REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PEPPER: Select Committee on Crime. Report on juvenile justice and corrections (Rept. No. 91–1806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Select Committee on Crime. Report on amphetamines, with amendment (Rept. No. 91–1808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Select Committee on Crime. Report on heroin and heroin paraphernalia (Rept. No. 91–1808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

659. The SPEAKER presented petition of the Gushikawa City Assembly, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands, relative to removal of poison gas weapons from the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GENERATION GAP

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there has come to my attention one of the finest addresses I have ever had the pleasure to read. This was an address delivered by Dr. Thomas A. McGoldrick, Jr., of Savannah, Ga., at a meeting of physicians at Sea Island, Ga., last fall.

Dr. McGoldrick's speech deals with the so-called "generation gap" that troubles so many of us today. It contains an eloquent message for anyone who has children and who are concerned about young men and women today. It should be especially meaningful to youth.

I bring this fine message to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF DR. THOMAS A. MCGOLDRICK, JR.

(By Dr. Thomas A. McGoldrick, Jr.)

We were to meet at 4:30 that first morning, and it was understood that we would have our talk on the second night.

There was much to be done, the tanks, the nets, the cushions, the ice chest, the lunch.

I had left out an old skivvy shirt of mine but you preferred your leather vest; and I had left out a can of insect repellent.

Sometimes at low water we have clouds of tiny gnats, the "no-see-ems" we call them, that have a way of getting into one's nose and ears, and I was a little apprehensive over what they might do in your shoulder length hair. But you left it behind.

I told you to select your own tackle, and you chose a heavy casting rod with a large reel. I took my light spinner.

In the first gray of dawn we slipped into a shallow creek and the water was alive with the shrimp we would use for bait. I was amazed at your quick dexterity with an unfamiliar shrimp net. We had a chest full of bait in no time and we talked about ways of handling shrimp and keeping them alive.

We ran down the sound and the morning was early October crystal. The eastern rim of sky was a rosy blaze and the water was blue as the sea.

We turned up a small river with the tide at dead low and anchored off a point of shells. Never had the water looked more fishable. We cast in and no nibble, we talked about depth and the ways to thread shrimp and the color of floats, and nothing.

Then suddenly both our floats were down and I knew we were in the fish. I was leading mine in when you gave a great yank and the hook flew out of the fish's mouth.

I had my fish in the boat and another on the line when you cast in hastily and I looked and saw that your reel was caught in a horrendous back-lash. I finally persuaded you to take my rod while I worked on that back-lash.

There are few tests of frustration quite equal to working on a fouled reel while the fish are biting like mad . . .

You were catching fish, good fish, missing some, and after a long time I had you rigged. Finally, we were both back in the water—and the fish were gone . . .

We had a minor mishap a little later when we had changed drops. You turned quickly to cast in another direction and your hook buried in the fleshy part of my upper arm.

You are obviously distressed and wanted to help pull it out, but I showed you that with the barb on these hooks (as on other things) there was no way to retract it.

Fortunately I have always kept in my tackle box a syringe and some Xylocaine and a sterile surgical blade, and after a good bit of clumsy surgery I was able to dig the hook out; there was a fair amount of bleeding and the edges were jagged but I pulled this together with some band-aids.

You were looking gray. I assured you it was not the first time that this had happened.

We sat a long time waiting for high water drops and in the meantime you had taken the top off the motor and were making some adjustments. It was obvious you had considerable proficiency in things mechanical.

At the same time I had misgivings, this was an old motor and it had never failed me, and there is a saying in this part of the country "If your outboard motor's running pretty good, don't start tinkering with it."

The fishing was sometimey that afternoon, we caught an occasional school bass on the high water, but we never really got into the fish.

By now afternoon was lengthening and we headed for home; when we came to a point about a mile and a half from the dock my faithful motor suddenly conked, and I knew it had been adjusted too fine.

We coaxed and cajoled, but no motor, and I saw that with the wind and tide still against us we were losing way. We each took an ore and sat shoulder-to-shoulder and started to row.

I watched you row easy and strong, but the boat was heavy in the water and I was beginning to pant, I was after all close to forty years your senior. But I vowed I would stay with you if I collapsed in the boat.

We rowed until I knew I could not pull another stroke, when we finally nudged the floating dock and threw the line around a cleat, and then we both fell forward across the oars.

We were away early the next morning and I noticed that you were wearing my skivvy shirt and that your hair was coated with insect repellent, and in the boat I saw that you had selected one of my light spinning rods.

We commented on none of these things.

It was late, near time to head home, when you suddenly said "BIG BITE." I looked and your float was down but your line was slack, and you said, "He's gone." And I said, "Be careful, sometimes a big fish will swim up your line."

You tightened the slack and suddenly there was a great swirl in the water and your reel sang as the fish headed for deeper water. Four times you brought that fish in and four times he made another run for the river.

Once again you brought him in, this time close to the boat near enough for me to get a glimpse. And I said, "My God, that's a huge stag bass."

The fish was tiring, but he made another run. I wanted to give you advice a dozen times, but I thought no, this was your fish, and anyway, you were handling him beautifully.

I have fished a thousand hours, and I don't think I have ever prayed about a fish before, but I watched that mono-filament line and I found myself praying, "Please God, don't let's lose this fish."

Once again you brought the fish in near the boat and I made a lunge with the net and this time I had him—and suddenly we had fish and net and line flopping all over the boat, and we were both standing, shouting, laughing, crying, pounding each other's chest—and in that moment that's all there was in the world—the sky, the river, that fish and us.

We ate a tremendous supper, fresh fish broiled in lemon sauce, corn and tomatoes from the back garden, homemade ice cream with fresh sliced peaches, and we laughed and talked of nothing but that fish, 14 pounds of stag bass, the largest ever caught in these waters.

We both helped clean up.

It was dark when we walked down to the Bluff and sat in those rickety, wooden easy-chairs.

This was the second night.

The tide had turned and we watched a gentle whisper from the southwest sway in the Spanish moss and started a strumming in the palm fronds. Overhead was a canopy of dusky blue with only a few stars.

We sat a long time, exhausted, sunburned, and I think, both deeply contented. The breeze freshened and we could hear the water lapping at the boat.

The sky had turned a paler blue and now was dusted with a million tiny diamonds.

After a while, I don't know how long it was, you stood up and watched the river, now dark blue with the tide running. Abruptly you turned and said, "Thank you, sir, and good night."

And this had been our talk.

You left sometime during the night; and I was not to hear from you or see you again until June, when by chance I was on campus on the day of your commencement.

You had graduated magna cum laude and you were standing tall in a group of excited friends, all of whom had shoulder-length hair and peace symbols on the sleeves of their gowns.

It was not important, but I noticed that your hair was trim and that you were not wearing a peace symbol.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

I elbowed my way through the group and clasped your hand. We did not speak but our eyes met, and for a moment they were merry, and then they were shadowed quickly in sadness.

We were thinking about that fish. And other things.

I walked away from the crowd and over to a grassy slope, where I sat against an elm overlooking your historic river.

And as I sat I thought with all of the knowledge and all of the brilliance so, superior to mine, how little do they know?

How little do they know that a tolerance of frustration will be the price tag on things they will prize most highly in life.

How little do they know of the benignity of patience; and that this is something different from benign neglect.

How little do they know of the barbed hooks of personal tragedy, of a pretty 16-year-old cheerleader daughter with acute leukemia, or of an accomplished wife who has become a secret alcoholic.

Or of the faces some men wear every day as masks of quiet desperation.

How little do they know of the pesky gnats of life, of tonsils and fillings and tap-water enemas.

How little do they know of the way strangers will stand shoulder-to-shoulder in times of common peril, and of the unspoken friendships born in unexpected moments that may last a lifetime.

How little do they know that boredom is a fertility pill to sterile and undisciplined minds, and that strikes with an immediacy of demands for impossible goals are senseless.

How little do they know that fire bombs are the playthings of idiots.

How little do they know that the imperfections they find in leaders and government are less than the imperfections that have existed in leaders and government through all the ages; that as far back as the very beginning even the Almighty had to fire some of His best Archangels out of Heaven.

How little do they know that later on they will awake in the still hours of some morning and make for themselves startling new discoveries of profound philosophical truths, to find in the reflective calm of day they have stumbled upon the same eternal verities men had discovered two thousand years before.

How little do they know, that knowledge is a cheap, over-the-counter, glamour stock; and that it is the beginning of wisdom that is the long-range, preferred blue-chip.

How little do they know that for all of its scarred and weather-beaten appearance the outboard motor of this government is still running "pretty good."

How little do they know that in a brief 175 years American democracy has become mankind's most splendid achievement in self-government.

And how little do they know, and how little do some of their brilliant and tax-supported faculty know, that if they destroy this now, then this will have been mankind's most unspeakable desecration.

THEY'RE WORKING THEIR WAY THROUGH JAIL

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House an excellent article from the New York Times regarding the warden of the Bucks County Prison, John D. Case. Warden Case has done an outstanding job in operating the prison and has used the work release program in an extremely effective manner.

The article follows:

THEY'RE WORKING THEIR WAY THROUGH JAIL

(By Michael T. Kaufman)

DOYLESTOWN, Pa.—The tall graying man is an Annapolis graduate with a background in law. For the last eight months he has been working as a teacher at a local high school here. During this period he has also been an inmate of the Bucks County jail.

Another man, middle-aged, with a history of alcoholism, completed a two-year sentence for burglary six weeks ago. He is still in jail, voluntarily. He spends his days at a clerical job that he started while under sentence and returns in the evening to the room he shares with three convicts. Like the working inmates, he pays $17.50 a week for board while making the transition to full freedom.

