In 1961, there were 678 community colleges enrolling 750,000 students; by 1969, there were 1,050 community colleges enrolling 2.1 million students. This year, 1970, the total number of community colleges exceeds 1,060 and enrollment has climbed to 2.5 million. This means that almost 35 percent of all institutions of higher education are 2-year community colleges and that about 30 percent of all post-secondary students attend these schools. In fact, among freshmen entering college in 1969, more enrolled in 2-year colleges than in 4-year institutions.

As we talked to people about community colleges, we found that two conflicting misconceptions were frequently expressed. Some felt that community colleges were mere extensions of high school—a sort of 13th and 14th grade program which provided programs similar to those of secondary schools. Others, however, felt that community colleges, or junior colleges, were simply 4-year colleges in an abbreviated form. We found, from our first-hand contacts as well as through research, that community colleges are truly unique institutions different from either high schools or 4-year colleges.

One of the most unique features of public community colleges is their accessibility. They provide financial accessibility, stemming from low tuition or in many cases no tuition at all; geographic accessibility resulting from the location of community colleges close to the people and communities they serve, enabling the vast majority of students to commute to school from their homes; and academic accessibility resulting from the variety of programs and educational goals available at community colleges.

The programs offered by community colleges fall into three principal categories—2-year programs leading to the associate degree, usually in a job-oriented field; freshman and sophomore college work designed to permit students to transfer to senior or 4-year colleges; and programs needed by the community's residents such as short career preparation and career advancement courses, general interest courses, cultural events, and community services.

Community colleges have a unique student body also. A great many of them are people who hold down full-time jobs, support families, and are established members of their communities. The community college, for them, provides a way to advance their career skills, to get the college education they had to forgo when they were younger Because of the high participation of adults in community college programs, the average student age at most community colleges is 25 or 26.

Within the overall structure of society, community colleges meet a number of important needs. First, they provide a way to approach the trend toward universal postsecondary education without diminishing university excellence. Every year the percentage of high school graduates going on to college increases despite the fact that some students lack academic inclination, skills, or interest. Nevertheless, they find themselves drawn to college campuses, perhaps because they wanted to follow their friends, or perhaps because they or their parents felt they would have a better chance in life with a college education. It is not surprising that many of these students are dissatisfied with the typical university fare. As a result, they may be unsuccessful in their academic work and they may become involved in disruptive student activities. Had they attended a community college instead, there is a good chance that they will have found academic courses geared to their abilities and readiness as well as vocational courses designed to prepare them for meaningful and satisfying careers, and their college experience would have been far more valuable to them and to society. If the United States is to continue the trend toward universal postsecondary education, and do so without compromising the quality of higher education, it will be necessary to rely heavily upon community colleges. This would enable those who really want a university education to pursue it, while those who really want and need a different kind of post-high-school education would find it available to them as well.

Yet this is not to imply that students would be divided into two categories for community colleges serve to keep options open for their students. Many high school graduates are at the most crucial decisionmaking point in their lives. Should they go on to college? Or should they prepare directly for a career? Some students are not yet mature enough to answer these important questions, much less to break away from their homes and parental supervision. At a local community college, they can, in effect, try the best of all possible worlds. They can take both academic and vocational courses, if they wish. They can attend college, but still have the support of family, friends, and familiar surroundings. They can take a program of academic or vocational studies that rewards them with an associate degree or certificate in 2 years or less but which still enables them to go on to a 4-year degree should they wish to do so at a later time. Thus, by attending a community college, students can pursue both occupational and academic goals, both immediate and long-range plans.

This point was mentioned by President Nixon on March 19, 1970, when he proposed legislation pertaining to higher education:

> Too many people have fallen prey to the myth that a four-year liberal arts diploma is essential to a full and rewarding life, whereas in fact other forms of post-secondary education—such as a two-year community college or technical training course—are far better suited to the interests of many young people. . . . A traditional four-year college program is not suited to everyone. . . . Our young people are not sheep to be regimented by the need for a certain type of status-bearing sheepskin.

Not only do community colleges serve to keep options open for many students, but they make the option of a college education possible when otherwise it might have been out of the question altogether. Studies have shown that in areas where there is a community college, a much higher percentage of high school graduates go on to college than in areas where there are only 4-year institutions or no post-secondary educational institutions at all.

Community colleges have a singular ability to meet the adult educational needs of their communities. It is here that the "town and gown" can truly meet—where young and old, black and white, rich and poor, farmer and technician, scholar and businessman can widen their perspectives, pursue their interests, develop their talents and enrich their lives. Through their response to the particular demands unique to their local situations, community colleges can serve as catalysts to focus community concern and interest on local needs and problems by bringing together the people with the skills, motivations, and authority to meet such needs or solve such problems.

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, community colleges provide the career preparation that is so badly needed both by our country and by our students. It seems paradoxical that today, with relatively high unemployment rates, there are still thousands of jobs going begging. The reason? These jobs require special skills and technical training, and there are simply not enough qualified, trained applicants to meet the demand. Secretaries, medical technicians, teachers' assistants, electronic technicians, dental assistants, practical nurses, air conditioning specialists, policemen, automobile mechanics, environmental technicians—the list is seemingly endless. A service to both students and to the Nation, community colleges provide opportunities for motivated high school graduates to learn the skills needed to begin careers in these critical skills areas and to continue to upgrade their abilities once launched in a field of specialization.

Despite these encouraging aspects of the community college movement, there remain a number of problems that must be resolved if community colleges are to meet their potential as a unique form of post-secondary education rather than to mimic other types of institutions. As with all burgeoning institutions, community colleges have the expected "growing problems"—inadequate facilities, insufficient trained teachers and counselors, and disproportionate Federal assistance in comparison with 4-year institutions. Yet there are other concerns at least as vital to the future of the community college movement.

PLANNING

Many States still lack a coordinated comprehensive approach to planning for the establishment and development of community colleges. The importance of planning should not be underestimated.

Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., executive director of the American Association of Junior Colleges, for example, observed that:

> Community colleges are strongest and most comprehensive in those few states that already have taken the lead in planning for systems of community colleges and are well along the road to an integrated overall higher education effort. Invariably, these are the same states where post secondary educational opportunity falls within commuter distances of the highest percentages of the people.

The States seem to be well aware of the need for community college planning. Albert A. Canfield, chairman of the National Council of State Directors of Community Junior Colleges, stated that:

> We need legislation which will give us time to plan and prepare for an orderly and effective expansion of our services and facilities . . . We need legislation that recognizes and accepts varying state organizations and implementation.

The Education Commission of the States' Task Force on Community Colleges has also called attention to the need for Federal legislation to encourage effective comprehensive planning for community colleges and to provide funds for accomplishing this aim.

The bill being introduced today is no panacea for all of the problems touched upon above. It is intended in these closing days of the 91st Congress to serve as a stimulus for further thinking in this critically important area and to make certain suggestions based upon the task force's studies.

Essentially, this is a bill which would provide financial assistance to the States to plan for the development and improvement of comprehensive community colleges and would further provide $100 million in Federal funds to assist community colleges in establishing and developing occupational education programs.

The bill being introduced today provides in title I for Federal funds to encourage and develop the planning process for community colleges at the State level. Among the 50 States, there exists a wide discrepancy among the degrees of advancement of State-level organizations for planning for community colleges and just as wide a discrepancy among the degrees of progress being made to establish a system of comprehensive community colleges. Thus we allow wide flexibility, in our bill, in the way each State chooses to develop and organize its planning effort. In each State, whichever State agency has primary responsibility for community colleges will also have the responsibility for administering these Federal planning funds. We expect that the pattern will vary widely. In a dozen States there are State boards of community colleges or junior colleges. In five States, community colleges fall under the Chancellor of Higher Education. In five States, chief State school officers responsible for elementary and secondary education have responsibility for community colleges. In three States, community colleges fall under the State university.

The report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The Open Door—June 1970—summed up problems that States must plan to overcome:

> How to stimulate the growth and development of community colleges in States that are barely beginning to establish them or have thus far failed to make a beginning;
>
> How to provide more adequate financial support for the community colleges and to bring about a more equitable distribution of the financial burden among federal, state, and local governments;
>
> How community colleges can achieve improved quality and, in many cases, a broader selection of both academic and occupational programs;
>
> How to strengthen the relationship among highly selective universities and colleges, less selective four-year and five-year institutions, and non-selective community colleges;
>
> How to ensure that the community colleges will maintain not only open access but also low tuition policies; and
>
> How to encourage appropriate private two-year colleges and institutions to become more comprehensive and to serve community needs in the manner exemplified by the best of the public community colleges.

To this list, we would add the necessity for State level planning for community colleges to take into account the activities of such other institutions in the State as vocational schools, comprehensive secondary schools, adult education agencies, State manpower agencies, labor unions, business and industry, and the general public. For this reason, we provide that these institutions and groups must be represented on an advisory council to the agency responsible for planning for community colleges, a step which we hope will result in the development of close coordination between the capacities of community colleges and the needs of those they serve.

CAREER EDUCATION

As I mentioned before, community colleges have a special role to play in helping people prepare themselves to take advantage of the exciting and challenging career opportunities that are going begging because there are too few well-trained skilled workers. Community colleges are accessible to the students who want career training. And they are in close touch with the resources of their communities and its manpower needs. They can devise meaningful combinations of work and study for their students, and they can do this with much better information about the kinds of careers which will actually be available in the community upon their students' completion of formal course work.

These potentialities, however, are matched by some difficult problems. Occupational programs are much more expensive than typical classroom courses. Teachers must be recruited, for example, from the ranks of well-paid skilled workers in business and industry. Extensive and expensive workshops and laboratories must be constructed and equipped. Career education classes typically must maintain much smaller student-teacher ratios than classroom lecture courses.

The repercussions of the expense of career education are often felt when budgetary problems necessitate cutting back, limiting expansion, or trimming corners. Far more students can be handled at less cost in academic university-parallel programs than in occupational programs, and too often when confronted with the choice, community college administrators decide that occupational programs rather than academic programs must be restricted. The unfortunate result in many areas has been a gradual shifting of the balance in favor of liberal arts programs and away from career education.

The legislation we are introducing today provides $100 million for career education programs in community colleges. By career education programs, we mean instructional programs, carried on at the postsecondary level, which are designed to prepare students for entry into, or advancement in, positions of gainful employment that require postsecondary training. These programs usually do not require a baccalaureate degree but can lead to 4-year college and professional school options.

Despite this emphasis on occupational education, this does not mean that we intend to encourage career training at the expense of all other alternatives. The Carnegie Commission correctly emphasized the need for comprehensive community colleges which encompass academic, occupational and general education programs to allow the students a wide range of choices. Thus, although the legislation we are introducing today would provide a substantial new source of Federal funds to encourage the development and improvement of occupational training programs, we also require that in order to be eligible for these funds, a State must have developed a comprehensive statewide program for improvement, development and construction of community colleges including occupational-technical programs, adult continuing education programs, counseling-advising programs and university-parallel programs.

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

There are over a dozen Federal programs that relate to community colleges, yet there is nowhere in the U.S. Office of Education a single distinct office to serve as a focal point for community colleges. The Community College Assistance Act approaches this situation in two ways. First, it authorizes the establishment of an agency within the Office of Education which shall be the principal agency for programs and activities relating to community colleges. This agency will administer the programs for State planning and occupational education authorized in this act as well as coordinate all other programs affecting community colleges which are administered by the Office of Education. Second, the act authorizes this agency to provide technical assistance to the States and agencies in developing community college capabilities.

AMENDMENTS

The bill proposes a number of changes in existing legislation. The first concerns title I of the Higher Education Act. This program is intended to strengthen the community service programs of colleges and universities so that they can effectively relate to and actively assist in the solution of community problems. Because they are supported at grassroots level and serve their local communities, we feel that community colleges are the best

institutions to provide community services programs. Yet in fiscal year 1969, community colleges received only 9.2 percent of the funds appropriated for title I, and 2-year institutions in 28 States and territories received no funds at all. Our legislation would earmark 50 percent of the title I funds for community colleges.

Under the library assistance program, title II, of the Higher Education Act, colleges must maintain their previous financial effort for libraries in order to be eligible for funding. In most situations this is feasible and simply means that colleges do not use Federal funds to replace money they might have spent on libraries. In the case of many new institutions just starting out, however, this provision precludes them from participating in the program. In their first year, they spend inordinately large amounts on establishing an initial library collection. Then their annual expenditures taper back to the levels needed to maintain and develop their library. Yet to participate in the title II program, they would have to continue to spend annually the same amount they spent to establish their library. To correct this situation, we have proposed an amendment which would allow the Commissioner to make exceptions where he deems appropriate to the maintenance of effort requirement in the case of institutions less than 5 years old.

A similar situation prevails in the developing institutions program, title III, which excludes institutions less than 5 years old. Again, we are proposing an amendment which would allow new institutions to participate in this program.

Finally, we are proposing changes in the Higher Education Facilities Act. As the situation now stands, public community colleges are eligible for funding under section 103 of the act and all other institutions are eligible under section 104. In each State a State commission is organized to develop plans for the use of funds under both sections 103 and 104—this commission is, by and large, dominated by representatives of 4-year institutions. The only section to receive appropriations this year was section 103, pertaining to community colleges. Yet because of the makeup of the State commissions, community colleges in many States found that they had little to say in the administration of these funds. Private community colleges found that they had been excluded from funding because they were eligible under section 104. The amendments we are offering would change the existing situation by setting up two State commissions in lieu of the one that now exists—one for section 103 and another for section 104, and by making private community colleges eligible to participate under section 103.

At this point, I would like to summarize briefly the contents of the Community College Assistance Act and to insert the language of the act:

SUMMARY OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE ASSISTANCE ACT

TITLE I

Authorizes $10 million annually for fiscal year 1971 through fiscal year 1974 for grants to State community college agencies to implement Statewide plans for development of community colleges.

To allow planning time, this Title would be in effect for one year before the other sections of the bill.

TITLE II

Authorizes $100 million for fiscal 1972, $150 million for fiscal 1973, and $200 million for fiscal year 1974 to assist community colleges with career education programs. The Commissioner would allot funds on the basis of the number of full-time equivalent students enrolled in career education programs at each participating institution.

In order for the community colleges in a State to participate, the State community college agency would have to submit to the Commissioner the Statewide plan authorized under Title I.

TITLE III

Authorizes $1.5 million annually for Commissioner of Education to make technical assistance available to community colleges. Directs Commissioner to establish a special agency within the Office of Education responsible for community college programs.

TITLE IV

Definitions, including a broad definition of the term "career education" as used in this act.

TITLE V

Technical amendments to the Higher Education Facilities Act.

Amendments to the Higher Education Act would:

(1) Earmark 50% of Title I funds (community service) for community colleges.

(2) Authorize Commissioner to make Title II funds (library assistance) available to new community colleges less than five years old.

(3) Make Title III funds (developing institutions) available to community colleges less than five years old.

H.R. ——

A bill to provide assistance to community colleges through a program of Statewide planning for community colleges, financial assistance for career education, technical assistance, and amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Community College Assistance Act".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to assist the States in making postsecondary education available to all persons in all areas of each State by assisting States in planning, developing, strengthening, and improving community colleges, including the development of career education programs, adult continuing education programs, counseling-advising programs, community service and enrichment programs.

TITLE I—STATEWIDE PLANNING FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

STATE APPLICATIONS

SEC. 101. The Commissioner shall approve any application for funds for planning for carrying out the purpose of this Act if such application—

(1) provides that such funds shall be administered by the State agency with primary responsibility for community colleges;

(2) provides that a State advisory council broadly representative of community colleges, other institutions of higher education, vocational schools, comprehensive secondary schools, adult education agencies, State manpower agencies, labor unions, business and industry, and the general public will be established to advise such agency;

(3) provides that such State agency will make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require, and to assure verification of such reports, give the Commissioner, upon request, access to records upon which such information is based; and

(4) sets forth policies and procedures designed to assure that Federal funds made available under this title will not be so used as to supplant State or local funds, but to supplement and, to the extent practicable, to increase the amounts of such funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the purposes of this title.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 102. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of this title the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for each of the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1975. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making payments to States whose applications for funds for carrying out such purposes have been approved.

ALLOTMENT TO STATES

SEC. 103. The sums appropriated pursuant to section 102 shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States on the basis of the amount needed by each State for the purpose of this title, except that no such allotment to any State shall be less than $50,000.

TITLE II—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR CAREER EDUCATION

STATE PLANS AND PAYMENTS

SEC. 201. (a) Any State desiring to receive its allotment of Federal funds under this title shall submit a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

(1) provides for the administration of such plan by the State agency primarily responsible for community colleges, with advice from the State advisory council designated in section 101 above;

(2) sets forth a comprehensive statewide program for the improvement, development, and construction of community colleges in the State for the purposes of this Act, including but not limited to the development and carrying out of occupational-technical programs, adult continuing education programs, developmental programs, counseling-advising programs, and university parallel programs;

(3) takes into account existing State plans for vocational education and any other State plans for education;

(4) provides for the necessary State and local financial support to carry out such program with assistance under this part;

(5) sets forth policies and procedures designed to assure that Federal funds made available under this title will be so used as not to supplant State or local funds but to supplement and, to the extent practicable, to increase the amounts of such funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the purposes of providing career education;

(6) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to community colleges) under this title; and

(7) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 202. (a) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of section 201 and shall pay to such State, from its allotment for each fiscal year, the reasonable cost, as determined by the Commissioner, of carrying out such portion of the approved plan that provides for the es-

tablishment or improvement of career education.

(b) In the event the Commissioner shall not approve a State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, he shall first afford the State agency or institution submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearings to the State agency or institution administering a State plan approved under section 201, finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of such section, or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify the State agency or institution that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 203. (a) The Commissioner shall, in accordance with the provisions of this title, make payments to the State agencies primarily responsible for community colleges, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for each of the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1975.

(b) For the purposes of making such payments, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 204. The Secretary shall allot the sums appropriated under section 203 among the States so that the amount allotted to each State bears the same ratio to such appropriation as the number of full-time equivalent students enrolled in career education programs at community colleges and technical institutes in the State bears to the number of such students in all States.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SE . 301. (a) The Commissioner shall, directly or through grant or contract, make technical assistance available to States and to agencies participating or seeking to participate in programs assisted under this Act on a continuing basis to assist them in developing and carrying out State plans.

(b) Payments under this section may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Commissioner may determine.

(c) There are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of this section such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for each of the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1975.

SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary shall take all necessary steps to coordinate programs under his jurisdiction, affecting community colleges. To this end he shall establish in the Office of Education an agency which shall be the principal agency for programs and activities relating to community colleges and which shall, unless otherwise specified, carry out Titles I, II, and III of this Act.

(b) No later than January 31 of each calendar year, the Commissioner shall report to Congress on activities carried out under Titles I and II of this Act and other activities of the Office of Education pertaining to community colleges.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 401. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education.

(2) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(3) The term "community college" means any technical institute, junior college, or any other educational institution in any State which—

(A) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education;

(B) admits as regular students high school graduates or equivalent, or persons at least 18 years of age;

(C) provides a two-year post-secondary educational program leading to an associate degree, or acceptable for credit toward a bachelor's degree, and also provides programs of post-secondary vocational, technical, occupational, and specialized education;

(D) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and

(E) is accredited as an institution by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association, or if not so accredited—

(i) is an institution that has obtained recognized preaccreditation status from a nationally recognized accrediting body, or

(ii) is an institution whose credits are accepted on transfer, by not less than three accredited institutions, for credit on the same basis if transferred from an institution so accredited, and for purposes of this paragraph, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

(4) The term "career education" means a nonbaccalaureate program at a community college which prepares students enrolled in such program for entry into, or advancement in, specific technical or semiprofessional positions of gainful employment, including but not limited to industry, engineering, business, paramedical and health-related occupations, and those occupations which involve skills designated by the Secretary of Labor as those in which a critical manpower shortage exists.

(5) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 402. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its plan submitted under section 202, such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

PROHIBITIONS

SEC. 403. Section 422 of the General Education Provision Act is amended by inserting "the Community College Assistance Act of 1970," after "the International Education Act of 1966."

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT AND HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

STATE COMMISSIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

SEC. 501. (a) Section 105(a) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, is amended as follows by striking out the first sentence of the section and inserting, in lieu thereof, "Any State desiring to participate in the grant program with funds allotted under section 103 of this title shall designate for that purpose an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of public and private nonprofit community colleges in the State, or, if no such State agency exists, shall establish such a State agency, and submit to the Commissioner through the agency so designated or established (in this title referred to as the State Commission for Community Colleges) a State plan for such participation. Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under section 104 of this title shall designate for that purpose an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions eligible to participate in such program, or, if no such State agency exists, shall establish such a State agency, and submit to the Commissioner through the agency so designated or established, a State plan for such participation." (In this title referred to as the "State Commission for Colleges and Universities.")

(b) Subsequent references to "State Commission" in this title shall be amended accordingly.

PRIVATE NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 502. (a) Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, is amended by striking out "public community colleges and public technical schools" where it occurs in sections 103(a); 103(b)(2); 104(a) ; 105(a)(3); and 107(b), and substituting "public and private nonprofit community colleges."

(b) Section 401(g) is renumbered section 401(g)(i) and section 401(g)(ii) is added as follows: "The term 'private nonprofit community college' means an institution of higher education owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual and which is organized and administered principally to provide a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree or a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge, and, if a branch of an institution of higher education offering four or more years of higher education, is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located."

COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 503. (a) Section 105(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended as follows by striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (5), and inserting after clause (6), "and (7) provide for the allocation of federal funds to institutions of higher education in such a manner as to assure that at least fifty percentum of such funds are allocated to community colleges."

(b) Section 1201 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after

clause (k), (1) The term "community college" means any technical institute, junior college, or any other educational institution in any State which—

(A) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education;

(B) admits as regular students high school graduates or equivalent, or persons at least 18 years of age;

(C) provides a two-year postsecondary educational program leading to an associate degree, or acceptable for credit toward a bachelor's degree, and also provides programs of postsecondary vocational, technical, occupational, and specialized education;

(D) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and

(E) is accredited as an institution by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association, or if not so accredited—

(i) is an institution that has obtained recognized preaccreditation status from a nationally recognized accrediting body, or

(ii) is an institution whose credits are accepted on transfer, by not less than three accredited institutions, for credit on the same basis if transferred from an institution so accredited, and

for the purposes of this paragraph, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

COLLEGE LIBRARY RESOURCES

SEC. 504. Section 202 of title II, part A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting the phrase, "except that in the case of community colleges in existence less than five years the Commissioner may make exceptions where he deems appropriate," after "June 30, 1965," in clause (a) and at the end of clause (b).

DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 505. (a) Section 302(d) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting before "has met" the following: ", if an institution which provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree,".

(b) Section 306 of such Act is amended by striking out "(other than developing institutions)".

MILITARY POLICE STATE?

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, for a number of years this body has been graced by the presence of a Senator who has performed a devoted service to his country as a guardian of constitutional rights.

Senator ERVIN, the senior Senator from North Carolina, has been eternally vigilant as to the authority of the sovereign States, and as to the liberty of individual citizens.

In his scholarly efforts, he has been consistent in asserting that the mandate of the Framers of our Constitution must be followed to the letter. Recently, he has been engaged in an investigation of what might well be a shocking violation of individual rights.

I salute Senator ERVIN for the service he has performed and ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Extensions of Remarks, an excellent editorial from the December 18, 1970, issue of the Northern Virginia Daily of Strasburg, Va., entitled "Military Police State," which deals with Senator ERVIN'S investigation of military surveillance of civilian officeholders.

The editor of the Northern Virginia Daily is James J. Crawford.

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

MILITARY POLICE STATE

Current news regarding compilation of dossiers on the activities of public figures and private citizens by Army intelligence investigators could be lost in the Christmas rush, but it shouldn't be. The revelation concerns a development which is extremely significant and should be fully exposed.

It comes from the office of Sen. Sam J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina, a veteran member of the Senate, and certainly not one for extravagant, unfounded dramatics. The information concerns a rather elaborate Army intelligence apparatus, operated by so-called domestic investigators who have been spying on private citizens for several years, and was supplied the senator by a former agent whose veracity is apparently unquestioned.

Many people in public office and in private life have been under surveillance, according to Sen. Ervin. Targets have been individuals who have opposed the government's policies. Sen. Ervin explained it this way:

"It was enough that they opposed or did not actively support the government's policy in Vietnam or that they disagreed with domestic policies of the Administration or that they were in contact or sympathetic to people with such views."

High-ranking political figures, as well as a host of state and local officials, political contributors, newspaper reporters, lawyers and church leaders have been subjects of this dubious distinction. The snooping has gone far beyond the military's earlier claims that investigations of civilians were limited to those who "demonstrated a penohant for violence."

The list of those on whom dossiers have been compiled is said to include such well-known public figures as Illinois Senator-elect Adlai Stevenson III, former Illinois governor Otto Kerner, now a federal judge, Rep. Abner Mikva and Sen. William J. Fulbright. All of these have been frequent critics of government policy.

If, indeed, the activities of the Army intelligence in gathering information on civilians have been this extensive, who knows how many more American citizens may be included on this list. Or for what reasons. The danger is that such a list which is compiled today to include only those who oppose the Vietnam war, if that were the case, could tomorrow include civilians who simply oppose the party in power.

What is involved here is an insidious activity which, if allowed to go on unchecked, can lead to a military police state. This is not the American way.

Sen. Ervin states that the informant who was the source of his information will be called to testify next February before the subcommittee on constitution rights, which he heads.

Good. It will be none too soon to start putting an end to this un-American practice.

REAGAN—THE CHAMPS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan Raiders have done it again. Last weekend, they met and conquered the Odessa Panthers for the State championship in AAAA Texas high school football.

This is the third crown in 4 years for Coach Travis Raven and his "Little Southwest Conference" champion. For the past 5 years of University Interscholastic League competition, the Reagan dynasty has chalked up a record as a true powerhouse, with a 57–6–1 record. This ranks them with the other legends of Texas schoolboy football: the Waco team of the 1920's, the Amarillo 11 of the 1930's and the Abilene team of the 1950's. Never, in 14 playoff contests have the Raiders lost.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we take our football serious in Austin, and all of Texas for that matter. We are proud of our young men. And we know they have the character to carry the fight. Congratulations are again in order for the Reagan Raiders of Austin, Tex.

RADIO COMMENTATOR ALAN COURTNEY REMARKS ON "A TROUBLED AMERICA"

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years, many in our great Nation, including myself, have offered commentary on the malaise of America, and where we, as a free people, are heading.

Mr. Alan Courtney, one of south Florida's leading radio commentators, who has his own nightly radio talk show, in an editorial offered some very poignant remarks on the subject. I have listened to Mr. Courtney's program for many years and have, therefore, heard his comments on a great number of subjects, and I truly believe that he has captured the gist of what appears to be troubling our great Nation today.

Mr. Courtney is one of the original pioneers of radio, having started his illustrious career in 1929 on the Mutual Broadcasting Network where he was then one of the Nation's leading disc jockeys. In 1948 he pioneered the radio talk show idea in New York City. In 1949, he came to the Miami area where his program became the first regularly scheduled radio talk show in the country.

Since his conception of a regular radio talk show with the public was started, it has been copied and has become a regular feature of radio and television stations across the country. As a result, literally millions of Americans have been offered the opportunity to discuss their views, both pro and con, on any subject. It truly personifies a part of what is great about America; namely, the constitutional right of free expression of ideas and beliefs.

Needless to say, Mr. Courtney has been honored by many groups and organizations across the Nation. One honor that I know he is distinctly proud of is a Public Service Award which he received from FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover.

For the past 21 years, many people of

south Florida have recognized how lucky they are to have Alan Courtney and his open-phone forum which continues to draw hundreds of listeners who forsake a "night on the town," or their sleep, to talk with Mr. Courtney, or one of his many interesting guests.

Mr. Courtney is a sincere, dedicated man. He organized a foundation called "Americans in Distress"—AID—which helps raise money in order to assist those unfortunates who may have been hit with a catastrophe.

Alan Courtney loves America. His views that follow come from the heart and I am sure once you read them you will agree.

I am sure that he would also like to hear your views on the subject and you may direct such views to Mr. Alan Courtney, radio station WIOD, Miami, Fla.

His comments, which I feel you should read, are as follows:

COMMENTS BY ALAN COURTNEY

For some years now we have been exposed to a variety of books, articles, and lectures about "The Troubled America" . . . "The Silent Majority" . . . "The Silenced Majority" . . . "The Revolutionary Minority" and the image of a nation determined to destroy itself through frustration, confusion, discontent, and a people no longer sure of its destiny.

Now that everyone old enough to understand the world around him agrees that we are going through a serious stage of domestic unhappiness and uneasy stages of what might be described as domestic guerrilla warfare, the issue is no longer the repetition of what ails us. The issue is what must be done to help correct it, without resorting to a cure worse than the disease!!

What I am going to say I feel will alienate some of our friends and inflame our critics all the more.

Certain historical causes, I believe must be conceded, if we are going to redirect the course of our great Republic to a safe and sound road ahead.

The creation of a revolution within a highly civilized and democratized country takes time, effort, persistence, and deception. It takes organization, finance, and know how. It takes unprincipled devotion to achieve a goal, and it requires that the ninety-five percent be constantly lulled or distracted into believing they must accommodate their own executioners lest they destroy their own freedom and their own pursuit of happiness.

The strange combination of individuals and organizations who have been dedicated to altering the United States into some kind of paternalistic form of Socialism called Liberalism, wherein nobody goes hungry, nobody is deprived, nobody is unhappy, and justice reigns supreme, has long been the basic motivation and drive that most of us my age are personally familiar with.

Since most Americans were, until the mid-thirties, by tradition, education, and choice, traditional "Jeffersonian Liberals", it never dawned on these sincerely motivated people that their cause was being slowly undermined and corrupted by a minority of highly educationed revolutionaries in dignified spectacles . . . while most Americans have always been alert to the obvious dangers of violent crime and overt demagoguery, most Americans have been extremely naive in the area of modern day politics and international geo-political warfare.

It is natural and understandable that anarchy, permissiveness and amoral or immoral behavior, and thought, is more easily tolerated by the liberal, than the conservative.

Revolution to the doctrinaire liberal is something he dreams of and works for, even if his or her effort is not always known or obvious to others. The liberals backed every revolution of the left for the last forty years when FDR recognized the Soviet Union. To the ritualistic liberal, revolution to the left was for the uplift of mankind—a revolution to the right was turning back the clock to despotism.

It took decades for many of the liberal leaders to admit they were dangerously wrong. They still refuse to concede the Communist brand of tyranny for what it is. But they will spring to the forefront like Pavlov's dogs upon the slightest emergence of what they immedately condemn as "Fascism" or "Nazism".

Over the last forty years our schools and colleges have miseducated and misled millions of Americans to believe in distorted versions of history, while assuming the very fashionable technique of debunking our heritage, our heros, and our patriotism.

Permissiveness and progressive education became the big crusade.

Every domestic failing and domestic evil was blown up into a mammoth monster of hysterical proportions to the point where the only way to save the Nation was to destroy it first and then rebuild it somehow from the ashes.

The moderate evolutionary liberal who clings to much of his fabianized indoctrination, now is trying to bring us together and deplores the polarization, as he calls it, of those like the late Senator McCarthy, General Douglas MacArthur, the late Senator Bob Taft, J. Edgar Hoover, The House Committee on Unamerican Activities, the "Police Brutality", they are so fond of referring to, the dangerous "Military-industrial Complex", the National Guard, and any strict construction of the Constitution, law and justice.

The signs along the road going back over the years to those who know full well the irreputable lessons of history were:

The growing centralization and bureaucratic power of agencies from Washington, as well as in some of the States, that assumed they were carrying out a mandate to compel everybody to be "good" and "free" . . .

The art of compulsive order originated and grew into a Frankenstein under the liberals, supported by frightened conservatives who were afraid to challenge the fallacies and follies of their liberal friends and brothers.

The liberals adopted a paradox of schizophrenic values. On one hand they claimed they believed everybody must be equal, everybody has a right to preach the overthrow of our Government, and our society, as well. Everybody was guaranteed a right to an income from the cradle to the grave and everybody has a right to do anything he damn pleases.

This was steadily moved into the powerful force called "Civil Disobedience" . . .

The first modern demagogue who exploited and capitalized upon this alien doctrine was the late Martin Luther King.

What started out as a rather innocuous testing of the "Back of the Bus" business, only was the starting point to build a following to further emphasize and inflame "The Revolution" as the media so proudly hailed it night and day. TV could perhaps be condemned as the worst of all culprits in their daily presentation of something they called "The Revolution at Home" . . . every misfit and anarchist and Communist and con man was brought before the cameras day after day lecturing, posturing and promoting the case of revolution against the "Establishment". Here again is an alien slogan, just as "Ghetto" was deliberately built in the minds of millions of naive people to be an authentic meaning for neighborhoods where economic conditions of most, were less than other neighborhoods, where white poor people dwelled. The "Ghetto" was then made the symbol of oppression.

Strikes to get more for doing less, became an accepted fact.

Criminals were described more and more as sick people of underprivileged who had to turn to crime to survive.

Courts started to play God and Solomon with our laws.

Defense attorneys started to become part of the criminal community in search of techniques on "How to beat the rap," rather than how to secure justice!

The barriers of established norms were broken down by those who started to depart from rules and codes that were long accepted by almost every responsible American.

We are today finally aroused as never before.

It has taken a long time.

The bombings and violence and terroristic tactics of kidnapping and assassination is a typical pattern of red revolutionary techniques that the gullible still pretend does not apply.

Those who claim that it must get far worse before it gets much better are saying in a sense that for decades so many Americans "went along to get along", the necessity now of even changing some of their own wrong ideas and behavior comes upon them with a rather unpleasant threat to their long held liberal abstractions of utopian solutions.

This is why, for example, Spiro Agnew is pictured by the unrepentent liberals as the one who is keeping us apart! What a farce! Every normal adult liberal with the slightest degree of intellectual integrity knows full well the causes of our present plight of domestic unhappiness (using this word in broad terms). He knows, but won't concede his own past record of extremism which he rationalized as middle of the road or moderation.

The United States must survive . . . it will . . . despite those who helped carry the disease they now are attributing to others.

DILEMMA FOR FEEDLOTS

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every American citizen is aware of the urgent and well publicized need for our Nation to clean up and protect our environment.

Pollution is everyone's problem. The task of cleaning up our environment calls for a total mobilization by all of us. It cannot be a matter of simply sitting back and blaming someone else or any particular industry. The task is ours together.

Unless each individual citizen accepts the responsibility for a pollution-free America, all of the local, county, State, and Federal plans put together will not result in "America the Beautiful" or "America the Safe."

Mr. Speaker, an editorial written by Mr. Fred Brooks, editor of the Garden City Telegram in Garden City, Kans., most accurately describes the point I am trying to make. Mr. Brooks points out the fact that the Kansas feedlot industry is now going through a most uncertain period as a result of possible feedlot en-

forcement regulations on both the State and Federal levels. I commend this editorial to all of my colleagues who, I am sure, are interested in protecting our environment with realistic and workable standards:

DILEMMA FOR FEEDLOTS

Kansas has lost four feedlots and a cement plant because of federal and state anti-pollution regulations. The loss to the state's economy is estimated at $40 million.

Now it is losing another feedlot, one which is providing a $5 million annual market for hay, silage and feed grains in addition to its service to beef producers.

The Crofoot Feedlot at Strong City has announced it cannot continue to operate because of the uncertainty of future federal regulations.

The owner of the feedyard is willing and ready to spend $250,000 to build waste treatment facilities to comply with state standards. But he has no assurance that this expenditure would qualify for secondary treatment standards which the federal government plans to impose in 1975.

Farmers and livestock men are concerned about the future of agriculture in the state. And the state's environmentalist shares that concern. Melville Gray, chief of state ecological operations, is paid to protect the environment. But he sees the possibility that federal standards to come might wipe out feedlots in Kansas.

There is no quarrel that reasonable regulations are needed to control pollution from feedlots. And the feedlots are complying with state regulations requiring holding ponds—or they are shutting down.

But feedlot owners are not going to pay huge sums for pollution controls when they don't know what the federal standards will be five years from now.

Two years ago the average person didn't know what the word ecology meant. Now emotions are running and unreasonable and sometimes vague regulations are the result.

We need to clean up the environment. But unrealistic standards will do more harm than good.

THE GREAT RETREAT

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Mr. James Burnham entitled "The Great Retreat" spells out the current thrust of our foreign policy in no uncertain terms. There is very little that can be added to Mr. Burnham's assessment. Any observer with a mind not clouded by liberal mysticism which regards strength as being a danger for the one who possesses it and surrender as being in the national interest understands that the picture outlined by the author is quite realistic.

The most engrossing portion of the article is the section on the language of retreat. Cliches such as "we cannot be a global policeman" and "our deepest challenge must be to evoke the creativity of a pluralistic world" substitute for rational thought not only among the general public but, most unfortunately, in the upper policy echelons. These little phrases that cover up big losses are a vivid and frightening manifestation of a mental condition noted by Alexander Hamilton when he said:

Men, upon too many occasions do not give their understanding fair play; but yielding to some untoward bias, they entangle themselves in words and confound themselves in subtleties.

How far have we wandered from the only sound national policy in matters relating to the security of the Nation: Peace through strength, or, when strength fails to deter aggression, peace through swift victory.

The article follows:

THE GREAT RETREAT

Suppose we ask: What, in the widest sense, is the current strategic posture of the United States? Once we open our eyes, we can have little doubt of the answer: withdrawal, retreat, on every front, in every field. Not merely defense ("containment"). Retreat.

Many of us overlook the fact of universal retreat because we do not expand our focus to take in the pattern as a whole, and because within each separate sector the withdrawal is covered by one or another sort of verbal camouflage. In Southeast Asia it is called not "retreat" but "Vietnamization." The cutbacks, perhaps liquidation, of the SST is not a bugout but a responsible concern for the environment. Naval aircraft get laid up as part of the struggle against inflation. And so on.

What counts is the vector, the direction of motion. No one can dispute that we are moving out of (i.e., retreating from) Vietnam, not moving in (i.e., advancing). Is our space program—the greatest enterprise ever undertaken by our country—expanding or contracting? It wouldn't take an unemployed aerospace scientist, engineer or technician more than a tenth of a second to answer that one.

The Navy is scrapping or laying up ships by the hundreds, building them by twos and threes. When a handful of hot-headed soldiers in a desert semi-nation order us out of a strategically situated air base on which we have spent hundreds of millions, we don't even argue, we run away, tail between legs. Rickety Latin American juntas grab the mines, oil wells and installations that exist solely because of our expertise, work and money. We don't even think of resistance; we pack up and leave. Month by month, without public fanfare, our battalions slip away from Western Europe. At a frown from a Latin American Marxist, we give up the critical station built on a remote island over which he claims jurisdiction, and prepare to get out of the great astronomical complex our brains and wealth have been constructing high in the local mountains for the enlightenment of all men.

BRAINS INTO REVERSE

Covering our negativism by demagogic ecology claptrap, we are on the verge of surrendering our historical predominance in air transport. We watch passively as the Soviet Union first matches and then surpasses our strategic weapons power. We sail idly in circles as, in one water after another, new Soviet warcraft enter to challenge our aging ships. We hardly notice as the cadres of our incomparable aerospace industry—source and foundation of our scientific-technological primacy—dissolve into idleness. The "brain drain" that for two decades drew to us tens of thousands of the most talented and vigorous scientists, engineers and technicians from all the rest of the world, is reversing.

It is difficult to name a major sector of national activity—geographic, military, diplomatic, economic, social, scientific, technical—on which we are holding, not to speak of advancing; the great retreat is almost universal. There is no lack of explanation: "We can't be global policeman"; "we must rearrange our priorities"; "we have to stop polluting"; "curing our cities is more important than going to the planets"; "we must make recompense for our generations of guilt"; "we must liquidate our disguised imperialism"; "we can't impose our interests on others"; "we must give up the arrogance of power"; "we've got to strengthen the dollar"; "foreign adventures and space projects will bankrupt us"; "we can't save those who won't try to save themselves"; etc. etc. However convincing any one of these may be made to seem when taken by itself, viewed in their entirety they are transparent derivations (in Pareto's sense), rationalizations. They obscure but do not alter the effective reality; the vector of U.S. withdrawal, general retreat.

The retreat of the U.S. is the more striking because our main rivals are not retreating but continuing to advance. However awkward their performnace in this or that field, the Soviet Union, China and Japan, are thrusting upward and outward all along the line. They are not cutting down, pulling back, putting in mothballs.

Of all currently faddish beliefs, perhaps the most illusory is the revived isolationist dream that the U.S. can cut its "involvement" with the rest of the world and attain happiness, well-being and love by concentrating efforts and wealth on the domestic problems of poverty, ignorance, crime, urban decay etc. The truth is, rather, the opposite. The great retreat marks a decline in the nation's energy that makes us less likely to get anywhere with these domestic problems—as is manifestly the case. But apart from that somber truth, it is absurd to suppose that just because we should stop "interfering" with others, they would stop interfering with us. Does anyone really believe that if we pulled our Sixth fileet out of the Mediterranean, the Kemlin would pull out its Mediterranean fleet?

IF NOT LIBYA, WHAT?

In the life of all nations there are successive up and down cycles for the various sectors and for the whole, until the last dip begins. If we have not yet reached that end phase, there will have to be some sort of reversal soon, in at least one or two sectors. if not the whole. A month ago in *NR* (Nov. 17) Charles Benson proposed a dramatic and sweeping method for reversal in a decisive sector: the seizure of Libya. The response indicates (not unexpectedly) that most people considered this proposal either outrageous or unserious. Why so? Once you get your mind out of prevailing stereotypes, what is so absurd about this project? And if you think it absurd but are not yet reconciled to permanent retreat, how about coming up with something better?

ARCHBISHOP AMBROSE SENYSHYN ON CHRISTIANITY IN SOVIET UKRAINE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently Archbishop Ambrose Senyshyn delivered the first lecture of the newly established Ukrainian Catholic Studies Foundation of St. Josaphatis Seminary. The subject of his lecture was "Christianity in Soviet Ukraine." The essence of the lecture is well described in the column of William Willoughby of the Evening Star. In his December 19 account, Mr. Willoughby well states that it is a "Message to Americans—It's No Time for

Fiddling." His reaction to this first lecture is worth reading.

The lecture follows:

MESSAGE TO AMERICANS—IT'S NO TIME FOR FIDDLING

(By William Willoughby)

"The Fiddler on the Roof" probably is the most delightful musical to come out aside from "My Fair Lady." For those who didn't see it during its two flits in and out of Washington, it's the story of a Jewish family in Russia, just prior to the Bolshevist Revolution. Things were tough. Real tough.

But Tevya, the head of the little family in Anatevka, had two things going for him through it all—an intimate acquaintance with God and a good sense of humor. His acquaintance with the Bible, however, was a classic chapter and verse example of malapropism.

Tevya talked with God the way God must like to be talked with. Man to man. One time when things were going real bad for Anatevka, old Tevya got just a little out of fettle with God.

"God," he said, "I'm glad you've made us the chosen people, but please, couldn't you choose someone else some of the time?"

Tevya's prayers have been answered—but not by God. Any person who's religious enough to be honest in Russia seems to be saying the same thing. The show of religious freedom in the Soviet Union isn't at all what it appears to be in print.

Last month, 2,000 Jews gathered at Washington Cathedral to protest atrocities and pressures against 3.5 million of their religious and ethnic kindred behind the Iron Curtain. Ostensibly, they were protesting the circumstances of the Leningrad trial now going on in which several Jews are among those accused of attempting to hijack an airplane. Jews the world over see this as an example of anti-Semitism rearing one of its many heads.

But as valid as the plaints of the Jews are, Christians likewise are feeling the pressures against them. Communism hasn't found having God as a house guest too convenient. Especially, since God had been in the house a long time before communism took it over.

Growing concern for religious conditions in the Soviet federation of republics and unwilling satellites is being shown by Baptists, who, by Russian standards, are a significant Protestant element in the country.

An integral part of Christianity is the Great Commission of Christ to teach and preach the Gospel. Such activity is called proselytizing over there, and what Christians ought to be doing as an outgrowth of their faith can bring them prison terms.

Some of the biggest sufferers since the revolution have been the Byzantine-Ukrainian Catholic and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in the Ukraine. Church leaders are complaining, but seem to get nowhere. About the best they can hope for is to keep their plight before the public. And maybe get God's ear.

The other day here in Washington a significant step was taken by the Ukrainian Catholic Church when it dedicated the Ukrainian Catholic Studies Foundation at St. Josaphat's Seminary near Catholic University.

In the inaugural speech, Archbishop Ambrose Senyshyn, who heads the 500,000 members in the United States, made 21 charges of genocide and other crimes perpetrated against his church and other branches of Christianity in the Ukraine.

He said all this is happening notwithstanding constitutional guarantees of religious freedom.

The Communists, he said, are bamboozling the outside world by displaying to foreigners a few "show" churches. As long as these remain open they can cover up a deep-seated intolerance of religion while appearing to be tolerant.

Among the charges Senyshyn made is that the Soviet Union caused to be killed or to die in prison many thousands of bishops, priests, nuns, vergers, professors of theology and prominent faithful. They also destroyed or confiscated historical churches, monasteries, seminaries, schools, icons, chalices and other church property.

Even Christian cemeteries and monuments were destroyed and the stone was converted into building blocks for roads and sidewalks.

One of the key elements in deterring religion, Senyshyn said, is the Union of Atheists run by the Communist party, which is supplied with various propagandist means at government expense. This contrasts sharply with the churches' inability to minister outside their doors.

Hoodlums have been sent into churches to disrupt services and to attack priests and the faithful. Terroristic measures have been used to disuade priests from hearing confession, celebrating mass and caring for needs of churchmen.

In some cases the population has been organized for anti-religious demonstrations under duress of arrest if they did not participate. From bishops on down, charges of collaboration with the Nazis have been leveled by the Communists.

Senyshyn said the Soviet Union closed all his church's schools and denied the religious press the right to publish, closing all publishing facilities.

Some more subtle actions have taken their toll. The children of the clergy, for instance, are denied their right to get an education and denied entitlement to work for normal wages unless they severed all connection with their parents.

By declaring the clergy and other functionaries of the churches "non-working elements," they were denied certain civil rights available to other members of Soviet society.

Atheists have been dressed in priests' vestments, who, with cross in hand, held wild masquerades in the streets and ridiculed God, faith, the church and the priesthood so as to discredit the dignity of belief in God.

But Senyshyn knows something the Communists don't. Tevya knew it, too, in the Jewish understanding of things.

"The fathers of the church have always taught us that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church," Senyshyn said: "The Ukrainian Catholic Church has not ceased shedding her blood, and because of this alone, coupled with an ardent faith in God's divine providence, we can expect a glorious future for the Catholic Church, not only in the Ukraine, but in every country where faithful Ukrainian Catholics have made their home."

And Senyshyn had an unspoken but clearly implicit message to all Americans: Take stock of the true freedoms we have and never sell them short.

This is no time to be fiddling on the roof.

AN UNPUBLISHED ARTICLE GIVES PERSPECTIVE ON ARMY ENGINEERS

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, in April of this year, the Atlantic Magazine published an article by Miss Elizabeth Drew entitled "Dam Outrage—The Story of the Army Engineers." The article was highly critical of the work of the Corps of Engineers—an organization often under attack today.

I have since discovered that Atlantic Monthly subsequently contacted Dr. Arthur Maass of Harvard University to solicit his comments on the article.

Dr. Maass has been on the faculty at Harvard since 1949 and has an established reputation as one of the Nation's outstanding academicians in the field of natural resource analysis, organization, and administration. He was the author of Muddy Waters, the Corps of Engineers and the Nation's Rivers, in 1951—a sharp criticism of the water resource development program in this country at that time. He has remained a critical observer of the program and its administration to this day. Apparently the Atlantic editors were confident he would applaud the Drew attack.

Dr. Maass did indeed write a response to the Drew article. His paper was forwarded to the editor who apparently decided that the comments received were not those that they had expected. A shortened version of the Maass article was sent to Dr. Maass for his approval. I would gather that it was with some misgivings that Dr. Maass agreed to the abridged version. A number of months passed and without publication of the Maass paper.

A recent inquiry to Atlantic Magazine determined that because of the long lapse of time since publication—for which they were responsible—they did not plan to publish the Maass comments, at least in the foreseeable future.

While I am in no position to know the full details of this matter, it does not seem to me that the public has received fair treatment. What Dr. Maass was doing was in the best interest of presenting an objective and constructive picture of important matters before interested parties in this country.

In the interest of fairness to the readers of Atlantic Magazine, and also to the facts of the case, I am including the full text of Dr. Maass' article, denied publication in Atlantic for unexplained reasons, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE UNPUBLISHED COMMENTS OF DR. ARTHUR MAASS

Sir: Your historical note relating Miss Drew's April article on the Army Engineers to the *Atlantic's* issue of 100 Aprils ago was certainly in order, for the piece is little more than early American muckraking. Her arguments and facts are selected to support a pre-conceived conclusion which is designed to appeal to the reader's moral indignation. Journalists have come far since then in their capacity to analyze and report on complex issues such as those that Miss Drew pretends to treat. It is a pity to see the *Atlantic* do so much less. Your readers, if the large number of them whom I know are a cross section, will buy a magazine with careful, sophisticated, even scholarly analysis, providing it is well written.

Miss Drew's piece uses history poorly in a second sense. She condemns today's Corps for what the Corps did in the recent past; and she has scarcely investigated what it is doing today.

First some examples of her biased selection and use of arguments and facts. Somehow one is expected to believe with Miss Drew that the findings of engineers retained by opponents of a Corps project are more reliable and technically more competent than those of the Corps. Somehow one is expected to believe that experts who change their minds over time from approval of a project

to disapproval are wise and courageous (e.g. the U.S. fish experts who in 1963 reported that fishery benefits of reservoirs in the Oklawaha River section of the Cross Florida barge canal should exceed losses to fish and wildlife, but who in 1970 raise questions about their earlier professional views) whereas those who change from opposition to approval have low motivations—they simply "dust off old projects."

Somehow one is expected to believe that elected representatives who support Corps projects are "self-serving politicians," whereas those who oppose them are noble statesmen. I daresay that Senators Mondale and Nelson who receive an accolade for their opposition to the St. Croix River project, which they no doubt deserve, would cringe at being called "self-serving politicians" each time they support a Corps project in Minnesota and Wisconsin, which they frequently do.

Somehow one is expected to believe that local interests that oppose Corps projects are right and good, whereas those that promote them are wrong and probably bad, and that although the Corps should be responsive always to the former and never to the latter, the opposite is the case, *quel domage*.

How responsive should the Engineers be to local interests, or to "people power" as it is sometimes called today? In the past the Corps has been criticized for being too responsive to them, including on occasion too responsive to interests that have opposed their projects (e.g. those who opposed a high dam on the lower Cumberland River in Kentucky). Is Miss Drew saying that the Engineers should be more responsive or less responsive? What criterion does she use to distinguish right from wrong, good from bad, statesmen from self-serving politicians, reliable and competent from unreliable and incompetent experts, proper from improper responsiveness to local interests?

The only clear criterion in her article is whether the result condemns or supports the Army Engineers. Under the surface there seems to be another criterion, whether the result supports "environmental quality", today's "idea", as against economic development. But this concept remains so thoroughly undeveloped, unanalyzed, and inchoate in her writing that the article does not rise above a muckraking attack on the Army. What is environmental quality? What factors contribute to it? How do we evaluate and compare the need for a reservoir to supply municipal and industrial water to that for preserving a wild area in the reservoir site? What about the growing influence of the new environmental coalition and the response of the several executive bureaus and Congressional committees to it? The Army Engineers, as will be seen in the following paragraphs, are concerned with these questions today; Miss Drew largely ignores them, for she is preoccupied with thrashing the Engineers. She condemns Corps projects that fail to give special attention to environmental quality; but she condemns also those that do give such attention, because in the latter case the Corps, as she sees it, is simply finding "new purposes, or rationales" for its projects.

To discover what are the Corps' concepts for water resource development today an investigator should look at the Engineers' most recent planning methods, rather than their current construction program, for projects that are being built today were planned some years ago. But Miss Drew, although she must have learned about new planning procedures because they are controversial and well known, has chosen to ignore the present in these terms. Let me, then, indicate in barest outline what is involved.

Unlike other improvement programs such as highways for which little economic analysis is made, the planning of water resource developments is in terms of a somewhat rigorous analysis of their benefits and costs. The criterion for measuring these benefits and costs is a limited one, however, namely, the impacts of a proposed project on national income—the national economic efficiency criterion. The most interesting and controversial aspects of water resource planning today are the efforts to broaden the criterion for measuring benefits so that they will include national objectives in addition to efficiency—for example, benefits from improving the quality of the environment, or from providing assistance to under-developed regions of the country such as Appalachia. Of all agencies of government, the Corps of Engineers is the leader in developing techniques for multiple, as against single, objective planning and in urging other agencies, including the cabinet-level Water Resources Council and the Bureau of the Budget, to adopt these techniques. The Corps is today using multiple-objective planning techniques in a number of its surveys, but they are encountering opposition from groups, both within and outside of government, that are opposed to the new planning.

The reasons why benefit-cost analysis was identified with national income alone when the technique was perfected in the late 1930's, why it has remained so limited until now, why the Army Engineers are today the leader in promoting innovations, and why certain groups oppose change—these make a fascinating and intellectually interesting story. But Miss Drew gives us none of it; and her several paragraphs on benefit-cost analysis are dominated by failure to comprehend the difference between economic analysis of projects and policies for repayment of their costs.

It is interesting, for example, that the representatives of several Conservation organizations are today opposed to multiple-objective benefit-costs analysis. At first this may seem irrational, for under the new method the objectives of these groups, relating to quality of the environment, would be evaluated for the first time in the all-important benefit analysis. On closer examination one finds that Conservation groups have been able to establish alternate means for accommodating their interests—namely, the requirement that water resource development plans be reviewed by certain government bureaus—the Fish and Wildlife and National Park Services, for example—that represent their concerns. No doubt the Conservation groups adopted this alternative means initially because their interests were not recognized adequately in a single-purpose (national income) benefit-cost analysis. Having perfected the alternative to the point where the review requirement approximates a veto on development in many situations, they are now loathe to give it up, however, for their interests are served frequently by preventing any development at all. These Conservation groups prefer, in other words, a flat veto to a decision process in which the benefits of their objectives can be compared to those of other objectives.

Why, one may ask, is the Engineers' construction program of today based on old planning concepts that the Corps is in the process of changing. The answer is related in part to institutional arrangements that developed in response to the old methods. Not only Conservationists, but others whose interests receive insufficient attention under the national income method that is used to design and evaluate projects in the first instance have sought to protect their interests by obtaining a voice in the process by which project plans are reviewed. "Full coordination with all possible interests"—not simply the most important ones—has become the standard for planning review. An "ideal planning process" has been devised, with various stages of framework, comprehensive, survey, and other categories of planning, each with several levels of review that, if it were followed in full, would require over 20 years from the start of planning to the start of construction. The ideal procedure isn't followed, of course, but lead time is nonetheless so long that projects being constructed today would be designed differently if they were planned today. This story, too, is interesting intellectually. Which interests have sought to prolong the planning process? What roles have the Army's public hearings, various interagency committees, the Bureau of the Budget, and Congressional committees played in this development? Miss Drew gives us none of the answers. Her statement that Corps projects are not examined very closely is the opposite of the truth; they are examined and reexamined, and reviewed and rereviewed interminably. And her comment that old and rejected plans are frequently dusted off and approved without further review is far off target.

I have been a severe critic of the Army Engineers in the past, as you may know, (See *Muddy Waters: The Army Engineers and the Nation's Rivers*, Harvard University Press, 1951), and I am critical today, as she is, of some of the projects that are being built, but I cannot support either the character and the level of analysis or the major thrust of her article. There is no virtue in pursuing the style and substance of 100 Aprils ago if our knowledge and events have made them obsolete.

THE LESSON FROM NTA

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, a report carried in newspapers and over the airwaves this past weekend deserves the thoughtful consideration of this body, and indeed this entire Nation.

In brief, U.S. Surgeon General Jesse L. Steinfeld announced that sodium nitrilotriacetate—NTA—one of the chemicals urged as an alternative to phosphates—has caused grave birth defects in animals. This finding, discovered in Government studies carried out at the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences in North Carolina, gives substance to little-heard earlier warnings that NTA could prove even more dangerous than phosphates.

Phosphates, as we all know, are the magic ingredient we have employed in recent years to make our white clothes whiter and colored clothes brighter. While performing this magic, however, indications are that phosphates have also contributed in large measure to the pollution of our waters.

Specifically, this past spring, the House Committee on Government Operations contended in its report, "Phosphates in Detergents and the Eutrophication of America's Waters" that:

> The evidence against phosphates as a major polluter of our waters was of such proportions that the use of phosphates should end by 1972. One alternative, the authors of the report suggested, was NTA.

My point is not to debate the merits of phosphates; and certainly it is not my purpose to question the necessity to curb, and ultimately to put an end to, the spoiling of our waters.

Along with CLARENCE BROWN and EDWARD GARMATZ, two of my colleagues on the Committee, I agreed then that there is much evidence to indict phosphates. We added:

But there is the possibility that it may not be true or that it may be only true in part. Certainly all the evidence is not in.

We argued that:

It is a big step from questioning phosphates to recommending that they can be effectively or safely replaced by nitrates. To suggest that nitrates have been proven harmless is as arguable as to suggest that phosphates have been proven guilty.

In sum, our point was that phosphates may be harmful to the water that is essential to life; but, if we accept the first replacement that comes along—without pausing to make a searching examination of it—we may find it to be more imminently packed with peril.

The point of my dissertation today could well be we told you so. More important, however, is the lesson to be learned. In our haste to solve a problem, let us not grasp the first straw in the wind. We may well leap from the frying pan into the fire.

CHRISTMAS AND THE FAMILY

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, philosophers and wise men of all civilizations have recognized that the family is the cornerstone of human society. Christianity gave a special dignity to the family, but pagan societies as well—Rome, for example—recognized that no State which did not safeguard and respect the family could long survive. Our own country has held the family in high esteem, and with good reason, since to a very large extent our frontier was tamed and our Nation built by families. Christmas in America has always been in a special way the festival of the family.

Recently, however, there has been a growing number of outright attacks on the essential concept of the family. These attacks have come not just from a few underground publications, but from mass-circulating magazines and the Government itself.

In an earlier newsletter I discussed two particularly flagrant examples of Government interference with the primary right of parents to care for their children. In Mexico, N.Y., six children of Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Gracey were forcibly removed from their home and parents and placed in foster homes, because Mr. and Mrs. Gracey refused to send them to a public school which was teaching them "sex education" in conflict with their religious beliefs. They were returned only under intense public pressure on the judge who had ordered this family broken up. In Little Rock, Ark., according to testimony presented before a subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee in September, Mrs. Daniel Youngs and her two children were harassed and persecuted for 2 years by school officials because she refused to allow them to be given behavior-control drugs.

At the same time as basic parental rights are under attack, "women's lib" and other strident voices cry out that motherhood itself is obsolete. Look magazine, for instance, recently carried an article by a senior editor entitled "Motherhood: Who Needs It?" The critics of motherhood lobby for free abortion on demand so that children conceived need not be born, and for Government child-care centers so that children who are born need not be cared for. It is hard to see how personal irresponsibility could go much further.

Finally, marriage is under attack. The divorce rate continues to skyrocket and most State legislatures, far from making it more difficult for marriages to be sundered, are making it easier. Last year California passed a divorce "reform" law which essentially permits a family to be destroyed whenever either marriage partner feels like it. A report presented to the recent White House Conference on Children called for the legal recognition of new "family" groups, such as communal group marriages and homosexual "families."

The enemies of the family often refer to the agonies of our Nation's children as somehow justifying their position. Clearly many children in America today are abused in subtle and not so subtle ways. On the one hand there is the Dewey-Spock school of permissiveness, which denies children the security of objective values and reasonable discipline in the home. On the other hand, there is the growing number of cases of child beating and neglect.

Yet it should be obvious that our children can only be given lasting help by strengthening the family, not by accelerating its breakdown. Continued weakening of family ties will make children in effect become orphans—wards of the State. Has anyone ever known a child who would be happier without any home or family?

Most of us draw especially close to our families at the Christmas season. There could not be a better time for renewing our commitment, not only to the security and the strengthening of our own family ties, but to the institution of the family itself, on which our whole civilization ultimately depends.

1969–70 REPORT OF SENATOR WILLIAM B. SAXBE OF OHIO

HON. WILLIAM B. SAXBE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

INTRODUCTION

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, nearly 2 years have passed since I came to the Senate of the United States.

What follows is the first of what I intend to be an annual report to my constituents detailing my activities during that period.

The role of a Senator and a senatorial office are extremely broad and varied and on any given day virtually run the gamut. A typical day, for example, may range from my casting a vote on the Senate floor on something as historically significant as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, to meeting the press in my office to hosting my State's delegates to Boy's or Girl's Nation.

In short, the life of a Senator is often one of extremes. In this report, I intend to outline for my fellow Ohioans, the men and women who sent me here, something about my personal thoughts and actions in connection with the major votes of the Senate in the 91st Congress.

Taking an over-view of my first 24 months here, I authored six separate bills, I introduced amendments to five others, and I was a cosponsor on some 60 other pieces of legislation. Measures I initiated, which I shall explore in more detail later in this report, ranged from bills to provide tax credits for industries installing pollution abatement equipment, to a resolution setting up a study commission to examine campus violence in America.

During that same period, I sought to keep tabs on the tremendous flow of mail into the Washington office, plus that which is forwarded from my State offices in Cleveland and Columbus.

You might be interested to know that since the beginning of 1970, my office received 125,000 letters covering literally hundreds of subjects. The mail averages out to about 11,000 letters a month, or 2,750 a week or about 550 each working day. While many of these letters do not require answers, the majority do. In the same 12-month period dating to last January 1, for example, my office sent out 85,000 answers to letters we received—a monthly average of 7,400. This does not include some of my more personal replies, nor the matters dealing with individual casework. The casework section of my office has helped some 1,000 Ohioans who had some sort of problem with the vast Government bureaucracy—in matters ranging from social security and veterans' affairs, to passports, grants, contracts, and the like.

During these same 24 months, I have made trips back to the State for speeches and appearances whenever possible or feasible. I also sought to travel on official business at every opportunity because I realize that, once I begin compiling seniority and my committee responsibilities increased, it would become more difficult to get away from the Capitol. So I want to enhance my knowledge of world affairs early in my career, when time is more readily available.

And now for some specifics. I propose to divide my report into two broad general categories. First, foreign relations, where some of the most widely discussed votes of 1969 were centered; second, domestic concerns ranging from crime to the economy to health care to drug abuse. I have also broken down each category by subject to make the report easier to read.

FOREIGN RELATIONS: THE ARMS RACE

In the 20th century there has been an erosion of the Senate's role in foreign relations. I came to the Senate with the commitment to restore the historic constitutional balance between the executive and the legislative branches.

Since the end of World War II, we have spent approximately 1 trillion dollars on armaments and Armed Forces. When I took office in 1969, our Federal expenditures for defense and defense related costs were greater than all Federal, State, and local outlays for social security, health, education, housing, and agriculture. Yet the military budget seemed destined to grow, spurred by a seemingly self-propelled mechanism which operated with little or no attention to merit or national needs. I was determined to seek new priorities and to restore the Senate's role in foreign affairs.

During President Eisenhower's term, many generals were resigning in protest at his refusal to yield to their desires for more arms. When Secretary McNamara took office, it was with the avowed aim of establishing greater civilian control over the military. Yet, the harsh fact of the matter is that when he left, the military had greater influence over American policy than at any time in our national history.

I was pleased with President Nixon's "Guam Doctrine"—that we should assume a low profile in our foreign affairs. It is my firm conviction that gunboat diplomacy ended with the creation of nuclear weapons. An arms race in a nuclear age is unthinkable. A halt to the nuclear arms race does not require unilateral disarmament. We can maintain our nuclear deterrent provided by our intercontinental ballistic missiles—ICBM—bombers and Polaris submarines while we negotiate in good faith with the Soviet Union.

This is what I have meant in public statements when I said that we must confront the assumption of risk and turn it from a risk of war to a gamble for peace. This decision need not be irrevocable. It is a calculated risk—one that can be reversed if conditions or events change.

One of my first acts in the U.S. Senate was to participate in the ratification of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty—NPT. The treaty's fundamental purpose was to retard the further spread of nuclear weapons by prohibiting the nuclear weapons states that are signatories to the treaty from transferring nuclear weapons to countries that do not possess them. Further, it prohibits the nonnuclear powers from receiving, manufacturing, or acquiring nuclear weapons.

I was encouraged by the commencement of the strategic arms limitation talks—SALT—between the United States and the Soviet Union in Helsinki a little over a year ago. These talks are an outgrowth of the NPT. The SALT talks present us with a rare opportunity and challenge—rare because for the first time, there is a rough balance between the strategic nuclear arsenals of the two super powers, and challenge to overcome the threat of a new nuclear arms race. My optimism has been somewhat tempered by the lack of an immediate moratorium on the testing and the deployment of the multiple independently-targeted re-entry vehicle—MIRV—ABM, and the huge Soviet SS9 missiles.

I cosponsored and voted for Senate Resolution 211 on April 9, 1970, expressing the sense of the Senate favoring mutual suspension of further deployment of strategic weapons systems—MIRV, SS9, ABM—by the U.S.S.R. and the United States. The resolution passed 72–6. Unfortunately, however, neither side has heeded this advice.

To restore the Senate to its constitutional role in treatymaking, I voted in favor of the National Commitments Resolution (S. Res. 85). This resolution provided in part that:

> A national commitment by the United States results only from the affirmative action taken by the Executive and Legislative branches of the United States government by means of a treaty, statute, or concurrent resolution of both houses of Congress specifically providing for such commitment.

On October 13, 1969, I cosponsored two bills and one resolution designed to increase the effectiveness of Congress' role in foreign policy and defense. Senate Joint Resolution 160 would create a joint congressional committee to review and recommend changes in national priorities and resource allocations. S. 3024 would establish a temporary national security commission. This commission would make recommendations to the Congress with respect to the improvement of policy for national security and the effectiveness of procedures and organizations in those agencies of the Federal Government which function in the area of defense. S. 3023 would create an office of defense review. This office would have the continuing mission to provide reports giving independent evaluation of defense and national security matters such as arms length relationships between defense procurement agencies and suppliers of goods and services, defense procurement cost estimates and performance of weapons systems, and the preparation of alternative defense budgets. Their hopes for passage now or in the near future are dim.

WEAPONS SYSTEMS

During my first 2 years in the Senate, many questions have been raised concerning the desirability, workability, and effectiveness of various weapon systems authorized in the military procurement authorizations before us for fiscal 1970 and 1971. Foremost among them is the safeguard antiballistic missile system. I have been opposed to deployment of the ABM because I am convinced after much study, debate, briefings and hearings that it will not work and it is but another step in our skyrocketing military expenditures.

First, we do not, in fact, need Safeguard. Our nuclear forces consist of three separate weapon systems: land-based missiles, intercontinental bombers, and Polaris submarines. Even if the United States suffered a heavy attack on one system—the land-based minute man missile system, for example—and it was destroyed, our ability to strike back would still be preserved through our Polaris submarine fleet and our bombers.

Second, the ABM would be the most complicated weapon systems ever developed and its reliability could never be truly tested under attack conditions with many weapons exploding within a short time; with hundreds of incoming missiles to be tracked and their trajectories to be calculated; and with, perhaps, a break in communications due to radar blackout.

Three, the key component of the safeguard system is the missile site radar—MSR—which controls the firing of the ABM. While the minute-men are in hardened silos that can withstand a megaton explosion less than half a mile away, the MSR installation is not nearly as hard. It is therefore, very vulnerable to smaller offensive missiles with less than pin-point accuracy.

Four, clouds of metallic chaff, balloons, or other light-weight decoys could be devised and deployed with relative ease by such tactics. Defense can be rapidly exhausted and the attacker can successfully penetrate them with enough surviving warheads to destroy the target. Even if we build into our missiles the capacity to distinguish decoys from real warheads, the enemy then only has to send in more warheads than we have ABM's and exhaust our defense in this way.

Finally, it is several times less expensive to produce an offensive missile than it is to produce a defensive one. Therefore if our efforts at the SALT talks fail it would be much more effective to continue to deploy the MIRV, ICBM. A MIRV is one that has many warheads on top of a single launcher, each warhead independently directed to a different target. It thus becomes impossible to tell by satellite surveillance how many warheads are on top of a single launcher. The accuracy of such a weapon has disturbed the strategic equation by making possible for the first time a counterforce capability—first strike—of destroying the other side's intercontinental ballistic missiles while still in their silos.

On August 6, 1969, the Senate voted on three amendments to strike the authorization of funds for phase I of the Safeguard program. Opponents of the program were defeated on all three attempts, the closest vote being a 50–50 tie. A majority was necessary to carry the amendment.

This year on August 12, opponents again were defeated in an attempt to halt completely further deployment of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system at the phase I sites of Malstrom, Mont., and Grand Forks, N. Dak., and again in an attempt to allow completed deployment at those phase I sites but prohibit deployment at the additional phase II sites at Whiteman, Mo., and Warren, Wyo. The vote on the latter amendment was 47 in favor to 52 opposed.

I have spoken out on other weapons systems—not so much against the systems as against the procurement policies and auditing procedures of the Defense Department in purchasing the system. For example, the C–5A airplane will cost the Government approximately $2 billion more than originally planned. I hope that with patience and prudence

we can make some headway in the selection and purchase of our weapons systems.

As a final note, I was greatly encouraged by the administration's response to the Presidentially-appointed Fitzhugh Commission Report to Secretary Laird. The report recommended increased efficiency and cost consciousness in the Defense Department's procurement policies.

VOLUNTEER ARMED FORCES

The 91st Congress has expressed itself to the effect that lottery selection is workable, necessary, and an improvement over the previous system of selective service. I agree.

I do not support, however, the all volunteer army proposal, which failed. It seems to me that those who favor an all volunteer army do not make the necessary distinctions between those endeavors where voluntary individual initiative has served America so well and those where it cannot be expected to do so. We are profoundly not a militaristic people. We are not a society whose values have ever given great prestige to a military career for itself, honorable as it is.

Those susceptible to volunteering would primarily be the poor, less educated and less sophisticated segments of our youth population. Is it proper for our Nation to be defended by those who have been favored by it least? Is not the burden of the common defense something that all segments of society should share equally, or at least share an equal risk of sharing?

The Army is an old and powerful institution, fixed in its ways and resistant to change. The major pressures for change must come and are coming from the GI's themselves, aided by a concerned and alert public. The attention of Congress, the press, the Federal courts, and anxious parents would drift far from the indignities of military life the moment that life was proclaimed to be voluntary.

INDOCHINA

Not only have I urged Congress to live up to its responsibilities in providing for the common defense through the SALT talks, weapons systems analysis, and procurement procedures; I have also urged this Senate to assume its constitutional treatymaking and warmaking powers in an effort to reduce our commitments abroad.

I have been a consistent and persistent critic of our involvement in the Vietnam war. As anyone knows who listened to what I had to say during the campaign of 1968, I favor United States withdrawal from South Vietnam. In a speech in Cleveland in September 1969, I called for the beginning of an immediate withdrawal of U.S. combat troops. At that time I said the following:

> I believe our mission there is accomplished. It is time to announce this to the world and begin getting out. I think we should turn over our military hardware to the South Vietnamese government and withdraw.
>
> Communist aggression, which brought American military forces to South Viet Nam in the first place, has largely been stabilized and most of our goal has been accomplished. We have stopped the invasion from North Vietnam, stabilized the government of South Vietnam, furnished supplies to the South Vietnamese army, opened up supply routes and trained the South Vietnamese army. We cannot maintain that government forever. We have got to tell the South Vietnamese that we have done our job; now they must do theirs. . . .

To seek more now is unrealistic. The decision was made by a previous administration to fight a limited war in a limited way. To defeat an enemy on the battlefield one must isolate him and destroy him. This option has been discarded. Therefore, I believe we have accomplished all we can.

I do not want my call for an immediate withdrawal to be misunderstood however. I think it is simplistic and irresponsible to say that the way to get out of Vietnam is to load the troops on ships and leave. We do not want a Dunkirk, a bloodbath. We want a responsible withdrawal over a period of several months; a withdrawal that would permit us to disengage the enemy without further loss of life.

When I arrived in Washington to assume my Senate responsibilities, there were 535,500 troops in South Vietnam. Today this number has been reduced to 344,800. But I still favor a faster rate of withdrawal.

I have voted twice for the repeal of the Tonkin Gulf resolution, as an amendment to the Foreign Military Sales Act, and as a concurrent resolution. This resolution approved August 10, 1964, provided the peg upon which our Vietnam involvement was hung. It approved:

> All necessary steps, including the use of armed forces, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia collective defense treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

And it allowed the "President, as Commander in Chief to take all necessary measures to repell any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression." Unfortunately, both the Foreign Military Sales Act and the Senate concurrent resolution are doomed to die in the Senate-House conference committee because of the refusal of the House of Representatives to approve of this language.

I was dismayed by our incursion into Cambodia on April 30 of this year. I was impressed with the concern of the nearly 3,000 people who visited my office in the weeks following the Cambodia incursion. I cosponsored and voted for the Cooper-Church amendment to the Foreign Military Sales Act which passed the Senate on June 30, 1970. It prohibited the expenditure of funds for one, retaining U.S. forces in Cambodia, two, paying U.S. military advisers to the Cambodian forces, three, paying foreign mercenaries to fight in Cambodia, or four, conducting any combat activity in the air above Cambodia in direct support of Cambodian forces.

The Cooper-Church amendment is little different from the Cooper-Mansfield amendment to the 1970 Defense Appropriations bill which was agreed upon by both houses and signed by the President. That amendment forbade funds appropriated by that act to be used to finance the introduction of American ground troops into Laos or Thailand. The Cooper-Church amendment attempted to add Cambodia to that list.

Although I am disheartened by the fact that the Cooper-Church amendment and the repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution failed to pass the House of Representatives, I believe that the U.S. Senate has expressed its firm conviction that the Indochina war should be rapidly deescalated.

I did not vote for the McGovern-Hatfield amendment. I had grave reservations about it as an effective means to end the war. The sponsors of this legislation deserve the appreciation of the people for their efforts to bring to the Congress and the President their deep conviction, shared by millions, that the war in Vietnam should be brought to a close. However, I feel that the McGovern-Hatfield amendment would detract from our efforts to negotiate a settlement of the war.

I have said that I favor an immediate withdrawal. Yet, we must never fail to realize that the President and the President alone is the force who can end this war. This is why we must, as much as is possible, support the President. Although I favor a faster rate of withdrawal than is currently taking place, I do not believe that such a withdrawal can be facilitated by a cutoff of funds as envisioned in the McGovern-Hatfield amendment. This reduces the flexibility that the President must have to withdraw our troops safely.

I have cosponsored two resolutions calling for the release of all Americans held as prisoners of war. One calls upon the State Department, Defense Department, the United Nations, the peoples of the world, to vigorously use all peaceful persuasion at their disposal to bring the facts concerning the treatment of our prisoners of war by the government of North Vietnam, the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, and the Pathet Lao to the attention of the world to elicit international support and respect for measures to obtain the prompt release of our prisoners. The other resolution seeks in part, information on the status of U.S. prisoners of war held in North Vietnam and by the National Liberation Front, and evidence that these prisoners are being treated humanely in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Convention. I believe that rational discussion and rapid disengagement will promote the fastest possible release of our prisoners of war, rather than a continuation of the present hostility which may place their lives in jeopardy and endanger the lives of our remaining troops.

EUROPE AND NATO

I recently returned from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—NATO—assembly. It costs the United States $14 billion annually to support NATO and keep some 350,000 American troops in Europe. I believe that the European nations enjoying the unlimited prosperity of the Common Market can pay their own way and share the load. With these facts and figures in mind, I view with favor Senator MANSFIELD'S resolution calling for the sense of the Senate that a substantial

reduction of U.S. forces permanently stationed in Europe can be made without adversely affecting either our resolve or ability to meet commitments under the North Atlantic Treaty.

GREECE

On March 12, 1970 I spoke on the Senate floor calling for full restoration of rights in Greece. After the events of April 1967, when a small group of men forestalled what they considered to be a serious threat to their nation, there came a period of strict control over the freedom of the Greek people. As the anxiety of the crisis passed, and as the new leaders of the government settled into their self appointed jobs, some of the strictures and bans were relaxed, but some still prevailed. Parliamentary government remains in suspension. Individual rights of the Greek people are circumscribed by law. Free speech is banned, not by law but by intimidation with fears of reprisal. I believe that the Greek Government could act with more speed in returning Greece to a democratic course. When will Greece again be a Democracy? I ask not as an accuser or a critic, but as a concerned friend.

Until that time, I do not believe that the United States should furnish armaments to the Greek army which can be used to subjugate its own people instead of the designed purpose of defending itself from its enemies abroad. It is true that Greece is strategically important to NATO's south eastern flank. However, if we destroy from within the form of civilization which NATO is supposed to defend, the defense of the geographical area becomes meaningless. At the present time, Greece has more than enough arms to defend itself from threats in addition to the nuclear shield provided by the United States.

Therefore, I voted on June 29, 1970, for the Hartke amendment to prohibit further military assistance to Greece except what was already in the pipeline. On December 12, 1969, I voted against an amendment to strike the committee provision to limit military assistance to Greece. Both efforts to limit arms to Greece failed. However, the closeness of the votes should be a lesson to the Greek junta and a warning against continuation of curtailment of democracy in Greece.

MIDDLE EAST

The Middle East stands at the crossroads of civilization. It is the birth place of the three great Western religions, Judaism, Islam, and Christianity. It is the land bridge between Europe, Asia, and Africa. It contains the world's largest known resources of oil. Because of its importance, it is an area of simmering confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union.

During the campaign of 1968 I advocated the immediate delivery of phantom jets to Israel. Those planes have since been delivered. On January 6, 1969 I signed a statement with Senator JAVITS and 14 other Senators expressing deep concern over the rapidly deteriorating situation with respect to peace in the Middle East. I have expressed concern over one-sided Security Council resolutions against Israel, called for the additional sale of more phantom jets to Israel, settlement of the Arab refuge problem, and establishment of an organization for economic cooperation in the Middle East.

I advocated direct negotiations between the parties. I still do. I supported Secretary Rogers' peace initiative. To my dismay the United Arab Republic and its Soviet advisers violated the agreement within the cease-fire zone. However, the cease-fire continues. For this I am grateful. I have urged military aid for Israel in the form of weapons and material but not troops. We cannot deprive Israel of the arms to provide for her national and personal survival. We must see that the Russians do not overwhelm Israel.

On June 1 of this year I signed a letter along with three quarters of my colleagues urging Secretary Rogers to provide Israel with the aircraft it so urgently needed for its defense. I voted on September 1 of 1970 in favor of the Jackson committee amendment to the Military Procurement Authorization bill of 1971. Section 501 of that bill provided in part:

> That Congress views with grave concern the deepening involvement of the Soviet Union in the Middle East and the clear and present danger to world peace resulting from such involvement which cannot be ignored by the United States. In order to restore and maintain the military balance in the Middle East, by furnishing to Israel the means of providing for its own security, the President is authorized to transfer to Israel, by sale, credit sale, or guarantee, such aircraft, and equipment appropriate to use, maintain and protect such aircraft, as may be necessary to counteract any past, present or future increased military assistance provided to other countries of the Middle East. Any such sale, credit sale, or guarantee shall be made on terms and conditions not less favorable than those expended to other countries which receive the same or similar types of aircraft and equipment.

Since then President Nixon has sought roughly half a billion dollars to finance credit sale authorized under this amendment. The new deal includes roughly 180 M–60 and M–48 tanks, 18 Phantom F–4 fighter bombers, six Phantoms for reconnaissance missions and 175 millimeter long-range artillery as well as strike air-to-ground missiles to combat the san 2 and san 3 missiles the Soviet Union supplied to the United Arab Republic during the cease-fire.

While I realize that the preceding report does not cover all of the foreign affairs matters that the Senate dealt with, I believe I have touched on the most significant subjects.

I should like to turn now to matters closer to home and review my activities in those areas during the last 2 years.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS: THE ECONOMY

Virtually every piece of legislation acted upon by Congress has some effect on the Nation's economy, but there were several measures in the 91st Congress which will have a profound impact for better or worse, on the State of our Nation's health in the future. I refer specifically to the 1969 Tax Reform Act and congressional action on Presidential vetoes of several major appropriations bills.

The necessity for true tax reform was apparent at the beginning of this session inasmuch as there had not been any major tax reform legislation since 1954, a period of 16 years. During this period, indeed, earlier, there were some glaring inequities in the existing tax structure. It was for this reason that I was initially enthusiastic about a tax bill which would eliminate the inequities and provide reform.

My enthusiasm soon turned to disenchantment, however, as I saw what form the House-passed version of the bill was in and as I watched what occurred to the measure on the floor of the Senate. The House bill passed August 7, 1969, and would have provided $9.3 billion in tax reductions and only $6.9 billion in tax reform. The Senate provision passed on December 18, 1969, in the waning days of the first session of the 91st Congress and provided for a phenomenal $11 billion in eventual tax reductions and only $5.6 billion in needed reform.

During the period of time that H.R. 13270, as the tax bill was known, was under consideration by the Senate my position remained constant. I voted against all the proposed amendments to this measure save one, despite the insistent urgings from the representatives of many special interest groups concerning amendments which affected their members. I voted against the bill itself when it came to a vote in the Senate. I voted against acceptance of the House-Senate conference report and called upon President Nixon to veto the bill.

My rationale for the negative votes on the tax bill was straightforward, uncomplicated and twofold in nature. As I have stated frequently, I believe that there are priorities which are unmet and for which expenditures must be made. To fund these expenditures we must, I feel, cut expenses in other areas of our national budget such as the antiballistic missile system and other questionable projects that will eventually build up into many more billions of dollars than their proponents and supporters have originally indicated.

Cutting expenses alone, however, is not enough. To meet our responsibilities for those many priorities we must be willing to tax ourselves. To borrow the money to tackle these problems is an exercise in self-delusion, for we are merely diluting the money available to the point that we have lost ground.

I am aware that advocacy of increased taxation is unpopular. That is why the 1969 tax reform legislation became transformed into what is known as a Christmas tree bill, something in it for everybody, and provided for basically tax reduction rather than true reform. I felt that to support the bill and the amendments was to avoid my responsibility to my constituents. That is one reason I voted as I did.

My second reason for voting against the bill and for calling on the President to veto it was due to the inflationary aspects of the legislation that you and I are paying the price for right now.

When we as a nation spend in excess of what we take in we must borrow to make up the difference. Our borrowing is based in good part on credit. It is paper and stands for nothing more than

an I O U, a check from our own Government, and as it becomes cheaper and cheaper people are paying more money for the same thing.

The effect of the 1969 tax bill was a net decrease in revenue to be received by the Federal Government. At the same time expenditures continue at the same level, or more accurately, at an accelerating rate. The result is more dollars chasing fewer goods, or in a word—inflation. Those penalized are the American taxpayers who through a cruel hoax are being forced to pay the most vicious tax collector of all, an inflationary economy.

Allow me to restate my two reasons for opposition to the bill. First a belief that this country must face its responsibility and be willing to tax itself to find the solutions to the problem through meaningful tax reform, not simply tax reduction. Secondly, the abhorrence of the inflation which a tax bill like H.R. 13270 engenders because proposed revenues do not measure up to committed expenditures in the public sector of the economy. As a footnote, it might be added that even as I write this report to you, my constituents, responsible fiscal experts and public officials are urging the 92d Congress which convenes next month to take up again the question of tax reform.

Not withstanding the objections which I and many of my colleagues had to this measure and despite his own reservations, President Nixon signed the Tax Reform Act of 1969 into law on December 30 of that year.

On more than one occasion, President Nixon was forced to veto important appropriation bills because the Democratic controlled Congress had authorized more funds than the administration had requested in its budget message. In each instance, the President cited the inflationary result of the increased spending authority provided by the Congress.

The measures to which I refer are the $4.4 billion fiscal 1971 education appropriations bill, the appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, for 1971 and legislation to extend the Hill-Burton construction program for an additional 3 years at a cost of $2.79 billion.

In each of these instances I supported the President's efforts to hold down inflation. No one takes particular satisfaction in voting to sustain vetoes on such important measures as the authority for hospital construction expenditure or appropriations for education, but it was, in my opinion, the height of fiscal irresponsibility to do otherwise.

In the case of the Hill-Burton extension and the 1971 Education Appropriations, the Congress overrode the President's veto. The presidential veto of the appropriations for the Departments of Labor and HEW was sustained. Subsequently, a revised appropriations measure which was more in line with the President's request was approved.

LAW, ORDER, AND JUSTICE

No single issue has been more important in the 91st Congress, or will be more important in the future, than that commonly known to politicians running for office in 1970 as law and order. This issue leads my list of priorities for the future. However, I would like to go beyond the rhetoric of law and order and speak to each of its dual aspects: law enforcement and the administration of justice.

Our systems for law enforcement and the administration of justice are in disarray. Daily we more surely convince citizens that our society has failed because of the breakdown of these two most important elements of our democracy. All of us suffer the consequences, whatever our income and whatever our station in life. But, the poor and the uninformed suffer most acutely the frustrations of a faulty system, a system of inadequate protection, incomplete representation, delays, and inefficiencies.

Crime threatens injury and death to citizens and law enforcement officers throughout our Nation. For example, in Ohio's central cities with population of over 250,000 the approximate number of serious crimes per 1,000 inhabitants last year stands as follows: Cleveland, 60; Dayton, 46; Akron, 43; Columbus, 39; Cincinnati, 26; Toledo, 26. Serious crimes include murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny of $50 and over, and auto theft.

The cost of fighting crime has now reached $51 billion a year. This equals more than 5 percent of our gross national product. In short, our economy is paying tribute to an ever-increasing criminal society. Criminals in this underground society range from the sophisticated, organized white-collar criminal to the mugger lurking even in some of our best neighborhoods. We must overcome present roadblocks to law enforcement and the administration of justice if we are to begin solving more complex problems of our inner cities.

During the 91st Congress, three important bills came to the floor of the Senate directed at solving our crime problems. They were the Organized Crime Control Act of 1969, the District of Columbia crime bill, and the amendments to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

The Organized Crime Control Act contained provisions designed to curb the infiltration of legitimate business by organized criminals. It provides for expanded immunities for prosecution witnesses, authorizes judges to increase sentences of habitual or professional criminals, compels more detailed testimony before grand juries, permits special grand juries to issue reports on misconduct by appointed Government officials, and strengthens existing legislation against organized gambling and racketeering. The measure passed and it is now law.

I voted for the bill because organized crime has become increasingly diversified and entrenched in legitimate businesses. Criminals engaged in this white-collar crime often employ terrorism, extortion, tax evasion, bankruptcy fraud and manipulation, as well as other sophisticated measures designed to drive lawful owners and officials from their businesses. Also, wherever organized crime existed, it frequently corrupted public officials and exerted extensive political influences which insulated its activities from government interference.

Corrupt officials and law enforcement officers operated in conspiracy to support organized crime. The syndicate could not continue to operate without corrupt judges and prosecutors, or without the assistance of a handful of bribed policemen. This law will be an able tool in the apprehension and conviction of organized criminals.

In July the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 came to the Senate floor. I voted for the bill, which was passed and is now law. The bill provides a complete reorganization of the present court system in the District of Columbia, including the creation of a local court system for the adjudication of all local criminal and civil matters.

The law also transformed the legal aid agency experiment into a fully equipped public defender service authorized to provide legal counsel for up to 60 percent of all indigent criminal defendants, and to aid the courts in establishing an effective court-appointed counsel system for the remaining 40 percent. A bail agency was required to make recommendations to the courts on the full range of pretrial release conditions.

Most controversial in this bill were the "no-knock" provisions and a limited pretrial—preventive—detention alternative for certain dangerous defendants. This provision was restricted to 60 days with an expedited trial. Much rhetoric and emotionalism surrounded these two issues. Opponents referred to "no-knock" as a blueprint for a police state. However, the provisions included in the District of Columbia Crime bill codified existing laws. The District of Columbia crime bill went one step further; a requirement that no-knocking be conducted whenever possible on the basis of court approval only.

Pretrial detention had been attacked on the ground that it violated the 8th amendment to the Constitution of the United States as well as the due process clause of the 5th amendment. It did neither. The 8th amendment did not expressly deny or grant the right to bail. And, it did not prevent Congress from defining the classes of crime in which bail would be denied.

I chose to vote for this measure, agreeing that the bill was the keystone of President Nixon's program against crime in the Nation's Capital. The current level of criminal activity in Washington has reached 78 serious crimes per 1,000 inhabitants. Therefore, law enforcement and judicial reorganization was indispensable to any permanent reduction in criminal activity in the District of Columbia.

Late in September, the Senate Judiciary Committee reported a bill amending the Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. This legislation authorized $3.55 billion in Federal law enforcement aid to States and communities in fiscal 1971, 1972, and 1973. It established a new grant program to improve correction facilities, with emphasis on community-based correction. Under the program, grants may be for up to 75 percent of the cost of any particular project; 85 percent of the funds for such grants shall be

given in block grants to States. The legislation also required that all State plans allocate an adequate share of the benefits of law enforcement aid to areas with high law enforcement problems. I voted for this legislation, even though there was some controversy over the effectiveness of Federal funds being used by States and localities only for the purchase of hardware and riot control equipment.

However, I felt that this was a distinct improvement over the 1968 law in that it allows for much more flexible Federal assistance to local law enforcement agencies and allows for substantial increased Federal share of the cost of law enforcement. The legislation also calls for better cooperation between State planning agencies and local law enforcement units. It increases to 70 percent the Federal share of the cost of most law enforcement programs. It also allows for some payments of grants for salaries for regular law enforcement personnel and limits to 70 percent the share of program cost, which may be paid with discretionary funds.

Several Senators criticized the bill for disregarding the need to insure that a larger share of Federal aid was allocated to areas with the greatest crime problem, and because its provisions are still rather rigid. I am somewhat in agreement with this criticism, but feel the measure was an essential step to better Federal participation in the reduction of crime.

Going beyond the Omnibus Crime Control Act, I am presently working on a comprehensive crime bill that will be introduced early in the 92d session. I feel our criminal justice system can be greatly improved by using sound management of increased Federal funds, better law enforcement recruiting training and personnel procedures, as well as better pay for police, prosecutors, judges, and court officials, and correction employees. The heart of the program, which has been endorsed by three other Senators who are assisting my drafting efforts, is a Federal subsidy for local law enforcement agencies which agree to provide matching funds roughly equal to their normal budgets. These agencies would also meet Federal guidelines. To qualify for Federal funding the local police departments must agree to statewide coordination and cooperation in such above-named areas as training, equipment, and pay. Police parochialism stands in the way of effective crime fighting. The more Federal money you put into the present system, the more you increase the separateness and the fragmentation of current crime-fighting forces. My program, administered on the State level, will be voluntary, but so financially attractive that hard pressed local departments will want to participate. This program would take over much of the work of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA—now being funded by the Omnibus Crime Control Act discussed above.

It is my hope that such legislation will repair the breakdown in justice and order, restoring confidence in the citizens of our country, by providing adequate law enforcement protection, better legal representation in our established bars of justice without delay or inefficiences. This program will be geared to a "model state" at its inception with the hope that such a model will be so successful that all of the States will choose to participate in the near future, if the bill becomes law. You will hear a lot more about this program in the weeks ahead.

HEALTH CARE

While health care for all Americans is a continuing concern of mine, an area that particularly bothers me is the all too frequent deprivation of our senior citizens. I have said it before and I say it again now: The forgotten American is the old American. He is that individual who helps make up the faceless army numbering nearly 10 million today. He marches to a distant, fading drum. He is too old to work, too young to die, too proud to beg.

During the 91st Congress the Senate passed several measures which extended and improved health care in the U.S. As a member of the health subcommittee and the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have been an active participant in the formulation of these new laws.

One of the critical health problems has been the acute shortage of hospital beds and health centers. The new Hill-Burton bill will partially correct this situation with its increased funding and improved method of financing hospital and medical facility construction.

I introduced two amendments to this bill: One increasing the funding for outpatient facilities by $30 million a year for 5 years; and the other, enlarging the scope of the "outpatient" category to include neighborhood health centers for both rural and urban areas. These amendments were designed to relieve the pressure on the inpatient bed situation and at the same time, to make a positive effort toward getting adequate health services to the rural and urban poor.

Other significant measures passed by this Congress which are products of our health subcommittee include the mental retardation bill, the Health Services Improvement Act, and the allied health bill. The mental retardation bill enlarges coverage to include other disabilities such as epilepsy and cerebral palsy and expands the grants to include services as well as facilities. The health services bill extends and improves the research and training programs run by the regional medical program and comprehensive health-care planning services to combat major diseases such as cancer, strokes, heart and kidney disease. The allied health bill provides grants and loans for the education and training of medical and paramedical personnel, and a special emergency provision for medical schools in distress. I supported and voted for all these bills because they corrected some of the existing problems in the health field and looked toward improving services and facilities for all Americans.

Despite the passage of these worthwhile provisions, there still remains—and there will continue to be—a health-care crisis in our country which is not being met by current legislation. Present problems and shortages cannot be solved by simply pouring more and more money into existing programs; instead, the entire health-care delivery System must be revised. In this light, together with 3 of my colleagues, have introduced a comprehensive national health insurance bill which envisages many changes in the organization and delivery of health-care.

Let me say immediately that our bill does not contain provision for a national health service with the government owning and operating facilities. Rather, the Government would merely assist in the financing and administration, but the health services would be provided by private practicioners and institutions. The Federal Government would take an administrative role through a health security board appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, to insure adequate services, high standards, and controlled costs.

The national health insurance program would make benefits available to all Americans, not just the poor or the elderly. It would replace the present medicare and medicaid systems, inadequate, incomplete, and costly; and instead provide comprehensive services with built-in standards and cost control. The program's biggest obstacle is its high cost. However, if we subtract from the total the present costs of medicare and medicaid, then the balance does not seem so prohibitive, especially since it would benefit everyone.

The program would be financed through a health security trust fund. The providers of health services such as physicians and dentists, would be compensated by various methods of their choice: fee-for-service, capitation payments, or retainers.

The organizational structure would move in the direction of group practice with teams of professional, technical, and supportive personnel in order to have a more efficient use of existing medical personnel. In addition, the bill would provide for the training of more doctors, and would give incentives for medical personnel going into the more isolated and less desirable sections of the country.

I do believe that the need for comprehensive national health insurance and concomitant changes in the organization and delivery of health care is our single most important issue in health policy today.

ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS

Like crime, doing something about air and water pollution calls for more than lip service. Our efforts to control pollution have been inadequate. We are making very little progress and in some respects, losing ground, to our own contamination. We are further along the road to disaster than most people, including business and government leaders, would like to admit. In fact, most of them completely underestimate the complexity and danger of this very crucial problem.

Existing pollutants must be controlled and we must anticipate new hazards. Emissions from cars, trucks, and buses compose the largest single source of air

pollution—upward of 90 million tons of contaminants into the atmosphere every year, about 60 percent of the total.

Autos present a special problem, obviously. The National Air Qualities Standard Act of 1970 established that 1976 model cars must achieve at least 90-percent reduction from the 1970 pollution standards. This actually advances the air pollution standards for autos at least 5 years. The bill also extended national emission standards to all vessels and aircraft. I voted for this very crucial measure, which readily passed the Senate.

It is clear that, despite renewed effort and a growing awareness of the problems, Federal attempts to control air and water pollution have fallen short. Government and industry must shoulder the responsibility of this problem on a 50–50 basis.

No business can afford the added cost of pollution-control equipment if its competitors evade it. And regulation by governmental bodies is impossible until industry ceases to find loopholes in pollution control legislation.

Collaboration also must extend beyond a Federal Government-industry relationship. If rivers are to be free from pollution, many industries and municipalities must cooperate.

I recently introduced legislation that illustrates the regional cooperation necessary for pollution control. My bill will provide for continuing and extending Federal grants to State conservancy districts for pollution control management and planning purposes. This bill was incorporated into the new Water Quality Improvement Act.

Congressional cooperation and leadership is also extremely important for Ohio in that many things short of legislation can be done to urge that research and demonstration programs for pollution in our State are fully funded. By working together, Senators from the States surrounding the Great Lakes were able to obtain $20 million for the Great Lakes cleanup program, the amount authorized by the Water Quality Improvement Act signed into law on April 13, 1970. I feel that this congressional cooperation is essential and will continue to press for it, especially in this vital area of pollution control.

More importantly, a sense of cooperation and responsibility must be instilled in government and industry to produce the most effective pollution abatement programs. In July, I introduced two bills that will allow government and industry an opportunity to share equally in the cost of pollution control. Government has long been lax in enacting laws setting forth adequate standards to prevent pollution.

We are now just beginning to enact strong laws that can be effectively enforced. However, the sense of responsibility must be instilled in industry to abate pollution, and industry must at the same time be given the financial incentive and ability to participate in tandem with government to abate and cleanup the ravages of industrial pollution.

It was with this in mind that I introduced two bills designed to enlist industry's aid in fighting air and water pollution.

The first bill was written to mesh with the administration's pollution control proposals. It amends the water pollution control act and makes available to industry a revolving loan fund for the acquisition, construction, and installation of water pollution equipment and facilities. This legislation is directed at small to medium-sized businesses which could borrow up to $350,000 from a loan fund to buy and install pollution-abatement equipment. This fund would be administered by the Interior Department and would be self-sustaining.

A companion bill would provide an incentive tax credit for firms embarking on construction programs for pollution abatement facilities. This legislation permits a 20-percent tax credit to firms installing pollution control equipment. The credit would apply to all costs of the control facility, including building improvements, machinery, equipment and total land costs. This bill would equalize the costs of pollution abatement between government and industry.

These bills were never considered in any great detail but both measures will be reintroduced in January. And the Small Business Administration has shown considerable interest in the revolving loan fund bill to the point of considering merging it with plans for comprehensive SBA legislation in the 92d Congress. The incentive tax credit bill has received good response, and I will press for early hearings on the measure in the Senate Finance Committee.

Public opinion is the most powerful weapon in our arsenal of pollution control. It will ultimately be the catalyst that forces the cooperation of all facets of Government and industry to provide the citizens of our country with a better way of life and a cleaner, more enjoyable environment. I hope all Ohians will raise their voices to make this a reality.

DRUG ABUSE

President Nixon has described the problem of drug and narcotic abuse as a serious threat to the health and safety of millions of Americans and I could not agree more. Experts tell us that conservative estimates peg the increases in drug users, both young and old, at 30 to 50 percent a year. At that rate, according to one estimate, a majority of youths between 12 and 21 would use drugs within 4 to 7 years. Drug abuse has been a growing problem throughout the last decade, but the scope and enormity of the problem has risen to the epidemic stage in the last 2 years.