FERTILE FOR REFORM

The yellow brick dormitory where the two men live contrasts sharply with most of the nation's 3,000 county jails, where as a rule rehabilitation is subordinated to security. At the Bucks County facility these traditional priorities have been reversed under the direction of John D. Case, a retired Marine major.

Mr. Case freely acknowledges that Bucks County, with its manicured farms and its largely well-to-do population of 400,000, may be unusually fertile ground for penal reform. But, he feels, too, that many of the programs he has instituted in his eight years as warden can be adapted advantageously by most county and city jails.

In addition to a work release program, which involves more than half the sentenced prisoners, and a half-way house for men coming out with no particular place to go, there are a number of other innovations as well.

For one thing, a citizens' committee, formed with the warden's encouragement, plays an active role. One of the members, Mrs. Faye Baer, commutes every day from her home 24 miles away to work as a volunteer bookkeeper and serve as a full-time friend to prisoners. Recently she has taken into her home the young wife of a prisoner, a woman whose home was in another state.

Inside the prison, guards address inmates as "mister." Books and mail are not censored. The building itself has neither bars nor locked gates. Escape is as easy as walking. In some cases, in fact, it is even easier since a number of the working convicts are permitted to have and use their own cars.

The other day, Warden Case explained his rationale for these innovations. "We're in the salvage business," he said, his 6-foot 4-inch frame and 300-pound presence filling a leather chair in his office.

"I don't think you can rehabilitate a man in prison, you do that in the community. What the jails have is the responsibility to give a man the motivation to change, give him the possibilities with which to change.

"What I believe is that taking away a man's freedom is punishment enough for the average inmate. By and large, though, the public feels there's some kind of magic about bricks and bars that will change a man. And the public is right. It'll make him worse."

Mr. Case attributes most of his views on penology to Howard Gill, a sociologist at American University. He says that back in the 1940's, when he was running the brig at Camp Lejeune, N.C., he thought nothing of putting a man on bread and water for 30 days.

But then a study ordered by the Secretary of the Navy concluded that many men given bad conduct discharges had become serious problems to the Marine Corps only after they had been put in the brig for minor infractions. It seemed that in many cases it was the brig experience that turned good marines into "bad conduct strikers."

PUPIL AND MENTOR

As a result, Mr. Case was sent to take a course with the penologist who has become his mentor. "I guess I was Gillanized," he remarks.

As of this week, there were 175 men in detention in the county facilities. Of these, 125 were awaiting trial on charges ranging from public drunkenness to man-slaughter. These men are housed in a stone jail in the center of town.

The 50 other prisoners, serving terms of up to two years, live in a seven-year-old building just outside town. Twenty-eight of them work at jobs found for them by a full-time vocational counselor. There are also eight former convicts living here as paying guests.

The warden says he is lucky that the county judges are sympathetic to his views and that they frequently recommend men for the work release program.

This concept, he explained, was first developed in Wisconsin in 1912 but has been used sporadically since. It is again coming into vogue in some places. In New York City, 33 of the more than 14,000 prisoners are participating in work release programs.

ECONOMIC BENEFIT

Warden Case points out that there is an economic as well as a therapeutic benefit in the program. To build a traditional prison with bars and cells would have cost about $1-million, he says. His dormitory-style structure was completed at a cost of $160,000.

In addition, the men who work pay a percentage of their salaries to support their families, thus reducing welfare burdens. They also pay court costs and fines. By the time they leave prison they may have saved as much as $2,000.

On occasion, Mr. Case says, particularly after an escape, there have been some cries of coddling. The escape rate at the open prison has been about 4 per cent.

Although that is relatively high—the escape rate at prison farms is usually around 1 per cent—the warden has won the backing of the county's officials.

"We must be willing to take the risk of a few walkaways in the hope of rehabilitation doing some good," said one of the three county commissioners.

And the view of the inmates?

"It's the greatest thing since they invented green money," said a convicted burglar now in the work release program.

REPORT ON ECONOMIC COOPERATION PROJECT BETWEEN GREECE AND TURKEY

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, since my first report to the Senate of January 3, 1965, I have annually reported on the work which was initiated by the then NATO Parliamentarians Conference, now the North Atlantic Assembly, and which looked toward cooperation of Turkey and Greece in the field of economic development.

I now propose to put before the Senate a report which covers events in respect of this work during calendar year 1970.

I

It is my firm belief that there is a strong consciousness in Turkey among responsible persons in all political parties other than those of the far Left of the desirability of a firm and friendly relationship with the United States. It is realized that such a relationship is a two-way street, and that Turkey benefits from this relationship quite as much as does the United States. It is important to say this now since there have been some anti-American demonstrations, and mainly during such high-visibility events such as the visits of the U.S. fleet.

Turkey is not only an important ally, and one in whose economic progress the United States has been deeply interested but also a country whose economic well-being is essential to the prosperity of a large region. It is and has been a major recipient of development loans from the United States, from the I.B.R. & D. and the European Investment Bank, and from the nations, including the United States, which make up the Turkish Consortium of the OECD. The economic development of Turkey benefits the free world. It helps to achieve objectives to which we all are dedicated.

It is my conviction that monetary aberrations and sporadic strains will in no way affect this fundamental mutuality of interests between the United States and Turkey. The friendship which has characterized our relationships for so many years shows every likelihood of continuing.

As to Greece:

Of even more long standing is the friendship which had characterized for so long the relations between the American people and the people of Greece. The United States has been the country to which Greek migration over the years has been strongest. We have greatly benefited from the infusion of the Greek character and the Greek skills and cultural heritage. The Western cultural tradition was built on Judaic/Hellenic roots. Much of the excellence in the western world had its origins in the great traditions of classical Greece.

It is therefore a source of especially poignant regret to all friends of Greece and of the Greek people, as to all friends of democracy the world over, that greater progress has not been made in the course of the last year toward the reestablishment of constitutional democracy and freedom in Greece. Some steps have been taken, but they were inadequate. Those, such as myself, who expected that there would be steady and accelerated movement toward the reestablishment of a constitutional democracy and personal freedoms were disappointed.

It is my profound hope that the strength of the inexorable tide which carries men toward free expression of their thought will soon be recognized by the Greek authorities, and that those measures will be removed which now prevent reestablishment of a working democracy and personal freedoms in the very country which fathered the Athenian democracy, and which has for so long struggled for independence and freedom.

II

I now turn to the record of the Greek/Turkish Economic Cooperation Project, which has been administered these last several years by a nonprofit unincorporated organization, the Eastern Mediterranean Development Institute—EMDI.

It may be recalled that as long ago as 1965, when this project was first launched, I stated that the project's goal was the establishment of on-going institutional arrangements. The establishment of viable, self-sustained institutions is essential, in order that recommendations emerging from reports and from studies may be carried out, and not remain to gather dust in file cabinets.

From the outset, those who have directed this project have subscribed to this guiding principle. Thus, it was decided that Greek and Turkish participants would predominate in the overall direction of the effort; and this is in fact the case, with Greek and Turkish directors having the majority on the Board of Directors of the EMDI.

The studies which have been carried out by the EMDI and its predecessor organization, have therefore been formulated with the full and initial participation of the Greeks and Turks. The work on these studies has been their work, as well as that of outside experts. The recommendations of the studies are recommendations in which the Greeks and Turks have participated, which they have molded, and which they are in a position to carry out. No outside organization can hope to see to it that expert proposals, however meritorious, result in action. But here, the stress has been placed on establishing organizations within Greece and Turkey, and on the formation of national committees of leading businessmen, industrialists, investment bankers and professionals. And these national groups clearly acknowledge and accept their active responsibility.

A number of the specific projects which have been initiated by the EMDI illustrate this principle, none perhaps more well than the project for the development of the valley of the Evros/Meric River. That river, which forms the boundary between Greece and Turkey in Thrace, has been the subject of an extensive prefeasibility study, carried out by Greek, Turkish and German scientists and experts, and financed through the generous help to EMDI of two West German foundations.

The study was important, first, for the results which it has brought about. Its recommendations have been or are being implemented. Further work, again financed by German foundations, has been undertaken on the Turkish side of the river, with the possibility of parallel development projects in the corresponding Greek area. Both Greece and Turkey have indicated to the United Nations Development Programme their desire for its help. The UNDP has now appointed a corrdinator whose task is to bring about an even greater degree of rapport for the purpose of economic development between Greece and Turkey. It is also significant that the Evros/Meric project has made clear the desirability and the possibility of cooperation with Bulgaria, in whose territory the river originates. Bulgaria controls that portion of the river in which electric power developments are possible. Bulgaria has also indicated an interest in cooperating with its riparian neighbors in the mutual benefit of all. Thus an East-West, as well as a Greek-Turkish, cooperative and nonpolitical project may prove to be entirely feasible.

These are important and significant accomplishments. Those who have supported the work of EMDI—notably the Ford Foundation and a public-spirited group of American businessmen, bankers and industrialists—have reason for considerable satisfaction with these accomplishments. And, important also, is the demonstrated ability of Greece and Turkey to work together to the extent of overcoming border restrictions and other anticipated hinderances in the interest of the common objective. Also the project has contributed to establishing a good working relationship between scientists on the two sides of the border. The working relationships thus established in the course of this joint effort are likely, in my opinion, to be of fundamental importance, and to provide a seminal and beneficial influence on Greek/Turkish relations for years to come.

Other projects similarly have produced this kind of relational benefit. Studies on tourism have been made. These have resulted in meetings of officials and businessmen, with resulting visible progress—roads being built, ferries established, a protocol on cooperation in tourism development signed, and so forth. Again, the truly important fact, the one which will yield future dividends, is that Government officials and the private sector alike have come to know and respect each other, have demonstrated the possibilities of cooperation, and have gained experience in working together. Where once participants from the two countries feared that publicity would result in difficulties for them at home, now cooperation and joint meetings are taken for granted.