The 91st Congress reacted to this social problem by enacting a Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act. This bill was designed primarily to correct existing inequities in present law and, simultaneously, to strengthen penalties for the hardened criminal who trafficks in drugs. I voted for the comprehensive drug bill and supported its key provisions. The legislation lowered the penalty for the first offender in marihuana-connected arrests to a misdemeanor, while greatly increasing the penalties for the professional criminals trafficking in drugs to a 12-year prison term. I voted for the so-called "no-knock" provision of the bill because I believe that we must give expanded law enforcement powers if we are to curb the rising epidemic in drug abuse.

Another bill passed by this Congress and enacted into law is the Drug Abuse Education Act. This bill received my support in the Labor Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics, as well as my vote on the Senate floor. It increases funds for existing drug education programs; and provides for the developing of new and improved curriculum, training of counselors and the establishing of model programs.

Finally, the Senate in 1970 passed two bills which recognize drug and alcohol abuse as a medical problem demanding scientific treatment and control. Both bills were written in our Subcommitee on Alcoholism and Narcotics, and received my support there and later, on the Senate floor. The two measures are similar in design and impact—one dealing with drug dependence and the other with alcohol. They establish national institutes within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to direct and to coordinate programs, and they provide funds for setting up Federal, State, and local programs for treatment and rehabilitation. The alcohol abuse bill has passed both Houses and is now law. Hopefully, the drug rehabilitation bill will be enacted during the coming year.

AGRICULTURE

Farmer's prices increased only 67 percent since 1947, while at the same time the cost to the consumer increased nearly 200 percent. At the same time the American farmer's expenses reached historic heights. Gross farm income in 1948 was $34.7 billion compared to $54.6 billion in 1969. Net farm income was $15.9 billion in 1948 compared to only $16 billion in 1969. In other words, farm expenses soared from $18.7 billion in 1948 to $38.5 billion.

These figures summarize the position that the American farm producer is not receiving a fair share for his contribution to the Nation's economy. And this was the situation that set the stage for the Agriculture Act of 1970.

It is obvious that this was not the time to reduce farm income. Yet, the House-passed farm bill would have done exactly that for most segments of agriculture. Not a single major farm organization endorsed the House bill, or even spoke favorably of it.

However, the Senate gave some income protection to farmers. The Senate bill would give farmers greater freedom of decisionmaking and remove some of restraints which had hampered farmers in their efforts to attain maximum efficiency. This legislation also provided more freedom for farmers to decide how they would use their acreage and still qualify for Federal payments under control programs.

I supported and voted for the Agriculture Act of 1970. It is a 3-year program designed to give reasonable assurance to consumers that food and fiber would be available at reasonable prices while a distinct effort was made to improve farm income, and encourage market growth

at home and abroad. The bill provided for administrative flexibility which should allow for more effective program operation, while keeping Government costs down.

The act allows farmers more freedom to plan their own production, thereby increasing individual production efficiency. Hopefully, farmers will realize a larger part of their income from sales and become less dependent on payments to sustain a viable agriculture economy.

The new legislation contains nine sections. The first is concerned with limitations on the maximum payment the single producer could receive under any one of the commodity programs. The ceiling on the amount of subsidy that can be collected is $55,000 in any 1 year under each of the three major crop programs—wheat, cotton, and feed grains. In other words, a farmer could collect $55,000 under each of the three programs, or a total of $165,000. The great majority of the farmers receive payments much less than $55,000. In fact, there were almost 2 million farmers receiving under $3,000 each.

Wheat, feed grains, and cotton are the nucleus of the "set aside" approach contained in the bill. The set aside program eliminates the old crop-by-crop controls that have been part and parcel of past programs. It provides instead a single set-aside of acreage that a cooperating farm would agree to keep out of production. In addition, the farm will maintain its conserving base—although this base might be updated in order to more accurately reflect current farming practices.

Beyond his "set-aside" and conserving base, the farmer will have maximum choice in growing whatever he wishes on his remaining land except for those crops which remain under quota because of previous legislation not affected by this act. These crops include rice, sugar, peanuts, tobacco, and other long staple cotton. In Ohio, wheat and feed grains are emphasized. Under the "set-aside" provisions for wheat, farmers will have to idle 13.3 million acres in 1971, leaving a nationwide figure of 55 to 60 million acres to be harvested. The 1972–73 "set-aside" will increase to 15 million acres. The price support of $1.25 per bushel will be inclusively guaranteed for the 3 years of the program.

In regard to feed grains, corn, barley, and grain sorghum set-aside acreage is left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. In 1971, farmers will be guaranteed $1.19 a bushel for corn, or $1.35 if the required "set-aside" is 20 percent of corn base acreage.

Farmers will decide the best use of their land, machinery, and other capital resources. If the farmer participates, he will be eligible for a commodity loan on all of his production crops.

This combination of a more flexible, market-oriented farm policy crop conversion program was intended to utilize diverted acres for sound public benefit. It also supports the firm commitment of Congress and the Department of Agriculture to work for a better rural-urban balance that will benefit the cities and rural America. If these objectives are accomplished, the Agriculture Act of 1970 will be considered landmark legislation. It was with those objectives in mind that I voted for it.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

As a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I have been privileged to assist in the formulation of the Occuupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. After extensive hearings, committee deliberations, Senate debate, and House-Senate conference, the Senate passed an effective and viable industrial protection measure.

I voted in favor of this bill because I believed legislation on this subject should be passed by the Congress of the United States. Each year more than 14,000 people are killed as a result of occupational accidents and more than 2 million persons are disabled.

I favored and voted for an independent board approach to the promulgation and enforcement of occupational safety and health standards. The concentration of power within the Department of Labor as proposed by some would not promote the stated objectives of this legislation. I am pleased that Congress provided for fair procedures by means of the establishment of an Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission as an independent adjudicatory body. I was additionally pleased that the House-Senate conference committee accepted the Saxbe-Schweiker amendment. That amendment required exclusive use of the courts for restraining conditions constituting an imminent danger to health and safety.

I would like to call attention to the fact that this historic bill does not take away forever the powers of the States to regulate occupational safety and health. The bill does contemplate that the States can reclaim their control over their domestic safety and health. I hope that the States will move to reassert their traditional role in this area.

The Occupational Safety and Health bill of 1970 followed the passage of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 which also came out of my Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. This legislation was designed to prevent disasters such as the Farmington, W. Va., explosion which took the lives of 78 coal miners. Also, it attempts to reduce the incidents of the dreaded coal mine disease of black-lung—pneumoconiosis.

AID TO VETERANS

As a veteran myself, I have a deep interest of veterans legislation. As a member of the Veterans Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I have had an opportunity to make my voice heard on all matters before it.

The Senate passed the Veterans Education and Training Assistance Amendments Act on October 23, 1969. I was pleased to have played a role in the committee consideration of this act. The bill increased the veterans education benefits by 46 percent. I was a cosponsor of this legislation and voted for it.

The Senate also has passed similar health care bills for veterans which improve and extend avaliable benefits. I am also proud that this legislation was reported out of my committee and with my support. I also have voted for these bills on the Senate floor.

Both the House and Senate have passed, with my support, legislation to increase monthly payments to widows of servicemen and veterans whose deaths were related to their military service. And since benefits are directly related to financial need, the legislation also increased the income limitations of the recipients.

I shall continue to urge Senate action for all those who have served their country and made it a better place to live.

CONCLUSION

As my second year drew to a close I found myself deeply involved in a project which may result in the first substantial changes in the daily procedure of the United States Senate in more than a century.

Along with 3 other freshman Senators from both sides of the aisle, I have developed after several months' work a series of proposed rule changes aimed generally at speeding up and streamlining some of the more archaic procedures of the world's most deliberative body. Briefly, our proposals would do such things as cutting down the time and length of speeches not directly related to the business at hand; making the daily agenda of the Senate more businesslike, and adopting a schedule where Senators could plan ahead a month or two with the knewledge that they would not be missing crucial votes during, say, a trip home for a speech.

Minority leader HUGH SCOTT and the majority leader (Mr. MANSFIELD) have responded favorably to the vast bulk of the proposals, as have most of the Senators already sounded out. It appears that some if not all of these suggested changes may become reality early in the 92d Congress. I shall keep you informed on the progress.

Speaking of making changes in the Senate's schedule reminds me that no report would be complete without at least a word about my activities away from the Senate floor. In the last 2 years, I have tried to get back to the State as often as possible for speeches and appearances, meetings and, in short, a chance to stay as close as my schedule permits to the people I represent. While it is impossible to get back as often as I would like, I have visited all of the areas of Ohio in those 24 months.

Knowing that an informed electorate is a strong electorate, I have made a special effort to meet the press as often as I could. These sessions range from small, informal interviews in my office, to full-scale news conference with the Ohio press every several weeks. I also try to sit down with the media representatives in the State whenever I return.

As most of you know, I have also instituted a newsletter which has been going out on a fairly regular basis since April, 1969. The latest edition, which shall detail some of my thoughts about Senate reform and the new session, will be coming out in January.

Any report such as this must, because of space limitations if nothing else, omit some things and gloss over others. That

is true of this one. But my initial report hopefully has covered most of the matters that have concerned you in the last 24 often stormy months—and so those are the matters that concerned me.

I sincerely hope that the report interests you and I shall look forward to any comments you might be willing to make about it. In closing, permit me to offer all of you my best wishes for a happy and meaningful new year. Thank you.

IN FOOTBALL AND DRIVING, DEFENSE PAYS OFF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Howard Pyle, president of the National Safety Council, attributes the lower traffic death toll to a number of factors, including the fact there are more drivers on the road who are qualified by special training. More than 2 million have taken the National Safety Council's defensive driving course over the last few years, thus demonstrating acceptance of civic and moral responsibility to improve their driving competencies.

In the October 1970, issue of Traffic Safety magazine, published by the National Safety Council, an article appeared relating the demands of defensive driving to those of defensive football, particularly to those defensive techniques used by the world champion Kansas City Chiefs. The parallels are both intriguing and compelling, and the overriding themes of both activities are alertness and good sportsmanship, in the same way that every demonstration of good citizenship requires awareness and fair play. It is tempting to consider that we may all possess the capacity to become championship driver-citizens.

Following is the article by Peter G. Barkley, director of the National Safety Council, which is entitled, "In Football and Driving, Defense Pays Off":

IN FOOTBALL AND DRIVING, DEFENSE PAYS OFF

If you're looking for an interesting mental exercise, try this. The next time you watch a football game make comparisons between the demands on a defensive football player and a defensive driver. You'll find a remarkably large number of similarities.

This observation was made by one of the best defensive ends in pro football, Jerry Mays, co-captain of the world champion Kansas City Chiefs, when he was the featured speaker at a dinner meeting of the Greater Kansas City Area Safety Council in 1965. I didn't hear his talk but was intrigued with the thesis.

Some of the comparisons are easily drawn. To be effective on defense in football, or as a defensive driver, you must "read" traffic patterns and react correctly and quickly to avoid being destroyed by the "other guy."

You need peripheral vision to avoid being "blind-sided" in either type of traffic. In both you must employ the elements of defensive driving—knowledge, alertness, foresight, judgment and skill.

A motorist passing a line of parked cars sees a ball rolling into the street. It's his clue that a child may be chasing the ball.

Defensive football players receive similar clues. When an outside linebacker sees both offensive guards pull out of the line to block, he knows a running play is probably developing in the direction to which the guards pull. If the offensive end on the linebacker's side blocks, it probably means a running play is coming at him. If the end doesn't block, it is probably a pass or a running play to the opposite side.

These are the kinds of comparisons observant football fans can readily make. However, there are many more similarities, some not so obvious.

I recently got some valuable help on this subject from Tom Pratt, defensive line coach for the Kansas City Chiefs; Tom Bettis, their defensive backfield coach; and Bill Hamilton, their sports information director.

Pratt and Bettis are the prime architects of the Chiefs' great defensive unit that contributed greatly to the team's success over the year, especially in the Chiefs' 23–7 victory over the Minnesota Vikings, which won them the world championship in the Super Bowl game played in New Orleans last January. I came away from my discussions with these men with increased respect for the Chiefs.

In my opinion, dedication and discipline are the outstanding qualities of the Chiefs. In their efforts to repeat as champions (and Coach Hank Stram has publicly stated several times that this is their goal for 1970) these qualities will be most valuable.

On April 1, just two and a half months after their Super Bowl victory, the Chiefs reported to training camp in Kansas City to begin 16 weeks of general conditioning in preparation for the 1970 season. Full-scale workouts began in July. The Chiefs opened the season by beating the College All-Stars, 23–7, then completed a six-game exhibition schedule before starting their challenging 14-game season.

Obviously it takes this kind of practice and study to stay on top in football. It also takes a lot of effort to be a top driver. To stay safe in traffic a driver must learn to operate his vehicle skillfully and become thoroughly familiar with the rules of the road in his locality. He must then put this knowledge into practice every time he gets behind the wheel—even if it's only to drive to the corner store. He must also update his knowledge constantly. He can do this by keeping abreast of new traffic conditions and laws in his own community and in any area through which he plans to travel and by periodically taking refresher driving courses.

The National Safety Council's Defensive Driving Course is the positive approach to driving. It teaches a driver to anticipate the driving situations he will meet on the road. Being forewarned, he is to some extent forearmed. Coach Hank Stram follows the same principles. By drilling the Chiefs on the tactics he believes an opponent will employ, he prepares for the "traffic" patterns he expects his team to encounter in actual play. He sums up his approach this way, "Everything we do is designed verbally and artistically. Nothing happens by accident."

The DDC instructor tells his class that there are only six ways in which a vehicle can be involved in a two-car crash. These are with: the vehicle ahead, the vehicle behind, the vehicle coming in the opposite direction, the vehicle at an angle intersection, the vehicle passing him and the vehicle he is passing. The purpose of DDC is to teach the driver to be alert to the dangers these "opposing" vehicles may present and to avoid conflict with them, or to cope with such conflict when avoidance is impossible.

Similarly, the basics of defensive football remain unchanged and the players must be thoroughly grounded in them. There is, however, one major difference that makes it considerably tougher for the player than for the driver. Each week he's faced with a new opponent, and each opponent presents star players with their own variety of skills. This means a new defensive game plan, new alignments, different coverage, decisions on when and how often to "blitz," etc.

Defensive driving instructors define a preventable accident as "one in which you failed to do everything you reasonably could have done to prevent it." That's not a bad description of a touchdown from a defensive coach's point of view. His responsibility is to determine the reason for the defensive breakdown and how it can be prevented the next time. His objective, like that of the driver trainer, is to minimize the frequency and repetition of errors.

Driver trainers and defensive drivers study accident records to determine how accidents can be prevented. Football coaches study game films to see how opponents can be outmaneuvered.

The Chiefs' coaching staff grades each player from the game film. They can determine such things as how the players reacted mentally and physically to various situations, how well they "read" the offensive actions, how well they tackled, and how well they concentrated.

The Chief's next opponent will see the same film and know what mistakes the Chiefs made and what players made them. Of course this works both ways. The Chiefs are also able to get a line on their opponents' strengths and weaknesses by viewing films of their previous performances.

Pro coaches get additional information on other teams' capabilities from scouting reports. By the time two teams face each other, each has a pretty good idea of the other's strategy and has worked out countermeasures to upset it.

In preparing for a game the Chiefs' defensive unit is put through drills that simulate the conditions their coaches expect them to encounter on the field. How well they learn to cope with the "traffic patterns" in which they are likely to be involved could mean the difference between victory and defeat.

The Chiefs' defensive unit has been a key factor in the team's success. These men don't make the headlines, but they get the job done. Their satisfaction comes from contributing to team success. Similarly, the defensive driver who avoids an accident doesn't get his name in the paper. His reward is his survival and the satisfaction of knowing that he is not responsible for death or injury to another.

One mistake could cost the defensive driver his life. The defensive player isn't penalized quite as heavily, but one defensive mistake could lead to a touchdown by the opposing team—which might cost his team the game.

GUESSING GAME

One of the most striking dissimilarities between football and driving is that a cardinal rule of good defensive driving is to *show* your intentions to other drivers, while the skilled football player does all he can to keep his opponent from guessing his intentions.

The Chiefs are good at this guessing game. Coach Stram is known for his creativity, and his innovations are widely discussed in football circles. Football observers have said, "The Chiefs played the offense of the 1970s before the '70s got here." Stram insists that his men always try to steal that fraction of a second that gives them an edge, and always try to give the other team something it isn't expecting.

One of the Chiefs' defensive formations is the "triple-stack" defense which sets up a number of camouflaged moves and gives the defense the appearance of being in anything from a three-man front to a seven-man front. Its purpose is to keep the other team's quarterback guessing about the Chiefs' defensive intentions and disturb the offense's concentration.

On offense, the Chiefs try to keep the defense guessing. They have 66 sets (alignments) and 300 plays in their repertoire. They use the shifting-I and "play-action"

pass plays to create a split-second of indecision by the defense. It may be all the time needed to spring a running back loose or complete a long pass.

Unfortunately man drivers also keep the other guy guessing—and for drivers, that's poor technique. On the road, there's no place for competition; everybody should be playing on the same team.

Perhaps the closest parallel between defensive driving and defensive football is found in the definition of defensive driving itself, "driving to avoid accidents despite the incorrect actions of others and despite adverse conditions of weather, road, light, traffic, vehicle, and driver."

For defensive football the definition might be paraphrased, "playing to prevent the opponent from scoring despite its offensive tactics and despite adverse conditions of weather, terrain, light, skill of opposing team, and impaired physical condition."

Football players can't ignore adverse weather, they must play the game. Here the defensive driver has an edge on them. Sometimes he can change his plans so he will not have to drive in it, or if caught out in it, he can sometimes pull off the road until conditions are more favorable.

Rain or shine, the football player must perform. His only safeguard is to be prepared. Defensive play must be adjusted for adverse weather. Players are hampered in their ability to start and stop and maneuver on a rain-soaked or snow-covered field. Their balance and body control are affected.

Varying light conditions also hamper players and drivers. The defensive driver reduces the glare from the sun with visor and sun glasses. Football backs and ends settle for a dab of eye-black on each cheek.

Loss of key players at crucial times can be an extremely adverse condition for a ball team. The Kansas City Chiefs have had some experience with this type of problem. It hampered them in their efforts to get into the Super Bowl, when they had to win play-off games against the New York Jets, the defending Super Bowl champions, and the Oakland Raiders, who had the best record in pro football in 1969.

The National Safety Council instructor's manual for DDC makes the point that the driver who makes a perfect trip must avoid five types of errors; accident, violations, vehicle abuse, schedule delays, and discourtesy. Football team must avoid the same errors.

Accidents. Accidents, or injuries, are painful and costly. They can ruin a season—and even a life.

Violations. Violations by the defense usually mean a first down for the other team, except for the five-yard, off-side penalty. The most expensive defensive violation is pass interference. Offensively, the road to victory is rocky enough without incurring a penalty when you're in scoring position or mounting a sustained drive.

Vehicle (Player) Abuse. Many football games are won in the final minutes, so the difference between a championship season and a winning one can be the physical condition of competing teams. The Chiefs try to maintain player condition by a program designed to achieve a constant level of conditioning. Proper player condition lessens the chance of injury.

Schedule Delays. A football team has 60 minutes to get the job done.

Discourtesy. Prospective Chiefs are rated on their character. Coach Stram insists that all members of the squad represent Kansas City and the team with grace, style, class, and dignity. However, football is a game of violence, and players are rated on their "hitting" ability. You don't win games by "yielding the right of way"; players who yield soon become "ex-Chiefs."

The defensive football player must apply the Standard Accident Prevention formula. He must "recognize the hazard," "understand the defense" and "act in time." He must also see the big picture and use both short-range and long-range judgment.

The short-range hazard for the defense lineman is the offensive blocker, particularly the three nearest him. They are the ones who can hurt him first and end his participation in the play.

While he is fighting off blockers, he must also see the "big picture." His job is not done until he reaches the ball carrier. He has only split seconds to react and make decisions.

Defensive halfbacks usually concentrate on one opponent, and their first thought is to protect against the pass, especially the "bomb" that can mean a quick six points. This demands the most intense concentration and immediate reaction.

Obviously, the successful football player must be physically powerful—with a mind to match. Selecting him is an important part of the coach's job.

It is a job somewhat parallel to that of the fleet supervisor. Both are looking for men with special physical qualifications who also have the mental capacity to get the desired performance from their physical capabilities. They need men who can assimilate and retain information and who can react immediately and accurately to unusual situations.

When it comes to physical requirements, such as size, weight, speed, and playing ability, the Chiefs rely heavily on information provided by their talent scout, Tommy O'Boyle.

But they also try to find out what kind of man the prospective player is. They ask themselves such questions as: what are his attitudes, his motivations is he courageous? would he sacrifice personal glory for team success? The fleet supervisor asks himself similar questions.

I'm sure there are more similarities than I have listed between defensive driving and defensive football. It was fascinating making these comparisons, and I think many DDC classes would find it an interesting exercise, too. If you're a DDC instructor, you might take a little time out to give one of your classes a shot at it. Such a new approach might speed up the learning process and liven up the class.

TEXAS A. & I.—NO. I

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, we produce champions in the 15th Congressional District of Texas—and I am deeply proud of the latest champions, members of the Texas A. & I. football squad, the Javelinas, of Kingsville.

The Javelinas are the national intercollegiate football champs. They won the title by defeating Wofford College in the 15th annual National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics champion bowl game at Greenville, S.C. The score I might add was a lopsided 48 to 7.

This south Texas football team has winning ways. Their victory was the second championship in a row and the third overall for the Javelinas. Both titles are NAIA records. I might add we are truly No. 1 because this is no selection by sportwriters. The Javelinas played for their championship.

The man who has coached the Javelinas to these victories is Gil Steinke, himself a product of Texas A. & I. And just as there is something special about the team there is also something special about the coach. He admits that, philosophically, his coaching methods adher to the old school.

"We do not have a real permissive opperation," says Gil Steinke, "the kids do not always get to do exactly what they want."

Mr. Speaker, I could propound this theory that the country would be better off if this coach's philosophy was applied across the board—but I will not dwell on that. I simply want to offer my warmest congratulations to Coach Steinke and his champions and to let the world know that south Texas is proud of them.

CHEAP NUTRITIONAL FOOD

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, there recently came to my attention a booklet published by the General Foods Corp. for the benefit of its employees. It was entitled, "GF News, Commitment, a report of GF's actions in the field of social responsibility." The booklet tells in my opinion a story of important and effective actions by this very large company to improve the world in which it does business, and in which we live.

One article particularly attracted my attention. It has to do with the development of a new highly nutritious low cost food item called, "Golden Elbow Macaroni." It begins by making the point that there is a peculiar thing about many foods designed to lessen hunger and malnutrition and that is that "those who need them won't eat them."

There are several reasons for this. Many foods developed especially for this purpose have an unfamiliar taste, some are not "belly filling," others carry the stigma of being "poor people's food."

The General Foods product may provide an answer. At least it is indicated in the article that tests in several places overseas and in the United States offer promise that this is so. The pasta form is familiar; the taste apparently appeals to many, particularly in the South and among the Indians of the Southwest.

It is said that in terms of quantities suitable for 100 savings, Golden Elbow can be had for $3.75. Sirloin steak with equal protein would cost $19.94. Regular macaroni of equal nutrition value would cost $30.90.

I have heard from independent sources that this General Foods product represents an important technological breakthrough, and offers substantial promise in the war against hunger, a war that has by means been won.

At a time when American business is so often charged with failure to act, much less lead, in the social field, and

when this charge is leveled at food companies with regard to their obligations concerning nutrition, it is encouraging to read of one company's efforts. I know somewhat efforts are also extended by other firms.

In fact, my conclusion is that what these critics are really saying is that only the great American food industry has the knowledge, the resources, the capabilities to effectively tackle the problems of hunger and malnutrition. If my conclusion is correct, it would be well for all of us to give them all possible encouragement. And that is why I ask to have placed in the RECORD this salute to General Foods.

PRICE SAYS NO TO FURTHER U.N. SUBSIDY

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the House acting to give the United Nations a special $20 million grant just so it can expand its bureaucratic base of operations in New York City.

This Nation is in tough straits financially. We are suffering the grim effects of an inflation caused by Federal waste and fiscal mismanagement during most of the last decade. We are fighting a war against an implacable foe in Southeast Asia. And we are attempting to order our affairs here at home.

We clearly do not have enough financial wherewithal to meet the pressing problems facing this Nation. What, then, makes anyone think we can afford to subsidize the United Nations' expansion program? In my view, we already pay far too much money to support its activities, especially given the fact that on occasion after occasion and in crisis after crisis, the United Nations has been inept and impotent as a world peacekeeping organization.

From the ranks of those who support this legislation, the argument has been made that if the United States does not come up with at least $20 million, the U.N. will be forced to remove its headquarters from New York and will seek more suitable accommodations in another country. To this argument, I say fine. If this is what it takes to get the United Nations out of the United States, I am for it.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that serious thought be given to the possibility of getting the United States out of the U.N. altogether. To date, U.S. involvement in the U.N. has largely been a waste of time and a waste of money. This Nation simply cannot afford to sponsor such an expensive international debating society. What few good things the United Nations accomplishes can surely be separated out, appropriately reorganized, and cooperatively funded at modest costs.

VETERANS DAY ADDRESS

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, with the thought that it will be of interest to readers of the RECORD, I am submitting herewith the address given at a Veterans Day ceremony at the Palo Alto Veterans' Hospital by Lt. Col. John L. Armstrong:

VETERANS DAY ADDRESS

(By Lt. Col. John L. Armstrong)

Quoting from President Nixon's Proclamation: "On this Veterans Day our thoughts are especially with those who have returned from the war in Vietnam and those who are still a part of it, with those who are held as prisoners and those who lie in hospitals, with those who are missing in action and those who died in combat. All of these men and women have proved themselves worthy inheritors of the great traditions which veterans of other wars established and maintained. Though much has changed in our country through the decades, the selfless devotion of our fighting men has not changed.

"It is important that all of our servicemen and all of our nearly 28 million living veterans understand that there is something else which has not changed in this country: the gratitude and respect which the American people feel for them. . . ."

Hark—they are here in ghostly assemblance, the men of our land long dead, and our hearts are standing at attention while we wait for their passing tread. We, sons of today, we salute you "You" sons of an earlier day: We follow—close order—behind you, where you have pointed the way; the long grey line of us stretches through the years of a century told, and the last man feels to his marrow the grip of your far off hold. Grip hands with us "now" though we see not, grip hands with us, strengthen our hearts, as the long line stiffens and straightens with the thrill that your presence imparts.

It is Veterans Day—Nineteen and seventy—a day which affords this entire, indivisible nation an opportunity, not only to assess its accomplishments of the yesterdays, but also to examine its duties and responsibilities of today and the tomorrows. This is a good year to make such an examination. Fifty five years ago "The Guns of August" roared in Europe. WWI began. There in the dark skies, the bright flares spelled it out—war to end all wars—war to make the world safe for democracy. Did we win the war and lose the peace? Or did a new tide of international events sweep in a new scourge—World War II? And it was only 5 years from VJ Day to Korea. Today 300,000 American sailors, airmen, and soldiers are serving in Vietnam to help stem the tide of ruthless communist aggression. What? Oh, what? Must that ghostly assemblance think of us? Have they fought and died in vain? I think not. Indeed, how brash to even question it.

So history marches on, in step with the perpetual tempo of time itself. From the history books have come legions of patriots who were cradled in the difficulties of their epoch. But where are today's patriots? And from whence will come our patriots of tomorrow? Some of us are very concerned that our schools do not teach patriotism. That the parents in America today don't set the example of being a good citizen, that our affluent society makes it so easy for the young men and women that they have lost the challenge. In fact they cop out when getting an education seems difficult, or maintaining freedom seems dangerous.

Well, I don't have an answer. But I do have enough faith in God and our democratic system of government to believe that we will always have strong leaders to take us down the by ways of history, a nation of proud citizens and great accomplishments.

However, we cannot be complacent. We must be vigilant. Freedom is not free. The freedoms, liberties, and rights which we have today were bought and paid for by the most noble people of our land—you veterans.

So today it is proper that we interrupt our daily routines and business to reflect upon patriotism, democracy, liberty, and the veterans who are honored this day. What rights do we have? How and when were they given to us? What have we done to earn them?

We have no birth rights, really, that were not earned for us one way or another. Those rights were bought with death, with wounds, with the inconvenience of military service, and with the burdens of war borne by our civilian compatriots. There is a common quality which sparked our veterans to have courage on an unknown battlefield—to have resolution during unrecognized hardships. And that quality is patriotism. So we honor our veterans—both living and dead. We thank them for gaining and preserving our liberty. But we cannot meet our obligation to them with laurels and eulogies alone. The veteran offers an enduring example of duty well performed. He doesn't ask about the price. He doesn't question the necessity. He knows. Somehow, he feels something in his heart that tells him—"do it even if it may cost me my life." I saw it at Pearl Harbor, I saw it in Korea, and I saw it in Vietnam. We at home may not know what it's all about, but there are hundreds of thousands who have fought in Vietnam who know what it *is* all about—and they don't cop out.

As I see it, the greatest need in America today is for an awakening—on a grand scale—of the public conscience. While America is being torn apart by a mere fraction of the total population, the average citizen dozes. He complacently smirks at the crazy demonstrators on TV. He avoids being involved in a positive constructive manner. He listens to the pacifists advocating peace at *any* price. Well, we have got to ask him if he is ready to pay that price—any price. We cannot let opportunistic politicians seize on this tragic moment to backslide and pick up a few votes.

None of us here has any quarrel with Communism as an ideology—if that's what some people want—an enforced political regime—let them have it. But I think all of us here don't want Communism exported to our country. We stand steadfastly opposed to its goal of world domination. Yes indeed there's nothing wrong with hating something. The courts and law enforcement people hate crime. Former drug users hate drug abuse. People in the military hate war. The Bible teaches to hate sin. Patriots hate despotism.

Hear what Thomas Jefferson said: "I have sworn eternal hostility to any form of tyranny over the minds and hearts of men."

On the other hand there is lots to be said about loving and caring. We can love our country, we can care about what will happen if we remain complacent too long.

Listen to what General MacArthur said about the veterans: "His name and fame are the birthright of every American citizen. In his youth and strength, his love and loyalty, he gave all that mortality can give. He needs no eulogy from me or from an other man. He has written his own history and written it in red on his enemy's breast. I do not know the dignity of their birth, but I do know the glory of their death. They died unquestioning, uncomplaining, with faith in their hearts, and on their lips the hope that we would go on to victory."

So grip hands with us "strengthen our hearts" for we *must* fight as valiantly as they did to insure the same blessings for our posterity. And—if our God so wills it—for that blessed peace throughout the world. It *will* come when the brazen throat of war has ceased to roar. President Wilson said:

"Only *free* people can hold their purpose and their honor to a common end, preferring the interests of *mankind* to any narrow interests of their own."

Let's make further note of our corps of veterans. You know? A soldier is a lonely man at times. At some time or another he must make a terrible and soul-searching decision—will I, or won't I, kill my fellow man in the defense of my country, my home, my family, my freedom? And wars are won—not only by industrial might—but also by the *moral fibre* of a nation's men. Yes, in the final analysis victories are won by the *men*—lonely individuals whose skill "courage" determination—moral strength—and willingness to die firmly establish the full measure of our nation's strength. Abraham Lincoln said that "God must have loved the *common* man because he made so many of them" and many common men have defended democracy. In the first World War, one of every 22 Americans was actually in uniform; in World War II, one of every nine; in Korea one of every thirty. Today one in every eight living Americans in a veteran of wartime service. The advent of great 20th century technological and international developments indeed make for closer and more immediate contact among nations of the world. It took thousands of years for man to move faster than a horse. Then, in only 50 years he learned to travel 18,000 miles per hour orbiting the earth in a capsule. From the isolationism of the early 1900's, we are now the recognized leader of the free world. Enormous responsibilities are imposed upon us individually and as a nation. Yes, the tasks to be performed by our armed forces in the "Time-Distance," shrunken world of today have never been so numerous or difficult. President Johnson reminded us that "Aggression unchallenged is aggression unleashed." As a result you find 2½ million men in uniform—of which 40 percent are deployed outside the United States.

However, the man on a far flung outpost can be little better than his country men at home. He is but their shield and he reflects the actions and ideals of the United States people. The citizenry of a nation constitute the ultimate strength of that nation.

As we seek peace in the world, we must remember, and be guided by our heritage, and use our strength with wisdom. We in America are holding high the torch of freedom, the olive branch of peace, the white gown of morality for the whole world to see. Those who would move forward in the light of this torch we are ready to help. Those who would extinguish it we are prepared to resist. Indeed ours is a noble calling, one that we would do well to rededicate ourselves to, not only on Veterans Day, but all the days of our lives. And let us hope that our sons of the tomorrows will have that faith and patriotism, passed on to them as it was passed on to us from the men of that long grey line grip hands with us—strengthen our hearts.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

THE "DELTA QUEEN" GOES TO WAR

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the *Delta Queen* appears to have emerged victorious from her "war" with the bureaucrats and the Congress. I have just learned of her participation in an earlier war. The December 1970 issue of the Naval Reservist details her military service during World War II. This provides another, if somewhat belated, reason for exempting her from the deep-draft safety statutes.

RIVERBOAT RESERVISTS ON THE OLD "DELTA QUEEN"

The saga of the *Delta Queen*, last of the overnight accommodation stern-wheelers to ply the inland waterways of America, spans 43 years—including a 6-year stint in the Navy as YFB (District Craft—Ferryboat and Launch) 56 in San Francisco Bay.

The proud old paddlewheeler was scheduled to end her regular round trips between Cincinnati and New Orleans on 2 November, and the occasion brought back special memories for some Naval Reservists.

They were among the more than 100 present-day and former Navymen from the San Francisco area who gathered at the Naval Station Treasure Island, opposite the city of San Francisco, to swap sea stories about their days on board *Delta Queen*. Many of them had their first "sea duty" on the old riverboat while she was part of the U.S. Fleet between 1940 and 1946.

"About 300 Naval Reservists in the San Francisco Bay area were called up in 1940 and reported to the *Delta Queen* for transportation to the Naval Station on Yerba Buena Island," recalled Lee Mineau, a San Francisco businessman.

The Reservists' first introduction to active duty was pleasant, but far from typical.

"The civilian crew was still on board, and the dining tables were covered with white table cloths. We used the ship's best china and silverware. In fact, the ship's waiters served us at mealtime."

"This didn't last long," he added.

Before the Navy purchased the vessel she was used as an overnight passenger and freight boat on the Sacramento River between Sacramento and San Francisco. In the Navy *Delta Queen* was used as a training and barrack facility at Yerba Buena Island and, later, at Treasure Island.

The transition of the stern-wheeler to a naval vessel was not without its problems. The layers of grease in the galley were reported to be so thick that all efforts failed to dislodge it. A subsequent fire did the job. Whether or not it was deliberately set by a fussy cook is not known.

Lou Spadia, owner of the San Francisco 49ers football team, and Roy Gilbert, an administrative assistant in the 49er organization were two of the San Franciscans who served on board. And five members of the original *Delta Queen* Navy "crew" are still participating in the Naval Reserve program at Treasure Island.

The Navy declared the flat-bottomed boat surplus in 1946, and she was sold to a Cincinnati firm. Since the late 1940s she has carried passengers on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, helping to preserve a part of America as it was during the riverboat era.

A full passenger list is 192, with a crew of 75, and every trip this year has been a near sellout.

However, the *Queen* has been declared unsafe according to modern sea regulations, and her future is uncertain.

LTJG BARRY STEPHENSON, U.S.N.R.

"THE STATE'S RIGHT TO KNOW"

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the University of Massachusetts earlier this month inaugurated its 17th president, Robert Coldwell Wood. The university, and, indeed, the entire Commonwealth of Massachusetts is honored and privileged to have such an outstanding man heading this great school located at Amherst in my First Congressional District.

Dr. Wood has long been known to the Members of this body as an eminent political scientist, chairman of the department of political science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, internationally known urban affairs specialist, and talented administrator.

Dr. Wood has also served the executive branch of this Government, both as Under Secretary and later as Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The university and the State have been extremely fortunate to secure the services of this man and I am sure his tenure as president will be marked by great success.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD Dr. Wood's inaugural address entitled "The State's Right To Know" which was delivered at his installation at the Statler Hilton Hotel, Boston, on December 9:

"THE STATE'S RIGHT TO KNOW"

ADDRESS BY ROBERT WOOD, PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

We are together today for purposes of continuity, commitment, and celebration.

We affirm the continuity of three traditions:

—A tradition of *scholarship* that goes back seven centuries to the medieval university.

—A tradition of *public education* that was written into the constitution of Massachusetts in 1780.

—A tradition of *service* that was central to the origins of this University in 1863.

These traditions are our strength and salvation. And it is deeply in my nature to preserve and cherish them.

In this time, however, preservation is not the only task and tradition does not suffice. Indeed it is open season on established mores, and the sacred cows of the campus—including university presidents—are being served up regularly for lunch. Higher education is being asked to defend its processes, its standards, its entire rationale.

Combatting the educational establishment can be a healthy exercise, so long as the weapons are those appropriate to an academic community. Recent changes in

U-Mass campus life and governance are—in the main—entirely sensible and probably overdue.

But most of the changes that have resulted from the turmoil and agitation of the past few years—not only at this University but across the country—are largely marginal and incremental: A pass-fail option, a few urban courses, a black studies program.

I think the time has come to undertake more systemic changes.

How do we build the public university of the future and not the public university of the 50's?

What should the future university teach?

How should we organize the university and its resources?

What should it look like?

These are the questions that intrigue and trouble me, the Trustees, the Chancellors and the Dean. Each month we are asked to review the plans for another carefully designed building—representing a major capital investment, based on certain educational premises, destined to be part of our scene for 50 years or more. Next spring we will be asked to act on tenure for faculty members who will still be teaching in the year 2000 and whose students will be running this state well beyond that.

If we don't try consciously to shape the University's future, the pressures of growth will shape it for us. And we will replicate the past.

It is my conviction that new patterns, new models must be found for University eduaction in the Commonwealth, our Liberal Arts education derives from the days of Cardinal Newman and the idea of training for a leisure class. The language requirement—recently under seige on the Boston campus—can be seen as a remnant of the conviction that no gentleman should be ignorant of Latin and Greek. Similarly our sometime preoccupation with graduate students and graduate schools comes from a venerable tradition of scholarly elitism that is now in sharp collision with the harsh facts of supply and demand.

Despite our 107 years, this is a youthful University: The Medical School is training its first 16 doctors; the ground—or the compacted trash if you will—has just been broken at the Boston campus; Amherst is growing like an adolescent. I am the first President of the University since the establishment of the three campus system with responsibility for development and management on a university-wide basis.

We can withstand and profit from an identity crisis.

I propose to structure a serious effort to discover what the future University of Massachusetts can and should be. To begin this process, the Trustees will be meeting informally toward the end of this month—at some cost to their holiday plans—for a two-day policy review.

As a major source of help, perspective and guidance in our endeavors, I am today appointing a President's Committee on the future University under the chairmanship of Vernon Alden, Chairman of the Board of the Boston Company, and distinguished former President of Ohio University. Mr. Alden and his committee members—representing students and faculty of the three campuses, the alumni, the public, labor and business, the professions, and the academic community both within and outside of the state—and will report to me and to the Board by the end of next summer. I think you will agree this committee is an extraordinary assemblage of talent and knowledge and creativity.

The committee will listen to those who know this University best—the students, the faculties, the deans. They will listen to our legislators and citizens who have a just concern with how the Commonwealth educates its children. They will explore new ideas that are floating around the educational community and identify the ones on which we should be working. I intend to listen *to* the committee members as well as *with* them, and I am deeply grateful they are willing to take on this assignment. Responsibility for acting on their recommendations rests, as always, with the Trustees of the University.

While we await the work of the committee and the emergence of some consensus on the future University, I would like to share with you three of my predispositions regarding university education.

First, I am pre-disposed to the old-fashioned idea of *pluralism* in education as in politics. Contemporary theories to the contrary, I aspire to no monolithic establishment, no rule by any elite, or counter-elite, no single pattern of institutional excellence. Within the universe of higher education there are a variety of valid tasks to be performed that demand the best of human wit, and energy and will. The idea that you're either Harvard or a trade school has had no real foundation since the emergence of the great public universities of the west and mid-west. It is completely gone today.

Excellence in informing and enriching society comes under many different educational guises. Within this University, it is important for each campus to find its particular identity and contribution. And even on a single campus, I would favor great latitude for individual preference as to program content and learning schedules. The most recent report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education identifies a national need to expand the options—

For deferring college after high school;

For entering career and apprenticeship programs rather than a university;

For changing career directions in school;

For returning to school in middle age.

We want to weigh each of these options at the University of Massachusetts.

My second predisposition is toward *utility*. In this credential society, our universities have become the great certifiers of employability for the young. I believe we owe them the substance as well as the certificate.

Much of traditional education is really a preparation for graduate work. Graduate study may be an excellent exercise but it inevitably prolongs the time of training and narrows the range of career choice by emphasizing teaching and the established professions. Today only about 5% of the average U-Mass freshman class—15% of the seniors—enter graduate school. Our primary job, for the next few years at any rate, is not so much to concentrate on graduate education for its own sake, but to ensure that it helps the bulk of our students who won't experience it directly.

In brief, this means an educational program in which graduate work enriches the undergraduate experience and is not undertaken indiscriminately. Because knowledge is the basis of utility, the University's own graduate program is essential to continued quality in our under graduate teaching. And where we go forward with graduate work, we should never settle for second place. But I am inclined toward research that will actually solve problems and toward education that really helps the student concerned.

Seventy-five per cent of our students come from families earning less than $15,000 a year and at least half are the first generation in their families to go to college. Only half can depend on family funds to finance their education and the rest depend on employment, personal savings, loans and scholarships. These students are in school at some sacrifice and they are there—at least in large part—to expand their career choices and their job opportunities.

Too many of them work hard to get B.A.'s in Psychology or American History or Greek Literature or even Political Science only to discover that a degree at that level just isn't worth much on the job market. I'm sure we can do more in counseling and perhaps in departmental candor. Some sophisticated market analysis could tell us a lot about employment opportunities for our graduates. But the real challenge comes in bringing the University and the real world together in new ways so that students become aware of society's needs and capable of responding to them.

One promising way of going about this—and this is my third and final predisposition of the morning—is through the *service function* of the University. I am concerned with the absorption as well as the production of knowledge. In field after field, the knowledge we have has out-run our ability to use it and our willingness to pay what it costs. Dramatic new designs for housing have not yet sheltered the poor. New technology in transportation does not now relieve congestion on city streets. New medical advances are still too often restricted to the knowledgeable, the rich, or the welfare patient.

The knowledge and skills that exist in this University are among the state's great natural resources. They represent opportunities to bring about not only incremental improvements in the environment but institutional change.

Both the nation and the university community have been in a period of what might be called a volunteeristic approach to change: from paint-ins in Harlem to Earth Day on the campus. These exercises owe much in spirit to the inspired use of nonviolent resistance to destroy the remnants of public segregation in the south. But as applied to the stickier dilemmas of how to end the war, preserve the city, or upgrade the environment, this approach hasn't really worked.

I am persuaded that the real hope for change lies in an *institutional* approach. The University as an institution that represents both knowledge and change can work with other institutions that need knowledge and are receptive to change. This process—properly undertaken—can feed back to and strengthen the University's own educational and research capacities. And we begin to move forward. . . .

I don't want to overstate the case. The scientist as miracle workers is in disrepute—and *any* university professor will follow suit if we expect miracles. We are talking here about complex and subtle relationships and about solution-resistant problems.

But we are also on the threshold of a period of other opportunities. As the war draws to an end and the national economy begins to adapt to peacetime requirements, we have already begun to see a liberation of manpower resources capable of effective application to domestic social problems. By working with public agencies to define critical issues and develop realistic proposals, the University can play a major role in assuring that this capability is not wasted. Let me tell you about some of the ways in which we have already begun to move in this direction.

This state's minor economic miracle in cranberry culture and cooperative marketing owes much to the work of the University's historic centers of service: The Agricultural Extension Service and the Agricultural Experiment Station. Both the College of Agriculture and its related institutions are moving into new areas of assistance.

In one county the extension service is working on the drug problem and another has home economists working in three public housing projects. Several have organized family affairs trouble-shooting units. Dean Spielman is very much interested in bringing the assets of the college to bear on consumer protection, environmental and land use problems as well as regional planning and development. These assets include a great deal of both experience and equipment.

For five years the Amherst faculty has been engaged in a joint effort with the Belchertown State School for the mentally retarded led by Professor Benjamin Ricci. Special

problems of helping retarded children and adults—from diet to the redesign of recreational equipment—have been tackled by faculty and students from the Departments of Nutrition, Biochemistry, Physical Education, Engineering, Economics, and Education. We want this program supported and expanded.

We are developing a joint research proposal with Commissioner Milton Greenblatt and the Department of Mental Health looking to the decentralization of the department's service delivery system. This joint endeavor could produce not only organizational and procedural recommendations for the department but proposals as to how the University might organize educational and training programs in management, clinical service, and community participation. This can be the work of our new Institute for Governmental Affairs.

—We are working with Public Health Commissioner Alfred Frechette on a child health study centered in Worcester and Falmouth. This state is a leader in public health and medicine, but the sobering fact is that one-third of our 19-year-olds can't pass the routine army physical.

—We are getting together with Sheriff John Buckley of Middesex County to work in the correctional area.

—The Labor Relations Research Center and the Institute of Labor Affairs are performing a number of services for the labor movement including consulting on contract problems, training for union leadership, and the development of special courses in the area of labor education.

—The Boston campus is working with model cities to help in mathematics programs. Boston has also begun "The Library and the City Child"—the first step to an urban library program.

—The two-year old center for business and economic research in the business school has been conducting a series of studies relating to the economic development of Springfield. I hope this can be the foundation for broader efforts in the conversion process. As the nation moves toward peace, we must be sure that our state resource of highly trained manpower is not lost.

As I said, these are just beginnings. But the excitement is there. I am very much aware that *any* consideration of university service must build on a basic "good neighbor" policy with regard to the neighborhoods and communities in which university facilities are located: Amherst, Worcester, Waltham, and—most particularly—Savin Hill and Columbia Point. What with competition for space and differences in priorities, we can hardly expect these relationships to be without tension. But I can promise that the University will take an active and positive role in resolving these tensions in ways that respect the interests of the community involved.

I emphasize Savin Hill and Columbia Point both because they are our newest neighbors and because I want to make quite clear that we are in the new Boston campus to stay. In fact the first contracts for driving piles are now being signed. I feel certain that our new facilities and services there can be organized in ways that promote mutual benefit and interaction rather than chilly coexistence—the small town rather than the Manhattan style of good neighbors.

Together with the Columbia Point Health Association, the residents of Columbia Point, Tufts Medical School, and any other parties who wish to participate, the University will seek support for a Health Center at Columbia Point in which the neighborhood and the University's needs can be joined.

Even with a commitment to service we are left with difficult questions of resource allocation. The University of Massachusetts is not rich. Although we are close to the top in recent progress, we still fall below the national average in per capita support for higher education.

Universities across the country are engaged increasingly in diverse non-educational activities: Running community health and day care programs, training paraprofessionals and Vista workers, running federal laboratories, helping city governments, building low cost housing. In part—thanks perhaps to the uncommon success of academics in the Manhattan project, post Sputnick space activities and computer technology—these new responsibilities have been *thrust* upon the universities. In part, they are responding to the prodding of conscience and the indignant young. In part, as with the downtown university that finds itself overtaken by urban blight, involvement is the result of self-interest rather narrowly defined. But as Professor Carl Kaysen has pointed out, universities have reached out for new activities since the 40's *primarily* because these new activities have an intellectual justification and are of interest to university faculties.

This reminds us, I think, of what universities are all about and rescues us from Clark Kerr's stark formulation of the university as a "service station." In assessing what kinds of involvement make sense, we must take account of the history, skills, make-up and nature of the campus concerned. But the basic gauge should be whether the involvement furthers the university's own particular responsibilities for education and scholarship.

As a land-grant University we inherit an historic commitment not only to public service but to equality of opportunity. The first annual report of the University's Board of Trustees in 1866 was largely devoted to the implications of this commitment. "Republicanism," the Trustees explained, "has undertaken in America to recast society into a system of equality. It proposes to create true and safe equality, not by conferring on the ignorant and degraded the rights of citizenship but by raising all, through education, to the full dignity of free men. Its purpose is to diffuse education and property among all the people, to give as nearly as possible every child an even start in the world, and an equal chance to be President, member of Congress, farmer or mechanic as he may choose.

To effect this, our fathers abolished hereditary rank. In England, the King's son is born to be a King, and the Lord's son to be a Lord, and the oldest son inherits all his father's land.

"In our country, the President's son has no better claim to be President than another, nor a Senator's son to be a Senator; and all the sons and daughters share alike the father's property.

"Then comes in the great regulator and elevator, general education, like a huge subsoiler, breaking up the old foundations . . . this, must finish the work."

The work of equality is *not* finished, of course—even now 100 years later. But our University forefathers' deep faith in the power of education reaches across the century to touch us still. Let us retain their commitment and use that power to break up the old foundations—poverty, ignorance, discrimination—that prevent the true greening of America. Let us retain it especially in the public university.

I am proud to be the 17th president of the University of Massachusetts.

Let us proceed to celebrate together.

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1970

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, PHIL PHILBIN is one of the finest, friendliest, and most unselfish men I have ever had the pleasure of knowing. He has served the House of Representatives during the past 28 years with great devotion. He has represented his Massachusetts constituents with boundless energy and skill. He has devoted most of his life to the service of his country.

He has always taken the time and cared enough about his colleagues to offer help with any problem, large or small, and his presence is a daily reminder of the value of a kind heart and a good word. I have been the beneficiary of his generous spirit for the 18 years that I have known him.