Nowhere is this new attitude, which has replaced the suspicions formerly endemic in the area, more evident than in the record of a highly important meeting of industrialists and businessmen which took place in Istanbul and in Izmir during the week of October 11, 1970. That meeting was in a sense a counterpart to a meeting which was held in Athens at the invitation of the Greek Federation of Industries, in the period just prior to the outbreak of the Cyprus difficulties. Annexed to this statement is a list of the Greek and Turkish participants at this important meeting.

The Istanbul/Izmir meeting of October last underlined the strong interest of the private sectors of both Greece and Turkey in the economy of the other.

The Executive and European Directors of EMDI, the Honorable Seymour J. Rubin and M. Albert Zumbiehl, were present during these meetings, which were jointly sponsored by the Federation of Turkish Industries and by the EMDI, under the leadership of The Honorable Kasim Gülek, a Turkish legislator of international standing, who was one of the sponsors of EMDI and remains as its Deputy Chairman. The program of the meetings involved a series of visits to Turkish industrial establish-

ments, to the offices of the Federation of Industries, and so forth.

Greece and Turkey are both associate members of the European Common Market, and may move toward full membership in the near future. The problems of termination of the transitional period are somewhat parallel in the two countries, and in both cases, are substantial. The discussions between business and industrial leaders and investment bankers on these problems, on methods of handling them and on cooperation between Greece and Turkey in the interests of a beneficial regionalism, were most impressive. The unanimous conclusion of the meeting was that there should be additional visits, not for purposes merely of tourism or for ordinary convention attendance, but for purposes of serious examination of the economic problems and the economic possibilities of the two countries.

The Istanbul sessions decided to set up two committees of economists, to be provided by the leading banks and industrial institutions on the two sides. Each of these committees was to examine the problems involving Greek-Turkish as well as relations with third countries. Two studies were to concentrate on relations between Greece and Turkey and the Common Market—an issue which as indicated above, is very much in the forefront of thinking of business and commercial leaders in both countries. Thereafter, the two groups were to bring their analyses together. Arrangements have now been made by EMDI for a meeting to be held early in 1971 in Paris in which the Greek and Turkish groups will participate. The distinguished Secretary General of the OECD, Mr. Emile van Lennep, has indicated the full support of his organization and its willingness to participate in this contemplated meeting.

I dwell on this matter for two reasons.

First, the Istanbul session is substantively important. It has demonstrated the capacity of a private organization like EMDI to mobilize the forces of reason and cooperation on the two sides and to provide a channel through which business, banking, and industrial interests which have much in common can come together for the common good. It has already resulted in suggestions of participation on the one side and industrial development projects on the other, where economics of scale indicate the necessity of a Greek-Turkish market, rather than a market limited by the national boundaries of either country.

The Istanbul meeting was an effective demonstration of the success of the method which has been followed from the outset by the Greek/Turkish Economic Cooperation project and by EMDI. That is, though EMDI was certainly an important catalytic influence, the program of the meeting was worked out by the Greeks and the Turks. The arrangements were made by them, the decisions as to the areas of industry or banking on which they would concentrate were made by them, the discussions were at all times led by the Greek and the Turkish representatives. Emphasis was not only put on their leadership, but that leadership was fully and freely assumed. The significance here is that it can truly be said that a lasting basis has been constructed which could result in ongoing cooperation, independent of an organization like EMDI.

The hope has been expressed on both sides that EMDI will continue, despite the fact that the generous financial support which has been given to it by the Ford Foundation terminates as of the end of 1970. The continuation of EMDI would in my opinion be highly desirable; certainly it can continue to provide a catalytic influence. Nonetheless, it now seems clear that in time a food offices organization such as EMDI will hopefully no longer be essential to the continuation of the Greek-Turkish economic cooperation.

It is thus on a note of real accomplishment that I can submit to the Senate what may be perhaps my final report on the project for Greek-Turkish Economic Cooperation. Clearly, at the outset of the project, an outside initiative was essential, and this outside initiative provided the major part of the impetus for such subsequent cooperative economic effort as came about. It is equally clear that the situation at present is reversed. Initiative in Greece and in Turkey will now, as it should, take over the major responsibility, with EMDI confining its activities to lending its good offices to the facilitation of meetings, helping from time to time to provide channels of communication with potential sources of financing and similarly acting as a friend of both peoples.

The assumption of responsibility by the Greeks and the Turks, and particularly by the private enterprise and voluntary and educational communities of these two countries, is the major matter which I wish to stress in this report. I congratulate my colleagues and coworkers on this achievement. Attitudes have been changed, patterns of human and material behavior have been improved. This, in a day when techniques and expertise are readily available, but in which national attitudes remain the major barrier to a peaceful and better world, is a significant accomplishment.

GREEK INDUSTRIAL MISSION TO TURKEY—ISTANBUL MEETING

Industrialists: Mr. John Mitsos, Mr. Anthony Georgiou C.E., Mr. George Karantzos, Mr. Constaninos Ladas, Mr. Iason Stratos, Mr. Alexander N. Zullas.

Bankers: Mr. George Gondicas, Mr. Denis Kotsonis, Mr. Gregory Panas.

Advisers: Prof. George Coutsoumaris, Mr. Ev. Kourakos, Mr. Manos G. Safarikas.

TURKISH PARTICIPANTS—ISTANBUL MEETING

Senator Kasim Gülek: Deputy chairman of EMDI, president of Akdeniz Havzasi, Gelistirme Dernegi.

Bankers: Mr. Resid Egeli, board member of EMDI and managing director, Turkish Industrial Development Bank; Mr. Resid Aksan, board member of EMDI and manager, Ottoman Bank; Mr. Bulent Yazici, chairman of the board, Turkish Industrial Development Bank.

Industrialists: Mr. Nejat Eczacibasi, chairman, Eczacibasi Holding A.S.; Mr. Rahim Koc, director, Koc Holding A.S. and member of board of EMDI; Mr. Hussein Gülek, president, Matas Trading Co.; Mr. Melih Birsel, architect and city planner; Mr. Tewfik Ercan, businessman.

Organizer: Mr. Ahmet Ramazanoglu, member of board of EMDI.

REPRESSION OF SOVIET JEWS

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the resolution reported from the House Foreign Affairs Committee, "Concerning the Continued Injustices Suffered by Jewish Citizens of the Soviet Union." The harsh sentences meted out in the recent Leningrad "show trial' is but another dark chapter in the long history of injustices suffered by Soviet Jews.

Although the charge against the 11 defendants in the Leningrad trial was "treason," their only real crime, as one of them put it, was that "they were born Jews and wished to remain Jews"—something which, for all practical purposes is impossible in a state which not only severely limits the right to worship, but which is notorious for its persecution of its Jewish citizenry.

To compound the frustration, despair and persecution is the further denial of the right to emigrate, a right recognized by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Soviet Union has repeatedly and heartlessly denied all requests by Jews to return to their Israeli homeland. As a consequence, Soviet Jews have endured long years of both religious persecution and political repression at the hands of the Soviet Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that today the Supreme Court of the Soviet Union is hearing the appeals of those 11 defendants against the harsh verdicts handed down in Leningrad. It is my sincere hope and prayer that reason and justice will prevail in that appeal, that the two death sentences will be commuted and the other sentences reduced. This is not only the thrust of our resolution, but the plea being made by persons of all nationalities and faiths throughout the world.

At this point in the RECORD I include three articles from today's New York Times:

SOVIET COURT ACTS ON APPEAL TODAY—11 IN LENINGRAD HIJACKING CASE TO GET HEARING IN SPEEDED PROCEDURE

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

MOSCOW, DEC. 29.—The Supreme Court of the Russian Republic announced today that it would hear appeals tomorrow of 11 persons—nine of them Jews—who were convicted of treason in Leningrad last week for planning to hijack a Soviet airliner.

By Soviet law, the court could have waited until mid-January to rule on the defense argument against the harsh verdicts, which included two death sentences and prison camp terms ranging from four years to 15.

But the court has moved with unusual speed to dispose of the case. Russians and

Westerners presume that this reflects concern over the furor abroad and signs of uneasiness over the severity of the sentences against the group, whose Jewish members had sought unsuccessfully to emigrate to Israel.

The latest Soviet appeal against the verdict was made by Andrei D. Sakharov, the physicist and civil libertarian, who pleaded with President Nikolai V. Podgorny to prevent the death sentences from being carried out and to lighten the prison terms.

The significance of the prompt appeal hearing was not clear, but the prevailing view was that the Supreme Court would probably uphold the verdicts.

Under Soviet procedure, the Supreme Court has four alternatives. It can leave the verdict unchanged, vacate the judgment of the Leningrad City Court, order a new trial or reduce the sentences.

Since the 11 defendants have all pleaded guilty to plotting the hijacking, which would have taken them to Sweden or Finland, the most likely possibilities are that the Supreme Court will accept the verdicts or reduce the sentences. It is rare in cases involving the Soviet state's reputation that the Supreme Court asks for a new trial or overturns the verdict of a lower court.

HEARING NOTICE POSTED

The announcement of the appeal hearing was posted in the Supreme Court Building not far from Red Square. It said the court's criminal section would hear the appeal at 10 A.M. tomorrow.

Such hearings take one day. The defense lawyers and the prosecutor make their arguments and the court, consisting usually of three judges, retires and returns with its decision. No additional appeal is possible through the court system. The two sentenced to death, Mark Y. Dymshits and Eduard S. Kuxnetsov, can, however, ask for commutation of their sentence by the Presidium of the Russian Republic's Supreme Soviet, or legislature.

In cases of this importance, the Communist party leaders can influence decisions since there is no strict separation of powers between the judiciary and the party.

Informed sources said the defense lawyers would probably plead that the accused should not have been judged under Article 64–A, the section dealing with treason, but rather under other articles on stealing state property and illegally leaving the country, neither of which carries the death penalty or long prison terms.

The trial has had no impact on the average Russian, since he probably knows nothing about it. Except for two brief articles in a Leningrad newspaper at the start and end of the trial, the Soviet media have been mute on the case. The results of the trial, however, are known to many Moscow Jews and intellectuals. There seems a general sense of shock at the severity of the verdicts. Many Jews take as a good sign the fact that the press had been quiet and has not tried to make a "Zionist plot" of the case.

APPEAL FOR ANGELA DAVIS

Mr. Sakharov, the physicist, who made available to correspondents an open letter addressed to both President Nixon and President Podgorny.

To Mr. Nixon, he expressed the hope that American courts would judge the case of Angela Davis with "full impartiality" and with "humanity." The Soviet press has carried on a vigorous campaign on behalf of Miss Davis, a Communist party member, who faces murder charges in California.

The Soviet press has also given publicity to the conviction of the Basque nationalists in Spain and has launched a campaign against the six death sentences.

Mr. Sakharov asked Mr. Podgorny for clemency on the ground that the hijacking plot had been prompted by "restrictions placed on the legal right of tens of thousands of Jews to leave the country.

"Comrade Chairman," Mr. Sakharov said to the Soviet President, "don't allow the execution of Dymshits and Kuznetsov. This would be unjustified brutality. Lighten the punishment of the other accused."

ASSAIL REPRESSION OF SOVIET JEWS

To the Editor: Is there an anguished conscience left in the world to witness and protest the outrage being perpetrated by the Soviet Government against Soviet Jewry, the last great remnant of East European Jewry that survived the Nazi holocaust?

The Jews who were sentenced to death or to harsh prison terms in Leningrad on Dec. 24 were charged with having planned to hijack an airplane and divert it to Finland. In fact they were tried for the crime of being Jews.

They were not accused of an actual hijacking, or of a physical or violent attempt to hijack, or of actual or planned violence of any sort. They were not accused of hostile acts or plots against the state, or of subversion, revolution or even of the language of subversion, violence or criticism. It is obnoxious to moral sensibility that some should be executed, some imprisoned at hard labor for long years merely for having discussed and planned emigration to Israel.

But their real crime, as one of them put it, "was that they were born Jews and wished to remain Jews." They are among 34 young jews arrested and held incommunicado since last June 15 in Leningrad, Riga, Tbilisi and Kishinev, as part of a nationally concerted secret police action aimed at militant Jews who have time and again applied for exit permits to Israel, addressed appeals to world opinion, and secretly dared to study Jewish history and the Hebrew language.

These people are heroes and martyrs, not criminals. They have been chosen as object lessons to intimidate the untold numbers of Soviet Jews who wish to maintain their Jewish identity and want to exercise their elementary human right to leave the country. The gravest apprehensions must be felt about the "justice" meted out in this and other trials yet to come.

In our lifetime, virtually in our presence, six million Jews were slaughtered because they were Jews. We can not escape that witness. The shadow of death hovers over any country tainted by anti-semitism. It lurks in the U.S.S.R. today. We cry out against the cruel, inhuman attempt to destroy the spirit of Soviet Jewry.

THEODORE M. HESBURGH, ARTHUR MILLER,
HANS J. MORGENTHAU, BAYARD RUSTIN,
TELFORD TAYLOR.

NEW YORK, *December 25, 1970.*

(NOTE.—Twelve other scholars, scientists and writers also signed this letter.)

PROTESTS HERE AND ABROAD CONTINUE ON SOVIET JEWS

The storm of protest stirred by the outcome of the Leningrad hijacking trial continued unabated yesterday as individuals and groups denounced the sentences and appealed to the Soviet leadership for clemency.

Today was proclaimed a "Day of Concern" in New York City by Mayor Lindsay, who urged New Yorkers to gather in Foley Square for a rally at noon.

Mr. Lindsay called the trial "legalized injustice" that has "shocked the conscience of the world," saying that the "only real crime" of the 11 defendants, two of whom received death sentences, "was their profession of mankind's oldest faith."

Nine of the 11 defendants, including the two sentenced to death, are Jews. The Soviet authorities have denied that the fact that the defendants were Jews was a factor in the trial.

"The simple decency of caring about life and liberty compels us to speak out for those Soviet Jews who cannot speak for themselves," the Mayor said in his proclamation.

"We must appeal to Soviet leaders for compassion and clemency. We must hope they will respond."

About 100 members of the Young People's Socialist League picketed the headquarters of the Communist party to protest the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union. A Communist party spokesman said the organization was in no way connected with the Soviet Union.

In Toledo, Ohio, a 24-hour vigil of protest began at 6 P.M. last night in Levis Square, where an interfaith mass rally was scheduled to be held in a Methodist church at noon today.

MEETING TODAY IN CAPITAL

A group of Jewish leaders planned to meet today in Washington. A spokesman said they would visit foreign embassies, Senators and State Department officials.

Among those appealing to the Kremlin leadership was Arthur J. Goldberg, former United States delegate at the United Nations, who sent a telegram to Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Goldberg said the goal of "a wide-reaching détente will be substantially prejudiced if the sentences in Leningrad are carried into effect, particularly the death sentences."

A cablegram reportedly signed by more than 900 American scientists from campuses throughout the country was sent to Mr. Kosygin last night.

"We, the undersigned American scientists, appeal for commutation of the Leningrad death sentences," the cablegram said.

Ninety college and university professors, including three Nobel Prize winners from the Boston area, sent telegrams to Ambassador Antaoly F. Dobrynin in Washington and to Yakov A. Malik, the Soviet delegate at the United Nations.

The Nobel winners among the signers were George Wald, the biologist, of Harvard University, and Salvador Luria and Paul Samuelson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Among others in the academic community who sent telegrams or attached their names to protests were Edwin C. Reischauer, former United States Ambassador to Japan, and David Reisman, both of Harvard.

Six Princeton University professors have also sent a telegram of protest to Mr. Kosygin and Mr. Dobrynin, expressing "horror and revulsion" at the death sentences.

The professors were Carlos Baker, John Bonner, Marvin Bressler, William Browder, Richard Falk and Edward Freiman.

President Hans-Peter Tschudi of Switzerland said yesterday that the death sentences had "dismayed" the Swiss people. He went on to say that the Swiss Government "shares the dismay of our people and hopes that the appeals for clemency for the sentenced men and for the respect of human rights will be heard."

Chief Rabbi Immanuel Jacobovits of Britain warned that "The Leningrad trials may be the tip of an iceberg" of repression against Soviet Jews.

"Deep concern" at the circumstances under which the trial took place was expressed by Britain's Labor party in a statement that said also that restrictions on the freedom of Soviet Jews to emigrate was a "root cause of anxiety and distress among the Jewish community in the U.S.S.R."

A statement expressing the Canadian Government's concern about the death sentences was given yesterday to the Soviet Ambassador, Boris P. Miroshnichenko, in Ottawa.

THE APPOINTMENT OF DR. JOHN R. SILBER AS PRESIDENT OF BOSTON UNIVERSITY

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I report to the Senate that one of America's foremost educators, Dr. John R. Silber, has been appointed as the seventh president of Boston University. As most of my colleagues know, Dr. John Silber was until recently dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Texas at Austin. In that position, Dr. Silber brought great distinction to the university by his devoted and tireless efforts to improve the quality of education.

It has been said that great men "light up their time." Certainly this is true in the case of Dr. Silber. Boston University, one of this Nation's oldest and most respected centers of higher learning, was attracted by the bright glow from Dr. Silber's achievements as a teacher and an administrator and has chosen him to lead the university during the coming years. As one who is well acquainted with Dr. Silber and his achievements, I can say without hesitation that Boston University has made a wise decision.

In academic circles throughout the world, Dr. Silber is recognized as an authority on the philosophy of Kant. He also has gained national recognition as an administrator. However, Dr. Silber's activities are not confined solely to the campus. On the contrary, Dr. Silber has made one of the truly great contributions to public education of this century by his important work on Project Headstart. Dr. Silber was the first to bring this highly successful program to the attention of the Johnson administration and is responsible for its inclusion in the original Economic Opportunity Act. During those days, I worked with Dr. Silber in gathering support for this program and can attest to his vision, resourcefulness and dedication.

Mr. President, Dr. Silber is the type of man the youth of America need at the helm of our colleges and universities. He is a man of strength, character, conviction and ideals. His loss has left a great vacancy in the academic life of Texas; however, Texas' loss is Boston's gain. I wish Dr. Silber every success in his new endeavor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following article entitled "Dean Who Was Ousted at Texas Is Named President of Boston U." by Robert Reinhold which appeared in the Friday, December 18, 1970, issue of the New York Times be printed in the Extensions of Remarks today.

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

DEAN WHO WAS OUSTED AT TEXAS IS NAMED PRESIDENT OF BOSTON UNIVERSITY—SILBER, AN AUTHORITY ON KANT, TO ASSUME POST IN 1971—PUSEY TO JOIN FOUNDATION

(By Robert Reinhold)

BOSTON, December 17.—Dr. John R. Silber, the philosopher who gained national attention last summer when he was dismissed as dean of arts and sciences at the University of Texas in a battle with the school's conservative regents, was appointed today as the seventh president of Boston University.