His untiring work on behalf of his constituents in Massachusetts has never been a mere job for PHIL PHILBIN; it has been rather an intensely personal, compassionate, and deep concern for the problems of all those he represented.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, second in rank to the chairman, he handled demanding committee responsibilities with the same insight, conscientiousness, and uncommon service that has characterized all his public life.

For all of us PHIL PHILBIN has brought to this body a rare quality of kindness and warmth. He has enriched the lives of each of us.

PHIL PHILBIN is a gentleman in every sense of the word. He is a fine, decent human being—a man of great integrity. I am proud to have been able to work with him during the past 10 years and I wish him continued accomplishment and the greatest contentment, health, and happiness in the years ahead.

SOVIET PERSECUTION OF JEWS

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, today, 13 Russian Jews are being tried in Russia for an alleged plot to hijack an airliner.

There was no actual hijack attempt. The individuals were arrested for allegedly plotting to take over an airliner to fly them out of the Soviet Union.

Not commenting on the guilt or innocence of the accused, I believe, however, that the freedom-loving people of the world should be aware of the underlying motives in this case.

Going back to the early 1920's, the Soviet Union has used show trials with forced confessions as decisive evidence as a means of propaganda.

These staged trials were used by Josef Stalin in his notorious purges in the 1930's and early 1940's to arouse anti-Jewish sentiment.

After World War II, the show trials resumed and the anti-Semitic campaign was intensified. The last 5 years before Stalin's death were known as the black years. In this anti-Semitic campaign against Jewish intellectuals the show trials were used to close Jewish cultural institutions, liquidate cultural leaders and deprive the Russian Jews of his religious rights.

The wave of terror hit its peak in January 1953, with the anti-Jewish hatred aroused by an alleged plot by which Jewish doctors were supposedly planning to murder Soviet political leaders. The death of Stalin ended the purge temporarily.

In the 1960's a new round of purges began with the Russian Jew being cited for economic crimes against the state. In this new purge, crude propaganda material, overtly anti-Jewish, blanketed the country and mass trials were staged where the accused invariably confessed and were handed stiff penalties. Of the several hundred executed more than 50-percent were Jews—who constitute just over 1 percent of the total population.

To date there has been a consistent propaganda campaign conducted by the Soviet Government to encourage anti-Jewish feeling. The results have been that the Russian Jew is discriminated against in higher education and employment. His children are abused and mistreated at school and at work.

The Russian Jew has been deprived of his cultural and religious rights thus foreclosing the possibility of perpetuating his heritage and maintaining group identity.

At the same time the Soviet Union has denied permission to tens-of-thousands of Russian Jews to emigrate to Israel. This is a direct violation of the United Nations Charter which cites the human right of an individual to leave his country of origin.

The United Nations should censor the Soviet Union for this charter violation and I urge the United States to instigate proceedings at the U.N. The freedom-minded people of this world must make it absolutely clear that we will not tolerate injustice or the violation of basic human rights.

ADDRESS BY DR. ROGER A. FREEMAN

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to claim as my constituent Dr. Roger A. Freeman, senior fellow at Stanford University's Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace and formerly a Special Assistant to President Nixon.

On two recent occasions Dr. Freeman delivered addresses which I consider timely and important. I commend the remarks of this distinguished scholar to the attention of my colleagues and am therefore submitting them for inclusion in the RECORD:

MATH AND AFTERMATH IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: THE CONCEPT OF ACCOUNTABILITY IN EDUCATION

(Address by Roger A. Freeman, before the Annual Fall Conference, California Elementary School Administrators' Association, Oakland, Calif., October 22–24, 1970)

Ever since President Nixon sent his Message on Education Reform to Congress last March, a lively discussion has been going on about its content, its meaning, its implementation. Some of his critics thought that the President should have recommended federal support of public school operations to the tune of several billion dollars a year and left everything else to the school administrators, the boards of education and the teachers. That is what the National Education Association and its allies have been demanding, for well over a hundred years, and still deem to be the solution to the problems which beset the schools. But no President ever has recommended such a program, nor is Congress likely to approve one if it were proposed, at least for as far in the future as we can see ahead. In fact, the chances for federal general school support appear to be slimmer now than they were twenty or twenty-five years ago.

In his message of March 3 the President followed a track that runs counter to the road his critics in the educational establishment would want him to travel: he introduced the concept of accountability: "School administrators and school teachers alike are responsible for their performance and it is in their interest as well as in the interest of their pupils that they be held accountable." He declared: "We have, as a nation, too long avoided thinking of the productivity of schools."

That conjured up in the minds of some school principals a vision of being tarred and feathered if their students fell short of the national norm on standard achievement tests. But that is not what it was intended to mean.

At the outset the President made it known to the staff charged with drafting the education message that he wanted its prime emphasis placed on reform and not on finances. This message was in preparation for six months and was as thoroughly studied, discussed, revised and edited as any presidential document could and should be; it went through several drafts before it was finally issued.

In contrast to many other messages it does not say: here is a problem and this is the solution. It admits that we do not know as much about the learning process as we should, that we have no ready answer to the question why so many children do not learn the essentials they need. It makes it quite clear however that the time is overdue to find out.

Accountability of the schools is not an entirely new concept. Some of us have been talking about it for a long time. Wilbur Cohen, President Johnson's last Secretary of H.E.W., criticized three years ago "the voluminous, yet unsuitable data now available for assessing the products of our education." He complained that "practically none of it measures the output of our educational system in terms that really matter—that is in terms of what students have learned." He added that it is an "incredible fact that the nation has, year after year, been spending billions of dollars on an enterprise without a realistic accounting of that investment."

In this, the first message on education reform by any president, Mr. Nixon made it clear that though far more money would be needed for education in future years, money alone was not the answer. Educational processes and methods would have to be made more effective and more productive. "We must stop congratulating ourselves for spending nearly as much money on education as does the entire rest of the world—$65 billion a year on all levels[1]—when we are not getting as much as we should out of the dollars we spend."

The President promised: *"As we get more education for the dollar, we will ask Congress to supply many more dollars for education."*

If we are to establish accountability for huge manpower and material resources, whether in education or in any other field, we must relate input to output, or investment to return.

Quantity is usually easier to gauge than quality, input easier to determine than output. But some measurement of quality is essential, particularly in education.

Until not so many years ago almost everyone active in education knew how to measure the quality of a school: class size (i.e., teacher-pupil ratio); qualification of the teachers (i.e., academic degree, years of experience, salary); number of books in the library; age, size and equipment of the building; and dozens of similar gauges.

The number of tables in the NEA's annual *Rankings of the States*, listing available statewide data, jumped from 32 to 132 just within the past dozen years. But the final and most widely recognized yardstick of school quality that included all other measurements was: dollars expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance.

There is just one trouble with these data: they all list input, the resources consumed by the schools, they don't measure the output or product.

We know how many young people go through the schools and how many graduate. We don't know how much they learn while they are there. We don't record the capacity and the skills and knowledge of the students when they enter school, nor when they leave. If we did, we would at least know how much was added in the meantime, though there still would be a question of how much of the increase should be credited to the school.

To be sure, the public schools administer many millions of intelligence and achievement tests each year. But the results of those tests are not systematically used. Moreover they are closely guarded secrets in most school systems, for fear that they would be used, and possibly abused. A few major cities—New York, Washington, Oakland—have published test results in recent years and also given us such input factors as class size or expenditure per pupil; some have added socio-economic data which can be correlated. Those reports enabled us to gain valuable insights—which I shall discuss later—but we have no longitudinal studies which record a pupil's progress through his entire school career. Project "Talent" plans a sequential study but it will be some years before final results will be in.

Some have tried to justify sharply increased educational spending, past and future, by giving improved education much of the credit for growth in the nation's economy. That better education advances economic growth will hardly be doubted. But how much the education which our schools actually provided contributed to greater production and higher incomes is problematical. Brookings economist Edward Denison tried to find an answer by a residual process: he credited education with whatever economic growth he could not trace directly to the infusion of manpower and capital investment. His estimate that almost one-third of our 1929–1963 economic growth was due to education has been profusely quoted. But it is very tenuous and has been seriously questioned by other economists who came up with a far smaller credit to education.

Some observers have related the years of formal schooling which an individual completed to his income level, in order to show the high return on investment in education and thereby, indirectly, prove the value of a quality education. The Census Bureau computed lifetime earnings (from 18 to death) as follows:

---

[1] In the school year 1969/70. The corresponding figure for the current academic year, 1970/71, exceeds $70 billion. For the first time since the 1930s, the American people will in fiscal 1971/72 be spending more on education than on national defense.

[In 1968 dollars]

	Based on 1956 earnings	Based on 1968 earnings	Increase, 1956–68
Men with—			
Some elementary school	168,287	219,996	51,709
8 years elementary school	228,872	285,344	56,472
4 years high school	312,622	382,678	70,056
4 or more years college	477,137	602,864	125,727
Increase:			
8 years elementary over drop-out	60,585	65,348	4,763
High school over elementary	83,750	97,334	13,584
College over high school	164,515	220,186	55,671

In 12 years then the value of an elementary education increased by $56,472, of a high school education by $70,056, of a college education by $125,727.

These figures have been widely used and interpreted as meaning that a young man could add $97,000 to his lifetime income by attending high school, $220,000 by attending college. But that seems to overstate the case.

There probably exists a positive casual relationship between school attendance and income level—with important exceptions. For example, a plumber is now paid $355 for a 40-hour week in San Mateo County which is more than the average teacher there gets. But to attribute all of the higher income of persons who have stayed in school for more years to the fact of their longer attendance is naive or misleading. Extended school attendance as well as economic success in later life, are casually related to the same personality traits more than to each other: higher intelligence, ambition, i.e., motivation to work hard, to plan ahead, to forego immediate gratification for future advance, etc. In other words, a man earns a higher income for the same reason for which he attends school for more years: brains and tenacity.

The tendency of spokesmen for the educational profession to claim credit for the schools for economic growth, for higher income, and for just about everything else that is good and wholesome in American life, to praise school attendance as the answer to poverty and a remedy for most other ills, is understandable. But it boomeranged when shortcomings in the schools' products were becoming painfully obvious, and when some of the promised improvements did not materialize. Many educators laid a trap for themselves when they exaggerated the returns from school education; not surprisingly they were blamed for deficiencies even though the failures often were not the schools' fault.

Illiteracy has been sharply declining in the United States: it was reported at 11.3% of the population by the 1900 Census, at 4.8% in 1930, at 2.4% in 1960. These rates are higher than in major European countries—but at least they are coming down. Moreover, the 1960 illiterates averaged 58 years of age and with better than 99% of our school-age children now attending school, we seem to be well on the way of resolving the problem without too many years.

But *functional* illiteracy, that is, inability to read and write sufficiently for a minimum functioning in today's economic, political and social life is far more extensive than the Census reports indicate. The Office of Education estimated that 24 million persons 18 years and over are "functionally illiterate"—they cannot read, write or count at a fifth-grade level. Yet, there were on last count only 6.4 million Americans, 14 years and over, who have attended school for fewer than five years. In a study on Chicago's southside, for example, 93% of the respondents were found to have completed at least the fifth grade; but fewer than half could read at a fifth grade level.

School attendance in a particular grade, and even graduation, do no longer guarantee a specific educational level—ever since the schools, some years ago, discovered the secret of perpetual promotion. There are now some high school graduates who cannot even read their diploma. For about a quarter century, school critics such as Canon George Iddings Bell, Arthur Bestor, Mortimer Smith and Admiral Hyman Rickover have blamed soft curricula and failure to maintain standards, for the inability of large numbers of public school children and graduates to master the 3Rs. The schools' defenders countered that by maintaining rigid standards the schools would be driving less able children from the classroom, which obviously would not help to raise their skills and knowledge. The root of the problem, they asserted, was inadequate financial support.

In the early 1960s Congress became increasingly concerned over the reported educational deficiencies among millions of the nation's children, particularly those from low-income backgrounds. To be sure, the schools' revenues and expenditures had risen tremendously—from $5.8 billion in 1950 to $18.5 billion in 1965 (and to $32 billion in 1970), which is a rate of increase more than twice as fast as enrollment and prices combined. But the added funds, it was asserted, had not reached the sections where the poor and their children lived and went to school. Class sizes had been coming down in the national average, it was said, because certain suburbs and other wealthy sections could afford to hire additional teachers while central city schools were increasingly plagued by crowding and excessively large classes. Small wonder that children from poor family backgrounds were lagging several years and falling behind further while the offspring of middle class and well-to-do parents progressed.

There were no statistical data available to prove these charges. But they seemed plausible enough and were widely believed. To establish once and for all the existing discrimination against children from low-income backgrounds, Congress ordered, in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, that a comprehensive survey be undertaken, to form the basis for future legislative corrective action. Some grumbled at the time that it was a waste of money to spend $1¼ million to find out what had long been common knowledge. But the survey was undertaken anyway—the most extensive ever of American schools—by James Coleman, a sociologist from Johns Hopkins University. You all know the results, which surprised Professor Coleman and everybody else—with the exception of a few heretical researchers who had been saying so right along.

Coleman summarized his findings: "The evidence revealed that within broad geographic regions, and for each racial and ethnic group, the physical and economic resources going into a school had very little relationship to the achievements coming out of it." He concluded that "if it were otherwise we could give simple prescriptions: increase teachers' salaries, lower class size, enlarge libraries, and so on. But the evidence does not allow such simple answers."

In response to questions by the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Professor Coleman reported in June 1970 that eight reanalyses by other researchers had not in any way altered the results. Reviewing the national debate on the Coleman Report, Christopher Jencks of the Harvard School of Education summarized his conclusions: "Variations in schools' fiscal and human resources have very little effect on student achievement—probably even less than the Coleman Report implied."

Coleman found that the teacher-pupil ratio "showed a consistent lack of relation to achievements among all groups under all conditions."

Ample evidence of this was available long before the Coleman report. The *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, summarizing over 200 studies of class size and pupil achievement, reported in 1950 that—

"On the whole, the statistical findings definitely favor large classes at every level of instruction except the kindergarten . . . the general trend of evidence places the burden of proof squarely upon the proponents of small classes. . . ."

More recently, the most detailed report now available on any city school system (*New York City School Fact Book*, City University of New York, 1969) found:

"The evidence we have accumulated is somewhat surprising. We have recorded traditional variables that supposedly affect the quality of learning: class size, school expenditure, pupil/teacher ratio, condition of building, teacher experience and the like. Yet, there seems to be no direct relationship between these school measurements and performance. . . ."

A report on the Oakland Public Schools on 1966/67 state test results listed the median family income for each school. If we divide Oakland's 60 elementary schools in three groups, according to family income we find these results: in the lowest income group the median pupil-staff ratio was 1:20.5, in the highest income group it was 1:28.2.

SAT reading test results were:

	Grade—			
	1	2	3	6
Median of lowest income group	1.6	2.1	2.9	4.2
Median of highest income group	1.8	2.9	4.0	6.2
Difference	.2	.8	1.1	2.0

I could give you many similar examples. But that seems hardly necessary.

Coleman was careful to point out that "racial composition *per se* of the school was not related to achievement when the social class composition was controlled."

With the long held and still widely believed assumption of a positive cost-quality relationship disproved, and race not the controlling factor, how do we explain the troublesome phenomenon that some children learn well and some don't? We have long known that differences in achievement among pupils tend to be wider within schools and classes than among schools. This suggests that the student achievement is not as closely related to school features as we have been led to believe. Otherwise, performance within schools and within classes would be far more uniform than it is. Educational attainment seems to depend largely on forces over which today's schools exercise only limited control.

Coleman found the factor with the strongest correlation with student achievements to be the socio-economic-educational status of the parents. He, and many others, interpreted that as meaning that the home environment, the substance, level and intensity of conversations with the family, the presence or absence of books, the example, encouragement, stimulation and assistance by parents and other family member was the crucial element, aside from the contact with other children attending the same school. Few will question that home environment can be a powerful factor in motivating children to learn. But studies of adopted children suggest that characteristics of the natural parents are far more influential than environment. A study of one hundred adopted children by Marie Skodak and Harold Skeels, for example, found that "the intelligence of individual foster children appears to bear little relationship to measures of the foster home in which they are placed, while appreciable correlations appear between the I.Q. of the foster child and that of his own mother from whom he has been separated from birth." [2] Studies by Sir Cyrill Burt and others have found the I.Q.s of identical twins reared apart to be almost as

[2] *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 1968, vol. 7, p. 428.

closely correlated as the I.Q.s of identical twins reared together.

Considering what we can observe throughout nature, is it really so surprising that a child's score on the educational achievement tests of school tends to parallel his parents' score on the economic achievement test of life?

Intensive studies in recent years by Arthur Jensen, educational psychologist at the University of California at Berkeley, confirm the conclusions of the pertinent scientific literature in the field. For example, Bernard Berelson and Gary A. Steiner summarized in their massive volume *Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings* (New York, Harcourt Brace, 1964).

"Large differences in intelligence as measured by the standard intelligence tests, are due principally to heredity. Here is one expert's review of studies on how much difference in ability results from the types of environmental differences usually found among homes and communities. One summary with which most others agree fairly closely, is that the variation in tested intelligence among school children is accounted for 75% by heredity, 21% by environment, 4% by accidental factors." (P. 217).

Experience has shown that the schools can teach almost every normal child to read, write or count to the same extent to which it can teach him to sing, paint, sculpture, swim, run, play a musical instrument or play basketball, that is, according to his individual capacity to perform and succeed in each of these fields. It can no more teach *all* children to read or count at the national average, than it can teach *all* children to sing or swim or sculpture or play basketball at the national average. But some people seem to feel that in a country as rich and powerful as ours *everybody* ought to be above the average, or, at the least, at the average.

This reminds me of the alchemists who for nearly two thousand years, with a tremendous effort and at a huge expense, tried to do what we now know cannot be done. But they and their sponsors had a deep emotional need to believe that it can be done, so they kept trying and went undeterred from defeat to defeat, always expecting to find success around the next corner.

For how much longer will we let our latter day alchemists set goals for our public schools?

A few months ago at the Senate hearings to which I referred earlier, the Superintendent of Detroit Public Schools, Dr. Norman Drachler, pleaded with the committee in a manner that seemed facetious but was deadly serious:

"I might add, gentlemen, if this committee could do anything for education and equality, it would be wonderful if you would pass an act that would outlaw the national norm. It is a monstrosity for the school system . . . As long as we have a norm, 50 percent must be below that norm."

This means not, I believe, that we should abolish the national average as a statistical tool, but that we should outlaw it as a norm which all children are expected to meet. If school officials pretend that they can bring *every* child up to a national norm, they are bound to disappoint and frustrate many children, to antagonize their parents, shake the confidence of wide sections of the public and, in the end, diminish the schools' chances of attaining even the goals which are within their competence.

But the belief in the magic power of the dollar dies hard in and out of Congress, particularly among the potential beneficiaries of a federal program.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 sharply expanded the compensatory education programs which had been initiated in several cities during the late 1950s or early 1960s. Congress was promised then—and has been promised several times since—that the added federal funds would enable the schools to raise to national norms the cognitive skills of "deprived" children who are lagging one or several years behind their schoolmates.

Now, five years later, we know that Title I has done nothing of the sort. Most compensatory education programs have not raised the arithmetic and reading performance of the "benefited" children. That is what President Nixon reported to the American people in his Education Message of March 3.

"We must stop letting wishes color our judgments about the educational effectiveness of many special compensatory programs, when—despite some dramatic and encouraging exceptions—there is growing evidence that most of them are not yet measurably improving the success of poor children in school.

" . . . *the best available evidence indicates that most of the compensatory education programs have not measurably helped poor children catch up.*

"Recent findings on the two largest such programs are particularly disturbing. We now spend more than $1 billion a year for educational programs run under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Most of these have stressed the teaching of reading, but before-and-after tests suggest that only 19% of the children in such programs improve their reading significantly; 13% appear to fall behind more than expected; and more than two-thirds of the children remain unaffected—that is, they continue to fall behind. In our Headstart program, where so much hope is invested, we find that youngsters enrolled only for the summer achieve almost no gains, and the gains of those in the program for a full year are soon matched by their non-Headstart classmates from similarly poor backgrounds."

Headstart has been called the most promising of all these programs, and it probably is: it has *promised* more than any other—but it has not delivered. We have been sending an increasing number of children to school at four years of age and at three, which is all to the good, though it has not produced lasting results. Some are now proposing that we start at birth. But the available evidence suggests that even intervention at birth may come about nine months late.

I could recite to you the failure of the Higher Horizons and More Effective Schools programs in New York City, of the Bannecker project in St. Louis, of the Madison project in Syracuse and of dozens of others. Virtually all of these projects were initiated and directed by experienced educators, resourceful and enthusiastic leaders such as Jacob Landers, Samuel Shepard, Mario Fantini, Carl Hansen, supported by large numbers of equally enthusiastic teachers. The "Pygmalion in the Classroom" charge of self-fulfilling low expectations is contrary to the truth. Most of the big city projects were staffed by men and women who sincerely believed that they would succeed in lifting their students' academic achievements to higher levels. But sooner or later they could no longer hide their failure, from themselves or from others.

Just five months ago, on May 21, Neil Sullivan, whom many of you remember as the superintendent of Berkeley schools until 1968, testified before a Senate committee:

"Berkeley, as most communities in 1964, with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, put its first money into compensatory education. We went the whole route, lowered class size, provided remedial reading teachers, bought the machines, did those things that we thought were right.

"The results after 2½ or 3 years clearly indicated that not only did the child in the inner city not improve, he had retrogressed."

That experience was repeated in city after city. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission reviewed the major compensatory education programs since 1957 and found that "none of these programs seems to have raised significantly the achievements of participating pupils."

More Effective Schools in New York City has now been going for seven years. Its 21 schools have an average teacher-pupil ratio of 1:11.7 and spent in 1967/68 $1,275 per pupil. A similar-sized district in Queens Borough (No. 25 with 23 schools) had a teacher-pupil ratio of 1:24.6, spent $671 per pupil. Sixth grade arithmetic scores (norm 6.4) averaged: in District 25, 7.0; in the MES schools, 5.2—almost two years behind.

But the parents in the MES schools had been promised by city and school officials years ago that their children would soon catch up and perform according to norm. Is it any wonder that they no longer trust those officials and harbor bitter resentment, which on several occasions has exploded into violence?

Mayor Lindsay said last year: "Our schools are the most lushly funded school system in the nation . . . it has the best teacher-pupil ratio of any city . . . but the management of the thing is such that we just don't get the production." (*New York Times*, June 6, 1969) Achievements in New York City schools are substantially below national average, and they continue to slip.

New York City's school chief admitted last December: "We have been spending a great deal of money on solutions which have little relation to the causes. Nobody knows why certain children are not profiting from the educational program. . . . Money is being spent on new gimmicks but nobody knows the cause and effect relationship. . . . We have offered all kinds of solutions but they are not producing results and nobody knows why." (*New York Times*, December 4, 1969)

If this is the conclusion of the head of the country's biggest school system, which is already spending more than twice the national average per pupil, how can we justify pouring huge additional funds into the country's largest and fastest growing industry, education—now spending at the rate of $70 billion a year—until we know what works and what will give our taxpayers a proper return on their hard-earned dollars?

This is why President Nixon proposed that we try to find out what produces results in education before we add multi-billion dollar programs to our present total of educational spending.

Accountability is a tool to concentrate the attention and efforts of officials who set school policy and of principals and teachers who carry it out, on making tangible progress toward the designated goals of the drive to lift the cognitive skills of lagging children. "For years," the President said, "the fear of 'national standards' has been one of the bugaboos of education." He explained that "success should be measured not by some fixed national norm, but rather by *the results achieved in relation to the actual situation of the particular school and the particular set of pupils.*" (Emphasis supplied.)

So we shall have to measure the skills and knowledge of children when they enter school and at stated intervals during their years of attendance. We must then evaluate their progress in the light of *their own* capacity for growth and compare it with the advance which other, similarly situated, children achieved in the same school or elsewhere. Acountability should help to stimulate teachers, principals and school systems to vie with each other in friendly competition for the most effective instructional methods.

To conduct, sponsor, expand and strengthen research into instructional methods, the

President proposed to Congress the establishment of a National Institute of Education. It should help to find answers to some of the hundreds of questions which are puzzling those trying to solve our educational problems.

Here are some of the questions I would ask: Which are the most effective methods of teaching arithmetic, reading, writing to children who show little interest in those skills nor seem to possess much talent for them? Should we force all pupils into a Procrustes bed of standard curricula and national norms although we know that some children are tall and some are short, educationally speaking? Would it be more effective to shape various curricula to conform to children's differential capacities instead of trying to adjust all children to a uniform mold? If so, what goals should we set and how? Should we continue our present school structure, should we try new organizational ideas, or should we follow the pattern that prevails throughout most of the rest of the world? What is the potential of programed learning (machines), movies and other mechanical methods of instruction? Should we work largely through the public schools or should we try to broaden the variety of offerings by getting private schools involved, as much as possible? Admittedly, these are leading questions, dealing with highly controversial subjects.

The Office of Education and the Office of Economic Opportunity recently sponsored a few projects aimed to find answers to some of these questions. A far greater variety of instructional methods could be tested by free market methods if parents were given a choice in the type of school to which they want to send their children. At this time, the nearest (or assigned) public school enjoys a virtual monopoly because not many parents can afford to pay the high charges that private schools must demand which sustain themselves from tuitions. This could be remedied by a voucher plan which is now being tried out. NEA, AFT and other groups strongly oppose the voucher plan—whose results could prove embarrassing if some private schools succeeded where public schools failed. Income tax credits for school taxes or tuitions are another—and in my opinion more effective—way of reducing the economic penalty for the exercise of parental freedom of choice in the selection of a school.

The advantages and disadvantages of voucher and tax credit plans are also being explored by the President's Commission on School Finance.

James Coleman advanced another idea which is now being tested: performance contracting. Instruction is farmed out to a private school or organization whose fee is geared to the pupils' measured progress in the cognitive skills. This idea is as obnoxious as the voucher plan to those who believe in the superiority of the monopoly approach to education.

In conclusion: Much thinking will need to be revised, many long-established practices altered, if we are to succeed in preparing children from low-income backgrounds more effectively than we have so far for the social and occupational demands of life in the last third of the twentieth century. The needed changes will extend to many public policies and institutions. But the schools will of necessity play a key role in the process of turning children into self-sustaining adults, able to take their proper place and meet their responsibilities in our society. This is why those to whom the schools are entrusted will have to accept a greater responsibility for their product than they have in the past. I trust that they will live up to that responsibility.

(Address by Roger A. Freeman)

The demand for a "reordering of national priorities" has been strong in recent years and appears to be growing in intensity and power, as time goes on. It rests on the basic proposition that military expenditures have risen out of proportion in the past few decades and need to be cut back, while civilian public services have been starved, in absolute as well as in relative terms, and should be lifted to substantially higher levels. Thus the drive to reorder national priorities aims to multiply public funds for domestic functions, particularly in the field of social welfare, and to clip defense appropriations commensurately.

This movement is composed of two groups allied in a common strategy:

1. Those to whom for ideological reasons military activities are anathema, particularly when engaged in by the United States and other Western nations, and who therefore profess and pursue pacifist aims in this country.

2. Those who desire primarily to expand domestic public services as an effective instrument for the redistribution of income and who recognize defense cutbacks as a politically more palatable and therefore more promising source of funds than the available alternatives. They recognize the limitation to a boost in the funds for public assistance, urban renewal, environmental improvements, schools and colleges and dozens of similar programs if it is to be financed solely from the annual increase in federal revenues resulting from economic growth. They know that larger budgetary deficits lack widespread appeal at this time when rapid inflation has become one of the nation's most painful and intractable problems. And they are aware of the fact that to finance the proposed expansion in federal domestic programs by jacking up tax rates is politically even less attractive. Federal taxes are already at exorbitant levels because expenditures are so high. Everybody knows that federal spending has been soaring over the past ten or twenty years, far outpacing the growth rate of the nation's economy. Everybody, that is, who has not looked at the record.

The record shows that federal expenditures increased at about the same rate as the gross national product (GNP) or personal income (PI) over the past ten years, in fact for nearly twenty years. Since 1952 the federal budget has almost exactly tripled, as did GNP and PI.

This seems to suggest that we experienced over the past two decades, a balanced growth in governmental spending, when many people thought that we were living through times of runaway, spendthrift budgets. But it only *seems* balanced growth, until we analyze the component of budgetary growth: the share of defense was cut nearly in half, while the share of domestic public services more than doubled. Defense costs went up 57% between 1952 and 1971 which is just barely ahead of the simultaneous rise in prices; in relative terms, defense fell from 66% of the total budget to 36%, from 13.6% of GNP to about 7.1%. Spending for domestic purposes meanwhile multiplied 7.6 times (+662%) and its share of the budget jumped from 17% to 47%; the remaining 17% of the budget went for interest, veterans, international affairs and space. Outlays for education, health and welfare multiplied 12.4 times (+1142%), for all other domestic purposes combined, 3.2 times (+219%).

Only one-fifth of the $130 billion increase in the federal budget between 1952 and 1971 was allocated to national defense.

Some may feel that historical comparisons of governmental costs should include not merely federal spending because many domestic public services are partly or wholly performed at state and local levels. Between 1952 and 1969* all governmental expenditures in the United States (federal-state-local combined) for domestic purposes increased 420%: for education 489%, income maintenance 694%, health and hospitals 286%, for all other domestic services 299%. The increase for defense was: 74%, which subsequent changes have since reduced to 57%.

Outlays for national defense equalled 50% of all governmental expenditures in 1952, declined to 28% in 1969 and may be estimated close to 24% in the current fiscal year.

Some may feel that 1952 is not an appropriate year for such comparisons, because it was a war year. Actually, there is nothing improper about comparing a year in the late stages of the Korean war with a year in the late stage of the Vietnam war. But let us trace the trend the defense outlays farther back historically. U.S. Armed Forces expenditures reached $2 billion in no year prior to 1941 except at the time of World War I. It was precisely the military impotence of the United States—and of other Western nations—that invited Hitler's aggression in the 1930s and caused Japan's leaders to think that they could attack the United States at Pearl Harbor with impunity and would prevail in the end. They were proven wrong—at a cost of at least twenty-five million lives, of untold human suffering and of material values and destruction running into trillions of dollars.

But we did not learn our lesson. The United States dismantled its defense establishment between 1945 and 1948, cutting outlays from $80 billion to $12 billion. This unilaterial disarmament prompted aggressive action by North Korea and Red China in which our Armed Forces barely escaped military disaster. The defense budget was then raised to $50 billion and is still at that level, if counted in dollars of constant value. The nations in the Communist orbit have meanwhile been increasing the magnitude and striking power of their military establishment.

It we are to define what the priorities of the United States ought to be over the next decade, we should first try to evaluate what the priorities accorded military and civilian purposes in the 1950s and 1960s have achieved. Of an estimated $230 billion increase in governmental expenditures (federal-state-local) between 1952 and FY 1971, about $27 billion (12%) was allocated to national defense, with most of the remainder going into domestic public services.

The United States has shifted "from the warfare state to the welfare state" during the past two decades. What harvest has it reaped over this changeover? What is the return on the $200 billion which we now invest each year in social welfare and other domestic services? What has been the effect of cutting the share of national defense from one-half of our combined public budgets to one-fourth?

At the very least we might expect to have come closer to the goals which the Founders of the Republic established: ". . . to insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare. . . ."

But the evidence is to the contrary. Crime, delinquency and most kinds of social ills, new and old, have been multiplying at a frightening rate, to a point where American citizens are now less safe than they have ever been—or than people are in most other countries, more divided and more bitter at each other. Nor have there ever before been such anarchy-like conditions in the United States—mob violence, arson, looting, terror bombing, wanton destruction, assault and killing of law officers—as we have seen in recent years, weeks and days. Educational institutions have become the breeding places, and often the cause, of civic strife and contempt of law. Schools and colleges rank lower now in the respect and affection of the American people than they have at any time. This, despite the fact that in the current year we are spending $73 billion for educa-

---

*The latest year for which these data are presently available.

tion—almost as much as all of the world's other nations combined. The core of many of our large cities has become a festering sore. After spending billions on urban renewal, slum clearance, public or publicly subsidized housing over the past two decades, we find that those programs have destroyed many more dwellings than they have built.

I cannot, in this short presentation, give you the details or specifics on the failure of hundreds of well-meant but ill-conceived social welfare programs. Let me cite how President Nixon summarized the picture for the nation's governors slightly over a year ago:

"We confronted the fact that in the past five years the Federal Government alone has spent more than a quarter of a trillion dollars on social problems—over $250 billion. Yet far from solving our problems, these expenditures had reaped a harvest of dissatisfaction, frustration, and bitter division.

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

But there are many sincere people who claim that there is nothing wrong with these programs that could not—or would not—be cured by doubling or tripling their amounts. So they demand a "reordering of national priorities" in the 1970s, a further shift from military to civilian purposes.

A "reordering of national priorities" is truly called for—but in the opposite direction, if our national defense is to serve its task.

Rates of increase in the spending for military or other purposes or changes in the percentage which those outlays equal of the total budget or GNP, do not, in themselves prove whether the amounts are too big or too small. The only meaningful way to measure the adequacy of our military preparedness is by the power of the countries against which we may have to defend ourselves some day. By that yardstick we fall woefully short. Our international position and our defensive strength reached their apex at the end of World War II and have been slipping ever since. Held against the power of its potential enemies the United States has never been as weak as it is now.

With a planned appropriation of $73 billion in the current fiscal year and over 3 million men in uniform, our defense establishment offers a mighty and imposing sight. But the crucial point is that our adversaries have for many years been building up their military strength while ours has been diminishing. The USSR is winning the arms race, the USA the disarmament race. It is not widely known that much of the Vietnam operations was carried on by depleting the rest of our defense establishment of its best men and equipment. We are now left with "Swiss cheese" defenses as the case of the Pueblo, of a reconnaissance plane downed by the North Koreans, of a Cuban MIG17 flight to Florida's Homestead Air Force base, and similar incidents prove.

We still enjoyed a decisive military superiority over the Soviet Union at the time of the Cuban missile crisis in 1962—which is why the Russians yielded to President Kennedy's ultimatum to reverse the course of their missile-carrying naval vessels which were then steaming toward Cuba.

In discussions with Russian officials in Moscow, a few months ago, I was told that they had resolved in 1962 to see to it that the Soviet Government would never again have to back down in a future confrontation with the United States. Next time they will call our bluff.

When I watched the Mayday Parade in Moscow's Red Square, just six months ago, standing only a few feet from Mr. Kosygin, Mr. Breshnev and Marshall Grechko, I was surprised to see no military hardware, no big weapons, such as I had observed there in years past. Had the Soviets finally turned peaceful? They gave the answer yesterday at the Revolution Day Parade when they again displayed their arsenal on Red Square, for all visitors to see and take note.

Not that the Soviet Union were planning to start a war with the United States, or that Red China is. They hope that a war may in the end not be necessary. They believe that they may achieve their immutable goal of Communist world domination without a war if current trends continue long enough because the United States will eventually be in no position to resist any action or demands or provocation with which our adversaries may someday choose to face us, close to our shores or anywhere in the world.

Moscow has been pushing one of the greatest armament programs ever, pulled abreast of us in many respects, is ahead of us in land-based intercontinental missiles, missile-launching and other submarines, antiballistic missiles and in several other major weapons systems. The Soviets are headed for a clear-cut arms superiority within a few years.

It takes five to ten years to develop, test, produce, and deploy a major weapons system. What we do now about our missiles and missile defense, about the F–14 and F–15 fighters, the MBT–70 main battle tank, C–5A cargo plane (whose fleet was cut from 120 to 81), the AMSA (advanced manned strategic aircraft)—now to be implemented as the M–1 new strategic bomber—the nuclear carriers and submarine programs will decide whether our defenses will be strong in the second half of the 1970's and beyond or whether the United States will have to yield to nuclear or other forms of blackmail. The Joint Chiefs appear to be fighting a losing battle. We seem to have declared an open season on national defense.

The frightening facts were made known in recent months by several of our leading military experts. They were presented as somber warnings to his colleagues in a speech on September 3, 1969, by the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee Senator John Stennis and by his counterpart in the House, Representative Mendel Rivers, on September 28, 1970, who told the lawmakers that "we seem hell-bent on national suicide." But the House, on October 8, cut defense appropriations $2 billion below the President's recommendations.

IN SUMMARY

Our national priorities must be recorded in the decade ahead if the United States is to survive as a nation. The trend of shifting huge resources into so-called social welfare programs, at the expense of our military preparedness, which prevailed during the 1952-1971 period must be reversed. We must review hundreds of domestic programs, compare their output with their input, measure in each case the tangible return which our taxpayers receive on their huge investment, and weed out or revise those with little or no return.

We will inevitably make some mistakes, but such mistakes can be corrected—in domestic programs. We may have no chance for a second guess, get no opportunity for a second try, in national defense. If we miss the first time, if we are not adequately prepared against our opponents to begin with, we may never get a second chance. The two oceans which shielded us till World War II have long since been made ineffective by technological progress. If at first we don't succeed—we are through.

Time is running out. If we do not act decisively now and in the decade ahead, we may be known in future history books as the generation that inherited America from its fathers, and lost it because we were too short sighted to preserve it for our children, too occupied with trivial day to day conveniences to assure the survival of free government in this world.

This must not happen.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE STUDENT STORY

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in this day and age, it is altogether too easy to paint a negative picture of the students at our colleges and universities. We are continually bombarded with stories of how our students are rioting, bombing, and generally disrupting our campuses. For this reason, it is especially heartening to hear of some of the constructive activities of students. The following press release from the University of Iowa, and the clipping from the Des Moines Sunday Register describe some of these constructive activities of students at the University. I, for one, am convinced that the students described in the release and clipping are much more representative of the student body as a whole than those we see so frequently on the television and in the headlines:

U OF I STUDENTS SPREAD CHRISTMAS SPIRIT

IOWA CITY.—University of Iowa students are helping to spread the Christmas spirit in the Iowa City area this season via gifts, songs, parties and food to the shut-ins and needy.

Delta Delta Delta social sorority and Pi Kappa Alpha social fraternity gave a supper party for children from Psychopathic Hospital Wednesday (Dec. 9) evening at the sorority house. The same night Alpha Chi Omega sorority members entertained fifth graders from Horace Mann School.

Thursday evening, members of Alpha Xi Delta sorority gave a party for the patients at the Beverly Manor Convalescent Center. Nearly 100 children and tutors from HACAP are guests this afternoon (Dec. 11) at a party sponsored by the advisors and men of Rienow II. Other dormitory housing units have contributed money for gifts and a buffet supper for the children at the Rienow II party.

Kappa Kappa Gamma coeds are entertaining handicapped children at University Hospital today, also. Alpha Gamma Delta sorority members are preparing Christmas baskets of food to give to the Johnson County Social Welfare Department.

Tuesday evening the men of Tau Kappa Epsilon fraternity and members of Alpha Phi sorority will sing carols for patients in the Veterans Administration Hospital. In addition to delivering cookies to shut-ins, whose names were provided by Iowa City church groups, members of Kappa Alpha Theta sorority and Phi Epsilon Pi fraternity will sing carols at the Iowa City Extended Care Center.

Residents at the Johnson County Home also will have carolers Tuesday from Alpha Delta Pi sorority and Lambda Chi Alpha fraternity.

Because they found that several hospitals already have many Christmas visits and other festivities scheduled by campus and civic groups, several U of I residence units have postponed their entertainments until later this winter.

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, Dec. 13, 1970]

U OF I DORM HOSTS PARTY FOR NEEDY

(By Larry Eckholt)

IOWA CITY, IOWA.—Several hundred young people—most of them University of Iowa (U of I) students—jammed into a men's dormitory lounge here Friday afternoon, in part to see and hear a bearded, long-haired fel-

low and, in part, to spread messages of "Love" and "Peace on Earth."

The throng drew the interest of several top university officials—including the U of I president, the dean of students and a vice provost—who mingled with the young people.

CHRISTMAS PARTY

The occasion: A festive Christmas party for underprivileged children where students demonstrated the spirit of the Yuletide season to more than 100 happy guests of honor.

Friday's party was just one of more than a dozen events in which U of I students are helping to spread Christmas cheer to shut-ins and the needy this holiday season.

Sponsoring the party were residents and staff of Rienow II, a high-rise mens' dormitory. Special guests included about 70 children and their tutors from the Hawkeye Area Community Action Program (HACAP) and many children and their parents from South Park, the residential area adjacent to the men's dormitory complex.

There was plenty to do.

One little boy spent a lot of time preparing a sandwich made of minced ham and potato chips.

Other children made new friends, played games or listened to Christmas carols.

BIG ATTRACTION

Of course, Santa Claus was the big attraction. He and his helpers (including a vivacious Mrs. Santa whose name is Shirley Allen, a sophomore from Des Moines) distributed more than 200 presents to the children.

The gifts were donated by students. About 100 leftover presents will be donated to University Hospitals here where they will be given to hospitalized children, said Craig Waters, social chairman of the event, and a sophomore from Clarendon Hills, Ill.

U OF I PRESIDENT WILLARD BOYD STOPPED IN FOR A LOOK

When it was all over, Rienow II residents had an ecological disaster to clean up. Pop cans, paper plates, olive pits and all. But it was worth it.

Said Waters: When you see all of the happy kids, it makes you happy."

OTHER PARTIES

Other parties sponsored by U of I students last week included a supper party for children from Psychopathic Hospital given by Delta Delta Delta social sorority and Pi Kappa Alpha social fraternity and a party for patients from a local nursing home sponsored by Alpha Xi Delta sorority.

Alpha Gamma Delta sorority members are preparing Christmas baskets of food to be distributed by the Johnson County Department of Social Services. Other residence groups are planning to sing carols and deliver cookies to hundreds of patients in the area.

In fact, hospital officials report that so many Christmas visits and other festivities have been scheduled by campus and civic groups here that several U of I residence units have postponed their merrymaking until later this winter.

YOUTH RECEIVES AWARD FOR SAVING LIFE

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, America has carved herself out of the wilderness in less than 200 years to become the greatest country on the face of the earth, primarily because of the determination and dedication of her people. We always hear about the minority of our youth who are troublemakers and so many times the great actions of patriotism and heroism go unnoticed.

I have been notified by my friend, George M. Elsey, of the office of the American National Red Cross with headquarters here in Washington, D.C., of an act of mercy taken by one of my constituents, Mr. Tim Sutton, Rural Route 1, Harrisburg, Ill. Tim has been named to receive the Red Cross Certificate of Merit which is the highest award given by the American Red Cross to a person who saves a life by using skills learned in a Red Cross first aid, small craft, and water safety course. Young Tim Sutton saved the life of a child at the Harrisburg Park Pool on August 20, 1970.

I am enclosing a copy of Mr. Elsey's letter setting forth the details of this heroic action. I am indeed proud to represent such fine constituents and I commend the reading of the letter to my colleagues and offer my thanks and congratulations to this fine American boy.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL
RED CROSS, NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable KENNETH J. GRAY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRAY: I wish to call to your attention a noteworthy act of mercy undertaken by one of your constituents, Mr. Tim Sutton, Rural Route 1, Harrisburg, Illinois 62946, who has been named to receive the Red Cross Certificate of Merit. This is the highest award given by the American Red Cross to a person who saves a life by using skills learned in a Red Cross first aid, small craft, or water safety course. The Certificate bears the signatures of the President of the United States, Honorary Chairman, and E. Roland Harriman, Chairman of the American National Red Cross. Presentation will be made by the Saline County Chapter.

On August 20, 1970, at the Harrisburg Park Pool, a child called to Mr. Sutton that a boy had gone under and not come up. Mr. Sutton brought the victim to the surface and immediately began artificial respiration as he was not breathing. He then pulled the boy out of the water on to the deck and resumed artificial respiration until he was breathing normally. The rescuer administered first aid for shock until the ambulance arrived. The attending physician at the hospital stated that Mr. Sutton had undoubtedly saved the victim's life.

Mr. Sutton's action exemplifies the highest ideal of the concern of one human being for another who is in distress.

Sincerely,

GEORGE M. ELSEY.

GOVERNMENT MEDICAL SCENE: THE VA AND MILITARY HOSPITALS

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker. In recent months there has been considerable discussion of the Veterans' Administration's hospital system. Not too long ago a national magazine published a graphic article on the conditions of some of these hospitals. The article examined the conditions, I hope, in an attempt to evoke some constructive concern, and this is always good. However, I think the article involved a certain amount of sensationalism and omitted to deal with some of the efforts to improve veterans' hospitals.

Accordingly, I want to include in the RECORD an article which indicates the high priority the veterans' hospitals have with the present administration. I think we all agree that it is important that veterans' hospitals continue to provide high quality medical care to our nation's veterans.

The article follows:

GOVERNMENT'S MEDICAL SCENE: THE VA AND MILITARY HOSPITALS

(By Leon Schloss)

Only 45 years ago the United States spent a total of $4 billion to run the entire Federal establishment. Today—this year—the U.S. will spend more than that amount alone on the operation of military and veterans hospitals and medical-related fields.

This medical complex is easily the largest in the Free World—probably in the entire world. The two largest operations are the Veterans Administration (VA) and the military services, whose expenditures are about $2 billion apiece.

VA runs 166 hospitals with 125,000 operating beds, employing a staff of 157,000, including 5,000 full-time physicians, 10,000 part-time physicians, 700 full-time and 500 part-time dentists, and 16,000 full-time nurses.

Comparatively, the military services have 222 hospitals with 51,000 operating beds and a staff of 150,000.

Where such sums are involved there are inevitably critics. VA Administrator Donald E. Johnson does not take this lightly—much of which alleges that the Administration is cutting back on medical care and rehabilitation of Vietnam veterans. He told *Government Executive:*

"Only a little more than six months ago, President Nixon asked for $15 million more for Veteran Administration medical care than had been appropriated by Congress. Part of this extra money was used to hire nearly 1,800 additional full-time medical personnel.

"The President's initial VA medical care request for the Fiscal Year 1971 was $160 million greater than the initially approved appropriation for Fiscal Year 1970, and he upped this request by another $50 million even before Congress had acted on his original recommendations.

"As a result," Johnson continued, "VA's 166 hospitals are now operating at an expenditure level $210 greater than the initially approved appropriation for the last fiscal year. The extra money requested by the President will permit VA to add 5,700 more medical employees, bringing full-time medical employment to nearly 138,000—the biggest work force in the history of VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery. I submit that these fiscal facts by no means support the contention that VA hospital care has been 'cut by the Administration' or the statement that VA hospitals are providing 'inadequate medical care because of shortages in funds and personnel.'"

Vietnam casualties understandably much in the headlines today amount to only 10 percent of the VA medical burden.

Construction of hospitals is expensive. But the VA and military services feel that the new generation of facilities will lower end-costs of treatment through such advances as automated physical examination and the latest recording, evaluation and analysis techniques.

In Fiscal Year 1970 the military spent $52 million on hospital construction. The VA in Fiscal Year 1969 had $72 million worth of new construction in place and projected an overall estimated construction cost at $295 million. In addition, VA had $121 million worth of modernization projects in work, $10 million of which was in place.

Less than a month ago the Defense Department announced completion of studies of a health care system designed to provide its new generation of hospitals for the late 1970s. The studies were done by Westinghouse Electric Corp. of Pittsburgh, Pa. (at a cost of $892,000), and Arthur D. Little Inc., of Cambridge, Mass. (at a cost of $712,065).

The studies provide a detailed systems analysis of selected military hospitals, outpatient clinics and dispensaries to determine areas and procedures which eventually could lead to significant improvements in DOD hospital design, assignment of staff and cost of operation. Final reports will be available early next month.

The initial research disclosed that a 10 percent potential reduction in facility operating costs might be realized by using a computer-assisted planning scheme for design; by reorganizing ambulatory and intensive care subsystems; by building light-care (self-help) beds; by increasing automation in laboratory and radiology departments, and by using convenience food systems.

There also could be potential reduction in the need for scarce physicians, dentists and nurses by utilizing highly trained corpsmen as doctor assistants.

Certain recommendations (automation, light-care beds) will be tested in existing hospitals. Long-range plans include construction of a prototype hospital to be used as a development testbed for the new generation of hospital concept.

VA's Chief Medical Director, Marc J. Musser, cites a number of advancements in research and treatment. Among them:

New therapeutic techniques arrived at by medical research have made it possible to treat more patients without a corresponding increase in beds.

Breakthroughs in treatment of mental disease through use of tranquilizers and psychic energizers.

Research results which make tuberculosis no longer the serious problem it once was. VA no longer has to devote entire hospitals to TB patients.

Establishment of 50 cardiac catheterization units to diagnose heart disease better. Coronary care units have been established to preserve the lives of victims immediately following heart attacks. VA pioneered in open heart surgery and devised the "pacemaker" which electronically regulates the human heartbeat.

VA trains each year in its hospitals 40,000 medical specialists who take their skills to communities throughout the country. A training goal of 87,000 trainees has been set for 1975.

Other research milestones include organ transplants and progress with artificial kidneys. VA has the largest system of artificial kidneys in the world, with dialysis units available at more than 30 VA hospitals.

Advanced treatment of emphysema, the lung disease that affects half the male population of the United States.

Rehabilitation centers for the blind have been established. Research projects now include an electronic "reading machine" and a cane using laser beams to warn the user of overhanging hazards or such obstacles as curbs, furniture, holes or stairwells.

Tremendous progress in sensory aids and prosthetics. Some patients are now being fitted with artificial legs immediately following the amputation operation. Other developments give amputees new mobility and dexterity.

During Fiscal Year 1969 VA treated 800,000 patients in both VA facilities and non-VA hospitals—the largest number in VA history. Care was also provided to out-patients, who made 7,000,000 visits to VA clinics or fee-basis physicians during the year.