He succeeds Dr. Arland F. Christ-Janer, who resigned last January. The school has been headed in the interim by Dr. Calvin B. T. Lee, dean of liberal arts. Dr. Silber will assume his duties early in 1971.

Dr. Silber, who is nationally respected authority on Kant, is a 44-year-old native of San Antonio who was educated at Yale. He is hard-driving, eloquent and adept at raising money qualities that he is said to have used skillfully in raising the Austin campus of the University of Texas to the first rank academically in many areas.

His qualities, according to his allies, also made him a threat to the Texas regents, dominated by Frank C. Erwin, who has little patience for student activism.

OUSTED ABRUPTLY

In a dispute that left the campus bitterly divided, the popular Dr. Silber was dismissed abruptly, apparently without being told why. It was widely assumed that the force behind the action was Mr. Erwin. A clean sweep of most of the rest of the university's top administrators was also said to have been engineered by Mr. Erwin.

At Boston, Dr. Silber will have to deal with a campus that is no less politicized, although on a different level. The 102-year-old school has been plagued with demonstrations and bomb threats in recent months. Dr. Silber has sometimes taken conservative, and sometimes liberal stands on student disorders.

His stature as a scholar is high. His output is prodigious. A listing of his professional positions, honors, publications and speeches takes up 41 pages, typed single spaced.

After receiving his Ph.D. at Yale in 1956, he was appointed professor of philosophy at Texas, eventually moving up to dean of arts and sciences in 1967. His appointment at Boston was recommended by a 21-member search committee, which for the first time included students.

BUSH HAS THE STUFF TO DO A GOOD U.N. JOB

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the best appointments that has been made by President Nixon is that of Congressman GEORGE BUSH of Texas to be Ambassador to the United Nations. I know of no one in Congress who possesses Congressman BUSH's combination of energy, intelligence and innate sense of diplomacy, all qualities that will make him an outstanding ambassador in a difficult assignment. Further, he has a sharp awareness of world problems and ample ability to master the intricate mechanics of international politics. I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in a column that appeared in the Boston Globe on December 25, 1970, written by Darius S. Jhabvala. Mr. Jhabvala has been covering affairs at the United Nations for 20 years, lending his comments the weight of long experience in this field. I insert the following article in the RECORD.

BUSH HAS THE STUFF TO DO A GOOD JOB

(By Darius S. Jhabvala)

WASHINGTON.—Enthusiasm, a dash of idealism and much willingness to learn are the ingredients of a refreshing mix of attitudes which George Bush will bring with him to the United Nations next month.

In an arena which has long been dominated by the staid or the dilettante in striped pants, such attitudes are not common.

The old-school diplomat has been seasoned by posts elsewhere. Many go through the routine without any elan, biding their time for a transfer or pension.

The political or filial appointee, the pet of the party in power or of his uncle, the foreign minister or the President, has to be taught how to tie his diplomatic shoe laces as soon as he gets off the plane at JFK.

Both have made little meaningful contribution to the world organization.

Bush falls in neither of the two categories. He was born in the political family of Sen. Prescott Bush, has had a grade-A education, has been a multimillionaire businessman and has been honed in partisan politics since 1966.

All that is under his belt at the age of 46. In the House, where he represents the Seventh District of Texas, he is known as one of "Nixon's 10 advocates." He has served on the Ways and Means Committee and on the Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population Control.

This is a way of saying that he has no direct experience in foreign policy affairs, in international relations or in diplomacy.

But it must be admitted, also, that most of his predecessors—Warren Austin, Henry Cabot Lodge, Adlai Stevenson, Arthur Goldberg and the Washington Post's J. Russell Wiggins—were equally green in such matters when they were appointed to head the United States Mission.

By his own admission, Bush knows little about the arcane structure on the East River. He has heard of, but never directly participated in, big power arm-twisting, in scoring propaganda points in debates, and in fighting back prejudices, polemics, dogmas and what else one finds in the disconcerted world of international relations.

But it is hardly such experiences that make the difference between a good and a poor diplomat. Rather, intelligence, pertinacity, idealism, a sense of realism, of what is important and unimportant are the make-up of the former.

Bush is not pretentious. He is frank and admits with boyish candor his lack of know-how about reading the charts of his new journey.

"But I want to learn and I will learn what the UN is about and what we can do to help it towards its goal," he says with believable conviction.

"I think I can make a meaningful contribution. I want to do my share for world peace and I think I can," he adds.

He says all that not with the characteristic sly smirk of Andrei Gromyko, but with the open sincerity of John Lindsay.

Bush is a visceral politician and as such is sensitive to the unseen humanity and to its problems. "Deep down, I know what the UN is trying to do. I know of the problems of hunger and disease and ignorance. I know about the social indignities in our world. We have to solve them. We have to find a way of living, all of us together."

What more can one ask of a potential diplomat than awareness and honesty?

Unrealistic? He confides that he has the ear of President Nixon. That means a lot. It means that he can avail himself of the power and the prestige of the decisionmakers at the White House.

Last week, Bush visited the U.S. mission. After talking with Ambassador Yost and his staff, he lugged off a three-foot high pile of

background papers and documents for study during the congressional recess.

What will he gather from it? He will find out the chronic list of the world's complaints, he will find out what are our national interests and how they rub against those of other countries, he will discover the wiles and guiles of diplomacy.

But somewhere between the lines and in very faint but indelible print he will read the words: "We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations. . . ."

"I am sure we can," Bush says.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE H. FALLON

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, GEORGE H. FALLON, years ago had the very practical vision that what the country needed greatly was a system of modern highways to meet the needs not only of American industry and business but also to serve the desire of millions of American people to really become mobile and see their own country without great expenditures of money and in safety. It is indeed true that GEORGE FALLON, by the record, deserves the oft applied tag "Father of the Interstate Highway System."

A new Federal building in his home town of Baltimore has been named for him, an honor to which I gave enthusiastic support. But GEORGE FALLON's real monument stretches from Portland, Maine to Key West, Florida in the East and from Portland, Oregon to San Diego in the West, from San Francisco to New York City—the Interstate Highway System. Who can say how much pleasure it has given to our people? Who can calculate how much it has done to enhance the Nation's prosperity and above all the saving of lives and injury to our people and damage to property? These cannot be measured.

In addition it was through the efforts of our colleague that the Baltimore-Washington Parkway was constructed and again through his efforts it will be widened.

One of the main things I would like to point about this gentlemen is that by serving 26 consecutive years he established a new record for any Member from the State of Maryland, and he steps down as the dean of the delegation.

Since I was elected to the House of Representatives in the 86th Congress it has been a pleasure and a privilege to serve with him in the House and on the Committee on Public Works.

GEORGE H. FALLON leaves this Congress with a record that is unequaled as a legislator, a record which unfortunately is not appreciated as much as it should be. But we, his colleagues, know and will remember what he has done. We commend him for a job well done and wish him every success as he returns to private life. We will miss him.

ON PORNOGRAPHY

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, one of the subjects titilating the minds of our citizens these days is pornography, and particularly the purveying of pornography for profit. This is a puerile occupation in which, unfortunately, there are all too many people engaged. At the same time there are many others who are drawn against their will into this filthy occupation, because of their job. I refer to the managers of stores who are told by syndicated agencies what they shall sell, and to the men who run the machines in movie houses where the management, or the syndicate, schedule an objectionable film. A most perceptive letter published this morning in the Washington Post deals with the dilemma faced by such people, themselves upright citizens. The letter to which I refer was written by Mr. Leonard C. Whitsitt, chairman, Obscenity Laws Committee, Moving Picture Operators' Union, Local 224. It is a thoughtful letter, and it clearly states the difficulties faced by the members of his profession. As Mr. Whitsitt says, he and his associates welcome suggestions from the Congress, the public, and anyone else who can offer the solution to the dilemma they are in. The problem is not of their making.

Mr. President, this letter cogently states the problem of decent people caught in the current wave of obscenity, and it suggests where the solution must lie. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks at this point.

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

PROJECTIONISTS ON THE SHOWING OF "OBSCENE" MOVIES

Reference your article "Projectionists Remain Subject to Obscenity Law," page C4, Dec. 15. Everyone but the projectionist has offered opinions on the obscenity laws, may we present ours?

Representative Wiley Mayne (R-Iowa) argued that enactment of the bill (H.R. 2745, to exempt projectionists from arrest for showing obscene film) would "pull the rug out from (under) every upright citizen who happens to be a movie projectionist in his attempt to stem the tide of smut." Newspaper items stated that Congressman Mayne issued a victory statement, saying "It is time for Congress to start strengthening the laws against pornography, rather than weaken them."

We wholeheartedly agree with his victory statement. We, too, would like to see the laws against pornography strengthened. However, contrary to Congressman Mayne's first statement, the defeat of H.R. 2745 on Monday, December 14, 1970, has pulled the rug out from under about 260 upright citizens who happen to be movie projectionists in the Metropolitan Washington area, in their attempt to stem the tide of smut.

It is ironic that Congressman Mayne's projectionist constituents in the State of Iowa are currently enjoying the protection that he would deny the projectionists in the District of Columbia. The Iowa Legislature (of which Congressman Mayne is a former member) enacted protective legislation for his State in 1967, the second state of the 16 which has done so. The District of Columbia does not have its own legislature but must rely on the Federal Congress. The District Government, through its Corporation Counsel, has recommended enactment of protective legislation for us. If we had our own legislature, we most likely would have had the protection for several years.