To give the picture for an average day in FY '69, one would find 93,000 patients in VA hospitals, 2,000 in non-VA hospitals, 12,400 in VA domiciliaries, 7,140 in state domiciliary homes, 600 in VA restoration centers, 3,700 in VA nursing home care units, 2,153 patients in state nursing homes, 3,177 in private nursing homes. All of this is done at an operating cost of only $52 per patient per day. Medicare reimburses community hospitals $78 per patient per day.

Veterans with service-connected disabilities can get treatment at a VA hospital regardless of their financial condition. But this was not the case, until recently, for veterans with disabilities not connected with their service. Before they could be admitted to a VA hospital patients were required to certify that they were "unable to defray the expenses of necessary medical care." This was the so-called "pauper's oath."

Under legislation recently signed into law by President Nixon, a provision authored by Sen. Alan Cranston (D-Calif.), chairman of the Veterans Affairs subcommittee, eliminates the "pauper's oath" for veterans 65 or older and veterans of any age who receive a pension for nonservice-connected total and permanent disability.

The paradox here is that the U.S. will actually save $8.5 million a year under the new law. Explanation: these veterans are automatically eligible for admission to civilian hospitals under Government-sponsored Medicare, regardless of their income. And Medicare, as stated above, costs the taxpayer about $26 a day more per patient.

VA Administrator Johnson, pursuing the Vietnam veteran situation, said: "The Vietnam veteran is the 'now' veteran. He has fought perhaps the loneliest war in history and now must be recognized and rewarded for his service. The facts indicate that he is being recognized and rewarded on an increasingly encouraging scale, especially in the vital area of education and training.

"I tell you today that, contrary to recent criticism of VA medicine by some news media, by some public officials, and by others, you need not doubt the quality or the availability of VA hospital and medical care. This year we will care for nearly 800,000 veterans, the greatest number in history—nearly 2,000 more than we cared for just 12 years ago.

"Expenditures for medical research this year will exceed $59 million, another all-time high. We will place under contract the largest volume of hospital construction in 21 years.

"Concerning the high and improving quality of VA hospital and medical care, you don't have to take my word for it. Just ask the tens of thousands of veterans whose lives have been saved in the past five years because of the existence of intensive care coronary, medical and surgical units in VA hospitals."

Johnson continued: "I want to make clear my intention that our VA hospitals are going to admit all veterans entitled to and in need of such care—the chronically ill as well as the acutely ill. Patients will not be rejected because of the character of their illness."

The U.S. has 28 million living veterans who, with their dependents and the survivors of deceased veterans, constitute nearly half the population of the entire country.

In building up the quality of the VA medical system to care for these millions, VA has established affiliations with most medical schools. To strengthen these affiliations, VA has located its new hospitals near medical schools. The association has benefitted both institutions by blending the demands of the Free World's largest medical system with the high standards and goals of the academic world of medicine. VA doctors frequently are awarded faculty appointments and the cross-fertilization improves both the quality of the hospitals and the schools.

SENATOR HOLLAND IS A MAN FOR THE AGES

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, at the close of this Congress, a giant of our time will relinquish his seat in the U.S. Senate. When U.S. Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND completes this term, it will bring to a close the public career of the finest man ever to serve in that body and a man I respect and admire as no other.

This feeling is shared by the people of Florida who have honored him with the highest responsibilities within their power to bestow. I think it a tremendous tribute to say that they have never regretted any of those decisions.

If there is one word that I think would best typify Senator HOLLAND, it would be integrity. Men might disagree with him, but I have never met a man who did not respect him. He is that sort of rare individual.

And no tribute to Senator HOLLAND could ever be complete without mention of his charming wife, Mary. She is still first in the hearts of Floridians since the day she graced our State mansion as the wife of our greatest Governor.

There is something about this good and gracious lady that causes all of us to love and respect her as we do the Senator. She is that helpmate that made everything he did worthwhile.

Senator HOLLAND is a native of Florida, born in Bartow on July 18, 1892. A graduate of Emory University in 1912, he received his law degree from the University of Florida in 1916. At Florida he evidenced the unique qualities of leadership he has shown all of his life as he served as president of the student body.

He returned to Bartow after graduation to begin the practice of law and was named outstanding prosecuting attorney of Polk County in 1921. Thus, a fabulous career of public service was initiated.

In 1920, he was elected county judge and served two terms. In 1932, he was elected to the Florida State Senate and immediately he became a State leader. It was here that he gained the attention of the people of our great State and people still remember the distinguished service he rendered in that office.

From 1941–45 he served as Governor of Florida and there has never been a man who served in that office who left that position of trust with more respect and admiration than did SPESSARD HOLLAND. Those were difficult times for this Nation was engaged in World War II.

He was nominated for the U.S. Senate

in the campaign of 1946 and was appointed to serve in September of that year when Senator Charles O. Andrews passed away. Now 24 years later, he is ending his fourth term with the same respect and admiration which has followed him in every trust which has been thrust upon his shoulders.

Much has been said and will be said about Senator HOLLAND in the coming days. His record of public service is well known, but I would like to address myself more to a man whom I respect and whose friendship and guidance I have cherished.

When I came to the Congress some 8 years ago, I suppose I was like most freshmen Members who have to learn their way. This great and good man was never too busy to assist a new Member—to offer him encouragement and guidance. It would not be inaccurate to say that I owe him more than I would ever be able to repay.

It is my hope that I can in some way follow in his footsteps in service to my great State—and I would say to all those who come after us that this is the man to emulate.

To his union with Mary Groover were born four children and today, I pay tribute to a loving husband and wife, father, and mother, grandfather, and grandmother.

This is a life that has been lived fully. This is a life that all of us can respect and admire.

As he leaves the Halls of Congress, I can state with feeling that no finer man ever honored these Chambers with his presence.

As he walks down the corridors for the last time as a U.S. Senator, he can do so with the full knowledge that for many of us, this was truly a man for the ages.

Florida and this Nation can never forget his service as long as honor, integrity, ability, and dignity are cherished.

Truly, this is a man for the ages.

OREGON'S HAPPY PLACE

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, at a time when urban problems grab the headlines it is refreshing to read about towns which do not suffer from filthy air, soaring crime rates, and traffic congestion.

In the December, 1970 issue of Esquire magazine there is an article titled "Nine Happy Places." They are described as "communities in America where the kids look like the ones Norman Rockwell used to paint, and the scenery at the end of the town appears to have been created by some kind of omnipotent being."

One of those happy places in Asland, Oreg., a town of about 12,000 in the Fourth Congressional District.

That portion of the article is included for the enjoyment of my colleagues:

ASHLAND, OREGON

There is a line in *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* to the effect that every exit is an entrance to somewhere else. It always draws elbow nudges from playgoers at the Ashland, Oregon, Shakespearean Festival's modern indoor theatre, where *R & G are D* alternates daily with *The Merchant of Venice*. Ashland is the "somewhere else" to which many of its residents fled from busier places. It is sophisticated, as the thirty-five-year-old Shakespearean Festival implies, but not uptight. While the modern and Elizabethan plays alternate indoors, three Shakespeare plays rotate daily on the outdoor stage of a perfect replica of the 1599 Fortune Theatre of London, which is snugged up against a tranquil swan lake beneath the forested Siskiyou mountains. Some of the citizens like to describe their town as a "movie set" New England village in southwestern Oregon, but it is more like a mature Sausalito or a tranquilized Westport, which is to say that there is a lot going on but no one gets in a swivet about it. The surroundings are a calming influence. Geraniums, pansies, daffodils, tulips and a profusion of wildflowers bloom on the parkway that divides the main street. Wild berries grow up the telephone poles, and townspeople pick them to make boysenberry pies which some of them sell in little roadside stands. Kids are encouraged to swim in Ashland Creek, well-stocked so they can fish there, too. People who own horses ride them along woodsy trails every day. Skiers skim across unpolluted Lake of the Woods above town in the summer (there is *no* pollution of air or water around Ashland), and in the winter they go to Mount Ashland, where there are five ski lifts and a modern lodge. Rugged hikers use the wilderness trails, but down in the village there is a more cultivated area called Lithia Park, designed by John McLaren, who designed Golden Gate Park in San Francisco.

"It's just what a park should be," said a newcomer who had just emerged from it. "It's about a mile long. It starts off with a swan pond and you follow a dirt path past fountains (of Lithia mineral springwater, free to anyone who wants it), a little museum, then a mini-zoo, with some peacocks and monkeys, and then a deer park where you can pet the deer. It all just happens." The streets, all tree-shaded, are lined with comfortable frame houses. Solid old Victorians, squared off on ample, well-landscaped lawns that really *are* greener (because of the clean 2000-foot-high air and mineral water), sell for $15,000 or $16,000. Taxes are low, too, about a third of what they are in a comparable Westchester County, New York, village. Even so, the public schools are reputedly among the best in Oregon. The townspeople are an agreeable mixture of ranchers, small businessmen, academics and students at Ashland's Southern Oregon College. The crime business is slow, and arrests are only seventy percent of the national average. There are ten local doctors who will make house calls and a community hospital is available for serious cases. Cabdrivers are no problem, since almost everyone drives his own car. They park when they like, free; the town fathers explain that Ashland folks just don't like parking meters. For most of them it takes no more than three or four minutes to get to work in the local fruit-packing, lumber, wood-products or steel-fabrication industries. "One of the joys of living here," says a haberdasher, "is that Oregon is still a small state, and the chances are you're going to meet the Governor or a senator somewhere along the line, so you have a feeling of involvement." One day, he says, the Governor came alone into his store and bought a pair of Bermuda shorts. "I don't know where else in this country you could find a thing like that."

HEROIC ATTEMPT TO RESCUE POW'S

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the recent expedition into North Vietnam in an attempt to rescue some of our prisoners of war has evoked praise from all parts of the country.

I have long been saddened by the lack of good faith in the negotiations on the part of the North Vietnamese. In view of their refusal for a prisoner exchange, so heavily in their favor, and the absence of other signs of desire for a negotiated settlement, the President was right in authorizing the attempting to return of our prisoners of war.

I have written letters to the North Vietnamese asking for humane treatment of the prisoners as specified in the Geneva Accord, but these letters have been met with silence. There has been no response whatsoever.

The overwhelming passage of the House Resolution 1282 commending the men involved in the rescue attempt, of which I was a cosponsor, is evidence of the concern for the welfare of these men by Members of Congress.

One of the finest editorials which I have read on this subject appeared in the Twin Falls Times-News on December 3, 1970. I therefore include this editorial as part of my remarks in commendation of those men participating in the rescue attempt of our men imprisoned in North Vietnam:

ACE IN THE HOLE

Of all the criticism that has been made of the unsuccessful attempt to rescue American prisoners of war from a camp near Hanoi, the least persuasive is that it may have set back peace negotiations with the North Vietnamese in Paris.

How do you set back something that has never really begun?

Even some senators, sharing the universal desire for an end to this ugly war, have lulled themselves in to the belief that if we just keep plugging away in Paris, if we are patient enough, the impossible dream of achieving a "just and lasting" peace with a regime (North Vietnam) that is and always will be dedicated to the overthrow of another regime (South Vietnam) will somehow be magically realized.

The belief persists in the face of the fact that the United States is, month by month, reducing its military strength in South Vietnam. By this time a year hence, we will once again be essentially advisers and suppliers to the South Vietnamese rather than active combatants capable of mounting ground offensives on any significant scale.

The North Vietnamese, against most historical precedent (although fully in keeping with Communist precedent), as well as against simple humanitarianism, have chosen to make the prisoner of war question a central issue in the over-all peace (sic) talks.

And why not? The prisoners constitute one of the strongest cards they hold in their hands, statements by some prominent Americans do nothing to weaken that card.

For example, said Sen. Edward M. Ken-

nedy in his response to the abortive rescue attempt:

"The quickest way you get the prisoners out is to announce that we're getting out lock, stock and barrel."

The only trouble with this is that the North Vietnamese may have a different understanding of "lock, stock and barrel" than does the senator or most other Americans.

They have not promised to release the prisoners of war once our troops are out of South Vietnam. They have said they will consider it at that time. There is nothing to stop them from raising the ante on the prisoners to include not only withdrawal of all U.S. troops but withdrawal of all U.S. support—of the Saigon government.

There is no end to the blackmail potential in their continued holding of American prisoners.

The North Vietnamese have spurned our offer of a prisoner exchange with a better than 10-to-one ratio in their favor. They refuse even to release the names of the prisoners. They have violated the Geneva Convention on prisoners of war in every respect.

Yet a daring attempt to rescue a few of them is questioned in the Senate as an abandonment by the Nixon administration of the negotiation process.

No senator said, if only for rhetorical effect, and at the risk of sparking an eruption on some campus:

"The quickest way you can get the prisoners out is for this body, this government, the nation, to make it plain to the North Vietnamese that there will be no more withdrawals and no more negotiations until an exchange of prisoners is agreed upon."

There seems to be an unspoken but definite feeling abroad in the land that all guilt for this war rest with the United States and that whatever happens to our fighting men held prisoners is part of the price we must pay for our sins.

We are thus left with the faint hope that somebody, out of the goodness of their hearts, the North Vietnamese will forgive us and will permit these unfortunate men, those who survive, to return to their homes and families.

We call it "negotiations."

PLIGHT OF SOVIET JEW

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the Soviet Jew continues to cry out for justice. In these United States where the right to pray, to speak, to write, and to assemble are sacrosanct it is often difficult to imagine the difficulties that the Jew in the U.S.S.R. experiences in the pursuit of his faith.

However, we in the Western World can draw a close comparison with recent historical events. Not very long ago, Hitler's storm troopers marched across the European continent systematically annihilating 6 million Jews in their wake. The concentration camps and ovens of Auschwitz and Dachu and others will live in infamy as the most gruesome example of man's inhumanity to man in the history of civilization.

The Soviet Union, having studied the crime of Hitler, is now attempting to accomplish the same end only in a more sophisticated, virtually bloodless fashion.

This process in contrast to the tactics employed by the Nazis will have the effect of eliminating the Jews from the territorial limits of the U.S.S.R. without provoking the anger of the world community because of its subtlety. It becomes incumbent on all people of good will to make their voices heard now before it is too late.

How do they do this? The Jew is denied religious freedom. Through intimidation, discrimination and an oppressive bureaucratic attitude all Jews, and especially the young, find it virtually impossible and undesirable to practice their faith.

Moreover, they continue to deny those Jews who would voluntarily leave the country the right to migrate to Israel. One is easily reminded of the plea of the prophet before the Egyptian pharoahs. Were Moses alive today, he would certainly call out to the Russian pharoahs saying not simply, "Let my people go." but "Let them go—let them go to Israel."

Recently, in New York, there were demonstrations against the Soviet treatment of the 3.5 million Jews in the U.S.S.R. Although these demonstrations led to violence—which I cannot condone—it is easy to understand the deep emotions that motivated their actions.

For those demonstrating, the specter of a Third Reich rising again in the U.S.S.R. is clear. For those Jews held in bondage in their homeland, persecution and discrimination are very real. We in America whose tearful memories apparently fade with the passage of the years should never forget. Which of you, I ask, were the descendants of slaves and now are free? And which of you were immigrants in a strange land and now find a home? And which of you were poor and now find prosperity?

The fact is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which was unanimously adopted by the members of the United Nations in 1948 clearly permits freedom of movement within and without of one's country.

It says in part:

Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the border of each state.

Everyone has the right to leave any country including his own and return to his country.

I would hope that the Soviets will respect the spirit of the United Nations Charter and its declarations. And I hope they would think back to their own suffering under the czar and at the hands of Hitler long enough to show compassion to another suffering group, the Jews of the Soviet Union.

THE DAY OUR FLAG SPOKE

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a constituent from my district, Mr. George T. Nickolas, has written a most eloquent story about our flag. His article was one of the 1968 winners of the Freedom Foundation's George Washington Honor Medal Award. The article was reprinted in the Davenport Times-Democrat through the courtesy of Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co. I want to share this patriotic tribute with my colleagues:

THE DAY OUR FLAG SPOKE

(By George T. Nickolas)

The other day as I watched our Flag fluttering in the breeze, I was amazed to hear its cordial salutation: "Good morning, Citizen!" I was taken by surprise, and not knowing what to say, could only stammer, because what does one say to a Flag?

"You seem disturbed as you watch me waving in the breeze and I thought that you needed someone to talk to," responded our Flag. "Yes, Sir!" I replied. "I am disturbed by the actions of my fellow countrymen in the past few years—the abuse of freedoms in the name of freedom, the dishonor that is being wrought upon you, and the lack of patriotic display of your beauty."

"Citizen," the Flag began, "I can tell you of many actions in the past that are equal to the difficulties that are causing the torment in your heart today. I have seen the passing of many generations under my shadow. The Government of our country has changed its complexion many times without violent revolution.

"The democratic process of our country enables all of us to try things which are wrong, but remember that the same process also allows us to discard the wrong process with equal enthusiasm if we find that we cannot make it work.

"Popular election expresses the will of the people, but the basis of that will must be the true democratic spirit which alone can save us from the excesses of the rule of force.

"Should you feel despondent in the future, picture me swinging in the breeze before your eyes and remember our talk this day. Visualize my bright gleam of color, a symbol of yourself and the great free spirit that makes this nation hum. My stars and my stripes are your dreams and the dreams of all loyal Americans; they are bright with cheer and brilliant with the courage of many great men and women who have fought and died to keep me flying high in the breeze.

"Know you well, that wherever I may stand, I stand for the concept of freedom, the symbol of courage and the notion of dignity, and that I am the world's brightest beacon and hope for liberty, peace and self-government.

"I stand for America because citizens like yourself stand for America. I am in the final sense a reflection," concluded our Flag, "a composite of all the good deeds and actions of the people of this United States of America."

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS ON THE ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING OF THE LITTLE HOOVER COMMISSION

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity today to report to the Congress the initial action taken by the members of the Little Hoover Commission in their organizational meeting on December 16, 1970. The substance of this statement will also be released to the news media.

The Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of

Columbia—the Little Hoover Commission—met for the first time on Wednesday, December 16 in the treaty Room of the Executive Office Building. This was an initial organization meeting to which the 10 presently appointed members of the Commission had been invited. Under the provisions of Public Law 91–405, the Commission is authorized for 1 year, from September 22, 1970 through September 21, 1971. Accordingly, it was the consensus of the appointed members that it was important to begin the work of the Commission as soon as possible, notwithstanding the fact that two members from the private sector of the community must yet be named by the Senate. Although seven members constitute a quorum, it was decided that it was imprudent to hold any kind of organization meeting of the Commission until at least the two senatorial members had been appointed. Those appointments, Senator SPONG and Senator MATHIAS, were made during the week of December 7, 1970.

As many of you may know, both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees held recent hearings on budget requests for a supplemental appropriation for the District of Columbia. At these hearings, requests were made on behalf of the Little Hoover Commission for its initial funding so that it might commence its work. In anticipation of favorable action on the budget requests and in light of the fact that time is running on the life of the Commission, it was considered important to get the members of the Commission together for whatever action they felt could be taken toward organizing and making the Commission an operable entity.

Since members themselves must elect their own chairman and a presiding officer was not provided for by appointment, Messrs. Richard Nathan, Assistant Director of the Office of Management and Budget and Robert J. Brown, Special Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs—two of the Presidential appointments to the Commission—took the initiative in calling the meeting. The first meeting was relatively short but productive. There was an introduction of the members of the Commission currently appointed. Those appointed by the President, the House, and the Senate are as follows:

Presidential: Robert J. Brown, Thomas Fletcher, Elaine Jenkins, and Richard P. Nathan.

House: Myself, Hon. DON FUQUA, Hon. JOHN DUNCAN, and Marjorie Lawson.

Senate: Hon. WILLIAM SPONG and Hon. CHARLES MATHIAS.

Mayor Washington and Deputy Mayor Watt were also present at this meeting. Mayor Washington gave an introductory statement to the Commission members indicating that he and the District Government had supported the Little Hoover Commission legislation and pledging the continued support of his office and the District Government generally to the Commission during its study. He also outlined briefly some of the recent achievements of the District Government and some areas where he thought the Commission could perform a useful function on behalf of the District Government and its residents.

Deputy Mayor Watt also addressed the Commission members stressing that the Mayor, and the District Government shared one basic goal with the Commission: to provide the best possible service to the residents of the District of Columbia, with efficiency and economy, so that the District and its residents can derive the greatest benefit from the resources available. He added his commitment to that of the Mayor's to assist the Commission to the fullest extent during the period of its operation.

Deputy Mayor Watt indicated that he considered one of the best ways he and the District Government could assist the Commission would be to identify areas where the Commission's examination would be most rewarding and could produce the best results in terms of the congressional charge to the Commission. He saw two broad areas of productive study: first, study of how this municipal government accomplishes its job, and second, certain specific functions where service may be improved and greater efficiency achieved.

There was then a discussion by the members of the Commission of their views on the role of the Commission and possible areas of the District Government that might be examined by the Commission. In the course of this discussion, it was determined that, in light of the two vacancies on the Commission, there should not be a selection of a permanent chairman and vice chairman. The motion was made and seconded to appoint me as the temporary chairman pending the appointment of the other two members by the Senate. The Commission charged me with the task of establishing an agenda for the first meeting at which all of the members might be able to attend, and suggested that I might wish to appoint a small executive committee to come up with recommendations on staffing, organization, financing, possible duties and topics for future meetings, and so forth. I hope to name an executive committee in the next few days.

CARL ALBERT OF OKLAHOMA

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, all Oklahomans are proud of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT), the majority leader, of the House of Representatives.

Many persons have expressed an interest in the background and career of our colleague from Oklahoma. I think it important that Members know more about CARL ALBERT and include in the RECORD at this point under the unanimous-consent request an article from the March 24, 1962, issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Little Giant from Bug Tussle" by the late Col. John M. Virden, an unpublished article entitled "Portrait of a Barefoot Boy from Bug Tussle" also by Colonel Virden, an article from the January 15, 1965, issue of Time and a biography of CARL ALBERT:

LITTLE GIANT FROM BUG TUSSEL

(By John M. Virden)

Congressman Carl Albert walked briskly into his picture-lined office on Capitol Hill shortly after noon on January tenth of this year, and almost fell through a huge floral map of Oklahoma. This fragrant message of congratulations to the newly elected majority leader was fashioned from 2000 white chrysanthemums, bordered in mistletoe (state flower). It had been delivered while Albert was in the well of the House being installed in the No. 2 position in the leadership of the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives.

When the stumpy, redheaded politician regained his balance, he plucked off a telegram that came with this wall of blooms. It read:

CONGRATULATIONS, CARL, WE KNOW HOW FAR YOU HAVE COME

Carl Albert has indeed come a long way, starting from an ugly little country schoolhouse called by the improbable name of Bug Tussle. It was almost exactly forty-five years from the day he first made up his mind to be a Congressman until he was sworn in as floor leader of his party in the House.

Like almost everything else that has happened to Albert, the majority leader's job was gained the hard way.

The death of Speaker Sam Rayburn last November threw the Democrats into disarray. A group from the ultraliberal wing of the party seemed to reason the House leadership was up for grabs.

Front runner in the move to unhorse acting Speaker John McCormack and acting Majority Leader Albert—or both—was Representative Richard Bolling, from Kansas City, Missouri, a member of the powerful Rules Committee. Bolling is an articulate intellectual liberal who left the classroom to run for Congress in 1948, and has been there since.

Bolling's first pitch, a cautious one, was at the Speaker's chair, under the mistaken assumption that President Kennedy would lend support to head off the almost certain election of fellow Bostonian McCormack to the powerful position. When the President firmly declined to interfere, the Missourian went after the majority leadership.

Long friendly to both Bolling and Albert, the Chief Executive again refused to lift a finger to influence the outcome of the leadership fight. But former President Harry S. Truman, who resides in Bolling's district, gave his blessing to Bolling's effort. The Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) flocked around him. They were joined by stray Democrats of like views, and some who simply wanted a change in the "moderate" leadership. It is impossible to say how many members backed Bolling; anywhere from 80 to 115 were claimed at one time or another as sure votes.

In newspapers and on television Bolling made a case for himself, depicting Albert as lacking sufficient drive to push the Administration's $92,500,000,000 program through the legislative mill. He gave a number of interviews and appeared on a national television panel program. On the other hand, Albert worked quietly from his small, cluttered office in the old postoffice building in McAlester, Oklahoma, making no splash in the press, or on television. A few days after Mr. Rayburn's funeral, Albert sent telegrams and letters and made phone calls to every Democratic House member saying simply that he was a candidate for majority leader and asking their support. When the replies came back, Albert had the required 131 votes in the bag, with some to spare.

Six days before the party caucus, Dick Bolling quit the contest with the pathetic remark, "I haven't got a chance." He was right. His support had withered as the countdown neared.

The beginning of Albert's political ambitions came one January day in 1917. Representative Charles D. Carter, a five-eights Chickasaw Indian who had been Congressman from Oklahoma's fareastern district since statehood came to Bug Tussle, made a speech and handed out some packets of seed to the kids.

"I suppose you'd have had to hear Charley Carter speak to understand this," Albert says. "He had snow-white hair, and that gift of the American Indian for oratory. I made up my mind I was going to be a Congressman just like Mr. Carter." Thirty years later Albert was elected Congressman from the same district Charley Carter had represented.

When Albert, all five-feet-four and 130 pounds of him, in a blue-serge suit, strove down the aisle of the House for the first time, he was an immensely proud young man. As he approached his assigned seat, a veteran Republican member, mistaking him for a page, beckoned to him. The Congressman-elect stuck out his hand in his best campaign manner, and the older solon laid a sheaf of papers in it, saying "Son, take these over to my office."

Without a word Albert carried the documents over to the House Office Building then ran back to the Capitol in time to answer "present" when the clerk called his name, preparatory to the swearing-in ceremony of the 80th Congress.

From that ludicrous initiation Congressman Albert might have been put down among the numerous one-gallus characters the forty-sixth state has elected to office since its admission to the Union on November 16, 1907. True, he was born in a log cabin, May 10, 1908, and he walked the usual two miles to a country school until he finished the first eight grades. Also, in the best political traditions, he grubstaked himself to an education by doing menial chores. But right there—unless you count the fact that Carl Albert is as disarmingly friendly as a limber-tailed hound pup—all similarity between him and the run-of-the-cottonpatch type of politician stops. Far from being a smooth-politicking rube, Albert can list three college degrees after his name, two of them from Oxford. He had traveled widely in Europe, North Africa and the Pacific area before he came to Congress.

Democrats in Congress sometimes refer to him as "the Little Giant from Little Dixie" and compare him to Abe Lincoln's political rival, Stephen A. Douglas. But down in "Lapland"—where Arkansas and Texas "lap" over into Oklahoma—the voters in his district are more likely to call him "the Little Giant from Bug Tussle."

Albert's district is made up of a tier of thirteen counties in Oklahoma's southeast corner. In it live 227,692 people—farmers, ranchers, oil-field workers, lumberjacks, sawmill hands, small tradesmen and the like. Most of the members of the Choctaw Indian tribe live in that area. Bounded on the north by the meandering and beautiful Arkansas River, it stretches down to the brick-colored Red River. There it faces Sam Rayburn's old domain on the Texas side.

It is a rough piece of Oklahoma, any way you look at it, and the poorest. Per capita income in Pushmataha—called "Shove" by the natives—County is about $700 per year, or roughly one third the national average. As a banker at Antlers put it, "This is one of the few places where old-age pensioners belong to the country-club set." Income is a little lower in nearby Johnston County, but a good deal higher in more industrialized Pittsburg and Carter counties.

The rugged Kiamichi and Winding Stair mountain cover almost half the district. This is open-range land where thousands of cattle roam at will, and seem to prefer bedding down in the middle of the public roads. If you hit one, you have bought yourself a cow. Cattle have the right-of-way even when they are sound asleep. One grizzled old rancher near Tuskahoma told this reporter, "What I like about this country is that I can drive my cattle from here to Mena, Arkansas, (sixty-four miles), and never have to get off my horse and open a damn wire gate."

Millions of acres of virgin timber and second-growth pine forests flourish in these wild mountains, supporting the biggest single industry in that section of the state, the giant Dierks Lumber Company. There is little love lost between the lumber combine and the small ranchers who pasture their herds in the forest leased to or owned by the Dierks Company.

How many wildcat stills have operated in these mountains the Internal Revenue Service won't even guess. Now that legal liquor has come to traditionally dry Oklahoma, the number of moonshiners is smaller, but there is still a ready market for their corn whisky, called Three Hours in the Fence Corner, guaranteed to make a man "feel single and see double in twenty minutes flat."

Bug Tussel is only a white clapboard, two-room rural schoolhouse, six miles due north of McAlester. It is set in an acre of lumpy Bermuda grass and boasts a storm celler big enough to hold the entire student body. Bug Tussle has changed little in the past fifty years. From 1915 to 1923 Carl was usually in the classroom at Bug Tussle when he was not in a cotton patch one mile north. His eight years in the country school fashioned his personality somewhat more than did the seven years he spent in universities. Albert has never lost the demeanor of the gifted country boy who walked to school dreaming of going to Congress, and someday rising to be a power in the land.

Ernie and Leona (Scott) Albert had five children—four sons and a daughter, all living. Carl is the eldest. Mrs. Albert, a gentle woman with an iron will, who encouraged her children "to be somebody in this world," was a bedridden invalid for several years before her death in 1936. Ernie Albert lived to see eldest son sworn in as a Congressman in 1947.

In 1923 the Alberts left the farm and moved into a small house on the edge of McAlester so the eldest son could attend high school. Ernie Albert went to work full time in the coal mines. Carl's bookish habits soon put him on the school's honor roll. After classes he did odd jobs, practiced debate speeches and developed a thundering oratorical style. He was president of the Student Assembly by his senior year.

In 1927 he and Louis Dakil, now an Oklahoma doctor, won the national high-school debating-team championship. Later Albert placed third in the National Oratorical Contest sponsored by the Associated Press. His subject: the Constitution of the United States. The prize was a three-month trip to Europe. In England he saw the tall spires of Oxford and set his heart on going there.

Ernie Albert, tenant farmer turned coal miner, told his ambitious son that if he meant to get a college education, he would have to do it on his own. When young Albert enrolled in the University of Oklahoma that autumn he had ten dollars left after paying his fees. By sundown he had a job that provided room and board. During his four years at the university, Albert was a waiter, a soda jerker, a dry-cleaning solicitor and a tutor.

In his freshman year Carl latched on to more money than he had ever seen before—$1500 as first prize in the National Collegiate Oratorical Contest—and made the university debating team. With a speech on World Peace he won the national collegiate oratory title in 1929. He joined Kappa Alpha social fraternity, and plunged into student politics as leader of the Antiadministration Party. The young man from Bug Tussle was moving fast.

Albert's college speech teacher recalls "his absolutely unshakable mental poise." But a fraternity brother at Oklahoma says his knack of making the short, hard words hit like a flail came from much practice, rather than born genius. He drilled himself under the Canadian River bridge some miles south of the campus. A friend would go along with him, usually at night, to listen and to heckle him. As Albert practiced by blasting his speeches across the dry sandbar, his companion would mutter rebuttals, yank his necktie, unlace his shoes or throw sand at him.

On graduation day at the University of Oklahoma in June, 1931, Carl Albert was President of the University Student Council, wore a Phi Beta Kappa key and had been selected as a Rhodes scholar. The late Dr. William B. Bizzell, then president, called him "the brightest mind that ever passed through this university." Those spires of Oxford were visible from Norman, Oklahoma, that day.

On the ship passage to England, Albert met two other bright young Rhodes scholars—Dean Rusk, now Secretary of State, and Fowler Hamilton, now Director of the International Development Administration.

During his years at Oxford, Albert used the long English weekends and his vacations to tour Britain, the Continent, North Africa and the Middle East. In the House of Commons he listened for hours to the deliberations and speeches of the British lawmakers.

The nadir of the depression lay on Oklahoma in 1934. A parching drought had turned half the state into a vast dust bowl and had driven thousands from the state. That year Carl Albert came home from Oxford, flat broke. His English law degrees didn't impress prospective employers. There were many well-educated young men on WPA or in CCC camps.

His ambition to run for Congress gnawed at him, but there was the matter of money to finance a campaign. So Albert took the first job he could get, as an office clerk in Oklahoma City. Two years later he switched over to the legal staff of an oil company and stayed in that job until 1941, when he volunteered for the U.S. Army, and went to Camp Polk, Louisiana, as a private in the 3rd Armored Division. He spent nine months in the ranks before the commanding general decided the diminutive lawyer might do something other than wrangle heavy tanks, and recommended him for a direct commission. There followed a fast brushup on military law at the Army's Judge Advocate General's School.

Albert reported to the Pentagon, wearing shiny new captain's bars, early in 1942.

"So he'p me, there wasn't another unmarried man in that whole office," says pretty Mary (Harmon) Albert, "but I saw Carl's two-oh-one file before he arrived. When he walked in to report, I tol' the other girls, Now, you stan' back and stop droolin' cause this one is mine, he's just' mah size.' "

Mary Harmon of Columbia, South Carolina, was then twenty-one, stood five feet, wore a Size 7 dress and was a Pentagon clerk. In no time she had captivated the captain.

On August 20, 1942, Miss Mary Harmon and Capt. Carl B. (for Bert, a name he loathes) Albert were married in the old Lutheran Church of the Reformation at Columbia. They had a year together in crowded, frantic wartime Washington before he went off to the war in the Pacific. Mary returned to South Carolina to finish college.

Thirty-three months later Lieutenant Colonel Albert came home again with a fine fruit salad of medal and campaign ribbons stitched over his left breast pocket. He had a small wad of money saved from his pay, and a deep desire to go home and run for Congress.

Two older lawyers told Albert to move in

with them and they would toss him a few cases until he could get started. But he had not tried many cases when the late Congressman Paul Stewart decided his health would not stand another campaign. When Stewart withdrew in 1946, Albert jumped into the race.

There were six Democratic hopefuls in the primary. For one of the few times in his life, Albert was knocked back on his heels. Bill Steger of Durant bested him by more than 3000 ballots. But no one had a clear majority, and the two recently discharged war veterans battled it out in a runoff. Albert beat Steger by 391 votes. Later that fall he waltzed over his Republican opponent. In 1948 he beat his Democratic rivals by a comfortable margin and won the general election by six-to-one. In 1950 he enjoyed a politician's dream—no opposition.

Then came 1952, and Albert's primary battle was a real shindy. There he faced State Senator Kirksey Nix, a big, popular blue-jawed lawyer, handsome as a race horse.

"For a while I had Bug Tussle's pride treed right on top of his well-worn stump," says Nix, now a judge of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. "But in the last two weeks of the campaign he laid the lash of that Biblical oratory on me. I don't see why folks call that guy 'little.' He's just wound up real tight. When he talks, he commences to unwind, and before he shuts up, he's ten feet tall."

Election-night tallies gave Albert every county. The elections of 1954, 1956, 1958 and 1960 were easy ones for Albert. Though he always campaigned as though he were running against a dozen men, he had only token opposition or none at all.

A few days after his re-election in 1954, Speaker Sam Rayburn told Albert he had been picked as the Democratic whip of the House, a position he was to hold for the next seven years.

When the venerable Mister Sam was asked why the little-known Albert was picked for a key slot in the party organization, he said, "There's nothing peculiar about it. . . . Carl has tact and energy, intelligence, education and a sense of responsibility. And mind you, sir, these things don't always go together. I've been watching House members since Woodrow Wilson's Administration and I can tell big timber from small brush."

The term "whip" is a misnomer when applied to Carl Albert. Albert's forte is persuasion, and the uncanny ability to "sense the temper" of the House in much the same way Mr. Rayburn could. One long-time colleague says that Albert is "close to being another Sam Rayburn, but with more hair and an Oxford education."

The new majority leader of the House is not likely to be mistaken for a page now. For one thing, he is about thirty pounds heavier than he was in 1947. Short, compact, he has a big head that looks as though it might have been stuck on as an afterthought. He has a long upper lip and a hard jaw which give him a perpetually solemn look one Washington wag described, with more candor than kindness, as the mien of a worried Teddy bear.

Politically he is harder to classify. Generally he is a progressive-moderate, a middle-roader who fights for anything he believes will help farmers, cattlemen or public schools. Labor, veterans and the Department of Defense count him as a dependable and able friend on the Hill. Those who have worked closely with him say Albert is probably the congressional champ at resisting pressure groups.

"Maybe I'm not original in my beliefs," Albert says, "but a public servant must have a mind and will of his own, or he'll wind up little more than an errand boy. Hear all sides, sure, but he must do what he feels is right—even when it does not jibe with popular demand. If I felt otherwise, I'd be ashamed of myself and would get out of politics."

On Washington's feverish cocktail circuit the Alberts are almost strangers, attending only the must functions and a few of the soitees at the embassies. Though he neither drinks nor smokes and is a slow hand with the small chatter, Albert enjoys these gatherings because they allow him to practice his Spanish and French.

Most of the time he works six days out of seven on Capitol Hill, but tries to get home in time for a leisurely dinner with Mary and their two children. Their daughter Mary Frances is fourteen and David Ernest is a bouncy lad of seven.

In Washington the Alberts live in a rented brick house at 4614 Reno Road. They own a small frame home at 827 East Osage Street in McAlester and live there during the months Congress is not in session. In Washington or in McAlester, Sundays are strictly reserved for church and the family. No politics. After services at the Methodist church, there is dinner at home. Sunday afternoons and evenings are devoted to "whatever Mary and the children want to do."

Carl Albert is too much of a practical politician to make calculated guesses about his future, other than to say that is up to the people of the 3rd Oklahoma District. His affection for "his House" is evident to anybody who talks to him for even a few minutes. There is no doubt that he is exactly where he wants to be, and he expects to stay there.

An enthusiastic friend of Carl who has known him since they were boys told this reporter: "Carl's time was bound to come. Far too many cowboys, plowboys and prairie yodelers and several other kinds of political freaks get elected to high office. Maybe his popularity year after year and now his election as majority leader in the House indicate a trend toward higher quality men in the important places in the government. The good Lord knows I hope so.

CARL ALBERT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS—PORTRAIT OF A BAREFOOT BOY FROM BUG TUSSLE

(By Col. John M. Virden, USAF—Ret.)

The first time I ever saw Carl Albert he was walking down a country lane that stretches exactly one mile due north of a two-room white clapboard school house named Flowery Mound, but called Bug Tussle by everybody except prim elderly ladies.

Carl was kicking up a great cloud of red dust with his bare feet as he churned along in that fast walk that is almost a jog-trot, so characteristic of him then, and now. He was reading a book, oblivious to everything else. He was dressed in blue and white striped overalls with mismatching blue denim patches on the knees. He wore a hickory shirt and a broad-brimmed straw hat that had "shot up to seed" from being rained on too many times. And that was all.

He could have been any eight-year-old tenant farmer's son on that summer day in the year 1916, in the poor red hills of Eastern Oklahoma. Poor as gully dirt, the land *and* the people.

Not just *kinda* poor, but real poor, the kind of poverty you can not only see, you can *feel it*, and *taste it*, and *smell it*.

Sargent Shriver, the Field Marshal of the current Poverty War, tells us that poverty begins at the level of $3,130 per year . . . any family with less income than that is in dire straits indeed. By that yardstick, the Bug Tussle Community would have been declared a *disaster area* in that hot summer of 1916 and for several decades thereafter.

Any tenant farmer making that kind of money would have been considered a well-heeled man. The fatuous say "Oh, but the dollar bought so much more in those simple days." It did, of course, but not *that* much more . . . for 1916 was an inflation year when America was drifting swiftly but surely into the maelstrom of the Great War that had already turned Europe into a slaughter pen . . . the fashionable silk shirt with broad stripes sold at $14 and eggs sold for 60¢ a dozen . . . and were to go to $1.00 six months later.

The Alberts were little different from the Virdens, who had just moved into the next house down the road, a log structure of two rooms, where Carl had once lived when his father tilled the land my father had just taken over to try to make a crop of cotton and corn, on a third-and-fourth agreement. Mister Shrode, who lived in McAlester, six miles away who owned both these poor old worn-out hillside farms and was certainly not making much money out of either of them.

None of this entered the heads of two country boys who confronted each other for the first time one hot day in early September 50 years ago in a dusty lane that separated the two eroded pieces of hillside land rented by their respective fathers.

Carl and I did not even know we were poor-folks, which was possibly a good thing, since everybody we knew was in almost exactly the same circumstances.

We said "howdy" and told each other our names, and shook hands with that one-pump handshake peculiar to country kids and full-blooded Indians.

Thus began a close friendship that has now endured for more than half a century, through bad times and good times, through high school and college, and three wars . . . in one of which both of us were to spend almost three years in the combat zone of the Pacific Theater.

But that hot day Carl pointed out the three room rough lumber house where he lived, said that they had some late watermelons, and that he'd heard that I'd just moved in next door. The next day he and his brother, Noel and I went swimming in Old Blue Hole in Buckluxy Creek just down the hillside from the Albert home.

Carl explained that Buckluxy, in Choctaw tongue, meant "Many terrapins." And there were many around this deep waterhole. But there was something else . . . Carl's father had rolled the running gears of his wagon into the creek hub-deep to soak up the spokes and fellers during the dry spell so common to Oklahoma.

It was just too tempting. After paddling around for an hour in the tepid swimming hole we rolled the wagon off into the water 10 feet deep and out of sight.

Two days later Mister Albert came over to our house to ask my father if he'd borrowed his wagon, a custom not uncommon in those days. My papa said no he had not, asked some pointed questions about where Mister Albert had left his wagon.

When Mister Albert, a small man with muscles like pine knots, who worked in the shallow coal mines at Krebs in the winter, explained about the creek, papa looked at me hard for a long minute. Then he said, "Come on, Neighbor, I think I know where your wagon is."

Mister Albert picked up Carl and his brother Noel as we went to the swimming hole. Papa carried a length of hemp rope. When we got to the Creek the two men stripped off their clothes and waded into the creek until the water was up to their chins. Mister Albert felt the end of the wagon tongue with his toes and dived down and tied the rope through the goose-neck and together the five of us pulled the running gears of the wagon onto dry land.

We three boys tried to laugh off the joke. But it was no go. Our respective papas did not laugh. Each cut a hickory limb. For the next few minutes any passerby would have thought somebody was killing yearlings down there on Buckluxy Creek, from all the bawling and bellering that was going on.

A half hour later we were sitting on the Albert's front porch digging our toes into the dust of the yard when Carl observed philosophically, "You know, Johnny, rolling papa's wagon into the deep end of Old Blue Hole was not such a good idea, was it?"

There were all too few of the golden days of early September in Oklahoma left when we could swim in the creek, get into the scrapes country kids have got into since the beginning of time, or find late bearing watermelons. The melons were not really very good and Carl's father told us one day, "There's six chills to the bite in every one of those things at this time of the year."

It was not the immediate opening of school that worried us. For this was before the nine-month school term came to Oklahoma. Mrs. Fanny C. Ross, a handsome and portly woman of great dignity and a very low boiling point, would not open Big Tussle until mid-November. Meantime, there was that little stubbly bumble-bee cotton to be picked, and the corn . . . which was certainly not "as high as an elephant's eye," to be gathered and stored in the crib.

After that was all done, then Mrs. Ross could have her chance at trying to pound some knowledge in our hard heads, until it was time to plant and hoe the cotton and corn again the following spring, six months later. Some years there was a six-weeks summer school at Bug Tussle, after crops were laid by, if there was enough money to pay the school teachers, and there usually was not . . . so we were free as birds from about the Fourth of July until cotton picking time in September.

How well Mrs. Ross, God rest her stern and noble soul! did her job with the rest of her "scholars" might be debatable. But with one red-headed and freckle faced third-grader she worked wonders.

For she laid the foundation for an education that was to lift Carl Albert out of that hillside cotton patch, to the University of Oklahoma, where he proved to be the greatest orator and the best debater our native state has ever produced. And Oklahoma is famous for leather-lunged public speakers.

What was much more important, on Carl Albert's graduation day at O.U. the late Dr. William B. Bizzell, handed out his degree and said, "There goes the brightest mind that has ever passed through this University."

The tall gothic spires of Oxford were already visible to Carl Albert that bright June day of 1931 . . . the barefoot boy from Bug Tussle had come a very long way. He had been selected as a Rhodes Scholar. He had a steamship ticket in his pocket. That would take him to London. His cabin-mate on the voyage was to be another bright young fellow named Dean Rusk, also en route to Oxford University, and who is now Secretary of State.

Carl was in such a rush to get off to England that graduation day that he could not spare time to be awarded his commission as a 2nd Lieutenant in the U.S. Artillery Reserve. Ten years later this cost him dearly, when he volunteered for the Army right after Pearl Harbor and spent nine months wrangling heavy tanks at Camp Polk, Louisiana, as a private, before some military genius reasoned that a man with three degrees, two of them in law, might do better in the Judge Advocates General's Department.

Six months later Carl was a newly-minted Captain, a military lawyer, assigned to the Pentagon.

The office to which he was assigned contained three other officers and a number of hastily-recruited civilian clerks, female. Among these latter was Miss Mary Harmon, age 20, weight 97 pounds, standing exactly five feet tall, who hailed from Columbia, South Carolina.

"So help me," Mary Albert says, "there was not another single man in that whole department. When Carl walked in I told the other girls, Now you-all can just stan' back and stop droolin' . . . this one is mine, he's just my size."

On August 20, 1940, Captain Carl Albert and Miss Mary Harmon were married in Columbia, South Carolina. They had a few brief months together in frantic, crowded wartime Washington. Then the Captain was shipped out to the war in the Pacific.

In the next 31 months he went through the island hopping campaigns that finally led to Japan a few days after VJ Day. By then he was a Lieutenant Colonel with a very fine fruit salad of medal and campaign ribbons stitched over the left breast pocket of his uniform jacket.

Tendered a commission in the Regular Army, and a job as one of the chief prosecutors at the Japanese War Crimes Trials in Tokyo, Albert declined with that he was going home to get re-acquainted with his young wife and then start running for Congress in the District where he was born.

That is exactly what he did. He won the election of 1946 by a razor thin edge. He has won every one since by a rock-slide margin.

A lot of things have happened to Carl Albert since we stood in the middle of a dusty country lane 50 years ago, and talked about September watermelons, how good the swimming was in Buckluxy Creek just down the hill.

That was the first time I ever saw him. There began a solid friendship that endures to this day.

The last time I saw Carl Albert he was sitting in the office of the Majortiy Leader of the House of Representatives in the Capitol Building surrounded by furniture that, at the latest, could be classed as of the Very Early Grover Cleveland Period, though some declare that the decor is Late Andrew Jackson.

Whatever the period of Congressman Albert's office furniture, the fact remains that the one-time barefoot boy from Bug Tussle is today the most powerful man in the House of Representatives of the United States. What is equally important to an old friend of half a century is that he is the best-liked man in the House, and on both sides of the aisle that separates the two political parties.

The old school house at Bug Tussle stands lonely in a persimmon thicket, next to a small graveyard where lie several of the classmates Carl and I once knew. But on its white clapboard wall something has been added . . . there is a bronze plaque, marking Bug Tussle as a Historic Site, where the Majority Leader of the U.S. House of Representatives received his basic education. The historic plaque is signed by the President of the United States.

The Congress: An Adequate Number of Democrats

It was during the President's usual nap time, and it took a little while before the call was put through. Finally, Carl Albert, majority leader of the House of Representatives, was able to say: "Mr. President, I'm here with the new minority leader, Jerry Ford, and the dean of the House, Manny Celler, to report that the House is organized and ready for business."

"That's fine," said Lyndon Johnson. "I'm glad to know what's happening."

Soon afterward, with the parliamentary pomp, the exhilaration and the confusion of the opening sessions over, Oklahoma's mite-sized (5 ft. 4 in.) Carl Albert was back on the House floor, ready for almost anything that might happen in the 89th Congress. Strolling among the desks, Albert sized up and greeted the neophytes. "Hi, how are you getting along?" he asked, extending his hand. "Come by and see me if I can help you in any way." One eager newcomer asked when he could make a speech. Albert replied briskly: "When you feel ready and have something to say. Beyond that, there are no holds barred."

Enough for Two

All week long, the freshmen in both House and Senate moved uncertainly through their new surroundings. They were a diverse group, among them a machinist from Wisconsin, a mortician from New York, a spice merchant from Michigan, a labor leader from New Jersey, and a college dean of men from Iowa. Many have names that carry family echoes of one kind or another; in addition to Bobby Kennedy joining his brother, Ted, they ranged from Maryland's Democratic Senator Joe Tydings, stepson of the late Millard Tydings, to California's Representative John Tunney, son of the former heavyweight champion. Many were symbols of political upheaval; a Democratic Congressman from Maine who won by 40,000 votes, a Republican from Mississippi who won by nearly 7,000, and a Democrat from New York's suburban Westchester County, the first of his party elected there in over 50 years. There were 20 Roman Catholics, 63 Protestants, six Jews and ten who professed no denomination among the 99 newcomers to the 89th (there are now 107 Roman Catholics in Congress, with 88 Methodists in second place). They were youngish, the average age being 44.

But mostly they were Democrats—71 in the House, six in the Senate. And they helped set the cast of Capitol Hill for the next two years—the most lopsided Democratic Congress since the one that convened in 1937. If Lyndon Johnson has anything to say about it, it will also be one of the hardest-working sessions in memory, for he means to use it as his springboard to the Great Society. Contemplating the President's legislative program, Senator Everett Dirksen remarked wearily that "there would easily be enough to engross the time and the attention not of one but of a number of Congresses."

Yet chances are that Johnson will get most of what he is asking for in this session.

Arranged for L.B.J. The numbers are with him. In the Senate, Democrats outnumber Republicans 68 to 32, and while Southern Democrats will continue to oppose many liberal measures, enough Northern Republicans are likely to line up with Lyndon to keep the Senate reasonably safe for his program. But the Senate has been fairly dependably Democratic for several sessions. Such has not been the case in the House chamber that Johnson's Great Society bills will live or die. A muscular conservative coalition of Southern Democrats and rural Republicans had worked together to spoil or drastically slow down some favored bills of both John Kennedy's and Lyndon Johnson's Administrations. But now the Democrats have a 295-to-140 majority. Furthermore, they carried out a quick little revolution by making some significant changes in the rules and composition of key House committees—all carefully arranged to be pro-Johnson.

The true potential of the House can never be measured by the numbers alone. It springs from the state of 435 divergent minds, working within a welter of parliamentary mechanism and traditions. The task of making the Democratic majority consistently effective in this setting rests heavily on the Democratic leaders of the House—and none will feel the pressures more than Carl Bert Albert, 56, whose unassuming, somewhat puckish appearance masks not only a Rhodes Scholar but one of the sharpest political professionals in Congress.

He is second to Speaker John McCormack in the House party hierarchy, but Albert's delicate handling of the membership from the floor—developed to a profound proficiency after seven years as party whip and three as floor leader—will dictate to a large extent the pattern and timing of Lyndon's proposals. Says Albert: "I think we have a real opportunity to pull the party together."

Southern Discomfort. But first there had to be a little pulling apart. The leadership

faced the thorny problem of disciplining two Dixie Democrats—Mississippi's John Bell Williams and South Carolina's Albert Watson—for defecting to Barry Goldwater during the campaign. Some hot-tempered Democrats, including Speaker McCormack, wanted them drummed out of the party. But Carl Albert and other cooler heads insisted on a less corrosive punishment, and the Democratic caucus merely stripped both renegades of their seniority on committees.

In the Senate, too, the Democrats staged a relatively minor North-South clash. Louisiana's Russell Long, 46, wanted to replace Vice President-elect Hubert Humphrey as majority whip—even though Huey Long's son has a notable record of anti-Administration votes, including those against medicare, aid to education, foreign aid, the nuclear test ban treaty, the Peace Corps and civil rights. Because of past political favors, because the liberals were badly organized—and because the White House carefully did not intervene—Russell Long won out over Rhode Island's John Pastore and Oklahoma's Mike Monroney. Said Russell after his election: "This means the Civil War is over." Indeed Long could go far to help swing at least a few Southern Democrats into the Administration's camp on some tough bills. And he has even hinted that he might ease his views on segregation: "I've been able to recognize that things move and to adjust myself to a changing world."

Canceling the Conservatives.—With party punishment thus meted out and leadership jobs filled, the Democrats proceeded to grease every possible skid for Johnson's upcoming legislation. Most important was the move to establish control over two major points of conservative power in the House—the Ways and Means and the Appropriations committees, long dominated by a coalition of conservative-minded Democrats and Republicans. When it was chaired by Missouri's late Clarence Cannon, one of the crustiest old tightwads in House history, Appropriations often choked off extra funds for almost anything that smacked of liberal legislation. Cannon died last spring, and the chairmanship went to Texas Democrat George Mahon, a loyal Lyndon man—but to Democratic leaders there was still a disturbing aura of conservatism about many of the 50 committee members. As for the 25-man Ways and Means Committee, headed by Arkansas Democrat Wilbur Mills, it had a long-time tilt to the right too—enough so that the committee managed to keep the Administration's medicare bill from ever getting to the House floor last year.

Thus, at their caucus on the Saturday before Congress convened, the Democrats made sure that henceforth things would be different. They did it by simply canceling a gentlemanly, if arbitrary, agreement made years ago between the late Speaker Sam Rayburn and G.O.P. Leader Joe Martin, to the effect that the ratio of party memberships on the two committees would be frozen, no matter what the makeup of the House. On Ways and Means, the majority party had 15, the minority 10, and on Appropriations the ratio was 30 to 20. The caucus voted to reject that standing ratio and make committee appointments on the basis of actual party membership in the House—and the Republicans had to go along. Thus Democrats would hold a hefty 34-to-16 margin on Appropriations and a 17-to-8 ratio on Ways and Means. Of course, the new members were to be of a distinct L.B.J. bent. Said Larry O'Brian, the President's No. 1 congressional liaison man: "Half the struggle of enacting the Johnson program was over Saturday evening."

AUTOCRATIC OUTRAGES

The liberal Democrats' next target was the once mighty Rules Committee, which must pass on every bill before it goes to a floor vote. Until 1961 Virginia's conservative Democrat Howard ("Judge") Smith had almost dictatorial powers, because of a coalition with Republicans. Smith's strength was dissipated in 1961 when John Kennedy and Speaker Rayburn rammed through a change in committee membership. But Lyndon's lieutenants in Congress wanted to take no chances of any kind, and the caucus approved new rules that would give Speaker McCormack broad powers to release any bill bogged down in the Rules Committee for more than 21 days. Opponents of the move complained that it meant a return to the bad old days when the Speaker was a near autocrat, but the speakership is still a long way from Uncle Joe Cannon and Tom Reed, who liked to announce his arbitrary decisions by declaring: "Gentleman, we have decided to perpetrate the following outrage . . ."

While the rules changes breezed through the Democratic caucus easily enough, they had to be approved by the full House—and, incredibly, the seemingly solid wall of Democrats was full of breaches on the session's first key vote. No fewer than 78 Democrats voted, along with 123 Republicans, to make amendments to the resolution. If 16 Republicans had not bolted to side with 208 liberal Democrats, carrying the rules changes 224 to 201, the majority party would have been beaten. Carl Albert, careful nose counter that he is, was startled, because it indicated defections by some Southern Democrats who had last year helped squeeze several Administration bills through the House. Said he: "I don't think we have a runaway majority."

For the Image. Whether Albert will have to count consistently on a few Republicans to augment his majority remains to be seen. At any rate, the G.O.P. minority in the House was undergoing upheaval too. Last month Michigan's Gerald Ford (*see following story*) had challenged the floor leadership of Charlie Halleck—on the grounds that old Charlie just did not fit the forward-looking image the party needed. Backing Ford was a group of rebels, including Wisconsin's Mel Laird, chairman of the G.O.P. Convention's Platform Committee at San Francisco, who went after the chairmanship of the Republican House caucus. It was a bitter fight, complicated by the fact that Conservatives Ford and Laird are anathema to some liberal Republicans. In a fit of pique, New York's John Lindsay actually backed Halleck. But Ford and Laird won. What did Ford think about Johnson's chances of getting his program through? Said he: "They certainly have adequate numbers of Democrats to put through everything they want—if they can hold the line."

The line will probably hold, if only because Lyndon Johnson is not likely to push too hard, will tend to ask only what he can reasonably expect to get. His legislative program and its probable fate in Congress shape up something like this:

HEALTH

Since 1961, Democratic Administrations have tried in vain to get a medicare bill that would offer hospital care for Americans over 65, paid for by an additional social security tax. This year Johnson made medicare the subject of his first message to Congress and embedded it in an elaborate package of other health projects. To make medicare acceptable, Johnson agreed with Wilbur Mills' plan to finance it with a separate payroll tax. The bill almost certainly will pass both houses. "That will be done quickly," predicted Albert. And New Mexico's Democratic Senator Clinton Anderson, a co-sponsor of the proposal, added: "This time it is going to be a law, not just a bill."

EDUCATION

This is the bill the President seems to be keenest about this session. It calls for $1.5 billion to be added the first year to the $4 billion now being spent for federal aid to education. Unlike Kennedy, who sent up a public school construction bill that roused a roaring controversy in 1961 by flatly excluding private and parochial (mostly Roman Catholic) schools, Lyndon tiptoed around the religious issue. About $1 billion of the package would go to public schools in "poverty-impacted" areas rather than across the board. The rest would be for individual scholarships and grants, and for carefully pinpointed programs such as expanded testing, guidance, and gifted children's facilities in both public and private schools. Albert called Johnson's cautious plan "a fringe attack on the education problem," but predicted it would still be tough to pass. Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield agreed: "It will be a problem—although the religious debate is less of a factor every year."

TAXES

Johnson wants to cut by about $1.5 billion federal excise taxes on retail items, perhaps including luggage, jewelry, cosmetics. Congress is eager indeed to slash excise taxes—so much so that there is considerable agitation to repeal nearly all of them. Frugal Lyndon wants to stop far short of that and may run into rugged opposition to holding the cuts down to his figure. But Albert is slightly optimistic, says: "I do think something can be worked out." The President also wants Congress to ensure quickie tax-cut procedures that would allow fast—but temporary—action should a recession appear in the offing. Well aware that the legislative branch is savagely jealous of its taxation powers, Johnson wisely planned to leave the authority for quick cuts with the Congress rather than ask for the power himself—as John Kennedy had done when he lost out on a similar proposal in 1962.

LABOR

While the President asked for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act's Section 14–B, which allows states to have right-to-work laws that prohibit compulsory union shops, any real presidential pressure to force this measure through Congress would almost certainly create an uproar. It might harden the conservative-liberal schisms in both houses to the point where Johnson could lose valuable support on other more important bills. Though repeal of the clause was demanded in the 1960 and 1964 Democratic platforms, there seems little likelihood the President will risk a fight for it now. Says Mansfield: "We ought to have the legislation, but I am doubtful that we will get it this year." Johnson also wants to expand the federal minimum wage ($1.25 an hour) to cover another 2,000,000 people—mostly hotel, restaurant and laundry workers. That measure has a far better chance.

AGRICULTURE

Bluntly, the Johnson Administration has no idea what to propose for farm legislation this session. In his State of the Union address, Lyndon settled for brief platitudes, calling for "new approaches"—a phrase that drew laughter from him and his advisers as they drafted it. There is some talk in the Administration of lower support prices for larger, prosperous farmers, and higher ones for smaller growers. No matter what Johnson dreams up to mold the U.S. agricultural mess to fit the shape of a Great Society, 1965 farm legislation will be a sticky problem. Says Carl Albert: "This will be an urban-oriented Congress—and that means trouble for farm bills."

IMMIGRATION

An early push will be given to a favorite Johnson bill—revising immigration to give priority to highly skilled people rather than fixing quotas arbitrarily for each country. This bill may hit a snag in the House, for the immigration subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee is chaired by testy Ohio

Democrat Michael Feighan, who is as close to an isolationist as there is in today's Congress.

APPALACHIA

Johnson wants this bill badly for his "war on poverty." It would offer about $1 billion—mostly in job-creating road construction—to the deeply depressed eleven-state Appalachia region where the unemployment rate has risen to 15%. The Senate approved a bill last year, but the House never got around to it because Democratic leaders could not muster enough votes in the waning hours of the session. Chances are brighter in the 89th, although Albert admits, "We may have some trouble."

POVERTY

Johnson wants to double the $784 million appropriation he got last year for area-redevelopment and job-training programs. He will run into some skepticism from Congressmen with a show-us-some-results attitude, but sooner or later the liberal 89th will probably deliver.

URBAN AFFAIRS

In 1961 John Kennedy proposed a Cabinet office to watch over the Government's city-oriented programs such as urban renewal and commuter transportation, as well as the federal complex of housing agencies. He was slapped down at least partly because Southern Congressmen suspected he was doing it to get Federal Housing and Home Finance Administrator Robert Weaver, a Negro, into the Cabinet. Weaver is still waiting in the wings, although Johnson has not committed himself as to who will occupy the post if it is created. Johnson will probably get this one through eventually.

ART AND TRAINS

Visionary stardust glittered from many of the President's other proposals. He wants a modest $20 million to study the possibility of a high-speed (200 m.p.h.) train between Washington and New York, and he will seek federal authority to control industrial air and water pollution. Both measures will probably pass easily. But he will find it harder to get funds to set up his suggested National Foundation for the Arts—if he really tries it. Congress' traditional distaste for spending tax money on culture cuts across liberal-conservative or even party lines.

Beyond the President's program for new legislation, there will be tussles over old familiar issues. The Senate is girding again for its usual argument over reducing the two-thirds vote required for cloture on a filibuster, and Republicans in both houses have prepared proposals that would cancel the Supreme Court's order to reapportion state legislatures on the basis of population only. Foreign aid will be a battle again. In the Senate, two top Democrats—Arkansas' William Fulbright, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and Majority Leader Mansfield—are agitating to have the bill split up instead of coming in "one big conglomerate mass." Their aim is to give Congress a chance to vote separately on various types of aid—a method that the White House strongly opposes. Foreign policy in general is already building up as potentially the most important debate in the 89th.

GOOD SOLDIER

The President will of course exert constant pressure on Congress, but will leave much of the overt maneuvering of members to House Majority Leader Albert. And Lyndon could scarcely ask for a better man on the Hill. Carl Albert is a fiercely competitive little man who was born to an Oklahoma coal miner, took his first schooling in a tiny wood-stove-heated school at Big Tussle (since renamed Flowery Mound). He worked his way through the University of Oklahoma, made the wrestling team, the debating team and produced a brilliant scholastic record in government, his major field. He won a Rhodes scholarship in 1931, took two law degrees at Oxford, where Secretary of State Dean Rusk was one of his classmates. Albert worked as a lawyer for several oil firms until 1940, briefly set up a private practice in McAlester, Okla., his home town. In 1941 he enlisted in the Army. Assigned briefly to Washington, he met and married a Pentagon clerk named Mary Harmon.

In 1946, as a newly released lieutenant colonel, Albert entered a five-man Democratic primary for Congress, eked out a 329-vote win out of more than 60,000 votes cast. Once elected, he immediately went to visit Sam Rayburn in Bonham, Texas, just across the Red River from Albert's home House district. Advised Rayburn: "Those who go along, get along." Answered Albert: "I'll be a good soldier."

POWER PLAYS

During his first few years on Capitol Hill, Albert watched Mr. Sam and studied his colleagues to learn how they voted and why. Says Albert now: "You learn the procedure, you learn the rules by the empirical method. It's a good way. I also learned the issues. And I stayed with my party as much as I could. I have been, I think, a real regular Democrat." In 1955, when Tennessee Democrat James Percy Priest decided he didn't want to be party whip again, Rayburn and then Majority Leader John McCormack pored over a list of House Democrats for a replacement. When they hit Albert's name, both said: "That's it."

Albert approached the job with dogged persistence. His responsibility as whip was to keep track of every Democratic vote on every major issue. Recalled Albert: "When I was whip, I'd get the reports in from the assistant whips. I'd call every doubtful member. I then could go down the list and know where the trouble was—which we could count on, which were absolute losses. Then I'd go to work on the rest of them."

Albert's technique was low pressure and easygoing. "You get criticized for not cracking the whip," he says, "but it doesn't make sense, for example, to make enemies that will lose you the farm bill to get the poverty bill, when you can get both." When Rayburn died in 1961 and John McCormack became Speaker, Carl Albert easily won the majority leader's job.

"I'm sot in the ways of the House," he says. And he is so "sot" that he works as hard at it as if he were still the whip, making it his business to "learn every member." Though Albert seems unassuming and mild-tempered, he is capable of using cold power plays. Last year, when Johnson was pressing heavily to get his anti-poverty bill through the House, Albert found many members reluctant to vote for it. He found out which public works projects were pending in districts of some recalcitrant partymen, informed the two committee chairmen dealing with public works, and added pointedly: "I would appreciate it if you will go to these members and tell them we need the votes." The bill passed handily.

Albert has long been a favorite at the White House. John Kennedy was highly impressed with Albert's ability, and in the last session Johnson often phoned Albert two or three times a day. Last summer it was Carl Albert whom Lyndon picked for the thorny job of heading the 1964 Democratic Platform Committee. Albert is virtually certain to succeed McCormack as Speaker.

NO CLIFFHANGING

Albert knows his Aristotle from his university days and has a great sense of the tradition of democratic legislatures, beginning with the Athenian lawmakers who met amid prayer, sacrifice and invective on the Pnyx, a hill near the Acropolis. He is too good a student of Capitol Hill, as well, to trust any kind of legislative majority by itself. He knows that Jefferson had more than 3-to-1 majorities in his Ninth Congress (1805–07), yet was not able to get the money in time for one of his pet projects—buying Florida. In the 41st Congress, Ulysses S. Grant had a 56-to-11 majority in the Senate, yet could not get his own party to support his desire to annex Santo Domingo. And Franklin Roosevelt's overwhelmingly Democratic 75th Congress (1937–38) turned on the President and killed many of his New Deal bills because F.D.R. had autocratically tried to pack the Supreme Court with liberals.

Albert is convinced that Lyndon Johnson will not make any such mistakes. Says he of Lyndon's ability as a congressional strategist: "He's one of the best who ever came down the pike. He moves when you don't know that he's moving, and his greatest talent is his tenacity and his endurance. Most Administration measures will not be handled in a rubber-stamp fashion. They'll be altered in the committees and altered on the floor. But they can be passed without the cliff-hanging operations we've had in the last few Congresses."

Beyond his loyalty to Lyndon and to the Democratic Party, Carl Albert has an even deeper pride in Congress as an institution. A liberal, he nevertheless scorns doctrinaire liberals—and political scientists—who seem to favor the executive and judiciary branches rather than the legislative, as the main instruments of progress. "A legislature in a country like ours, more than either the executive or the judiciary, has the power to effectuate new policy in a democracy. Its consensus is more of a national consensus than any other. And this very fact causes the legislature to be the real corner star of a democracy."

THE HEALTH BILL

The health of our people is, inescapably, the foundation for fulfillment of all our aspirations," declared President Johnson in his special message to the Congress outlining a broad health-care program that he termed "practical, prudent and patient." Its goal, he said, was to lay a firm foundation for "the healthiest, happiest and most hopeful society in the history of man."

At the top of the list was the most controversial and most publicized item in the package: medical insurance for the aged. Johnson's medicare plan is similar to one that failed to pass last year,* except for one important difference: while the old plan would have been financed by a simple increase in social security taxes, the new plan sets up a separate trust fund to be administered under the social security program. The change precludes the possibility that unexpectedly high medical costs could endanger the solvency of the regular social security fund. It also means that workers will know just what medicare is costing them. As proposed, that cost will be a payroll tax of no more than .45 of 1% of each worker's annual earnings up to $5,600, with a matching contribution by his employer. This is in addition to the present social security tax of 3.625% from employer and employee, which is already scheduled to rise to 4.62% by 1971.

Medicare would cover some 16 million persons aged 65 or over. Another 2,000,000 persons (many self-employed) not previously eligible for social security would receive similar benefits from the Government's administrative budget. Those benefits include up to 60 days of hospital care paid entirely out of the fund except for the first day, up to 60 days of post-hospital care in approved facilities such a nursing homes, up to 240 home-nursing visits a year, and a certain outpatient diagnostic services.

---

*The Senate passed medicare as an amendment to a bill increasing social security benefits. In Senate-House conference, House conferees refused to accept medicare, and the bill died.

Newest concept in the package is a proposal to set up 32 multipurpose regional centers in a massive attack against heart disease, cancer and strokes, as recommended by a special presidential commission (TIME, Dec. 18). A prime function of the centers would be to diagnose these illnesses early and, in serious cases, help patients take advantage of such new lifesaving techniques as open-heart surgery and high-voltage radiation therapy. The centers would be federally financed extensions of existing medical schools, teaching hospitals and other medical centers. Staff personnel would be chosen by the institutions involved and would work directly for them. A five-year program is planned. Total cost: $1.2 billion, to be financed from general revenues, not out of the medicare tax.

A third major proposal is to permit the Federal Government to contribute to the costs of medical and dental care for needy children in states that are ready to share the expense. Federal aid also would be increased for children who are crippled, mentally retarded, or disabled. Health clinics for migratory workers and their children would be extended, as would community vaccination services. Such increased aid to children would cost $125 million the first year, $320 million the next.

Other items include scholarships for medical and dental students "who would otherwise not be able to enter or complete such training," grants to help cover the operating costs of medical and dental schools and improve their teaching, funds to modernize existing hospitals, loans to build and equip group-practice clinics, and new federal controls over the production and distribution of habit-forming drugs.

No one, of course, knows the cost of this breath-taking proposal. Since it would start slowly, it is estimated that it would merely take an extra $262 million out of general revenue, which would rise to $800 million the following year. This is probably conservative, and is on top of employee and employer contributions.

BIOGRAPHY—REPRESENTATIVE CARL ALBERT

Congressman Carl Albert can look back on more than 23 years of distinguished service to the people of Oklahoma's Third Congressional District.

As a member of every Congress since his first election to the U. S. House of Representatives in 1946, Albert has served more years in the House than any previous Oklahoma representative.

From his first days as a freshman member—in an entering class which included John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon—Albert has worked his way up through the ranks of the Democratic Party to occupy the powerful post of Majority Leader, and in the process has become one of the most influential men on Capitol Hill.

But working his way up is nothing new for Carl Albert. The oldest of five children born to Earnest Homer Albert, a coal miner, and Leona Ann Scott, Carl is a fourth generation Oklahoman. His maternal great-grandfather, Stacey R. Scott, settled in Krebs in 1887. His paternal great-grandfather, Eli Albert, came to Oklahoma in 1889, and lived the last few years of his life in Wilburton. Both ancestors were Civil War veterans.

When Carl was three, his father bought a farm seven miles northeast of McAlester in the community now known as Flowery Mound, but then called Bug Tussle. It was there that he grew up and received his first eight years of schooling.

As a student at McAlester High School, Carl took an interest in public speaking which eventually resulted in his winning a district championship in the Midwest Oratorical Contest and the right to compete for State honors. For his performance before the Justices of the Oklahoma Supreme Court, he was awarded the State championship, $100 and a trip to Kansas City for the semi-finals. Again he emerged victorious with first place and a three month tour of Europe.

After graduating from McAlester High as president of the student body and class valedictorian, Carl went on to the University of Oklahoma where he was elected president of the student body and a member of Phi Beta Kappa, and became National Oratorical Champion, for which he received a $1,500 cash prize and a trip to Honolulu.

He graduated from O. U. in 1931 and was awarded a Rhodes Scholarship to study at Oxford University in England, where he earned a B.A. and a B.C.L. in law. During his three year stay at Oxford, he was able to visit most of the countries in Europe and North Africa.

Upon his return to the United States, Albert worked as a law clerk with the Federal Housing Administration in Oklahoma City, before entering the Armed Services in 1941 as a private assigned to the Third Armored Division. After serving with distinction in the Pacific Theater during the War, for which he received a Bronze Star, Lieutenant Colonel Albert was discharged in 1946 and shortly thereafter announced for Congress.

Locked in a five-man Democratic primary race he managed to win the nomination with a 329-vote margin out of more than 60,000 votes cast. Later that year, Representative-elect Albert crossed the Red River to visit House Speaker Sam Rayburn at his home in Bonham, Texas, thus beginning a warm friendship which lasted right up until the revered Speaker's death.

"Mr. Rayburn," as President Johnson remarked at a dinner honoring Albert in Washington in 1966, "was a wise judge of men. He liked Carl Albert and respected him as a brilliant lawyer. He saw in him the common sense and good judgment that rounds out an educated man, and he really must have seen a lot of himself in Carl, because they were cut from the same pattern."

These qualities, his years of service on the House Committees on Agriculture, Administration and Post Office and Civil Service, plus his knowledge of House procedure and a long-standing record of support for the Democratic Party made Albert a natural choice to succeed James Percy Priest as Party Whip, or assistant Leader, in 1955.

The appointment, announced to Democratic members by Majority Leader (later Speaker) John W. McCormack, gave Albert the number three position in the House Democratic structure and the highest office ever held by an Oklahoman in Congress.

His new job carried with it heavy responsibilities and few material rewards, but Albert attacked it with sedulity, attending policy conferences and briefings, keeping abreast of legislation and rounding up votes for important bills. These additional duties, however, were always subordinate to his primary task—that of representing his constituents in the Congress of the United States.

After five hectic months, Albert was still able to speak of his job with enthusiasm: "Although it has meant longer hours and harder work for me, I have derived a great deal of personal satisfaction out of the results we have been able to obtain. It has been an illuminating experience."

Albert's low pressure technique, compassionate yet effective, earned him the respect of both members and the leadership, and made him their easy choice for the Majority Leader's spot when Sam Rayburn died in 1961.

As Majority Leader, the Speaker's right-hand man, Albert's job is to lead the Democrats in the day-to-day partisan struggles which occur on the Floor of the House. With the Speaker, he formulates the strategies designed to attract a majority vote within the House for all legislative measures important to the country. He is in constant touch with important legislation in every phase of its development and is responsible for announcing the weekly programs under which the proposals are brought up for consideration.

Albert brings to his position an idealism tempered, but not diminished by the pragmatism he has gained during his two decades as a member of Congress. He is widely known as the most careful nose-counter in the House, and at the same time is admired for his deep sense of history and political philosophy. As President Johnson put it, "Carl Albert is one of the true intellectuals in Washington."

Despite the great burdens of his office, Albert's first loyalty is still to the people he works for, his neighbors in Southeastern Oklahoma. Although he is involved with great issues which affect the entire nation and the world, he is always eager to help an elderly couple in obtaining Social Security payments, or to assist a community in funding a new sewer system. In fact, as his responsibilities have multiplied, so have his opportunities to help his people.

In recognition of his efforts on their behalf, the people of his district and of his State have seen fit to honor Carl Albert in many ways. Lake Carl Albert, nestled in the foothills of the Buffalo Mountains northwest of Talihina, assures the surrounding area of water even in prolonged droughts.

Carl Albert High School in Midwest City stands as a living monument to the Majority Leader's everlasting interest in education. Even the main thoroughfare in McAlester, his hometown, is dedicated in his name.

But perhaps the greatest gesture of appreciation for his diligent efforts on their behalf has been the continued support he has received from his constituents during the past 23 years, and which he will strive to maintain in the promising future.

ALABAMA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER DISTRICT SUPERVISORS

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, on December 7, 1970, Alabama's distinguished senior Senator, the Honorable JOHN J. SPARKMAN, addressed the 28th annual meeting of the Alabama Association of Soil and Water District Supervisors in Montgomery, Ala.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the Senator's speech into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues may read the address which deals with one of the major problems of today, pollution and what is being done to curb it.

SPEECH BY SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN AT THE 28TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ALABAMA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS, MONTGOMERY, ALA., DEC. 7, 1970

Ladies and gentlemen, it is good to be with you. I was here in Montgomery just a week ago today, and I recall seeing quite a few of you at the Clean-up and Beautification Dinner that night.

I take a great deal of pride in the fact that, as the entire nation becomes increasingly aware of the need to conserve and improve our environment—I believe ecology is the popular word these days—Alabama is taking the lead in conservation and beautification progress.

The country *is* waking up to the tremendous need for conservation practices and programs. This need is not anything new to you and me. Throughout the years, you people have contributed so much to Alabama as you have carried out the progress of the Soil Conservation Service. And it has been my privilege to support these programs, first in the House of Representatives, and, for the last 24 years, in the Senate of the United States.

I was serving in the House of Representatives when some 35 or 36 Alabama District Supervisors met at Auburn on August 4, 1943, for the purpose of organizing the Alabama Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors. Just before I moved over to the Senate in 1946, the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts was formed at a meeting in Chicago. A fellow-Alabamian, Mr. P. G. Compton of Gallion, had served as Chairman of the State meeting at Auburn, and he played a prominent role in the organization of the National Association at Chicago. It has been a pl asure for me, down through the years, to work with both your State and your National organizations for the betterment of Alabama and the nation.

I know that you are proud of Alabama, as I am. But I want to say to you that Alabama is proud of you and of what you are doing and what you have done. The record you have compiled over the more than 30 years since conservation districts were authorized in Alabama has truly been outstanding.

As you probably know, Alabama wasted no time in getting Districts organized. The state was completely covered by Districts in early 1941. Since then, your record has indeed been impressive. You have completed soil surveys on more than 12 million acres of Alabama land. You have made conservation plans for more than 48,000 Alabama farms comprising more than 9 million acres. You have created more than 70,000 miles of terraces on Alabama farms; more than 300 miles of diversions, and more than 7,000 miles of open drains. You have built more than 46,000 farm and wildlife ponds. You have planted trees on more than 3 million acres of land in Alabama. I could go on and on and on. You know your record. I just want you to know that I know it, too; and I am proud of you.

I am sure that you will agree with me, however, that we cannot afford to rest upon our laurels. Unless something is done, the ecological problems in America today will get worse. You can count on that. We must re-double our efforts to protect the environment in which we live, because that environment is threatened as it has never been threatened before. The trend must be reversed.

There *is* an environmental crisis in America today.

A majority of Americans, urban and rural alike, live near polluted waters and breathe polluted air.

It is predicted that by the year 2000, the United States will need a trillion gallons of water a day—nearly three times the estimated use in the mid-1960's.

Big chunks of farmland are being swallowed up for houses, factories, airports and highways. Demands on our forests are multiplying.

The population of the United States—now roughly 205 million—may total 280 million to 300 million persons by the end of this century.

All these developments put pressure on our resources.

Consider the fact that the average American in a life span of 70 years uses 26 million tons of water, 21,000 gallons of gasoline, 10,000 pounds of meat, 14 tons of milk and cream, 9,000 pounds of wheat, and great quantities of other products from the earth.

As proud as we are of what we have done, we must do more. It would be well, I think, for us to examine briefly just how we have gotten into the "fix" we are in.

The gasoline engine, which revolutionized transportation and replaced muscle power in agriculture and industry, is also a prime polluter of the atmosphere.

Our modern industries and our great urban and suburban development projects which are so important to the American standard of living are also prime polluters of lakes and streams.

Our scientific agriculture, which provides the most abundant and varied food supply in the world, is under scrutiny for its use of pesticides and weed killers and its great cattle-feeding operations which produce difficult problems of waste disposal.

As we have strived for a better life, we seem to have ignored the side-effects—the by-products of our struggle.

And so, here we are. What are we doing about it, and what *can* we do about it. I know one thing. The least guilty among us is the farmer. With the help of the Soil Conservation Service and others, the American farmer was fighting against pollution and waste long before it became so popular to do so. And that is why I find it completely incomprehensible that the Nixon Administration is apparently determined to scuttle the Agriculture Conservation Program. At a time when this entire nation and its great people and its great resources are being focused upon the search for solutions to our ecological problems of pollution and waste, it just does not make sense to me to do away with the one program that has a proven, 30-year record of effective conservation and anti-pollution practices. I do not think the Democrats in Congress will let them get away with it.

I do not think many people know and appreciate what the Soil Conservation Service has done and is doing in the field of pollution abatement. As you know, one of the big problems today is the disposal of large quantities of animal waste that result from our cattle, hog and poultry operations. The SCS, the Extension Service at Auburn, the State Health Department, the Alabama Water Improvement Commission and other agencies have joined together in the development of specifications for waste disposal lagoons, and some 379 Alabama producers have requested and received design assistance and ACP cost-sharing on the construction of these lagoons. This has been a popular and an effective pollution-abatement program. Apparently, the Nixon Administration does not think so.

Another problem that we have is sediment pollution. In Alabama, County and City governments, rural development committees, and many civic clubs have joined with the Soil Conservation Service in combating the erosion which causes this type of pollution. This, too, has been a popular and effective pollution-abatement program. Apparently, the present administration in Washington does not think so.

I mentioned earlier that by the year 2000, the United States will need a trillion gallons of water a day. If we are to provide sources of that much water, we must encourage and increase the programs of the Soil Conservation Service, which has done and is doing so much in the field of water conservation. Apparently, the administration does not think so.

Ladies and gentlemen, I think you know that one of our gravest domestic problems today is inflation. It is eating away at the income of the American family, and it is hitting hardest at the least able to fight back—our older, retired people.

One of the ways to fight inflation is to reduce the level of federal spending. Each time that President Nixon vetoes an appropriation bill; each time that he puts a so-called "freeze" on funds appropriated by the Congress; and each time that he fails to request continued funding for programs already in existence, he makes a big play on this matter of inflation. He has accused the Congress of being big spenders. I think he even called us spendthrifts at one time. But I want to take this opportunity to set the record straight. Every year since President Nixon came into office, the Congress of the United States has appropriated less money than President Nixon asked for. If we had gone along with his budget requests, the level of federal spending would have been vastly higher than it is. In the 1970 fiscal year, we cut the President's spending requests by some 7 billion dollars.

I know the seriousness of the inflationary problem. I support reducing the level of federal spending as one of the effective weapons in the fight against inflation. But, to me, and to many others in Congress—mostly Democrats I might add—it is a matter of priorities.

When inflation is eating away at American income, and especially at the income of those living on Social Security and other forms of fixed income, it makes no sense to me to veto an increase in Social Security benefits.

At a time when so many of our citizens—both urban and rural—are living in substandard housing, and when the demand for water and sewer facilities throughout the country is so high—and the need so critical—it makes no sense to me to veto the bill making appropriations for these programs.

And at a time when the soil and water and air and food upon which we all depend for our very existence is threatened as it is today with many forms of pollution and waste, it makes no sense to me to cut off funds for conservation cost-share programs and watershed development.

Yes, my friends, it is a matter of priorities. The President has his ideas of what should have priority, and the Members of Congress have their ideas. But remember, in the final analysis, it has been the Congress which has cut the over-all level of spending. Frankly, I am convinced that our thinking on this matter of priorities is right, and I expect to continue to work against inflation, but, at the same time, I expect to continue supporting adequate Social Security benefits, adequate housing, adequate water and sewer facilities, and last, but certainly not least, the conservation and pollution-abatement programs of the Soil Conservation Service that have done so much to protect and improve the environment in which we live. I hope that we in Congress may have your support.

BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "Big Brother Is Watching You," which appeared in the Virginia-Pilot, Norfolk, Va., on Monday, December 21, 1970.

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

BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU

The disclosure that the Army—and apparently the other services—engaged in extensive spying upon politicians, antiwar activists, black militants, liberals, right wingers, members of the press, and civilians even casually involved in activities under military surveillance has stirred a storm.

The first report that the Army had spied upon Senator Adlai Stevenson II, former Gov-

ernor Otto Kerner, Representative Abner Mikva, and about 800 other civilians in Illinois provoked a prompt reply from Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor. But the denial he issued is unconvincing. For Mr. Resor said only that the Army hadn't been snooping upon Messrs. Stevenson, Kerner, and Mikva and "allegations to the contrary are without foundation in fact." His statement seems to confirm, tacitly, that the Army engaged in extensive surveillance of civilians, if not of Congressmen. And even his insistence that the Army wasn't spying on Senator Stevenson, etc., was contradicted by the former Army intelligence agent, John M. O'Brien, who had originally raised the subject. Mr. O'Brien who had originally raised the subject. Mr. O'Brien said he was sticking to his statement.

Corroborating evidence meanwhile has been supplied by other former military personnel who were engaged in "domestic data-gathering," to employ one of the euphemisms for the snooping. Although the first White House reaction was that it is "inconceivable," the notion isn't inconceivable to those who remember the U–2, the Bay of Pigs, the *Pueblo*, the raid on Son Tay, and other triumphs of intelligence work.

Billions of dollars go to support the bureaucracy of cloak-and-dagger types, conventional and electronic gumshoes, and miscellaneous monitors, sleuths, snoops, and special agents that has been created by the needs and neuroses of the Cold War and, lately, rising tensions in the U.S. All bureaucracies have a life of their own (the classic elaboration is Parkinson's Law) and it isn't inconceivable in the least that the civilians in the Pentagon aren t aware of everything that its "intelligence" represents.

But it is crystal clear that the military has no business spying upon the activities of civilians. Period. Any necessary surveillance should be undertaken by the FBI (and it is easy enough to believe that the Attorney General isn't always told what Mr. Hoover's men are doing, either) and/or the appropriate civilian law-enforcement agencies.

The principle is uncontested, as the official reaction shows. It is the practice that is in question. That is why the inquiry projected by Senator Ervin's subcommittee must be pressed vigorously.

DANGEROUS DRUGS

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, recently two newspaper articles and one editorial have called attention to the continuing problem of overproduction of amphetamine-type drugs, including methamphetamines, methylphenidate, and phenmetrazine. All of these drugs are commonly known on the street as "speed" and can have dangerous effects on the central nervous system of the consumer. The House Select Committee on Crime under the outstanding leadership of the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER has labored long and hard to bring these drugs under more effective Federal control, as described in a December 13 article and a December 17 editorial, both in the Los Angeles Times, and a December 15 article in the Miami Herald. Representatives from all over the world will be meeting in Vienna on January 11 to draft an international protocol on psychotropic substances. How will the United States look in the eyes of the world when it is so clearly evident that we have taken inadequate steps to control these dangerous drugs? I commend these excellent articles to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 17, 1970]

LIMIT PRODUCTION OF AMPHETAMINES

Strong drug industry lobbying apparently has stalled any congressional action this year on controlling overproduction of the very dangerous drugs known as amphetamines.

And until Congress imposes effective manufacturing restraints, millions of "bennies," "speed," and other amphetamine stimulants will continue to find their way into illicit channels—and to cause serious medical, social and criminal problems.

Extensive expert testimony at House Select Crime Committee hearings emphasized that no more than half of the 8 billion amphetamine units produced annually in this country could possibly have a legitimate medical use. In addition to prescription for weight control, the drugs usually are limited to treating the relatively rare conditions of narcolepsy and hyperkinesia.

The "popping" of amphetamines, medical experts agree, can be a serious threat to physical and mental health. Methamphetamine, or "speed," can be and has been lethal.

Members of the crime committee have been pushing legislation requiring the attorney general, with the advice of the Health, Education and Welfare Department, to impose manufacturing controls. For as Rep. Charles Wiggins (R-Los Angeles) pointed out, the drug producers "have not practiced any self-restraint, have not limited production."

The Senate agreed. But the House adopted weaker provisions that allow the Department of Justice to impose quotas administratively if it desires. And the House version was the one that was included in the omnibus drug abuse bill finally passed by Congress earlier this year.

"The drug lobby had people all over the Capitol," said Rep. Claude Pepper (D-Fla.), chairman of the House crime committee, which has vainly been trying to strengthen the drug bill in the post-election session.

Although Smith, Kline and French, a leading legitimate producer of amphetamines, insists that "quotas have no meaning with respect to the operations of clandestine manufacturers," the FBI reported that 80% of the amphetamines seized in 1968 had been produced legally.

Illicit traffic in the drugs is a particularly tough challenge to California law-enforcement officials because of the ease with which readily available pills can be sent across the Mexican border and then shipped back into this state.

Congress should act, and act soon, on controlling so serious a menace to the well-being of the nation.

No amount of industry lobbying can hide the fact that far too many amphetamines are being produced and that far too many persons have suffered from the easy accessibility of the drugs.

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 15, 1970]

PEPPER PUSHES PLAN FOR DRUG QUOTAS

(By Robert L. Jackson)

WASHINGTON.—A new congressional battle is shaping up over whether drug companies should be forced to curtail their production of amphetamines, the stimulants known to young addicts as "speed," "pep pills" and "bennies."

The drug industry is lobbying against the proposal, which is being pushed by leading members of the House Crime Committee.

These members are hoping for action in the closing days of this session. If not, they plan to renew their battle early next year.

At stake, according to those who advocate production quotas, is the health and well-being of thousands of potential addicts, some of them high school students.

Crime Committee Chairman Claude Pepper (D., Fla.), who is leading the drive to impose quotas, said eight billion amphetamine pills are manufactured each year in the United States.

This represents such a vast overproduction, Pepper said, that the figure is equal to 40 pills a year "for every man, woman and child in this country."

Since the manufacture of amphetamines is largely in the hands of four New York companies, Pepper's proposal would direct the U.S. attorney general to establish production limits "upon the advice and counsel of the secretary of Health, Education and Welfare."

Pepper, whose committee held extensive hearings last year, said 50 per cent of these eight billion pills "go into illicit channels of trade."

"They are not subject to any regulation," he said. "Limiting production by a quota system is the best way to get control."

Some major drug companies don't see it that way. They argue that rigid quotas for amphetamines would not eliminate drug abuse, and could impose a hardship on legitimate users of these drugs. They say only fly-by-night firms sell to customers they don't know.

"Even zero quotas do not prevent illicit drug trafficking," said Phil Jahle, Washington representative for Smith, Kline and French Laboratories, a major amphetamine producer.

"And quotas have no meaning with respect to the operations of clandestine manufacturers," Jahle said.

William Patton, assistant general counsel for the Washington-based Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, an industry group, added: "companies are generally opposed to the enactment of production quotas. They see them as not necessary and difficult to administer."

Rep. Jerome R. Waldie (D., Calif.), a committee member who has joined Pepper in the drive to impose quotas, said the legitimate need for amphetamines "does not exceed several hundred thousand pills annually," far below the billions being produced.

Committee hearings showed that a Chicago manufacturer shipped 1.2 million amphetamine pills to an unknown consignee in Mexico. Investigating the transaction, federal agents found the consignee's address was actually the 11th hole of a Tijuana golf course. The pills had gone into the black market and are believed to have been widely distributed in Southern California.

Amphetamines—and there are various types—are legitimately used to control narcolepsy, a chronic sleepiness, and hyperkinesia, a behavior disorder in children. They may also be used in controlling weight.

But committee members contend only a fraction of the amphetamines currently being produced are needed for these legitimate uses. They suggest that some procerned with profits from larger sales.

"Speed freaks," or those who become addicted to amphetamines or methamphetamines, either orally or through injections, can live on a "high" of feverish excitement for days.

But psychotic reactions or brain damage may develop later, sometimes leading the victim to commit crimes, some authorities say.

The Nixon Administration has withheld its support from Pepper's quota proposal, arguing that the Justice Department could impose controls on an administrative basis. But Pepper contends that in the absence of legislation, administrative procedures would face legal challenges, a process that could last for years.

The Justice Department's Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs is not ready to recommend production quotas for amphetamines "at this time," its director, John E. Ingersoll, wrote Pepper.

"We are still in the process of gathering all the information on these myriad drugs and their combinations," Ingersoll said.

Despite the administration's coolness, the Pepper proposal passed the Senate in October by a vote of 40–16 under the sponsorship of Sen. Thomas F. Eagleton (D., Mo.)

But—largely because of drug industry lobbying, according to Pepper—the measure was killed by House conferees in a closed-door Senate-House conference committee. Pepper is drumming up new support among House members and is exploring ways of getting the proposition to a public vote on the House floor.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 13, 1970]

CONGRESSMAN WANTS QUOTA ON PEP PILLS

(By Robert L. Jackson)

WASHINGTON.—A new congressional battle is shaping up over whether drug companies should be forced to curtail their production of amphetamines, the stimulants known to young addicts as "speed," pep pills and "bennies."

The drug industry is lobbying against the proposal, which is being pushed by leading members of the House Crime Committee.

These members are hoping for action in the closing days of this session. If not, they plan to renew their battle early next year.

At stake, according to those who advocate production quotas, is the health and well-being of thousands of potential addicts, some of them high school students.

Committee Chairman Claude Pepper (D-Fla.), who is leading the drive for quotas, said 8 billion amphetamine pills are manufactured each year in the United States.

FORTY PILLS EACH

This represents such a vast overproduction, Pepper said, that the figure is equal to 40 pills a year "for every man, woman and child in this country."

Since the manufacture of amphetamines is largely in the hands of four New York companies, Pepper's proposal would direct the U.S. attorney general to establish production limits "upon the advice and counsel of the secretary of health, education and welfare."

Pepper, whose committee held extensive hearings last year in California and elsewhere, said 50% of these 8 billion pills "go into illicit channels of trade."

"They are not subject to any regulation," he said. "Limiting production by a quota system is the best way to get control."

Some major drug companies do not see it that way. They argue that rigid quotas for amphetamines would not eliminate drug abuse, and could impose a hardship on legitimate users of these drugs. They say only fly-by-night firms sell to customers they do not know.

ILLICIT TRADE

"Even zero quotas do not prevent illicit drug trafficking," said Phil Jahle, Washington representative for Smith, Kline & French Laboratories, a major amphetamine producer.

"And quotas have no meaning, with respect to the operations of clandestine manufacturers," Jahle said.

William Patton, assistant general counsel for the Washington-based Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Assn., added. "Companies are generally opposed to the enactment of production quotas. They see them as not necessary and difficult to administor."

Rep. Jerome R. Waldie (D-Calif.). a committee member who has joined Pepper in the drive, said the legitimate need for amphetamines "does not exceed several hundred thousand pills annually," far below the billions being produced.

"When we balance the equities, as to any inconvenience which might occur to the drug manufacturers as against the definitive tragedies no one argues about the situation demands action," Waldie said.

CRIME PROBLEM

Another California committee member, Republican Rep. Charles E. Wiggins, said the abundance of amphetamines "is creating incalculable problems—crime problems and social problems." Producers of this drug "have not practiced any self-restraint, have not limited production," Wiggins said.

Committee hearings showed that a Chicago manufacturer shipped 1.2 million amphetamine pills to an unknown consignee in Mexico. Investigating the transaction, federal agents found the consignee's address was actually the eleventh hole of a Tijuana golf course. The pills had gone into the black market and are believed to have been widely distributed in Southern California.

Amphetamines—and there are various types—are legitimately used to control narcolepsy, a chronic sleepiness, and hyperkinesia, a behavioral disorder in children. They may also be used in controlling weight.

But the committee members contend only a fraction of the amphetamines currently being produced are needed for these legitimate uses. They suggest that some producers may be overly concerned with profits from larger sales.

LENGTHY "HIGH"

"Speed freaks," or those who become addicted to amphetamines or methamphetamines, either orally or through injections, can live on a "high" of feverish excitement for days.

But psychotic reactions or brain damage may develop later, sometimes leading the victim to commit crimes, some authorities say.

The Nixon Administration has withheld support from Pepper's quota proposal, arguing that the Justice Department could impose controls on an administrative basis. But Pepper contends that in the absence of legislation, administrative procedures would face legal challenges, a process that could take years.

The Justice Department's bureau of narcotics and dangerous drugs is not ready to recommend production quotas for amphetamines "at this time," its director, John E. Ingersoll, wrote Pepper.

"We are still in the process of gathering all the information on these myriad drugs and their combination," Ingersoll said.

SENATE PASSAGE

Despite the Administration's coolness, the Pepper proposal passed the Senate in October by a vote of 40 to 16, under the sponsorship of Sen. Thomas F. Eagleton (D-Mo.).

But—largely because of drug industry lobbying, according to Pepper—the measure was killed by House conferees in a closed-door Senate-House conference committee. Pepper is currently drumming up new support among House members and is exploring ways of getting the proposition to a vote on the House floor.

"The drug lobby had people all over the Capitol," he said.

The Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Assn., which Pepper said is coordinating the opposition, has a 70-member staff in Washington and a budget of $3.6 million a year. It represents 125 member companies in the prescription drug field.

Patton, the PMA assistant general counsel, said his group has been "very actively involved" in helping to draft drug abuse control legislation. But he denied that any specific lobbying has been waged, as an organization, against Pepper's proposal.

He conceded that most major manufacturers are against the measure.

A SOLDIER SHARES HIS THOUGHTS

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a letter, touching in its simplicity and wisdom, a letter from deep within the "hell" of Vietnam.

Sgt. Danny J. Giannelli is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Faust C. Giannelli, who reside at 2433 SW. 26th Street, Allentown, Pa. They must be deeply proud of their son. He is not only a fine soldier, but also a perceptive, sensitive human being. Danny has expressed a philosophy of life well worth noting and remembering, a philosophy tempered by the brutal realities of the struggle in Southeast Asia. I am sure that his brother, Scott, will treasure that letter always, as it clearly evidences Danny's deep love for his family, his country, and his future.

His father brought this letter to WKAP, an Allentown radio station, where one of the disc jockeys read it over the air. An Army recruiter, Sgt. Jim Loughran, heard that transmission and brought Sergeant Giannelli's letter to my attention. I am pleased to give all my colleagues the opportunity to meet this fine young man through his letter to Scott:

A LETTER FROM SGT. DANNY J. GIANNELLI

DEAR SCOTT: Hi there, brother, how are you doing? I hope you are feeling fine and not letting the girls keep you up too late. You need sleep you know. Of course you don't have to pull perimeter guard, so I guess you're getting pretty much sleep anyhow.

I'm doing pretty good. We flew out here to our fire base today by helicopter, but it isn't worth rotting two years of your life away just to ride on a helicopter once in awhile.

How is my wife doing? I hope you are being good to her. After all you will be an uncle pretty soon. I hope you are listening to Mom and Dad. Are you? I used to think I sometimes knew better than they did but I signed 2 years of my life away to this army before I realized they are always (and I mean always) right.

There is only one decision you will have to make for yourself some day, and that is the girl you choose to marry. I made a real lucky one there (one of the few times I was right). When it comes time to make that decision make it well, then God bless you both and I hope you will choose a wife as wonderful as mine is (but that's quite a few years from now). In the meantime worry a lot about school. Believe me, Scott, education is precious. That is what makes our United States so great, and believe me our country is the greatest. No matter what those damn fool hippies may think. In most other countries they would not be allowed to think anything, because the government would probably kill them. You know if the U.S. wouldn't offer good jobs and a chance for a higher education, we would be at the level of morons like most of the people over here.

Do you realize the food over here (from the army) is sometimes pretty bad and even the few things we don't like, can't stand, and throw away the Vietnamese people pick out of the garbage cans and eat. Sometimes they get so hungry they even kill dogs and eat them. You know how good cows look and beef tastes? Well their cows are water buffalo. God are they pitiful. If one of our cows had a

baby calf that looked like them the mother would probably stomp it to death.

Scott, this country is hell, so please always love the United States and your education. And when they play the Star Splangled Banner, cry because you're so proud to live in the greatest country in the world, and knock the hell out of anyone who ever puts our country down, or burns our flag and when he is down kick him a few times for your brother who is over here fighting for it.

Always keep your record clean, be a good boy and a good man. Always obey the law. Others may mock you but you'll be glad you did. Believe me, I know. I kept my record clean and it paid.