No projectionist in our area wants to show obscene films. They are innocent people "caught in the middle." Congress has been unable to enact laws to prevent the making and distribution of obscene films. The Supreme Court has been unable to come up with a concise definition of obscenity. How can the projectionist be expected to act as a judge of obscenity and, according to Congressman Mayne's suggestion, refuse to show obscene film? The projectionist is too busy with the mechanics of his job to view the film for obscene content—he is not qualified as a judge of obscenity. Where does he draw the line? There were lines in the picture "Guess Who's Coming To Dinner?", which was widely acclaimed as a good picture, that were offensive to me. Should I have refused to project it? I have seen no more than a half-dozen scenes of the picture I am currently showing and none of them were objectionable, but I have heard some of the dialogue on the booth monitor that is offensive to me. Should I refuse to project this film? It was given a favorable review in a local newspaper.

If Congressman Mayne will furnish us a list of the films that he wishes us to refuse to project, we will gladly comply if he will defend us against any breach of contract suit for failure to provide the services contracted for.

Among the States that have already enacted protective laws are: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington and possibly others. States in which similar bills are pending are: District of Columbia (H.R. 2745, defeated December 14, 1970), Florida, Illinois, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas and possibly others.

In the majority of instances the projectionist has not been arrested for showing obscene films but because minors were in attendance at "adults only" films. The projectionist, isolated from the audience and the theater entrance, cannot observe who is being admitted. He is only a mechanic, working for an hourly wage. He has no voice in management and no voice in the selection of the films shown. His primary concern is to do a job of professional quality and earn the wage he is paid.

The problems we face in regard to obscenity, pornography, etc., are too numerous and complex for the projectionist to solve alone. He needs the protection of fair legislation, the help of the Congress to enact adequate laws for the control of smut at its source, and the understanding of the good people among the general public. The projectionist is as much against obscenity and pornography as anyone. We welcome suggestions from the Congress, the public and anyone who can offer a solution to the dilemma we find ourselves in; it is not of our making.

LEONARD C. WHITSITT,
Chairman, Obscenity Laws Committee.

THE LATE MRS. ROSE McCONNELL LONG

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to rise in remembrance of

one of Louisiana's great citizens, the late Mrs. Rose McConnell Long, a former U.S. Senator; the wife of a former U.S. Senator, the late Huey P. Long; and the mother of my esteemed friend, Senator RUSSELL B. LONG. Mrs. Long recently passed away at the age of 78. The news of her passing leaves all Louisiana saddened.

Mrs. Rose Long, the late Senator from Louisiana, was one of the most remarkable and talented members of one of Louisiana's renowned political families.

Mrs. Rose Long was a gentle woman, a Christian woman, a faithful and helpful wife, and a devoted mother. She possessed great strength, strong character, and a deep sense of duty to her fellow Louisianians. Her life made a deep mark on the history of our beloved State.

Throughout her long and useful life, she was loved and admired by the people of Louisiana. She was indeed a friend to all, but more especially to the underprivileged. She championed their cause, as did her great husband, the late Huey P. Long, and this humanitarian spirit is indeed being continued by her son, Senator RUSSELL B. LONG.

Her memory will linger long in the hearts and minds of the people of Louisiana. Indeed, this world is a better place in which to live for Mrs. Rose McConnell Long having lived in it.

THE SUPREME COURT AND 18-YEAR-OLD VOTING

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, an interesting commentary on the recent Supreme Court decision involving the Voting Rights Act extension and its "18-year-old vote" provision appeared in the December 20 issue of the Washington Post. I believe this article by Mr. Merlo J. Pusey should be of great interest to my colleagues and others.

In these times of questioning the propriety and wisdom of many decisions and actions by that Court, it is well to note that basic and fundamental issues of constitutional construction often turn on the opinion of a single human being—provided that he happens to be a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. I insert the following article in the RECORD.

COURT'S CLOUDING OF THE 18-YEAR VOTE

(By Merlo J. Pusey)

Will the Supreme Court's decision in the 18-year-old vote case prove to be another "self-inflicted wound"? That term was originally used by Charles Evans Hughes, later Chief Justice, to describe the consequences of the Dred Scott decision and various others that brought disrepute upon the court. The current decision has proved to be popular, insofar as it permits citizens aged 18 to 21 to vote in national elections, but five wide-ranging opinions from the justices have churned the law on voter qualifications into a chaotic state.

The decision had to be communicated to the public with no one really speaking for the Supreme Court. Justice Black announced the judgment that 18-year-olds could vote in national but not in state and local elections; not one of his colleagues joined him in the opinion he wrote. Justices Brennan, White and Marshall (and Justice Douglas in a separate opinion) argued with considerable force that the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment is broad enough to allow Congress to override all laws fixing the voting age at 21. Justice Stewart, with the support of Chief Justice Burger and Justice Blackmun, accepted the Black thesis that the Constitution obviously leaves voter qualifications in local elections to the states (except in cases of invidious discrimination) but they parted company with Justice Black by insisting that the Constitution means what it says in providing that voter qualifications in congressional elections shall be the same as those for the most numerous branch of the state legislature. Justice Harlan rejected the basic idea of applying the equal protection clause to voter cases.

The effect is to leave the 18-year-old vote law hanging by the flimsiest thread. Justice Black acknowledged that the founding fathers had tied together voter qualifications in congressional elections and in state elections. Then he proceeded to pull them apart. His performance must be regarded as one of the strangest feats in the long history of American jurisprudence.

Where did the justice find authority for this bizarre conclusion? Article I, Section 4, of the Constitution provides—

The times, places and manner of holding elections for senators and representatives, shall be prescribed in each state by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations . . .

Justice Black read this as giving Congress sweeping authority over federal elections. But it says nothing whatsoever about any authority for Congress to change the qualifications of voters in defiance of the language in other parts of the Constitution.

Justice Stewart pointed out that the founding fathers were well acquainted with the word "qualifications." They used it in Article I, Section 2, when they said in very specific terms who was entitled to vote in congressional elections. They did not give Congress any authority to alter this section. Madison, Mason and others argued vehemently in the Constitutional Convention against giving Congress power to fix voter qualifications, and the Committee on Detail voted seven to one against a motion to let Congress exercise such power. On the basis of this Hamilton noted in "The Federalist" that the qualifications of voters in congressional elections "are defined and fixed in the Constitution and are unalterable by the legislature."

In the face of this history and the unquestioned language of the Constitution itself, the real question before the court was whether enactment of the Fourteenth Amendment gave Congress power it did not previously have to fix a national and state age limit for voters. Justice Brennan and his supporters did not pretend to find anything specific in the Fourteenth Amendment giving Congress such power. They acknowledged that the authors of the equal protection clause "papered over their differences with . . . broad, elastic language." These justices were willing to let Congress inflate that "elastic language" into a balloon because they believe in the primacy of federal power.

Justice Black, to his credit, was not willing to go that far. But having substantially deflated the balloon fashioned from "elastic language," he turned and seemed to cut the ground from beneath his own position:

As broad as the congressional enforcement power is, it is not unlimited. Specifically, there are at least three limitations upon Congress' power to enforce the guarantees of the Civil War Amendments. First, Congress may not by legislation repeal other provisions of the Constitution.

Congress has, however, with Justice Black's approbation, repealed that portion of Article I, Section 2, which prescribes the qualifications of voters in congressional elections. The whole thrust of Justice Black's lone opinion is to allow Congress to do what he later says that it may not do. He goes on to recognize that "Congress has exceeded its powers in attempting to lower the voting age in state and local elections," without acknowledging that the Constitution puts federal voting qualifications in the same package. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that he is willing to stretch with the elasticity school in the case of national elections because he regards congressional control over national voter qualifications appropriate in 1970 regardless of what the founding fathers may have written into the Constitution nearly two centuries ago.

In any event, the performance of the Supreme Court is a shabby sequel to a shabby gesture in Congress. The clean and proper way to lower the voting age to 18 was, and is, a constitutional amendment. After all the squirming and twisting and inflation of elastic language, an amendment is still necessary. Much confusion and weakening of constitutional safeguards could have been avoided by approaching this reform in the right way in the first place. The court should have been spared the unquestioned wound it has inflicted upon itself.

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the more quiet—yet more distinguished—Members of our beloved House has chosen voluntarily to leave our ranks by retirement.

The Honorable WILLIAM T. MURPHY of Illinois' Third District has had an impact on this Nation's destiny far out of proportion to the attention accorded him by news media.

As a senior member of the Foreign Affairs Committee—and chairman of its Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs—BILL MURPHY has played a most important role in shaping foreign policy concerning an area of key importance to the United States.

As we all know, BILL MURPHY has an incisive legal mind that served him well while he unravelled the tangled knots of problems in Asia and the Pacific. But at the same time he has always been a warm, personable human being, devoted to his family and church. He has chosen to leave us, and we shall miss him for those qualities.

Prior to his election to the 86th Congress, BILL MURPHY was keenly concerned about the future of his hometown, the great, sprawling, vigorous city of Chicago.

He was a member of the Chicago City Council for 25 years; chairman of its committee on labor management for 7 years; committee chairman for planning for 8 years; and chairman of the Chicago Planning and Housing Committee for 4 years. His honors at those tasks were many.

But despite that outstanding community service, BILL MURPHY felt unfulfilled and sought, successfully, election to Congress. Here he has served for 12 years and served well and ably.

But now he has elected to return home to Chicago. Knowing BILL MURPHY, I doubt that he will be satisfied to remain idle. His loss to this House and its Foreign Relations Committee will be a great one. But I am certain that he will continue to serve the citizens of Chicago in some other capacity.

As our colleague from Illinois departs this Chamber, I extend to him best wishes for good health and happiness.