I can work at General Electric or any other place because of it. I wouldn't even be a Sgt. if I hadn't because they checked my record and found I had no police record, and do you now know why? Because of Mom and Dad. It was them and them alone who taught me right from wrong and instilled in me a sense of pride for myself and my country, and led me to believe in God. Yes, let me tell you about God. Remember when I used to sleep late and sometimes refused to go to church, but you went? I'll tell you, Scott, I was proud of you, very proud and I still am. I hope you still go and I hope you do believe in GOD. Yes, I sometimes had my doubts, but take it from a man who is in HELL. When the bullets start flying over your head everyone starts praying. It doesn't matter if a man was an atheist in the states he is a Christian now. And when the smoke clears everyone prays then to thank GOD for getting them through. And going to church is an honor and a privilege so take advantage of it. Remember you have the freedom to worship and go to church, and many people don't.

And don't you ever become prejudiced against race or color. Black people are every bit as good as you and I. Over here he is right beside you fighting for your life and his, and if a man ever gets hurt you won't hear him say, "don't you help me, you're black." You pull guard while he sleeps and he pulls guard while you sleep. And believe me if you can't love a man who protects your life then you won't have a life very long over here!

I'll tell you, Scott, I had to come over here to realize a lot of things but you don't. Listen to my advice and always obey Mom and Dad and you will turn out to be one hell of a good man!

I love you, Scott, and I am proud of you. Please don't ever let me down. God bless you, stay healthy and the best of luck to you in everything you do.

Your brother,

DAN.

P.S.— Be a good uncle to my son. Can you believe it, your brother is going to be a father? I hope the child turns out to be as good as you and me. It can only happen if Donna and I are as good as parents as Mom and Dad.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON VOTING AGE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Supreme Court yesterday rendered an outrageous decision taking away from the States the right to set voting age qualifications.

The Richmond Times-Dispatch, whose editor of the editorial page is Edward Grimsley, published an excellent editorial today on this Court decision.

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

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

ALL SAILS

More than a century ago, Thomas Macaulay observed that the United States Constitution "is all sail and no anchor."

How right he was, how right he was. Yesterday's U.S. Supreme Court ruling on the voting age law confirmed that the Constitution is indeed "all sail," a vessel responsive to the erratic whims of a few powerful steersmen. The Constitution is equipped with what appear to be anchors, to be sure, but they are of no more value than a ship's figurehead.

One such "anchor" is the Tenth Amendment, which states, in one of the clearest sentences in the Constitution, that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

In the past, this amendment has proved unable to anchor the Constitution to the principle that the federal government cannot encroach upon the rights of states. And it failed again yesterday when the Supreme Court ruled that Congress has authority to establish the voting age for national elections, upholding the validity of a federal law lowering the voting age to 18 for presidential and congressional contests.

It should be stressed that the issue in the case was not whether 18-year-olds should be permitted to vote. It was, rather, a jurisdictional question: Does authority for fixing the voting age rest with Congress or with the individual states? Even men who are inclined to favor a voting age of 18 can weep for the blow yesterday's decision dealt the Constitution.

Nowhere does the Constitution state or even imply that the federal government has any responsibility whatever for determining the voting age for any election—federal, state or local. But it refers unmistakably to the states' authority in this area.

In Section 2 of Article I, and in the Seventeenth Amendment, the Constitution declares that voters who participate in Congressional elections "shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the state legislature." In other words, whatever qualifications a state imposes upon voters who particiapte in its legislative contests should apply to those who participate in Congressional elections. Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment recognizes 21 as the standard voting age. The effect of Yesterday's decision is to nullify all of these provisions.

So Congress now has the authority to determine the age of men and women who will select its members and the President of the United States. At the moment it believes they should be 18. But how long will it be before some Congressman, awed by the "youth culture" that so impressed the Scranton commission, will insist upon lowering the voting age to 17? Or 16? Or 12? After all, there's nothing special about age 18.

MEMORIAL TO WOODROW WILSON

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on October 19 last, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, established by the Congress to be a living memorial to the 28th President, opened its door to its first 22 distinguished scholars from this country and abroad in its interim quarters in the Smithsonian Institution Building in Washington, D.C.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate our former—and soon to be again—colleague in the other House, the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, who serves the center as chairman of the board of trustees, for the excellent work which he and his associates have done to launch this new intellectual resource in the Nation's Capital.

As some of my colleagues will remember, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars was established by Act of Congress in October, 1968, to be:

> . . . a living institution expressing the ideals and concerns of Woodrow Wilson . . . symbolizing and strengthening the fruitful relation between the world of learning and the world of public affairs.

The fellowship program designed by the center seeks to carry out this mandate through the selection of persons of intellect from the U.S. and the international community to study a variety of issues—mainly contemporary in nature—which are not receiving the attention they deserve by other institutions of learning. In its opening period, the center has chosen to emphasize particularly two most important subjects: the development of international law and cooperation in the uses of oceans; and man's relationships and response to his deteriorating environment, with special attention to the new forms of international cooperation needed to address effectively those environmental problems that transcend national boundaries.

It is noteworthy that fellowship recipients are selected not only from the traditional academic disciplines but from a variety of other occupations and professions, including law, business, labor, diplomacy, journalism, and so forth. By fostering this diversity, essential to the effective consideration of complex problems, and by emphasizing communication and the exchange of ideas between the scholars and members of the Washington official, intellectual, and diplomatic communities, the center hopes to create an institution that, in keeping with the Wilsonian spirit, will not only contribute new insights into ways of dealing with a set of important issues, but will add an important new dimension to the intellectual life of this city.

The accompanying list of first fellowship appointments attests to the fact that the center is off to a most impressive beginning. As a representative of the State which gave Woodrow Wilson to the Nation and the world, and as one of the sponsors and floor manager of the legislation which created the center, I am pleased by this beginning, and commend the center to the attention and support of my colleagues and the Nation:

APPOINTMENTS OF FELLOWS AND GUEST SCHOLARS OF WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

A. FELLOWS

(1) *Environment studies*

Stephen V. Boyden, 44, Australia, Head of Urban Biology Group at Australian National

University. Writer and lecturer on broad biological consequences of advancing technology of advanced societies. Desires to work on book on "The Biology of Civilization" which will be an attempt to describe aspects of the contemporary human situation in biological perspective, and to discuss interaction between natural and cultural processes as they relate to problems of modern man.

Douglas M. Costle, 31, attorney and government official. After graduation from Harvard and the University of Chicago Law School. Costle served in legal capacities in the Civil Rights Division at the Justice and later the Commerce Departments. After practicing law with a firm in San Francisco, Costle returned to government as a senior staff associate on the Environment and Natural Resources Panel of the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization under Roy Ash. Costle and one other have been given principal credit for formulation of President Nixon's reorganization plan and message on the new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). He will concentrate at the Center on related basic values issues of the quest for a better environment and the international institutional and political questions which will call for sustained attention.

Pyong-Choon Hahm, 38, Professor of Law and Director of Graduate Studies, Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea. A graduate of Harvard Law School and a past Fulbright research scholar at Yale Law School, Hahm is the author of a book and several articles on law and politics in Korea and comparative judicial and cultural studies. He would like to work at the Center on the comparative analysis of Korean and American cultures, with special reference to the differences between eastern and western attitudes towards man-nature relationships. (Coming March, 1971.)

Elizabeth Haskell, 28, member of the research staff of the Urban Institute in Washington, D.C.; previously aide to U.S. Senator Jackson; will head small task force project funded largely by the Ford Foundation to analyze existing state environmental institutions, with special emphasis on New York and Washington state agencies, and to formulate general guidelines based on legal and public administration research, to assist state legislatures in developing comprehensive, environmental institutional arrangements. Currently co-authoring book on thermal pollution, she has in past year compiled two-volume compendium and evaluation of federal programs involved in urban waste management and regulation of quality of urban environment.

Paul G. Kuntz, 55, Professor of Philosophy, Emory University, Atlanta. A Ph. D. from Harvard, Kuntz has achieved a large number of academic honors and taught philosophy at Harvard, Smith and Grinnell before going to Emory in 1966. He is the author of several books on philosophy and numerous articles covering a wide range of humanist concerns. He plans to work at the Center on a book on a three-part concept of order in a deteriorating environment—the order of the person, the order of society and the order of nature.

Athelstan Spilhaus, 59, meteorologist, oceanographer, environmentalist; president, American Association for the Advancement of Science 1970–71. Self-employed as writer and consultant in Florida during the last year, Spilhaus has been president of the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia 1967–69; dean of the Institute of Technology at the University of Minnesota 1949–66; and has held a succession of teaching, consulting and board positions in the fields of meteorology, oceanography and other natural sciences. He has held presidential appointments—UNESCO, Seattle World's Fair and National Science Board—under Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson. His extensive writings have concentrated recently on environmental issues, particularly new town issues.

Robert E. Stein, 31, attorney for U.S. Section of International Joint Commission (U.S. & Canada) and Attorney Advisor, Legal Advisor's Office, Department of State; previously attorney, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and American Law Institute; honor graduate, Brandeis University and Columbia Law School. Has well-developed study proposal for "organizing transnationally for environmental control".

(2) Ocean studies

R. P. Anand, 37, Professor and Head of Department of International Law, Indian School of International Studies, author of several books and numerous articles on international courts, arbitration and conflict settlement. Wants to write book on legal control of the seabed and ocean floor.

Edward Duncan Brown, 36, senior lecturer in International Law at University College, London; master of law with distinction, University College; Ph. D. thesis on institutional models for a legal regime of ocean space due for submission July, 1970; author of a number of articles and papers on ocean issues, particularly deep sea mineral resources, legal regimes and pollution problems. He plans to undertake a comparative study in depth of international models for a legal regime for deep ocean space.

Lucius C. Caflisch, 34, Assistant Professor of International Law, Graduate Institute of International Studies at Geneva, and lecturer in law at University of Geneva. Holds law degrees (*Licence en Droit* and *Docteur in Droit*) from the University of Geneva and a Master of Arts Degree from Columbia University. He has published international law articles in English, French and German journals. Caflisch wants to undertake research on legal questions relating to the pollution of the high seas, including the transport of oil and maritime accidents.

Moritaka Hayashi, 32, member of study group of ocean exploitation law at Japanese Institution of International Business Law in Tokyo; Lecturer at Hosei University in Tokyo; previous assignments with legislative reference bureau of the Japanese Diet. Has law degrees from both Waseda University in Tokyo and Tulane University in New Orleans, and has done advanced graduate study work at the University of Pennsylvania. Author of several articles and a book on various aspects of the law of the sea, particularly on continental shelf problems. He would like to do systematic research on Soviet attitudes toward ocean space, deep seabed and ocean floor problems, and the prospects for international cooperation with the West in this area. (Coming March, 1971).

E. W. Seabrook Hull, 47, marine affairs publicist. President and founder, Nautilus Press, and editor, *Ocean Science News* and *World Ecology 2000;* previously editor, *Underseas Technology;* editor with McGraw-Hill, Whaley-Eaton Service; author of books and articles on oceans; Master of Marine Affairs, University of Rhode Island. Wants to work on model international regime for prevention, control and clean-up of ocean pollution.

Vladimir Ibler, 56, Dean of Faculty of Law, University of Zagreb, Yugoslavia. Author of a number of publications on international ocean law and foremost Yugoslav scholar in field. Wants to explore new ways to extend international agreement to cover uses of the seabed and the political and economic dynamics of doing so.

Gerard J. Mangone, 52, Professor of Political Science, Temple University; previously principal deputy, Maxwell School, Syracuse; early interest in and writings about development of international law of oceans; considerable administrative experience. (He also serves as Executive Director of the President's Commission for the Observance of the 25th Anniversary of the United Nations). Mangone has made a long-term commitment to the Center as senior fellow and coordinator of ocean studies.

P. S. Rao, 27, a graduate of Andhra University, Waltair, India, Rao has just received his doctorate in international law at Yale for an excellent thesis on "Legal Regulation of the Exploitation of the Deep Seabed". He wants to undertake research on the international issues involved in offshore natural resources exploitation and world public order.

George E. Reedy, Jr., 52, writer; previously press secretary to President Johnson 1964–65; special assistant to the Vice President 1961–63; staff director, Senate Majority Policy Committee, 1955–60; member of (Stratton) Commission on Marine Science Engineering and Resources (1967–69). Based on his experience on the Stratton Commission and extensive subsequent research, Reedy now plans a book on marine policy problems for which he has received an advance from his publisher.

Hideo Takabayashi, 42, Professor of International Law, Ryukoku University, Kyoto, Japan; author of numerous articles and book on maritime and ocean law problems, particularly fisheries questions. Wants to undertake study of future regime of the use and exploitation of the seabed and ocean floor, with special emphasis on the needs of developing countries.

(3) General studies

R. C. Anderson, 51, Associate Director, Brookhaven National Laboratory; specialist in chemistry and American Literature; wishes to study role of science in modern society by an interview process with officials in the Executive and Legislative Branches. (October–November, 1970.)

Shlomo Avineri, 37, political scientist and historian; chairman of the Political Science Department of Hebrew University in Jerusalem; Ph.D from London School of Economics (1964). Author of recent works on Marx and Hegel, Avineri wishes to pursue his studies of possible options for the resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict, with special attention to the role of the Palestinians on whom he is an acknowledged expert. (Coming Sept. 1971.)

C. Alton Frye, 33, Administrative Assistant to Senator Edward W. Brooke; political scientist, writer; Ph.D from Yale. Plans to write book on "A Responsible Congress: The Legislative Context of American Foreign Policy", for which he received a grant from the Council on Foreign Relations.

Rajeshwar Dayal, 61, presently senior fellow at Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton; previously Foreign Secretary and Head of Indian Foreign Service; Special Representative of U.N. Secretary General in Congo and head of U.N. Mission; Indian Permanent Representative to U.N.; High Commissioner to Pakistan; Ambassador to France, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Romania and Greece; Minister in Moscow. Wants to write book on international peacekeeping, conciliation and mediation, drawing particularly on U.N. Congo experience.

Jackson Giddens, 34, Assistant Professor of Political Science at MIT; Ph.D from Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. After five years of related studies, he wants to study in depth the origins and effects of Wilson's approach to communications with other nations, and use of propaganda. (Coming January, 1971.)

Jules Gueron, 62, Master of Conferences, Science Faculty, Sorbonne; specialist in physical chemistry; former Director, French Atomic Energy Commission; former Director General, European Atomic Energy Community. Wants to study (1) process by which U.S. Government science policy is developed; and (2) relevance of U.S. interstate regulating system for European Community. An

internationally known physical chemist and science administrator as well as a philosopher and student of comparative political developments. (Coming June, 1971.)

Robert E. Lane, 53, Chairman of Political Science Department, Yale University; President 1970–71 of American Political Science Association; author of several books and numerous articles on American government and political life; wants to study how political science research can become more useful and better known to top Executive and Legislative Branch officials.

Yves-Henri Nouailhat, 35, French historian, writer; wishes to study relations between France and U.S. between 1914 and 1917. He has received a full grant from the American Council of Learned Societies for the coming year.

H. J. Rosenbaum, 29, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Wellesley College, and Latin American expert. Desires to study U.S. Military Assistance Program and its relationship to the political process and indigenous arms manufacture in Latin America.

H. I. Sharlin, 44, Professor of History (of science), Iowa State University. Desires to work on the role of 19th century science and technology in the formation of American attitudes.

Kurt Spillman, 32, Swiss historian at University of Zurich, now on research fellowship at Yale University; author of several publications, including article on Wilson. Wants to study "motives and goals of the peace concepts of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt: a case study of the gap between long-range objectives on foreign policy and the realities of making peace."

David Wise, 40, self-employed journalist and writer, Washington, D.C.; formerly Washington Bureau Chief, New York Herald Tribune, co-author of U–2 Affair (1962). The Invisible Government (1964), The Espionage Establishment (1967), numerous articles in leading newspapers and magazines; currently co-authoring college textbook on American political system. Wants to study processes through which government decision-making and action, especially in field of foreign policy are—or are not—translated into public information and public support.

B. GUEST SCHOLARS

Lynton K. Caldwell, 57, political scientist; professor of government at Indiana University; author of a number of books and publications on biopolitics, science, ethics and public policy and articles over several years on environmental questions. Now working on book on "Protecting the Biosphere: International Organization for Environmental Control" for publication in 1972 prior to U.N. Environmental Conference. Based on considerable travels books will concentrate on international understanding, cooperation and arrangements necessary for combatting environmental problems on international scale, influence of international business, science and technology and limitations of present international structure. Will conduct and participate in planned series of seminars at Center in 1971 on international environmental issues.

Aaron L. Danzig, 57, attorney, senior partner in law offices of Nemeroff, Jelline, Danzig, Paley and Kaufman, New York City; A.B. and LLB Columbia; LLM New York University; President, U.S. Financial Co., Inc., New York City; charter member World Peace through Law Center; chairman of U.N. Charter Commission; member Commission to Study Organization of Peace. Author of books and articles, including draft legal regimes on seabeds, U.N., etc. Plans to spend 3 weeks at Center developing treaty proposal on ocean pollution matters.

Wilton Dillon, 47, anthropologist, Smithsonian Institution, 1969 to date; currently working on AID project to initiate ecological studies in Ghana, Korea, Brazil and Kenya. With National Academy of Sciences (1963–69) as Head, African Affairs Section; Staff Director, Science Organization Development; and Director of Studies, Office of Foreign Secretary. Author of books and articles on development, social behavior, Science and African themes. Will spend part time at Center as guest scholar working on essay on management of science diplomacy.

Rene Jules Dubos, 69, micro-biologist and leading environmentalist; professor at Rockefeller University in New York City; first to demonstrate feasibility of obtaining germ-fighting drugs from microbes more than 20 years ago. Noted author of fourteen books, including Pulitzer Prize in 1969 for "So Human an Animal." Dubos has been concerned with the effects and environmental forces—physicochemical, biological and social—exerted on human life. His interest in the biological and mental effects of the total environment has involved him in the sociomedical problems of the underprivileged communities as well as the developed areas of the world. Dubos has indicated he will devote "ample time to participate in the activities of the Woodrow Wilson International Center" in defining environmental study objectives and in helping to find and select the scholars who would like to work on these problems at the Center in its opening year.

Edward Wenk, Jr., 50, professor of engineering and public affairs, University of Washington; Chairman, Committee on Public Engineering Policy, National Academy of Engineering; formerly executive secretary (1966–70), National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development; leading authority on multiple policy aspects of ocean uses; first advisor on science and technology, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; Executive Secretary of Federal Council for Science and Technology; Director of Engineering in civil engineering, Johns Hopkins. Dr. Wenk will spend regularly two days a month on ocean studies at Center.

MOVIE INDUSTRY UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, because of the serious unemployment situation in the motion picture industry, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by Mr. Ralph Peckham, business representative of the Motion Picture Set Painters, Local 729, of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, and secretary of the motion picture health and welfare plan, which he presented before the U.S. Tariff Commission dealing with this important subject.

The statement follows:

MOVIE INDUSTRY UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Ralph Peckham)

Mr. Chairman and honorable members of the Commission, my name is Ralph Peckham.

I am business representative of the Motion Picture Set Painters, Local 729 of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees.

I am also secretary of the Motion Picture Health and Welfare Plan and have been a member of the board of trustees of that fund for the past fifteen years.

In addition, I am cochairman of the benefits committee and secretary of the finance committee of the fund.

In this capacity, I am presenting this brief to show the serious economic effect unemployment, caused mainly by foreign produced motion pictures and T.V. series, has on the employees of the American motion picture industry.

The Motion Picture Health & Welfare Fund is experiencing serious economic problems due to the lack of employment in the motion picture industry. These problems are in relationship to the loss of employment opportunities and the direct loss of contributions which support the motion picture health & welfare fund.

The fund receives 22.55% per hour for all hours worked in the motion picture industry and all of the benefits provided for the members of this fund are purchased from these contributions. The administrator of the motion picture health & welfare fund reported at the last meeting of the board:

"During the last six-month period, the fund paid out more in claims than it received in contributions."

Specifically: The Insurance Carrier Union Labor Life, has notified the fund that the deficit for the past year has been $2,699,650. This is broken down into two separate funds, i.e.,

Active Employees Fund—At a total deficit, over the past year, of $1,907,658.

Retirees Fund—At a total deficit, over the past year, of $791,992.

(For further details, see attached report.)

The greatest concern to the union representatives in the Motion Picture Industry is the *deprivation and human suffering.*

3,024 previously eligible employees of the Motion Picture Industry, and their families, are no longer eligible to receive hospital and medical benefits from the fund, for the present period (July 1, 1970 to December 31, 1970). They were unable to work the minimum requirement of 300 hours in the previous six-month qualifying period. These employees and their families have no medical and hospital coverage and can receive no assistance from the Motion Picture Health & Welfare Fund. If they should suffer injury or become ill, they must resort to public welfare for assistance.

In addition to the problem of reduced contributions to the fund, due to the loss of employment, the difficult situation has been compounded by the spiraling cost of hospital and medical charges. The insurance carrier has notified the fund that, effective July 1, 1971 the insurance premium will be increased $7.50 per member, per month, for the active employees (a total of $508.08 per year). In addition, the retiree fund has incurred a 50% rise in premium, resulting in the retirees' loss ratio of 9.10%, requiring an increase of $7.06 per member per month, for the retirees' coverage. New total payment will be $37.07 per retired member, per month ($444.85 per year).

After careful consideration of the economics involved, the trustees are reluctantly initiating the following curtailments:

1. Amend the insurance policy to limit future psychiatric care in a general hospital to a maximum of 14 days.

2. Eliminate the present pharmaceutical provisions and to initiate an in-house pharmaceutical facility for participants in the health and welfare fund.

3. Eliminate all abuses.

4. Establish stronger collective procedures in order to guarantee employers' payments to the fund.

In addition to the above, the board of trustees voted on November 11, 1970, to sell common stock in the amount of $1,671,500. To provide liquidity in meeting the hospital and medical charges.

The motion picture health and welfare fund is not an elaborate fund, as it only provides for basic coverage. It does not provide dental care and practically no psychiatric coverage.

The facts presented dramatically demonstrate the serious condition of the employees in the motion picture industry. There is no relief in sight. As stated by the trustees representing the motion picture studios at the health and welfare fund meeting on November 11, 1970, the conditions in the motion picture industry, as far as unemployment is concerned, are the worst in the history of the industry and will continue to get worse, as there has been a serious cutback in television production and we have lost the greatest advertising customer, the cigarette industry, effective January 1, 1971, to the media. There is a very limited number of feature motion pictures being scheduled for production in this country in the next six months.

We need your help and assistance in protecting the employees of the motion picture industry and saving this vital American motion picture and television communications media for the United States.

SCHLITZ HIRES NOTED SCIENTIST AS ADVISER IN POLLUTION FIGHT

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 9, 1970

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co. of Milwaukee has engaged Dr. Rene Jules Dubos, world-famed microbiologist and environmentalist, as an ecological consultant. I insert, at this time, an article from the Milwaukee Journal of December 6, 1970, on the appointment of Dr. Dubos:

SCHLITZ BREWS REMEDIES

(By Harry S. Pease)

The Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co. stepped into the fight for the environment Saturday by engaging Rene Dubos, world famous bacteriologist and Pulitzer Prize author, as an ecological consultant.

Dubos, 69, is a professor at Rockefeller University in New York City. His research led to the development of antibiotics, to studies of the organism that causes tuberculosis and to demonstration that adverse conditions in early life have long term effects on animal and human development.

"So Human an Animal," one of the 13 books he has written, won him a Pulitzer Prize in 1969. It reflects his interest in ecology.

The Schlitz appointment was announced by Robert A. Uihlein Jr., the brewing firm's president and board chairman.

"We are honored that Dr. Dubos, one of the world's leading scientists, will join the people of Schlitz to seek meaningful answers to the environmental dilemmas that face our society," he said.

"Dr. Dubos gained fame by finding answers to some of man's most pressing problems. We at Schlitz realize that he might very well come up with recommendations not always easy for us to implement.

"Well, that's why we asked him to help us. He will be a consultant to whom we will listen."

The part time post is the first industrial affiliation Dubos has agreed to in his long career.

The scientist will advise on environmental problems arising directly from the brewing industry. He also will consider ways in which the resources of money, technology and management skill in big business can best be used to safeguard and improve the natural heritage.

"Schlitz, like many other American firms, is worried both as a citizen and as a business," Dubos explained in an interview. "In part it was worried about hostility toward business, because business was being blamed for spoiling the environment."

He said he would think about three specific brewery problems at first—avoidance of pollution in waste water from the brewing process, what to do about litter of bottles and cans now in use, and means by which containers could be made so they would decompose after use.

Of his wider ecological tasks he said:

"I believe it is the responsibility of industry to support, in some way, research in these problems . . . perhaps to support students in research . . . perhaps to encourage the mass media to advocate improvement. . . .

"It would go all the way, beginning from some social awareness that I have. I would be a technical adviser and an acting public conscience. . . .

"How I shall do it I have no notion."

He continued to muse:

"You cannot work a solution only from technology. You must make it socially acceptable to the American people. I can bring in a kind of confidence that it can be done.

"At the present time I've been making a kind of name for myself by being an optimist."

POINTS TO EUROPE

Dubos is fond of pointing out that Europe, which has been under intensive human use for 4,000 years or more, remains habitable and pleasant. He recalls examples of areas that deteriorated and have been restored. He points to terrible turn-of-the-century conditions that have been improved.

"I'm convinced that it is the responsibility of those who can afford it to shout over the rooftops, 'Yes, we have problems, but we have the financial and intellectual resources to pull ourselves out of it,'" he said.

Dubos has little patience with prophets of doom or the problem solutions they propose.

"In all the studies that are currently being conducted on the condition of the environment, I always have the feeling that many of the people active in the environmental movement are creating a world where there would be no people," he said.

"I think what motivates many of my colleagues who say man is on the threshold of extinction is that it's a very easy way to achieve notoriety, which is a kind of fame."

CHANGE IS CONSTANT

Man always has and always will change his environment, Dubos declared.

"I'm almost intoxicated with the expression, 'creative stewardship of the earth,'" he said. "Let's try to make something out of it, something that meets human needs and aspirations.

"I think we always manage the environment, to such an extent that I don't like the word 'conservation.' It means keeping things unchanged.

"The problem is not whether you manage or do not manage, but whether you develop the knowledge and common sense to leave the environment in good condition for following generations. . . ."

A rarity among environmentalists in Dubos' seeing some good in the suburbs. By landscaping their lots, New York suburbanites have re-created a forest that was lost, he said.

"There are many more trees in the immediate neighborhood of New York than there were 75 years ago," he said.

The physical environment isn't the problem, he said. The suburbs include people so much alike that children in them grow up with almost as narrow an experience as children in the city slums.

He does not oppose science and technology; he only wants to expand their world view. And, although much of the agitation comes from university campuses, he doubts that many solutions will originate there.

"Where the scientists have been at fault is in not being willing to direct their studies to the consequences of their actions, even after they have been warned," he said. He said the academic pattern did not reward that kind of effort with promotions, honors or administrative posts.

"At the end of the last century everybody knew that much of disease came from malnutrition, came from dirt in the streets, came from awful working conditions, came from the whole messiness of the total urban environment," he said.

"Yet nobody in science considered that a respectable problem. It was citizens in the general public who forced a study of this problem."

Even then, he said, the study was not made in universities. It was private agencies like the Rockefeller Institute in New York, the Pasteur Institute in France, the Lister Institute in England and the Koch and Erlich Institutes in Germany that came to grips with the need, he said.

Dubos has lived in the New York area since coming to the United States from his native France in 1924, but he has one tenuous link with Wisconsin.

DECIDES TO MOVE

He was considering emigrating when he fell into chance conversation with Acher Hobson, a University of Wisconsin professor of agricultural economics, at a scientific meeting in Rome. Dubos was worried because he had little money, knew nobody in America well and did not even speak English.

Hobson encouraged him to try it, adding that he could manage a loan if Dubos got into financial trouble. "I know how to pick a winner," Hobson said.

Dubos took the step and went on to enormous professional success. He never met the UW professor again.

Dubos became an American citizen in 1938.

He will retire soon from Rockefeller University to take over his appointment as director of environmental studies at the new State University of New York in Purchase, N.Y.

NATIONAL URBAN GROWTH POLICY FOR COUNTRY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 3, 1970, the House approved H.R. 19436, the proposed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970. The purpose of this legislation is to provide for the establishment of a national urban growth policy, to encourage and support the proper growth and development of our States, metropolitan areas, cities, counties, and towns with emphasis upon new community and inner-city development. This bill represents the Congress response in aiding this country to achieve the housing goals of providing 26 million units of housing over the next 10 years.

During consideration of the bill on the floor of the House, my colleague, Congressman GARRY BROWN of the Third Congressional District of Michigan, offered a substitute housing bill which was rejected. One section of Congressman BROWN'S bill. which he withdrew from consideration. would have amended the Public Utility Holding Company Act of

1935 to permit the acquisition by a registered utility holding company of securities of a subsidiary company engaged in the business of providing housing for persons of low or moderate income under programs authorized by the National Housing Act or any supplementary legislation, or any company organized to participate in housing programs under the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. Because of the interest in this legislative proposal and even though it was withdrawn from consideration, I would like to take this opportunity to state my reasons for opposing the measure.

The Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 was passed as a result of a 101 volume utility industry study conducted by the Federal Trade Commission. The study was so exhaustive that is has been described as "the most thoroughgoing investigation of an American industry that has ever appeared." The evils uncovered in the study and referred to in the act itself included inflationary writeups on the books of operating companies, which were found to complicate the regulation of rates; acquisitions of properties at grossly inflated prices; preoccupation of management with financial maneuvering rather than efficient production and distribution of gas and electricity in the meeting of local needs; and concentration of economic power too large for local regulation and presenting dangers of monopolistic control.

In the act itself, it is declared that the national public interest, the interest of investors in the securities of holding companies and their subsidiary companies and affiliates, and the interest of consumers of electric energy and natural and manufactured gas, are or may be adversely affected when subsidiary public-utility companies are subjected to excessive charges for services, construction work, equipment, and materials, or enter into transactions in which evils result from an absence of arm's-length bargaining or from restraint of free and independent competition. This danger of restraint of trade and independent competition is the basis for my opposition to an amendment allowing public utility firms to enter into the construction industry for the purpose of building low- and moderate-income houses.

Concentration is particularly troublesome in the energy industry. A number of committees of the Congress, Presidential task forces and Federal executive agencies are all engaged in studies directed at fashioning an appropriate policy to cope with our rather dramatic transition from an energy surplus to an energy deficit society. Further, all available data show staggering increases in common ownership of competing energy forms.

Hearings held by a House small business subcommittee, of which I am chairman, into promotional practices by public utilities clearly show the dangers inherent in allowing utility companies to enter into contracts for or the actual construction of residential property, whether it be low- or moderate-income or houses in higher brackets. By allowing an electric or gas utility company to construct and sell housing, competing energy fuels are almost automatically excluded from competition. The subcommittee hearings clearly showed that utility companies spend millions of dollars a year in cash payments to builders or developers, the sale of equipment at below-cost prices, free installation, and covenants on land requiring the use of only one type of fuel in the erection of any structures.

Since the hearing, a number of corrective actions have been taken by the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Justice, individual States and the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissions. Since it would be clearly counter productive within the context of those hearings to allow utilities to build markets for themselves from which competing energy forms might be excluded, I believe this would be a matter worthy of the fullest consideration before final judgments are made.

The need for and necessity of low- and moderate-income housing is of prime concern to me, and my voting record clearly shows my past and continuing support for legislation designed to alleviate this country's severe housing shortage. I am compelled to conclude, however, that there are many other avenues which can be followed in obtaining this country's goal of adequate housing for everyone without endangering competition and possibly fostering monopolistic control in the construction industry.

Thus, it is my position that we are discussing here a very important policy decision which will have profound impact in the decades ahead. Such judgments should be made only after appropriate forums are provided for all interested witnesses. Detailed consideration must be given to a myriad of factors for sufficient insight to be developed. In seeking to block Representative BROWN'S amendment, I did not mean in any way to preclude proper consideration of this problem on its own merits during the next Congress. In fact, I favor such a course. It is clear, however, that this was a matter of sufficient importance to the public interest that it not be resolved by a last minute amendment from the floor, which could not, of course, have had the benefit of more than a very cursory consideration by this body.

TRIBUTE TO A LOVELY LADY

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during my term in office, I have followed with great interest the Tocks Island projects and the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.

I was the cosponsor for the bill authorizing the national recreation area, and have given my fullest support through the ensuing years for both of these all-important projects. Naturally, I have also been deeply concerned with the impact these projects would have on the affected people of this region. And I have worked diligently to minimize the hardships that would be created. I feel very strongly that every precaution must be taken to see that the area is utilized fully for the purposes to which it is best suited.

Mrs. George R. Nyce of Allentown, Pa., wrote to me some time ago to express her feelings about the Tocks Island project. In her letter, she said:

I may be "maudlin and senile"—But I am 77 years old and I remember the valley since I was five years old.

So forgive me and read this bit of how I feel. But am so glad that it will be a wonderful place in years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I want very much to share Mrs. Nyce's fine poem with you and my distinguished colleagues. She is truly one of the "beautiful people."

The poem follows:

FAREWELL TO MY VALLEY

The River flows so peacefully
Between the fields and hills
Widening as a quiet pond
Or through a deep gorge spills.
Once birch canoes of Indians
Moved silently by day
While in the night, their camp-fire light
Cast shadows cross the way
Then white man came with eager tread
To farm the fertile land
And worked to earn a livelihood
With the strength of their own hands
In winter lumbering began
They cut with axe and saw
Dragged huge logs near river bank,
To wait the first spring thaw.
As rafters poled the timbers down
The fields were turning green
And farmers worked hard with their plows
To bring truth to their dreams.
The years passed by, and city-folk
Cause to spend the summer,
We made our home a boarding house
And welcomed each new comer
Then highways and great bridges grew
Over our peaceful valley
And throngs of people, came this way
Feeling Crowded alleys—
So engineers will build a dam.
And we shall say farewell
But in our hearts, there'll always be
Found dreams they cannot quell.

L. B. NYCE.

POLITICS KEEPS HIM YOUNG

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, we are increasingly told lately that, as with other things in our youth-oriented culture, politics is becoming the province of the young. As with all generalizations there comes along an example that makes us pause and reconsider.

I am proud to call my friend a man who has participated in local politics for 70 years and remains active today as a Democratic committeeman in the 42d ward in Philadelphia, one of 15 wards which comprise my congressional district.

At 94, Abe Katz is a wonder. In my recent reelection campaign, I remember vividly Abe taking the floor at the opening of my headquarters and giving the kind of spirited political pep talk any of us in this Chamber would envy.

With the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I enter here in the RECORD a column by Mr. Sandy Padwe which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on November 4 of this year and which describes far better than I can the remarkable accomplishments of Abe Katz:

HE'S "YOUNG" AT 94, THANKS TO POLITICS

(By Sandy Padwe)

Abe Katz works a 10-hour day at his finance company, then walks the streets of the 42d Ward in the Northeast campaigning and shaking hands, talking politics and making sure his voters will make it to a polling booth on Election Day.

At night, there are Democratic committee meetings and street corner rallies and sometimes those big $100-a-plate dinners.

Once, Abe Katz could breathe deeply at election time and inhale the crisp, fall air with its touch of burning leaves. But like so many other things, even that has changed. Now, people tell Abe Katz that it is dangerous to breathe the air in Philadelphia.

Abe Katz is 94 and a Democratic committeeman. He's been in local politics for 70 years. After all those bad cigars and smoke-filled rooms, air pollution doesn't frighten him.

Election Day is important to Abe Katz. He turns his office, on East Wyoming ave., into a command center where party workers are on the phones with the voters and where people can drop in for some political chatter between Abe Katz's frequent visits to the polling locations.

IF IT WEREN'T FOR POLITICS

"Ten-hour days are nothing for him; he has a lot of stamina," said Morris Katz, Abe's 64-year-old son. "Without all this he'd be lost. He loves it. If he gets tired, he has a bed in the back that he can use to rest."

Abe Katz agrees with his son. "If it weren't for politics," he said, laughing, "maybe I wouldn't be here. Politics keeps me healthy."

Abe Katz has clear blue eyes, a bald head, a loud voice and 70 years worth of political memories. The years haven't harmed his faculties. He is much more alert than many 50-year-olds.

He doesn't make many claims, but one bit of history Abe Katz insists upon concerns Theodore Roosevelt. Abe Katz says he was the first person to call Roosevelt, "Mr. President."

"You know," Abe Katz said, "that Roosevelt was once the police commissioner of New York City. Well, I started as a peddler in New York on the Lower East Side. I had a push-cart. I sold pears. Five for a dime. I used to sell them near Schwartz' restaurant at Houston and Clinton.

"Theodore Roosevelt used to eat in Schwartz' a lot and sometimes he bought pears from me. Even when he didn't, he'd wink at me or nod and say hello.

"One night, one of the policemen told me to move from the corner where I sold the pears. I went into Schwartz' and told Mr. Roosevelt about it. He came down later and spoke to the policeman. The next day the policeman comes up to me and says, "Why didn't you tell me you knew the commissioner?' That's when I started calling Roosevelt, 'Mr. President'."

SELLS ORANGES AT WORLD'S FAIR

From New York, Abe Katz moved to Philadelphia. He was still in the pushcart business. In 1904, he decided that the world's fair in St. Louis would be a lucrative site to sell oranges. Abe Katz went to St. Louis and had one of the prime spots outside the main gate.

"President Roosevelt," Abe Katz said, "came out for the opening ceremonies and when they were over he was leaving and walked past me, stopped and came back. It had been a few years since he had seen me. 'Do you have a brother in New York?' he said. Then I told him who I was and he laughed and invited me to Washington. I went there, too, on my way home from St. Louis and he showed me around his office and introduced me to everyone as the first man to call him, 'Mr. President'."

Abe Katz also claims to have saved Al Smith's life one particularly cold, blustery day following the Presidential election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. "I was in Washington with some people from the John O'Donnell Democratic Club and we were celebrating FDR's victory," Abe Katz said.

"We bumped into a group of New Yorkers and Gov. Smith was with them. I knew him and said, 'Governor, you don't look well, is there something I can do for you?' Now, remember, this is just before prohibition ended.

"Gov. Smith says, 'Yes, I am dying from this cold weather, does anybody have a drink?' "

Abe Katz recognized a crisis. Here was Al Smith, Presidential candidate in 1928 and an advocate for the repeal of prohibition, without a warming drink. Abe Katz was stunned. "New York Irishman without any whisky," he said. "That was terrible."

"I knew a janitor," Abe Katz continued, "who worked in the basement of the Capitol Building in Washington and sold the stuff to senators and congressmen. So I went over to him and he says, 'For you, Katz, anything.' I got a quart and took it back to Gov. Smith. He guzzled it like it was soda. He thanked me and told me I saved his life."

It is a mistake suggesting to Abe Katz that maybe a 94-year-old man should slow his pace. Abe Katz seemed indignant and started talking about the Bible.

"Old man Abraham," he said, "was 150 when he became a father. I'm not 150 yet, but . . ."

All politicians have their stock speeches. So does Abe Katz.

THE NEW YORK STAATS-ZEITUNG UND HEROLD

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the Christmas season is a nostalgic time when most of us reflect on old friendships and recall many of the organizations and institutions which made our communities better places in which to live.

Such an institution is the New York Staats-Zeitung und Herold, the second oldest daily newspaper published in America, which is located in my congressional district.

This highly respected periodical began publication on Christmas eve, 1834, and has been a tower of strength in the community and in the Nation ever since. It was my privilege to know its late publisher, Mr. August Steuer, for some 40 years, and I am sure he would be proud to know his paper continues to flourish today, not only as a chronicle of the day's events, but as a reference source for scholars.

I would like to share with my colleagues a recent article concerning this outstanding newspaper, which appeared in the New York Sunday News. The article follows:

FOR THE STAATS, WEINACHTEN IS NOT JUST YULE

Just as lusty but not quite as old, as Santa Claus, the New York Staats-Zeitung und Herold will celebrate its 136th birthday on Christmas Eve.

The second oldest daily newspaper in America, which has never missed an issue even when anti-German feelings ran high in World War II the Staats was born on old Newspaper Row opposite City Hall.

It was the night before Christmas, in 1834, when the first issue of the newspaper hit the snow-covered sidewalks of New York. The city's bustling German-speaking community greeted their newspaper with a cheery "Froehliche Weinachten" (Merry Christmas).

WON'T CUT FREQUENCY

Yesterday, publisher Erwin Single said the newspaper will continue to publish six times a week and has dropped any thoughts of cutting down to twice a week because of skyrocketing labor and production costs.

"I think diversification of our interests will help us to break even on the paper," said Single, a former reporter who knows almost every facet of New York City life as well as his own ethnic corner.

INCOME FROM BUS TOURS

"We derive income from motor tours of American cities, cultural activities and other promotions, and that really keeps the newspaper going," he explained. The Staats operation may soon solve the financial problem that faces all foreign-language newspapers in this country.

"We may begin to operate bus tours for other newspapers to help them raise new funds for survival," Single said.

The publisher, with co-owner Erwin Steuer and production chief Wolfgang Hamel, sees a bright future for Staats.

MORE LEARNING GERMAN

Steuer, in his 30s, the youngest executive at Staats, said, "I wouldn't be here if I didn't think there is a great future for the paper. The whole idea of people learning a second language is reviving. The number of German-language schools for children on Saturdays is growing. They will want to read, and keep up with events, in German. That's why our big weekend edition that carries a cultural section is so big with the younger readers; and, of course, we run all the soccer scores. In the German-speaking community, soccer is No. 1."

Single is also president of the U.S. Soccer Football Association, and a key man in the Steuben Parade Committee.

PROGRAM UPGRADES EDUCATION OFFICE SKILLS

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Office of Education has recently initiated an innovative program to provide upward mobility for nonprofessional employees. It is currently being considered for adoption by the entire Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Called the New Careers Intern program, it is designed to place lower-grade employees into part-time paraprofessional positions for 3 years while they earn a 4-year B.A. degree at Federal City College. At the conclusion of the program, the participants have a college degree and a professional position and salary within the agency. The program promises to provide a steady flow of talented and qualified professionals who will greatly help integrate HEW's professional staff and open new channels of communications with its clients.

This imaginative effort to provide equal opportunity for upward mobility regardless of economic status, skin color or cultural group membership should not go unnoticed. This program will not only help build employee morale in the Office of Education by demonstrating a genuine concern for lower echelon workers, but also will provide a highly talented group of professionals who are intimately familiar with the problems, programs and possibilities of the agency. I commend the Office of Education for this bold new step, and hope the Secretary will adopt and extend it throughout the entire Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to place in the RECORD an article on the New Careers Intern program from the Manpower Information Service Newsletter:

NEW CAREERS INTERN PROGRAM UPGRADES EDUCATION OFFICE SKILLS

The Office of Education has begun an in-house upgrading program which may become the model for other agencies concerned about workers in dead-end jobs. The New Careers Intern Program has been designed to advance 15 clerical workers (in the $6,500 to $8,000 pay range) to professional positions within the agency through on-job training and half-day sessions at Federal City College (FCC), from which they will receive a baccalaureate degree. During their three year training program, interns will receive a regular salary, starting at their present level and advancing one government pay grade each year.

The New Careers Intern Program was created and sponsored by the Bureau of Employee Development after one of their staff members, Daniel Sorensen, conducted a study of existing employment patterns within OE. Sorensen found that during 1969, 93 percent of the OE professional positions were filled by whites while 70 percent of the non-professional positions were filled by minorities, and many of the clerical positions were dead-ends for employees who did not have the educational background to advance. Sorensen also found that many bureau chiefs, having discovered their clerks were capable of doing more than secretarial work, had promoted them in terms of responsibility and job performance. However, the clerks could only receive payment for the secretarial work they did because they did not qualify for more advanced government pay scales.

Recognizing the need for technical and paraprofessional positions within the agency, Sorensen headed a task force which undertook a one month pilot project in the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development at OE. They attempted to create a single technician job. At the end of the month it appeared that they had merely created another dead-end position, but one with higher pay, rather than a springboard for future advancement. They concluded that for any development project to succeed, full support, including funds and commitments for future promotions, was needed from the administrators of OE.

Sorensen proceeded to convince the Commissioner of Education to support the development of a New Careers Program for upgrading the level of the educational bureaucracy. The Office of Education agreed to provide money for salaries, tuition, and books for the Career Interns, and a grant of $48,000 was obtained from the Manpower Development and Training Act to create a New Careers Institute at FCC.

THE SELECTION PROCESS

A brochure was sent out twice to all OE employees explaining the New Careers Program and eligibility. All interested persons were encouraged to apply. Two-hundred eighty clerical workers, out of the 600 eligible, applied, and from them, 15 had to be chosen to enroll.

No written examination was required, for Sorensen and his staff considered the existing ones to be culturally biased. Instead, Sorensen set up 13 three-member panels, consisting of two minority employees and one white, to interview each potential participant. Before the interview took place, panel members received copies of the applicant's life history (filled out by the applicant) and a supervisor's report. The purpose of the interview was to establish whether the applicant could handle college work and then advance into a professional job. Interview guidelines indicated that applicants should be rated on the following qualities: intellectual ability, emotional stability and maturity, judgment, creativity and imagination, empathy for the poorly educated and the economically poor, and a commitment to improving the educational opportunities of all people. These qualities were to be combined with judgments of the individual's motivation and maturity, ability in oral expression, bearing and manner, social adjustment, and possible personality conflicts.

Thirty-three semi-finalists were selected and interviewed by a final panel, consisting of the head of Federal City College's New Careers Institute, a young OE professional who had previously been a clerk, and a project officer from MDTA. Fifteen finalists, 14 of whom were black and one Puerto Rican (ten women and five men), were selected and taken off their old jobs. They were relocated in 15 newly created paraprofessional positions placed throughout OE.

HOW THE PROGRAM OPERATES

For four hours each morning the 15 interns attend FCC where they take a mixture of freshmen courses (English, math, and social science) and a special curriculum that is being designed. After two hours of class, enrollees have two hours of supervised study. In the afternoon they return to OE and their new jobs. After participating in the program for three full years, interns will receive a B.A. in Community Education; they will have received administrative training and experience; and, according to Sorensen, they will be able to hold down professional positions within OE and advance through the ranks.

Participants in the program will be evaluated periodically on the basis of their school work and the performance of their jobs. Because the purpose of the program is to upgrade employees and not to fail anyone, supportive services will be available for students when needed. Sorensen has also planned to analyze the newly created paraprofessional jobs, for at the end of one year, interns will be given the option to rotate or stay where they are.

PROGRAM PROSPECTS

The present plan for the future of the New Careers Intern Program is to continue selecting 15 participants each year. After the first three years, there will be a steady flow of upgraded OE employees joining the ranks of the educational professionals. Sorensen hopes the Career Interns will become as well known as the Management Interns, who are college graduates, training for government careers. Already other agencies are making inquiries about application of the OE program to their own needs. The Department of Agriculture, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and Head Start have expressed an interest in New Careers. Sorensen feels, "The program is happening because the time is ripe." The need for upward mobility within government agencies has finally been recognized and is being remedied, he says.

CHRISTMAS AND POINSETT

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following is my Christmas message to the people of my congressional district:

CHRISTMAS AND POINSETT

Congress is still in session in Washington, so I went to Calvary Baptist Church for morning worship service. First went to Calvary when I was a freshman Congressman in 1947. My secretary, later associated with Senator Bob Kennedy and Senator Sam Ervin, virtually ordered me to attend church on Sunday and suggested Calvary at the corner of H and I Streets. Riots burned and destroyed much of this area in April 1968, but Calvary was not damaged.

This morning at Calvary I was impressed with the Christmas decorations. At least 50 poinsettia flowers were beautifully arranged from the two pulpits upward to the marble baptistry in a graceful sloping bank. Around the base of the poinsettias were white pine boughs lit with white lights. There were tall cedars on either side of the poinsettia arrangement and four huge lighted candles in front of the pulpits. My thoughts for a fleeting moment drifted back to the Garden Clubs and the florists of South Carolina. I thought of them and, yes, of our South Carolina Festival of Flowers to be held in Greenwood in July.

I sat with Brooks Hays, a Congressman for twenty years, who while serving in Congress, although a layman, was President of the Southern Baptist Convention for two consecutive years. We listened to the sermon by Dr. Clarence Cranford who was President of the American Baptist Convention at the same time Brooks Hays was President of the Southern Convention and both were attending Calvary. In those days Brooks Hays, Congressman Orin Harris of Arkansas, now a Federal Judge, and I taught lessons in the Vaughan Bible Class, one of the largest and oldest in the world.

Amos Kendall, Postmaster General under President Andrew Jackson, helped to organize Calvary Baptist Church and later contributed $60,000 to the building of the present sanctuary during the War Between the States. After serving in Jackson's Cabinet, Kendall became the attorney for Samuel Morse. The late Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes was a member at Calvary and attended regularly; in his time he sat near where we were sitting.

Dr. Cranford in his superb Christmas message said the most challenging and inspirational two words to the fantastic scientific world are "try it." He suggested we try Christianity. Dr. Cranford said he tried it and "it works." Christianity had brought him more love, compassion, goodwill, brotherhood, courtesy, and understanding. Dr. Cranford pointed out that wherever Christianity prevailed there was more freedom, more justice, less ignorance, more concern for the diseased and the poor. Wherever Christianity, there are more rights for women, economic justice, charity and tolerance. Yes, more love of and fun for children. What would Christmas be without children? What would children be without Christmas? There would be no Christmas without a Baby born in a manger. Wise men realized this fact on that very night in Bethlehem.