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION HONORS STEED AS PREPAREDNESS CHAMPION

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Reserve Officers Association at its recent fall services meetings honored our distinguished colleague, TOM STEED, by naming him as a member of its Minute Man Hall of Fame. Formal induction ceremonies were held at the ROA session at Hot Springs, Ark.

The Reserve Officers Association cited Mr. STEED particularly for his successful efforts this year in leading the fight to save the Coast Guard Reserve from extinction by a budgetary cutback.

Army Reserve, in its November–December issue, contains an article regarding this award. In the Officer, publication of the ROA, its executive director, Col. John T. Carlton, described TOM STEED in his excellent column, "Across the Executive Desk."

I include at this point the two articles mentioned above:

CONGRESSMAN STEED HONORED BY ROA

The Honorable Tom Steed, Representative from the 4th Congressional District of Oklahoma since 1948, was introduced into the Reserve Officers Association's Minute Man Hall of Fame at the Fall Services Meetings at Hot Springs, Ark., on 24 October.

Reelected to Congress in November to his 12th consecutive term, Mr. Steed was honored for his service in the House of Representatives, where he has been a champion of military preparedness. Most recently he has been instrumental in preventing the dissolution of the Coast Guard Selected Reserve. In his remarks he said in part:

"It is an old story . . . that our military Reserves, the civilian soldiers, win our wars. The American concept of a small and skilled professional military, backed up with trained and equipped civilian Reservists, is still valid in these times. In the light of the situation which confronts us now, I believe this concept is even more compelling than ever before."

During the morning session, Lieutenant General William R. Peers, Chief, Office Reserve Components, and Major General W. J. Sutton, Chief Army Reserve, spoke to the Army Affairs Section. They both stressed the increased emphasis on the Army Reserve Components as the drawdown in Vietnam continues and the DOD budget is reduced.

Major General Sidney S. McMath, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, and former two-term Governor of Arkansas, was the principal speaker at the Army Section luncheon. He expressed his concern that, "a professional army would lack the diversification found in the Army Reserve, National Guard and the present military system."

Host for the Fall Meeting was Brigadier General Moise B. Seligman, supported by members of the 122d ARCOM, Little Rock, which Gen. Seligman commands and which has subordinate units in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas and Louisiana.

REP. STEED USES VERY FEW WORDS WHEN HE GETS READY FOR ACTION

(By Colonel John T. Carlton)

There is an increasing aversion, it seems to me, in this day when it is perfectly legal to lie about a public official without fear of the libel laws, to shy away from office holding some of the most gifted and dedicated patriots the country has produced.

On the other hand, I think that unless we wish to become enslaved by cynicism we must recognize that Americans simply are not born to be afraid.

One of the leaders in ROA used to go around patting people on the back, and telling them about this old prospector up in Montana who gave him the wisest counsel man has yet devised, for those who go out to face the rough and tumble battle which is life. This secret formula you nave heard, but it is worth repeating, in good sound Elizabethan English, "Don't let the —— get you down."

The thought I started out to develop however relates to our annual Fall Conferences, which will be in Hot Springs, Arkansas on 23–24 October, and the culminating 48th Anniversary banquet.

We usually try to do richly deserved token honor to one of the rugged, and oftentimes heroic men, of the Congress at this banquet, because ROA was born of a desire and a need for a citizens group to work with the Congress to prevent disarmament, and unpreparedness, and resultant disaster, in this country.

The man selected for 1970 is one of the most remarkable personalities in the Congress, and I am pleased as I could possibly be that some several hundred of our members are going to have the opportunity of hearing him talk.

He is the Congressman from Oklahoma's Fourth District, Rep. Tom Steed, who knows as much about the United States Government, the techniques of legislating, and the way the ball bounces, I reckon, as anyone on The Hill.

Mr. Steed can tell you how when he goes home on visits—and he does frequently, and talks with his constituents—that he finds out what is going on by getting on the trucks and riding around with the garbage collectors. They are the ones who really know what is going on, because what happens in the back alleys is what you really measure a town by. He'll tell you about . . . well, I can't go on all day, because I simply want to mention briefly how this one man saved the Coast Guard Reserve . . . and did it with so few words . . . and he didn't get any opposition.

Mr. Steed knows a lot about the Government, as I said above, and he knows a powerful lot about the Coast Guard. You don't tell him about that subject: you simply mention it, and then you can sit back and learn some things you did not know before.

Well, when the shooting got pretty heavy, we called up Mr. Steed one morning, and he invited three of us to lunch with him over in the House restaurant. We talked about a lot of things, and most of us were doing the listening.

Then, with his fourth cup of coffee, he said something like this:

"Now, let me tell you what we are going to do about the Coast Guard Reserve. There are seven on our Subcommittee, but only three of us are going to support continuance of the Coast Guard Reserve. No use of trying it there, but we'll make a record.

"When the bill gets to the floor, I'll offer an amendment to put the money back. No use trying it in the full committee; no use getting things all complicated. So we'll do it on the floor."

Now in case you happen to be one of those rare ROA members who thinks 'on the floor' means something else, let me just explain that he means when it comes before the entire House of Representatives—all 435 of them, or as many as choose to be present.

Anyway, the word was passed among a lot of people; and sure enough, it came out just like Mr. Tom Steed said.

Personally, I love to deal with a person who knows what he is talking about . . . and especially a man who talks for pleasure, and has not a great deal to say about his actions. He's from down in the Indian country, and we're putting him in the Hall of Fame for good!

LET'S NOT KID OURSELVES ABOUT THE BOMBING

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion in recent weeks regarding our "understanding" with North Vietnam. It has centered on such questions as whether the understandings included free flight of American reconnaissance planes over North Vietnam, whether the understandings were unilateral or bilateral, and whether they existed at all.

The central thrust of these discussions is the question of whether North Vietnam is living up to the bargain it made with us in return for our stopping the bombing. The implication is that we will resume the bombing if they do not live up to their part of the bargain.

Mr. Speaker, who is kidding who?

We did not stop the bombing in return for an agreement or an understanding. We stopped the bombing because it was a failure. We stopped it because it was counterproductive.

It is said the North Vietnamese hated the bombing, and that this proves it was doing some good. Certainly they hated it. Nobody likes to be bombed. They hated it so much they forgot their domestic quarrels, they united against the threat they could see in their skies every day, and they turned their energies to supporting the war in the South.

Discussing the effects of the bombing in hypothetical round numbers so as not to give away classified information, we might say that, before the bombing, North Vietnam sent 10 tons of war materiel per day to the South, along with a commensurate number of troops. At the peak of the bombing, we are cutting their delivery by, say, 70 percent. But they were sending not 10 but 100 tons per day to the South. So 30 tons—three times as much as before, and three times as many men—got through to kill American troops.

We raised the cost to the North Vietnamese, but they, and the Russians and

Chinese who supplied them, were willing to pay it.

Any general, or any public official, who judges the success of a bombing campaign by the amount of supplies destroyed and number of people killed is guilty of gross incompetence and does not deserve to hold his office. It is not the supplies and troops we destroy that count—they can and will be replaced. What counts is the amount that gets through. The fact is the harder we bombed, the harder the other side tried, the more it got through, and the more American men paid with their lives.

President Johnson recognized this in 1968, when he stopped the bombing he never should have started. If President Nixon now resumes it, he will be signing the death warrants of thousands of American troops.

In the words of former Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford:

I might say that if there is any one lesson that I've learned maybe with 5 years of experience about Vietnam, it is that the application of military force—in this instance, the increased application of military force—will not bring peace in Vietnam. That's why I think this policy could turn out to have tragic results.

We've been all through the bombing of Vietnam. We started in 1965, and in '66 and '67 and '68 we bombed North Vietnam. It was not effective then, and it will not prove to be effective now. It did not bring peace then, and I assure you it will not bring peace now. I tell you what the bombing will do, if he starts it again. It will mean more war, and more destruction, and more fighting, and more dying.

Joseph Kraft made the same point in greater detail in an excellent column in the Washington Post of December 20. I insert this column, entitled "Same Old Vietnam," in the RECORD at this point:

SAME OLD VIETNAM

(By Joseph Kraft)

Cute statements from the White House and Pentagon combine with recent bombing raids to make it seem that there is a new way out of Vietnam—the exit through air power.

But close inspection shows that it is still the same old Vietnam; so much so that what the President is now doing is just painting himself into an old corner.

Withdrawal of American troops, in line with the Nixon Doctrine and now spurred by declining morale, remains the basic element in the policy. Probably Mr. Nixon will have all American forces that do battle on the ground out of Vietnam by the 1972 elections.

He wants to keep a residual force, at a level of about 100,000 American troops. These troops are to be chiefly engaged in air operations. They will fly close support missions for the forces of friendly governments. They will be available to bomb North Vietnam. And they are thus supposed to cover the American withdrawal and to keep intact the noncommunist regimes of South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos.

At first glance, that recipe looks very inviting. Hardly anybody in this country is going to oppose a policy which guarantees Southeast Asia at the mere cost of a few bombing strikes.

But a closer look reveals that the exit through air power is full of weaknesses. For one thing, there is the attitude of the North Vietnamese themselves. In recent conversations with visiting foreigners, they have indicated that they are perfectly prepared to take a new dose of American bombing rather than abandon efforts in the South. The threat of devastation from the air, in short, is not going to make Hanoi lie doggo.

Additionally, there is the past record of air action. Bombing did not conclusively interdict the flow of men and supplies in World War II or Korea. The intense strikes that ran from 1965 through 1968, far from stemming the flow of supplies to the South, was accompanied by an increase in traffic. So, bombing or no bombing, Hanoi can be expected to keep a formidable force in being as a threat to South Vietnam.

Then there is the impact of air power on the local population. Strategic bombing and close air support are hell on civilians. Homes and farms are destroyed, refugees created by the thousands and local governments, weak to begin with, are even further weakened.