The brilliant Napoleon exiled on St. Helena was sad, lonely, reserved and reflective. Napoleon there is reported as having said, "Alexander, Hannibal, Caesar, and myself founded our Empires on the force of arms and they have all passed away. Jesus Christ

founded His Empire on love, and today millions worship at His feet."

From Calvary Church I walked to the National Gallery of Art and again saw Gilbert Stuart's painting of George Washington and the painting by Thomas Sully of Andrew Jackson with sword and uniform. Wandered to the Botanical Gardens with its gorgeously decorated Christmas trees and, yes, literally hundreds of beautiful poinsettias. Poinsettias of all sizes artistically arranged in sophisticated patterns—a wonderland avenue of red, white, and pink poinsettias. Washington is beautiful now—Christmas decorations everywhere challenge the imagination of creative minds. But wherever you go you find the poinsettia—in the offices of Congressmen and Senators, in homes, in the embassies, in hotel lobbies, in my apartment building—everywhere.

Joel R. Poinsett's portrait as Secretary of War hangs silently and somewhat lonely in the Pentagon. John C. Calhoun's portrait is likewise in the Pentagon as a former Secretary of War, but as the leader of a different South Carolina political philosophy.

Joel R. Poinsett was born in Charleston, South Carolina in 1779. Like so many of his aristocratic Charleston contemporaries, he spent his early childhood in England; attended private school in Connecticut and at Wandsworth near London, England; studied Medicine at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland; military science at Woolwich, England; studied law in Charleston and then traveled extensively in Europe for eight years. He was appointed by President Madison to investigate the struggle for freedom in South America where patriots struggled for liberty and independence against Spain. Later he returned to Charleston and declined an appointment by President Monroe as Commissioner to all of South America.

Poinsett was elected in 1820 to the United States Congress where he served with honor and distinction for more than four years and then resigned to accept appointment by President Monroe as the first United States Minister to Mexico. It was during his service to the Nation as Minister to Mexico that Poinsett introduced the poinsettia flower to the United States. Later Poinsett was appointed Secretary of War by President Van Buren. Joel R. Poinsett died in 1851 near what is now Statesburg, South Carolina. He was interred in the Holy Cross Episcopal Church Cemetery in Sumter County.

South Caroline's celebration of her 300th birthday is drawing to an end. We have honored our revered heroes of the past. All of America has paid tribute to South Carolina and her great contribution to the founding of the Nation as one of the original 13 colonies. Andrew Jackson's statue on horseback stands in Lafayette Square across from the White House, on the Battlefield of New Orleans, and in the Rotunda of the National Capitol. John C. Calhoun, his rival and fellow Carolinian, adorns the Capitol from one end to the other. Robert Y. Haynes' golden voice in the famous debate with Daniel Webster perhaps floats in space to be yet recorded by modern science. General Wade Hampton, one of the greatest generals of the Western World, drew his sword and left his blood on a dozen battlefields. Timrod and Hamilton grace the pages of literature, but no South Carolinian in all of her glorious history on the battlefields of the World or in the halls of Congress has left his name so warmly and graciously associated with cheer, love and peace as Joel R. Poinsett. Poinsett, like the Wise Men of Old, is indelibly associated with the birthday of the Prince of Peace.

He did it with a flower. Not with a sword, a brilliant speech or even the pen, but with a beautiful tropical flower, its leaves of scarlet like the setting sun and rich green like the Northern evergreen.

Throughout the world, the poinsettia is known and admired. Friendly Hawaii, Alaska, and even the firesides of the frozen North, every State in our great Nation, every community, the resting places of our dead, virtually every hearthstone, will be warmed and blessed by a flower—the poinsettia.

Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

Sincerely,

WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
Member of Congress.

DECEMBER 20, 1970.

THE LINDLEY-OLNEY LIONS CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA REMEMBERS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, all of us meet with civic groups which make singular and important contributions to their communities. This fall I enjoyed the hospitality of one such group which has undertaken a project that merits the attention and approbation of my colleagues.

The Lindley-Olney Lions Club is a service group in my Philadelphia congressional district. It conducts the full range of activities typical of Lions Clubs throughout the country. Additionally, however, 5 years ago the membership decided that, as a gesture of unity and a reminder that some at home do not forget, the Lindley-Olney Lions embarked on a special program.

The members decided to mail the community newspaper, the Olney Times, to servicemen and women from the community scattered across the world. In those 5 years, 100,000 copies of the Times have found eager readers wherever servicemen and servicewomen from our community have been called to serve.

The program continues and currently the Lions are mailing about 300 copies of the Olney Times every week.

Because I believe the Lindley-Olney Lions deserve our special gratitude and special appreciation for their magnificent effort, I here, with the unanimous consent of my colleagues, enter their names on the RECORD:

Charles A. Agner	Walter Goessel
James R. Allison	Herman M. Golove
William A. Anderson	Edward S. Green
Robert F. Barandon	Herman Grob
Clifford M. Bender	Fred H. Harper
George W. Bergey	Louis F. Henry
Fred G. Binder	Harrington Herr
John Blum	Fred J. Junkermann, Jr.
Raymond B. Blunt, Jr.	Dr. Morris Kaplan
Raymond J. Boldt	Harry C. Kohlmeyer
Samuel J. Bonanno	Carl Koshaml, Jr.
John J. Brady	John G. Kurz
David F. Bruce	Jacob H. Lang, Jr.
Henry P. Carr, Esq.	Philip J. Leavens
Edward J. Dunbar II	Louis Longo
Evan C. Eckert	Frank A. Mayer, Jr.
Donald C. Engel	William Miller
Enrique V. Fradera	John G. Muir
Frank J. Gallagher	Charles E. Murray, Jr.
Paul J. Geisz	Dr. Jacob J. Olitsky
Peter Geraghty	Thomas Quinn
Kenneth F. Glace	Walter A. Reznisak
Max Robinson	Richard J. Tamagno
John C. Schmidt, Esq.	Stephen Tretina
Charles J. Schrank	John A. Waldis
James D. Scully	John S. Wurst
Louis Sherman, Esq.	Charles E. Zebe
Clarence M. Stone	Alfred Zeller
Arthur A. Studenroth	

VOICE OF CONSUMERISM

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the December issue of Transport Topics, which my colleagues might wish to read in view of the discussion among many of my colleagues with reference to the consolidation of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Maritime Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board into a single agency:

VOICE OF CONSUMERISM

Seekers of change in the transportation regulatory setup often seek to wear the mantle of "consumerism," because that is one of the catch words of our time. But government leaders were given reason to question whether some of the proposed changes are really in the interest of the consumer.

The reason was given in the form of action by the National Industrial Traffic League which many consider to be the largest and oldest representative of consumer interests where transportation is concerned. The League (TT, 11-30-70, p. 1) voted against lumping the activities of the ICC, the Federal Maritime Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board into a single agency.

As William A. Bresnahan, ATA president, said last week, it would be "difficult to pinpoint a single transportation problem or condition which cannot be handled as well or better by the three existing agencies than by one new agency—assuming comparable authority and resources."

Most people close to transportation—shippers and carriers alike—are mindful of the complexities of effective regulation. They are quick to recognize that these complexities could only be compounded by mixing the problems of ocean, air and land transportation under the jurisdiction of one super agency.

It seems evident that much of the support for an organizational reshuffle in the regulatory field comes from those who recognize that, by itself, reorganization would complicate things. Their answer to this is to lessen the degree of regulation over such things as minimum rates, entry controls and destructive competition. It seems that the cry of reorganization is more an attempt to discredit the present regulatory setup than it is a move to achieve effective regulation.

Those who would change the regulatory setup give scant acknowledgment to its achievements. It seems to make little difference to them that the present regulatory agencies have fostered a sound transportation system, serving the world's greatest industrial complex, under private ownership. Certainly this should indicate to any reasonable person that no fundamental changes are needed.

There seems to be a consensus to this effect among most of the transportation forms and the shippers who use them. The national policy makers should certainly heed these opinions.

THE SCOTT REPORT

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my friend and constituent, Mr. Edward J. Sloane, of Springfield, Va., called my attention to a recent column by Paul Scott which he feels, and I agree, deserves wider attention than that it has received in the newspapers carrying Mr. Scott's column regularly. I insert the full text of the Paul Scott column for Friday, December 4, at this point in the RECORD:

THE SCOTT REPORT

(By Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON, December 4.—The establishment of Soviet Submarine "facilities" in Cuba has triggered a new controversy over the secret Kennedy-Khrushchev exchange of letters during the 1962 Cuban missile crisis.

Several members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which has the Cuban situation under study, have demanded that President Nixon release the correspondence in this exchange that has been kept secret.

Headed by Representative H. R. Gross (R. Ia.), the lawmakers want all the Kennedy-Khrushchev correspondence published to determine the full implication of the "understanding" reached by the two leaders on Cuba and its impact on present U.S. policy.

"Only by seeing what is in the Kennedy-Khrushchev correspondence," says Representative Gross, "will we be able to determine what type of commitments were made, and, whether the Russians have violated them by setting up submarine facilities in Cuba."

What isn't generally known is that Kennedy and Khrushchev exchanged more than 30 letters on subjects ranging from Cuba to the setting up of an international crisis commission to control disputes like the ones now developing in Cuba and Berlin.

The content of less than a dozen of these letters has been published. The most important letters dealing with the Kennedy-Khrushchev "understanding" on Cuba are still secret. Why?

In preparation for making a decision, the President has asked Secretary of State William Rogers to review the correspondence and recommend whether the letters can be declassified and published.

The State Department has vigorously opposed release of the still-secret part of the Kennedy-Khrushchev correspondence in the past for several reasons.

One objection is that the publication would violate an informal understanding made with the Russians at the time that several of Khrushchev's letters would not be released without prior Soviet approval.

Opposition to release of the letters was also based on the grounds that their content would "anger and excite anti-Castro Cuban groups in this country."

CHANGING SITUATION

The publication of former Soviet Premier Khrushchev's "memoirs" in the U.S. has caused the State Department to reconsider its first objection.

Several of Secretary Rogers' advisers have warned him that continued suppression of the highly controversial correspondence could eventually be an embarrassment to present Administration.

Since the White House has stated publicly that the President considers the Kennedy-Khrushchev "understanding" on Cuba to still be in effect, these State Department experts contend that the Administration should make the full details public before the Russians do.

Their concern is that the Russians are planning to use the Khrushchev "memoirs" to distort the meaning of the "understanding" reached by Kennedy and Khrushchev on Cuba to show that their activities on the island do not violate it.

Publication of one of Khrushchev's letters dealing with a Castro statement that Russia planned to establish a naval and fishing port, according to these State Department experts, would clearly show that the Soviets agreed not to undertake this type of activity in Cuba.

Other correspondence, including a long rambling letter from Khrushchev, also revealed that the Russians agreed that there should be U.N. inspection to determine if there were any offensive nuclear weapons in Cuba.

The legislators headed by Representative Gross now believe it would be a good time to make this commitment known to the world and for the U.S. to see if it can be carried out to determine if the Soviets are building a submarine base in Cuba.

Otherwise, the Gross group believes the U.S. should stop living up to its end of the "understanding" which apparently has been to protect Castro from attacks that Cuban refugees might try to launch from the U.S.

What President Nixon will finally do about the legislators request for release of the Kennedy-Khrushchev correspondence is conjectural. While he waits for the State Department's recommendation, aides say the President is reading proofs of Khrushchev's "memoirs" to see what he has to say about Cuba.

If nothing else, the new controversy over the Kennedy-Khrushchev letters should remind President Nixon that after eight years the U.S. has done nothing to help the Cuban people regain their freedom.

The movement of Chile into the Moscow-Havana Bloc would indicate that this U.S. policy if continued could be a disaster for most of Latin America and in time, the U.S.

CUBAN FALLOUT

From aerial photographs and other sources of information, American intelligence authorities report that Russia now has facilities at Cienfuegos, Cuba, capable of handling nuclear submarines. There are several barracks for crews and a soccer field. (Cubans play baseball while Russians play soccer). There are buoys for submarines to tie to; two powerless barges for minor servicing and disposal of radioactive wastes; and a tender of the UGRA class. Missile storage facilities are located nearby.

JOHN CONNALLY, A NATURAL LEADER

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the recent appointment of Hon. John B. Connally as Secretary of Treasury brings attention again to the outstanding capabilities of the former Governor of Texas.

Those of us who have known John Connally since his University of Texas days can vouchsafe for his natural talents as a leader. Through all these years in every undertaking, John Connally has demonstrated that he is a man of vision and forceful action. He will bring to the Cabinet a sense of awareness of our problems and a fierce determination to improve the economic status of every American. Having served as a former Secretary of Navy and former Governor of Texas, this man has proven his leadership.

Newspaper columnists have been speculating that there is great deal of unusual political involvement in this appointment. Indeed, some of the columnists have actually been speculating in the wildest manner that comes close to being journalistic fraud. The truth is that the President of the United States asked this outstanding man to serve in the Cabinet and Mr. Connally accepted because he felt he could render valuable service to his country. That is all the politics there is to it.

The question is whether Governor Connally can and will make a good Cabinet officer. Even his critics, Mr. Speaker, agree he is an outstanding attorney, administrator, and public servant. I can assure my colleagues he will prove to be a most refreshing and dynamic leader—and his type of leadership is sorely needed in our country now. John Connally will be an outstanding Secretary of Treasury.

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL INSURANCE SYSTEM FOR PRIVATE PENSION PLANS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 days the House has been asked to act on two bills which will have an important impact on some of the most powerful financial interests in our economy. Yesterday the House approved the conference report on a bill to create an insurance system to protect investors in stocks and bonds against financial loss due to the insolvency of securities brokers and dealers. Today the House will be considering a bill which authorizes the Federal Government to guarantee up to $125 million in loans to railroads in financial difficulties.

Both of these bills were strongly supported by the present administration. In his economic message of June 17, President Nixon described the investor-insurance plan as one of the measures needed to "help the people who need help most in a period of economic transition."

I voted in favor of these two bills when they came to the floor of the House because I felt they were urgently needed to increase the stability of two vital sectors of our economy and protect the public interest. But I feel it is indicative of the priorities of this administration that the President could have asked Congress to assist investors and the rail industry through such legislation while ignoring those in our society who have been hardest hit by the effects of this "period of economic transition"—American working men and women and their families.

Just last week we saw the President veto a manpower training bill which would have enabled thousands of jobless

Americans to remove themselves from the unemployment rolls. But in addition to such flagrant acts against the interests of American workers, the administration has failed to support other forms of legislation to protect the economic security of the worker.

Let me mention just one example. For several years now we have had before us in Congress proposed legislation of great importance to American labor. I refer to proposals, which I have cosponsored, to provide Government reinsurance of private pension plans so that employees covered by such plans will be protected if and when their employer is forced to go out of business. Yet the administration has failed to lend its support to this vital legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there are now 28 million American working men and women who are covered by private pension plans. The number is expected to rise to 42 million by 1980.

Yet these millions of low- and middle-income Americans now have virtually no protection against the possibility that the insolvency of their employers could deprive them both of their jobs and of the pension rights they may have acquired through years of hard work.

Between 1955 and 1965 approximately 4,000 pension plans were terminated in the United States. In all too many cases the workers involved were left with no way of securing their rights to retirement benefits from the pension funds to which they had in good faith contributed for so many years.

The people of South Bend, Ind., whom I have the privilege of representing in Congress, have good reason to be concerned about the absence of protection for employee pension rights. It was almost exactly 7 years ago to the day—December 20, 1963—that the Studebaker Corp. shut down its plant in South Bend, throwing thousands of workers out of their jobs and bringing about the greatest economic crisis in the city's history.

At the time of the shutdown, the company's pension fund had only enough resources to provide pensions to workers 60 years of age and older. As a result, 4,400 workers between the ages of 40 and 59, some of them with as much as 40 years of seniority, found their pension rights completely wiped out, with little prospect of finding employment elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, proposals to prevent such catastrophes as the Studebaker shutdown have been pending before the Congress since 1961. The technical details of a self-financing insurance plan have been worked out. The enactment of a comprehensive plan to protect the pension rights of American workers should be one of the highest priorities of Congress.

But so far the present administration has given no evidence of being at all interested in giving the American working man this much-needed protection. Instead the administration has persisted in its belief that "those who need help most in a period of economic transition"—an interesting euphemism for economic recession—are the bankers, brokers and boards of directors of business.

This is a premise which I doubt would be accepted by many American working men and women. It would certainly be greeted with scorn by the 6,600 citizens of South Bend—7.6 percent of the labor force—who find themselves without jobs in this period of "economic transition." Unemployment in the South Bend area now stands at its highest level since the Studebaker shutdown in 1963. The jobless in our country need more than rhetoric from the President about "those who need help most" in weathering the economic depression which the administration's game plan has created.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point a letter from Leonard Woodcock, president of the United Auto Workers, which discusses the need for a pension reinsurance plan:

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA–UAW,
Detroit, Mich., July 2, 1970.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing to you and to the other members of the Congress to urge that at least as much consideration be given to public reinsurance of the accumulated private pension rights of workers as is being given to bailing out both Wall Street speculators whose brokers go bankrupt and the stockholders of the Penn-Central Railroad.

In his June 17 televised address on the state of the economy, President Nixon told the nation that we are in transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy. Senator Mansfield and economic indicators suggest that the word for our situation is recession. We in the UAW are struck by the fact that whether we are in an economy of war, peace or transition, in recession or what passes for prosperity, the conduct of government and economic affairs remains too largely in the grip of a double standard: all Americans are equal, but some Americans are more equal than others. Walter Reuther used to refer to this double standard as Park Avenue socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor. The President's program "specifically addressed to help the people who need help most in a period of economic transition" reflects that double standard. Mr. Nixon called for:

"Establishment of an insurance corporation with a Federal backstop to guarantee the investor against losses that could be caused by financial difficulties of brokerage houses."

Yet he made no reference to and indicated no support for a long-pending proposal to provide similar insurance to meet the urgent need of wage-earners and lower-salaried workers who stand to lose the protection of privately negotiated pensions if the companies they work for should go out of business before their pension programs are fully funded. Yet the closing of plants and the wiping out of workers' pension rights are an obvious potential consequence of a transition from war to a peace economy, while it is difficult to see any necessary connection between such a transition and trouble in brokerage houses.

Again, the collapse of the Penn-Central Railroad has brought on the spectacle of Administration figures falling over each other in their haste to shore up the managements and to protect the stockholders of the Penn-Central and other threatened lines through massive infusions of Federally guaranteed loans. The Secretary of Transportation admitted that such action to help the Penn-Central management would be "gambling" on "high-risk loans." Nevertheless he attempted to panic the Congress and the country with the hobgoblin of nationalization of the railroads if the risk were not taken. And the President himself, in his June 17 speech on the economy, authorized the gamble by calling for:

"Legislation that will enable the Department of Transportation to provide emergency assistance to railroads in financial difficulties.

We in the UAW are not in principle critical of financial aid to stricken corporations. Nor are we necessarily opposed to action to protect investors or even speculators from losses stemming from financial difficulties of brokerage houses. Yet we ask: Are these people—the well-heeled managements of conglomerate corporations and others affluent enough to be able to speculate in Wall Street—among "the people who need help most in a period of economic transition"?

We think not. These people may need help, but they certainly need help less than the poor, the unemployed, and millions of aging Americans for whom retirement brings a severe slash in income that frequently means ending their days in poverty.

The President gave a thought to these older Americans in his economic speech, proposing that the Congress tie Social Security benefits to the cost of living. This would be helpful, but tying a poverty retirement income to the cost of living would merely guarantee an unruffled prolongation of poverty.

It is the gross inadequacy of Social Security benefits that has given privately negotiated pension rights such crucial importance in workers' hopes and plans for retirement. Yet the President was silent with respect to the plight of the many American workers who own no railroads and possess no stock portfolios to speak of, only a private pension promise that offers them hope of a standard of life in retirement beyond the bare minimum possible under Social Security. Public reinsurance of private pension funds—similar to the insurance provided since the 1930s for bank deposits and akin to the backstop Federal protection the President asks for investors—would bring all of us closer together and nearer to fulfillment of the American dream of which Mr. Nixon spoke to such applause in his address to the Junior Chambers of Commerce.

The number of persons dependent upon private pension plans is far greater than the number of Wall Street speculators and Penn-Central stockholders whose problems have generated the urgent concern and precipitate haste of an army of would-be rescuers. Some 28 million persons are presently covered by private pension plans and it is forecast that 42 million will be covered by 1980.

In contrast to the handful of brokerage firms that have experienced difficulties and the one railroad recently forced into receivership, some 4,000 pension plans were terminated in the United States between 1955 and 1965. These terminations, all too frequently, subjected affected workers to the double tragedy of lost jobs and loss of substantial prospective pension rights at a stage in life when they had little or no opportunity to earn further pension entitlement.

We in the UAW have been pressing since 1961 for an insurance program to protect private pension funds. Delegates to a UAW convention that year, comparing the promissory nature of bank deposits and pension plans, declared:

"Pension plans also represent private promises, this time by employers, which they may not be able to keep if they get into deep financial difficulties before the plans have been fully funded. These plans are so widespread and private pensions to supplement social security have become such an integral part of our system of providing for retire-

ment that their protection must also be accepted as an essential feature of public policy. The catastrophe to the worker who sees the security which his pension rights represent to him swept away by the failure of an employer is just as great as the catastrophe of the depositor who loses his lifetime savings in a bank failure. The solution is essentially the same."

Congress in the relatively prospering early 1960s was not impressed by the reality or urgency of this problem and failed to enact legislation which would have shored up the security of workers' pensions. Then, 5 days before Christmas 1963, the last car came off the South Bend line of the Studebaker Corporation, and as a result some 4,400 workers between the ages of 40 and 59, who had earned a vested pension right through ten or more years of service to the corporation, found that right meaningless when their plant shut down with only enough money in the fund to provide pensions to workers age 60 and over. As a result, workers with as much as 40 years of seniority who, even if they found another job, were too old to start acquiring new pension credits from another employer, were left stranded.

The collapse of Studebaker dramatized the predicament of its workers and of workers in other companies who might also find the paper promises implicit in unfunded pension rights repudiated as a result of plant closings. Still the Congress failed to enact a pension reinsurance law, leaning heavily on the argument that great technical difficulties in framing such a law stood in the way.

As of February 26, 1970, when Walter Reuther made a plea for a pension reinsurance law in one of his last statements to the Congress, the opposition no longer rested on technical difficulties; it was more or less conceded that, as Mr. Reuther said, for a small premium cost spread universally over all plans, they could be protected. The argument had now shifted to the claim that there was no need for such a protective mechanism, since only a small percentage of workers were affected in what was after all but an "incidental failure" of the present system.

Mr. Reuther stated that this is the logic to be expected from a computer but not from a human being. He called for:

"A balanced combination of adequate public and private pension plans, with appropriate public support assuring the fulfillment of expectations of the private sector . . ."

And he stated:

"As the richest nation in the world we cannot continue to deny our older citizens their measure of economic justice and human dignity. We must act now to assure society's promise to present retirees and to avoid the potential failure for even a small number of the millions of workers rightfully anticipating a secure retirement."

The closing down of plants or operations is not a rare occurence in any industry in our economy. In our own industry, we think of Hudson, Studebaker, Packard, Kaiser-Frazer as well as a host of smaller companies. Nor has it been rare in recent years for plants to close or operations to end, wiping out the hopes of security in retirement for men and women too old to start from scratch on other jobs. In recent years the UAW has been obliged to close out negotiated pension plans for a variety of reasons: a fire totally destroying the plant; the close-out of a smaller plant bought by a larger company; part of an operation discontinued because an obsolescent plant had become uneconomic. The latest closing of a plant under contract to UAW took place on July 1, 1970, with its pension plan 11 years away from full funding. Among the victims of that closing were a man and a woman, both 52 years old, each with 37 years of service. Because of their age, their entire 37 years with the company were washed out as far as pension benefits are concerned.

When plants are closed down, there is apt to be talk about "the price *we* pay for progress"—yet that price, is too often inequitably distributed, entailing, for example, a more efficient operation for the employer but unemployment and a wiped-out pension promise for the worker. Certainly from the fruits of the progress that we are all supposed to enjoy, assurance can be given that the security of pension benefits will be maintained.

The President speaks of the people who need help in a period of economic transition. But it should be clear that for wage earners and to a somewhat lesser extent for salaried workers, the "transition economy' 'is not a sometime thing but a permanent aspect of their lives. Blue-collar workers particularly work and live all their lives on the cutting and bruising edges of technological and economic change, in war and peace, in sickness and health, in youth and age. A special White House panel that studied the problems and needs of blue-collar workers has within the last few days transmitted a report to the President urging Administration action to deal with the economic and social needs of such workers, whom the report described as economically trapped and socially scorned. It is primarily these workers and their families, rather than railroad managers and speculators, who need help.

We detect a disproportion in the rationing of the President's concern, a show of preference for a kind of Wall Street or Easy Street welfare state which if indulged by the Congress would come dangerously close to—if it did not actually arrive at—a politics of class verging on the classic Marxian strain.

In this disturbing situation, we feel that the Congress has a strong role to play and a considerable responsibility to play it. The question of establishing a pension reinsurance system has been in Congressional limbo for years. The President of the United States has asked the Congress to produce legislation to insure investors against their losses. We earnestly hope that the Congress will now see the substantive and symbolic merit of enacting a pension reinsurance law without further unseemly delay Having thus offered assurance of retirement security to American workers, the Congress could then go on with good grace to consider the security needs of Wall Street speculators.

If we are to bring this country together, we are going to have to curb the impulse of Wall Street socialism in favor of much larger doses of Main Street and back-street democracy—on both sides of the railroad tracks. Treating Americans more equally would facilitate our progress not only toward a peacetime economy but toward a more peaceful society as well. Enactment of a law to protect negotiated pension funds would be one firm step in that direction.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD WOODCOCK,
President, International Union, UAW.

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the United States is no stronger or greater than the thousands of communities at the grassroots of our country. I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the following moving account of the Christmas parade in the beautiful southern city of Aiken, S.C., by Frank T. Galardi:

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

(By Frank T. Galardi)

The credo of the American Legion, "For God and Country," was dramatically and reverently brought to a living reality by the United States Air Force, 861st Radar Squadron, stationed in Aiken, South Carolina, during a recent Christmas parade.

The Aiken Jaycees, sponsors of annual Christmas parades, extended invitations to churches, schools, fraternal organizations, clubs and business firms to participate in their 1970 Christmas event. Among the invitees was the 861st Radar Squadron.

The 861st, a small Air Force group of radar specialists, assumed a community responsibility once again, as they have countless times before, and pitched in by working alongside the many participants to bring a special message for all to see.

In a short and hectic three days, the enlisted and officer personnel of the Radar Station were sparked with vitality, enthusiasm and imagination. Their mission was to create a prize-winning float—one which would serve as a living monument to both God and country.

As thousands of spectators lined the streets of the lovely city of Aiken to witness the parade, one could hear a great din hovering over the main artery of the city's thoroughfare. Traffic being rerouted, school bands on the march, exploding guns and cannons of old soldier units, siren wails emitting from local volunteer fire units, echoes of peppery school cheerleaders, young sweet tones of Girl Scouts, motor noises from the scooters of the fun-loving Shriners, and the sound of horses hoofs beating a tattoo as highly spirited Palominos strutted, all to the delight of the animated spectators.

As the parade advanced, one could see at a distance a huge rainbow of colors. Once these colors came into focus, a float appeared supporting many flags. As the float neared a vantage point, Old Glory seemed to leap out to say, "Hello." The noises, which earlier had created a stacatto of sounds, seemed to subside abruptly and then suddenly one experienced a warm and glowing feeling—The 861st Radar Squadron "For God and Country" float was in full view—What a wonderful feeling of inner satisfaction! What a tremendous feeling of National pride! Imagine, in just a few fleeting seconds of viewing, Christmas and America took on a new meaning, or rebirth—all because a small Air Force group cared and assumed a role in community involvement.

One could, as he viewed the panorama of color, see Old Glory proudly waving above the flags of fifty states of our glorious Union, almost as though a mother were looking over her brood of many, many children—then, as the eye moved to consume the display, a white altar supported the religious symbols of the Cross, Star of David and Crucifix separated by brilliantly polished brass candleholders bearing white candles—At the foot of the altar, three young Airmen kneeled in prayer as a young Airwoman (WAF) stood alongside a small pump organ and at her right stood an Airman "Oldtimer" playing the role of Chaplain—above the milk-white altar hung the word "PEACE" done in old English lettering. The music at the pump organ was being pantomined by a pretty teenage daughter of an Airman 1st Sergeant as the delightful strains of sacred Christmas music came to the ears of the spectators via pre-recorded tape.

In viewing the "God and Country" float, one could see history flashing by—Valley Forge, The Alamo, Iowa Jima, Pearl Harbor, Vietnam, Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln—one could hardly digest all that the float and its theme meant to portray—Was it Peace Through Power or a grateful people on their knees thanking the Almighty for the countless blessing He has bestowed upon this great nation.

One could conclude that our military is the boy or girl next door who donned a uniform and became part of a group we in Aiken have come to know and love as the "military-civilian complex." This feeling of understanding is evidenced by the many joint community projects which we share.

As the "God and Country" float passed out of view and the noise of the applauding viewers ceased, one could say in silent prayer, "Thank you, Lord, please grant us the Peace for which these young men and women have fought and prayed and above all, grant us an honorable peace; one that Old Glory and her brood of fifty can accept since it is peace with honor that we seek and have earned."

As a grateful citizen, I say to the personnel of the U.S. Air Force, 861st Radar Squadron, "Thank you for a job well done." To me your float, "For God and Country," meant Honor, Glory, Night and Blessings to show the everlasting Spirit of America.

U.S. LEADERSHIP IN WORLD TRADE—A BLUEPRINT FOR THE SEVENTIES

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. John P. Gallagher, president of the Chemtron Corp. of Chicago, delivered a speech in which he presented a blueprint for U.S. leadership in world trade for the 1970's. The speech was hopeful, and offered some insight on what we as a country must do to maintain our leadership. I believe Mr. Gallagher's remarks as a leading businessman will be of interest to my colleagues, and so include its final pages in the RECORD for their interest. The text follows:

U.S. LEADERSHIP IN WORLD TRADE—A BLUEPRINT FOR THE SEVENTIES

(By John P. Gallagher)

You've assigned me a broad subject and I'm not by nature given to broad statements. I would like to close by being very specific about what it will take to maintain U.S. trade leadership in the '70s. Let me preface my list by expressing considerable optimism. I have concentrated on our weaknesses and some adverse trends because they portend the need for constructive actions. I see these needed actions as taking the following specific forms.

(1) Defeat of the trade bill—either in the Congress or by Presidential veto. We can't afford to go backwards philosophically, and we can't afford the inflation, retaliation and adverse effects on poor people and underdeveloped nations of quotas or so-called protective tariffs.

(2) Strong support by business people, their trade associations and other entities for an abolition of tariffs and non-tariff devices that too often have been the response to business pleading. If we want to continue to promote exports we must stop all of our circuitous, disguised efforts at discouraging imports. William Blackie, Chairman of Caterpillar, speaking on this subject said "This means facing up to competition without protection of quotas, 'phony' customs valuations, anti-dumping sophistries and narrow 'nationalistic' restrictions against foreign bids to meet public tenders." I agree.

(3) We need a long term, unified government position on international trade that is sufficiently consistent between departments to permit business to make plans that can be used to compete effectively in world markets.

(4) Tax incentives are necessary to meet foreign competition, to increase exports and to correct our balance of trade position. The DISC proposal of the trade bill would have provided such incentives. Conversely, when American industry incurs higher rates of taxation than industries in other countries, we are at a competitive disadvantage. Remember that corporate taxes are a unique form of cost. There are no labor-saving devices that can be applied to reducing taxes. They must either be passed on to the customer or they reduce profits.

(5) We need forms of organization and management concepts that permit freedom to widely different conditions in various markets around the world. Some areas are characterized by trading blocs; others by strongly increased nationalism.

(6) Business must pioneer with its best people. There is no better developer of competent, young, high potential managers than international operations.

(7) We need better export financing—on internationally competitive terms and conditions.

(8) Finally, we need to be better businessmen. This means striving constantly for product superiority, being effective marketers adapting to the unique conditions of each market, making the most of our capital resources, and, always of utmost importance, controlling our costs to give the customer his money's worth.

Many years ago I had a Business School professor who said, "You must always remember that the fiscal year exists only in the mind of the accountant." I've since learned that some economists think that the decade exists as a discrete period of time and many analysts feel that there is such a thing as a fiscal quarter.

I believe that the '70s will be a continuation of the '60s just as the '60s continued the trends of the '50s. The U.S., among the countries of the world, is in a strong leadership position.

Our intent, desires and our continued prosperity depends upon our ability to compete as businessmen in international markets. We need a strong domestic economy. We need better government/business cooperation. The decade ahead will be exciting. We hope to improve the lot of the peoples of the world. We—you and I as American consumers and business people—have benefitted from our competitive environment. It is my hope that we may extend these benefits throughout the world. That is my blueprint for the '70s.

REDUCING FEDERAL GUN CONTROL

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues for voting to add .22-caliber rimfire ammunition to the list of other sporting-type ammunition presently exempt from the reporting requirements under the Gun Control Act of 1968. If the Senate concurs in this action, it will mean that sellers of .22-caliber rimfire, shotgun, and rifle ammunition will not have to make a record of any information about sales of this sort.

In my view, this change in the law is long overdue. More than 20 months ago. I introduced legislation which would have exempted sporting ammunition from the Gun Control Act. Congress, however, saw fit to act on my proposal on a piecemeal basis; last November the House exempted shotgun and rifle ammunition from the act, and now it has exempted .22-caliber rimfire ammunition as well. Taken together, these two actions fulfill the central purposes of my proposal; namely, to lift the onerous burdens of the Gun Control Act from the shoulders of the buyers and sellers of sporting ammunition.

As I have stated before, Mr. Speaker, regulating this type of ammunition is of no real usefulness in preventing or solving crimes. Now, both the Justice and the Treasury Departments have validated my claim. Based on 2 years of experience in administering the act, both Departments have reported there is not a single instance where any of the recordkeeping requirements for sporting ammunition has proved helpful in law enforcement or has led to the successful investigation and prosecution of a criminal offense.

In my mind, these conclusions state the obvious. Guns and ammunition do not kill people—people kill people. And as long as criminals think they can profit from crimes involving the use of guns, criminals will use guns to commit crimes. Thus, in a very fundamental sense, the Gun Control Act itself is an ill-conceived way to control crime. What is needed, rather, is upgrading and better equipping of our police departments, enacting new, tougher laws to deter potential criminals and to severely punish convicted felons, streamlining the criminal justice system, and reforming the penal system. These are the things that will help restore order with justice to our society, not gun control.

It is my fervent hope, Mr. Speaker, that this action by the House marks an even greater awareness of the fatal defects in the very concept of Federal gun control. And, I hope that one of the first orders of business in the 92d Congress will be the repeal of the Gun Control Act of 1968 in its entirety. The 92d Congress will have the opportunity to take swift action on this issue; because I will again, as I have done in the past, introduce legislation which, if enacted into law, will consign the Gun Control Act to the legislative wastebasket where it belongs.

THE BLOOD SHORTAGE

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the American Red Cross has announced that it is now facing the most serious shortage of whole blood in its 22-year history of blood collection. It is time that the Congress act to develop means for increasing the supply of donated blood which has become such an important form of medicine, particularly for the critically ill.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 19524, that is designed to both meet today's chronic shortage of transfusable blood and at the same time improve the quality of blood in our hospital blood banks. The bill would provide a $25 tax deduction for each pint of blood donated to a nonprofit organization like the American Red Cross.

Currently, only 3 percent of the public gives blood. If we can increase this percentage by just one point, the shortage problem could be solved and the demand for commercial blood would be greatly reduced, if not totally eliminated.

The economic incentive in such a tax deduction is directed to the blue- and white-collar men and women who can look forward to a small but helpful tax break at the end of the year. It would not be attractive to the derelicts and dope addicts that have become such a danger to our blood banks because of the on-the-spot cash payments offered by commercial blood-collecting agencies. Today, the danger of contracting hepatitis from a transfusion of commercial blood is 10 times that of donated blood.

The tax deduction, limited to $125 per person a year for health reasons, would be available to all taxpayers, including those using the standard deduction. I believe that this measure would provide the incentive needed—at relatively little cost to the Treasury—to encourage a sufficient number of people to make this "charitable contribution."

I plan to reintroduce my bill on the first day of the 92d Congress. I invite my colleagues to cosponsor it with me, and I hope it can be considered by the Ways and Means Committee next year.

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK FOR THE AIRLINE INDUSTRY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, high-flying inflation is hurting the airline industry. So hard, in fact, that one major carrier is predicting zero growth for next year.

Interestingly, businesses are cutting back on their flying executives, but the general public has shown an increase in personal and pleasure trips. Passenger counts, however, present but one dimension of the overall problem.

Donald J. Lloyd-Jones, an airlines executive, captured the mood of the industry in a recent address. I present his discussion here because he seems to be looking at various segments of the industry rather than simply his particular airline.

Mr. Speaker, obviously some of the language herein is obviously partisan to his own concerns, but the facts are hard and true. While I do not necessarily agree with all his recommendations and findings, I do think that Mr. Lloyd-Jones' remarks signal the trouble within the industry a matter of concern for each of us. Thus, I include the following remarks in the RECORD:

CURRENT INDUSTRY SITUATION

Pre-tax earnings of the domestic trunklines dropped sharply in 1970 despite substantial efforts by the airlines to control costs. The loss before tax of the eleven domestic trunklines will exceed $100 million, making 1970 the first loss year since 1961 and the largest single loss year in the history of U.S. commercial aviation.

Disappointing traffic growth was the principal factor in the earnings decline. A year ago at this time American had most pessimistic outlook in the industry with a forecast of 1970 traffic growth at 4%-5%; and most analysts were anticipating growth in the 8%-9% range. It is now evident that 1970 traffic will be lower than 1969, probably by 1%-2%. In prior recessions the industry has experienced periods of 12 months or more with no growth, but it has not experienced a calendar year loss in traffic since the late 1940's.

Three features of the decline in traffic during 1970 require special comment:

1. The decline in growth rate has been primarily in business travel; personal and pleasure travel has continued to grow throughout the year.

2. There have been two major airline strikes during 1970, covering periods totalling 273 days.

3. The full-year loss of 1%-2% in traffic disguises a rapidly deteriorating traffic picture. Traffic was level during the first half of the year; it is currently running about 5% below the comparable period in 1969.

These three features have affected the individual members of the industry differently, depending upon the individual carrier's seasonal pattern, the characteristics of its traffic and the degree of benefit or injury from strikes.

Heroic efforts by some portions of the industry have been insufficient to keep pace with the rapid drop-off in traffic. By the latter part of the year half of the ten trunk airlines not affected by strikes had reduced current available seat mile capacity below that of 1969 and had, in some cases, reduced departures by as much as 10%. In conjuction with these reductions more than ten thousand personnel have been furloughed by the industry, the majority of them in recent months. Many of these furloughs have involved the postponement of critical planning and developmental programs which could have adverse effects on industry costs in the years ahead. Nonetheless, the industry's current picture has continued to deteriorate throughout the year. Cost reductions have failed to keep pace with declines in revenues and the mid-year expectation of a $16 million loss for 1970 has deteriorated to the current $100 million loss projection.

Little help has come from the government. No significant fare relief was granted during the year and the fare increase granted in October 1969 has proven insufficient even to keep pace with the rise in cost of other goods and services. Recently another industry attempt at expense control was denied. A voluntary capacity control agreement was rejected by the Civil Aeronautics Board and onerous conditions imposed upon the reaching of any future such agreements. Particularly bothersome is the condition imposed by the Civil Aeronautics Board that such agreements, to be acceptable, cannot be longer than six months in duration. Six months is too short a period for airlines to realize major cost reductions in areas such as equipment planning, facility expenditures, flight crew headcount, etc. Fuel costs, landing fees, and certain maintenance expenses, which together account for only a small portion of total expense, are the only costs which can be reduced over such a short term.

Against this background airline creditors have become increasingly more cautious. Rates for airline financing have jumped to 11% or more and many former sources of airline capital have dried up completely.

B-747 INTRODUCTION

One cannot imagine a less favorable environment for the introduction of the B-747 into service. This aircraft was purchased by the airlines in expectation of continued strong traffic growth. The decline in traffic has meant low 747 load factors and the negation of many of the unit cost reductions provided by the 747.

Contrary to frequent articles appearing in the press, the 747 has performed as well or better than any new aircraft ever introduced into commercial service. Measured in terms of either premature engine removal rates or overall mechanical reliability the aircraft has equalled or out-performed other new aircraft at comparable stages in their introduction—and the 747 gives every indication of delivering the reductions in cost per seat mile which we anticipated.

OUTLOOK FOR 1971

The key to the 1971 airline profit picture lies in the area of traffic. Despite the relative disagreement between economists concerning when economic conditions will begin to improve materially and the rate at which such improvement will occur, there has rarely been a time when the range of probable traffic growth has been as narrow as it now appears to be for 1971. So long as one assumes that economic conditions will begin to improve relatively early in 1971 and will be accompanied by a general restoration of business confidence, I believe one can expect the seasonally adjusted rate of traffic to turn upward in the second quarter.

Given that assumption the primary determinant of 1971 traffic growth then becomes the rate at which recovery occurs. If airline traffic is recovering at a rate of 10% by the end of the year, 1971 could show an overall increase of 3% above 1970 levels. If, on the other hand, airline traffic is recovering only at a rate of 7% by the end of the year, 1971 passenger miles could be below 1970 levels by as much as 1%. The median of this range would indicate a 1% traffic growth for the year. We at American are using a zero growth rate for our planning purposes.

Needless to say a no-growth year for the domestic trunkline industry is ominous from the point of view of industry profits. Only positive action by the airlines and by the government can restore the airline industry to a profitable posture in 1971 and lay the groundwork for a return to more reasonable earning levels in 1972 and beyond.

Some of the solutions to the 1971 earnings outlook are under the direct control of the airlines; most are not. In areas which are controllable by the industry alone there are several favorable signs:

1. Capacity is already under fairly good control by most carriers. I look for seat mile increases in the U.S. domestic market of not more than 3%-4% in 1971, provided all airlines realistically assess their economic outlook.

2. Unit costs, which have increased at a rate of 5½% during 1970, should moderate in 1971. Inflationary pressures will still be present. In fact, we estimate that the average prices of goods and services purchased by the airlines next year will increase by 5.8%. Nonetheless, increasing use of wide-body jets and better utilization of manpower and materials should enable the airline industry to hold unit costs virtually level—with an outside chance of an actual reduction.

A 1% reduction in capacity can improve profits by only $35 million; a 1% reduction in unit costs can improve profits by only about $50 million. Neither of these avenues offers sufficient potential to do the job alone. Any real improvement in 1971 must depend upon a combination of fare increases, moderating inflation and multilateral capacity restraint. These areas, of course, lie outside the direct control of the carriers and require governmental/regulatory action. To that end we propose an eight point program to the government for its serious consideration:

1. Provide a modest increase in yields during the year 1971. This increase needs to be at least 5%.

2. Establish minimum and maximum fare levels within which fares may be set by competition without lengthy review by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

3. Create and preserve a more favorable climate for realistic agreements between airlines on capacity control (with duration long enough to be meaningful).

4. Recognize and act upon the real threat to the industry posed by the current seat war.

5. Adopt a positive attitude toward mergers which meet the criteria laid down by the Department of Transportation.

6. Restrict supplemental carriers to a more truly supplemental role.

7. Declare a moratorium on new route awards.

8. Develop a program to control runaway inflationary costs in regulated industries.

A LOT TO LIVE FOR

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, my constituent John Riehl, now a senior at Del Mar High School in San Jose, was selected as the California State winner in the Pepsi-Cola Co.'s "Why You've Got a Lot To Live" national write-in competition. John's winning essay letter, written to Gov. Ronald Reagan, follows:

Hon. RONALD REAGAN,
Governor's Office,
Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR SIR: George Chaplin, a nineteenth century American poet, wrote in his poem *Mourn Not the Dead:*

"But rather mourn the apathetic throng—
The coward and the meek—
Who see the world's great anguish and its wrong
And dare not speak."

As an American high school student, I have formed positive opinions on what America is today and America's potential for the future. Thirty years ago, a blind person, as I am, was reduced to selling pencils on the street corner unless he possessed unusually great talents. Today, the blind by utilizing the tools at their command can receive an equal education, attend college and have the expectation of obtaining a job in whatever field their abilities are suited. Blind lawyers, computer programmers, college professors, social workers, mathematicians and electronic engineers are leading normal, productive lives except that they cannot see. Americans regardless of their race, creed or handicap have the opportunity to succeed if they will discard apathy and really try.

Young people today insist that American society is corrupt, immoral and decadent. I disagree with this generalization. Once again the voice of the vociferous majority is being heard. We must positively believe that America is the greatest and richest power in the world and still a land of opportunity. Never before have we as a nation faced such a multitude of seemingly unsolvable dilemnas. Racism, poverty, inflation, pollution, war, education and crime are problems Americans cope with daily. It is my belief that apathy, or perhaps a more apt word, selfishness, is a disease that permeates society and causes it to stagnate. When only sixty per cent of the eligible voters vote in a national election, when only eighteen per cent vote in a local election, isn't this apathy to the highest degree? I believe that all Americans must take an active interest and become actively involved in the problems of today. The silent majority must speak out or be equally silent concerning the consequences of their apathy.

Many factions are actively organized to split America. The North is polarized against the South; the Negroes are polarized against the whites; the Conservatives are polarized against the Liberals; the students against educators. Will it take another world war to make Americans realize that only a team effort can be successful? This generation of Americans is at a turning point. America can either veto the existence of every living thing on the earth with the touch of a button, or it can use its great resources to solve the problems that haunt today's society. Instead of deploying weapons, we can defuse the tensions and hatred that plague our country and actively campaign for a country in which men are not only born free, but live free.

Why do I have a lot to live for? I want to live to be a participating American. An American who dares to speak loudly and clearly on the problems my generation faces, to look at the problems and seek solutions, to do my small part in building a better, more meaningful society and not merely be a member of the "apathetic throng."

Very truly yours,

JOHN RIEHL.

Having met this young man personally, I wholeheartedly concur in the comments of his school's English department chairman that John is a "happy, bright, cheerful boy whose values and standards are an inspiration to all of us who know him." He is active in Scouts, in school debating, and is a licensed ham radio operator, He has a high scholastic average and is enrolled in an accelerated program.

John's words, as well as his spirit, represent all that is good and hopeful in our young people today. I commend his essay to the attention of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

COAST GUARD INCIDENT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 22, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, there are questions still unanswered in the tragic case of the Lithuanian sailor, Simonas Kudirka, who sought asylum from his Soviet masters aboard a U.S. Coast Guard ship on November 23 and was denied it. I believe it is important that these questions be answered fully and candidly so that a disgraceful incident of this nature never will happen again.

In case there is anyone not familiar with the facts of the case, I will restate them briefly. Early in the afternoon of November 23, Mr. Kudirka, a radioman on the Soviet fishing ship *Sovietskaya Litva*, told a Coast Guard officer he intended to seek asylum. The Soviet ship at that time had rendezvoused with the Coast Guard cutter *Vigilant* off Martha's Vineyard, Mass., to discuss fishing rights.

The *Vigilant*'s skipper, Cmdr. Ralph Eustis, radioed the news to his superior, Rear Adm. William B. Ellis, in Boston. From there Coast Guard headquarters in Washington was notified and finally, at 2:30 p.m., the Russian affairs desk of the State Department. Commander Eustis was instructed not to encourage the sailor and to keep Washington advised of what happens next.

At 4:30 p.m. Mr. Kudirka jumped from the Soviet ship to the deck of the Coast Guard cutter and pleaded for sanctuary. When informed of the situation, Admiral Ellis directed the ship's commander to seek a written request from the Russian captain for the return of Mr. Kudirka. This was done and three Russian sailors were allowed to board the *Vigilant* to take Mr. Kudirka back. He fought so hard that three additional Russian sailors had to be called for to subdue him. Finally, at nearly midnight, Mr. Kudirka was hauled back aboard the Soviet ship—5 hours, I should point out, after the Coast Guard had originally reported him back.

Any objective study of the facts in this case must lead one to the conclusion that it was handled in an incredibly inept manner. Secretary of Transportation, John Volpe, the Cabinet officer who has jurisdiction over the Coast Guard, was he informed of the pending defection? If so, at what time was he notified? What advice did he offer? Did he seek the advice of the White House or the State Department? If so, what advice did he get?

On the other hand, if Secretary Volpe was not notified, why was he not? What Department of Transportation officials were notified by the Coast Guard? If no one at DOT was notified, why not?

Since Mr. Kudirka was not returned to the Soviet ship until almost 12 hours after the Coast Guard first was notified of the possible defection, no one can say that there was not enough time to reach the proper authorities. There was, indeed, ample time. So it leads me to ask: What kind of administrative procedures does the Department of Transportation have to meet a situation of this nature? It is not an idle question. DOT, with its jurisdiction over commercial aviation, the railroads and highways, should have the machinery to act immediately—and wisely—in a crisis situation of this nature. Who knows when some other incident may occur?

I raise these questions, Mr. Speaker, because nowhere in any of the accounts that I have read of this tragedy have I seen the Department of Transportation acknowledge its role in the fiasco.

Mr. Speaker, since at least one national publication—Newsweek, December 19, 1970—has indicated that the top brass of the Department of Transportation were fully advised of everything that happened and may have, in fact, made the decision to release Mr. Kudirka, I believe that Secretary Volpe and his subordinates should be called upon to explain their role in this sordid affair. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries which have jurisdiction in this area, I think the case should be examined in detail.

I call upon Secretary Volpe to fully report on the role of his Department in the affair.