Finally, there are the diplomatic consequences. Extensive bombing of North Vietnam triggers hostile attitudes toward the United States—even among such allies as Britain. The Soviet Union is bound to support the resistance of its socialist allies—hence the recent warnings against resumed bombing from Moscow. And with such strong international pressures coming to bear, it is even doubtful how long Americans would support a full resumption of the bombing.

So what looks like a new course turns out to lead back to a patch of familiar ground. If the President really tries to follow the exit by air, he will find himself a year or two hence just where President Johnson was back in 1964.

There will be a small and vulnerable force of Americans in Vietnam. The other side will be building up its troop strength and boring powerfully from within. It will be a question of letting Vietnam go down the drain or intervening on a massive scale in the air.

Nobody knows which path Mr. Nixon would choose. Maybe he would wind up the war again after the fashion of President Johnson. More likely, he would breathe fire, and then allow the position to disintegrate. But neither way out is very good. How much better it would be to alter the negotiating stance in Paris and try for an agreed settlement with Hanoi.

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, it has not been my good fortune to serve here with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. FEIGHAN, for as long a period as some Members have; but during my period of service I have had the opportunity of serving under his leadership as chairman of the subcommittee on immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary and have consequently come to know him in the working atmosphere of that subcommittee.

I am happy to have the opportunity to say, and to place the statement upon the record that the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. FEIGHAN, has at all times been a most courteous and considerate chairman of that subcommittee—and he has extended that consideration and courtesy in its fullest extent to this member and to other junior members of his subcommittee. Our mutual relationship, by consequence, has been an harmonious and a happy one, and has served as a most pleasant introduction to the work of congressional committees.

Regrettably, the fortunes of political war, to which all of us here are subject, have recently been unkind to the gentleman from Ohio, after his years of distinguished service in this body, and so we part, as colleagues, I am truly sorry that this is the case; and I take genuine pleasure in wishing him all the good fortune which he has earned by his many years of honorable service in this body.

LILLIAN B. MATHEWS

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I include in the RECORD a glowing tribute by Frank Spencer, editor of the Journal-Capital daily newspaper of Pawhuska, Okla., to Miss Lillian B. Mathews upon her retirement. Lillian Mathews has been a distinguished and outstanding career public servant and a good personal friend of our family for many years. I am delighted that this fine Oklahoma newspaperman has recognized her so appropriately with his tribute which follows:

Dedication to duty coupled with an unequaled ability, utilized to its utmost for the betterment of the government service is a combination that is a rarity. Such a combination—unflagging devotion to duty and an uncanny mental capacity and near total recall, is the record of Miss Lillian B. Mathews during her 32 years of service to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Osage Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma.

Miss Mathews, during her term of government service, performed not only the required duties of her various positions which ranged from Museum Curator, supervisor of mails and files, statistician, but also was able to provide the Osage Indian Agency, the Area Office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, individual tribal members and attorneys with a wealth of information and family history which was at her command through her irreplaceable memory and deep concern for the Osage Tribe, its history and traditions. Miss Mathews has made it a life-long project to become probably the most knowledgeable individual in the BIA on the family background, history and lineage of Members of the Osage Tribe. This information has proven invaluable not only for historical purposes but of great value to the individual Tribal members in their search for accurate, reliable and useful information concerning their legal claims and rights.

As an indication of the reliability of Miss Mathews' knowledge, since her retirement she has been called upon many, many times by agency officials, the legal profession, the courts and others—including many individual Indians—for information of an exacting nature. She has been unfailing in her willingness to provide the information from memory and to be able to cite the location of documentation for the information that she has committed to memory.

Miss Mathews first became associated with the Osage Indian Agency at Pawhuska as the first curator of the first Tribal Museum in the United States. Prior to the museum's opening she was responsible for the collection of artifacts and historical documents and photos for display in the museum. She catalogued the entire collection. Her wide and undisputed expertness in the history of the tribe made her the most valued person in this position.

After the opening of the museum until her transfer to the Agency proper, Miss Mathews oversaw the museum's growth and development and carefully carried out the systematic development of the museum which is one of the most complete of any Tribal museum in America and boasts of probably the best documented and historically correct collection available on the Osage Tribe.

After her association with the Agency proper at Pawhuska, Miss Mathews, through her statistical work and close association with the members of the tribe, their family ties and history; became increasingly knowledgeable of the many facets of tribal and family activity within the tribe.

This expanded knowledge developed through a deep and unvarying devotion not only to the Agency, the BIA and the Tribe but to people in general, became increasingly beneficial to the Service and to the Tribal members. As an indication, her extensive knowledge of family relationships played a large part in the establishment of Social Security, Medicare and other beneficial programs for individual Osage Tribal members who might otherwise have been deprived of them due to lack of knowledge of family background, history and the intricacies of securing such benefits. This painstaking research and work was done "above and beyond" the call of duty in her position in the Service at the time. However, her genuine concern for the individual Tribal members was the motivating force that made it her personal project to complete each and every application.

Her indefatigable devotion to the Service and to the tribe during her years with government service—and continuing even now after retirement—is an indication of her devotion to her job and to her people.

It is often that we fail to note the unselfish and dedicated federal worker, one who completes not only appointed and required tasks with dispatch and efficiency but goes "the extra mile" to perform services with compassion and effectiveness. Such an employee was Miss Mathews and her outstanding record—which is being continued because of her concern for people and the good of the Service—deserves recognition not because it is expected or wanted but because it is deserved and should be recognized as an example for others who aspire to truly dedicated public service.

MARINES WILL NOT CHANGE: CHAPMAN

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly heartened recently by statements made by Gen. Leonard F. Chapman, Jr., the Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps.

General Chapman took the occasion of a press conference held at the Armed Forces Staff College at Norfolk, Va., to voice very strongly the views which I feel are held by the great majority of the citizens of this country. At a time when we see social structures crumbling under the weight of permissiveness his voice was a welcome relief from what appears to be a growing trend.

I am pleased to include in the RECORD the report of General Clark's remarks as carried in my hometown newspaper, the Daily Press, Nov. 18, 1970, Newport News, Va.

MARINES WON'T CHANGE: CHAPMAN

(By Norman Covert)

NORFOLK.—Gen. Leonard F. Chapman Jr. turned on the expected U.S. Marine Corps image here Tuesday, stating without reservation the traditional corps attitude towards discipline will remain tough no matter what other services do.

Chapman, commandant of the Corps, said, "We expect no changes. If anything we are trying to tighten up discipline and appearance, military courtesy and performance of duty in all areas.

"We want to get back to, as rapidly as we can, a professional, tough, lean outfit of the highest standards."

Speaking at a press conference here at the Armed Forces Staff College, General Chapman said he did not mean to infer the Corps has slackened its demands.

"It is just that there are areas where we can tighten up and we're doing it!"

Newsmen questioned Chapman on policies other services have changed to fit the changing sociological standards of the civilian community. He would not comment on a recent decision by U.S. Navy Chief of Operations Elmo Zumwalt to ease hair regulations.

"It's not my business to comment on what heads of other services change, but I will say as far as the Marines, we will not change our regulation. It requires hair to be neat and closely trimmed; no beards or eccentric mustaches. There will be no changes."

General Chapman said the corps has no severe problems. He said reducing its size is "good. The Marine Corps got awfully big, but I don't think we got any bigger than we had to be to support the load we were carrying in the Far East."

Concerning a reported rise in drug use and alcoholism, General Chapman exuded an equally tough attitude.

"Our policy is simple. We are carrying out an extensive education program to try to dissuade every Marine from experimenting with drugs.

"If he elects to experiment with drugs we take action. We punish him. If he becomes a user we discharge him."

There are no rehabilitation programs for addicts at present, Chapman said. "There is no place in the corps for a drug user.

"If anyone has the poor judgment to take up using drugs, he can expect to no longer be a Marine!"

The Corps is changing in one area, however, Chapman admitted many officers have been reduced in rank saying more will be forced to accept a lower grade before the Corps is finally geared to peacetime.

He said job authorizations also are being changed. Jobs formally requiring a lieutenant colonel are being reduced to a major slot. Company commanders now must be at least first lieutenants.

Chapman says the changes will allow junior officers a better chance to "carry the load."

The Corps also is withdrawing troops from Vietnam at a fast rate. The 26,000 Marines left in Vietnam consist of two-thirds of the First Marine Division and one-third of a Marine air wing.

Any turbulence created in the Corps during recent years has been due to one-third personnel on overseas deployment.

The reduction in size, Chapman noted, results from the withdrawal of Marines from Vietnam where 84,000 fought a year ago. The proportionate number of Marines overseas has not changed however, since the prebuildup days of the early '60s.

Chapman observed, "Vietnam could end tomorrow if the North Vietnamese would go back where they belong and stay there.

"I think we are doing the right things at this point and the Cambodian operation propelled us. History will record Tet '68 and the Cambodian operation as the turning points in the war."

IMPEACHMENT POWERS OF CONGRESS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I sought counsel from a professor of law at Boalt Hall of W. C., Berkeley, regarding the impeachment powers of Congress.

That opinion was recently provided me and I include it in the RECORD.

Prof. Preble Stolz is an acknowledged expert in the field of constitutional law and is presently visiting professor of law at Yale Law School.

YALE LAW SCHOOL,
New Haven, Conn., November 16, 1970.

Hon. JEROME R. WALDIE,
Member of Congress,
Cannon House Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDIE: You have asked for my comments on the briefs which have been submitted to the Judiciary Committee on the scope of the impeachment power. These briefs were stimulated by the charges against Justice Douglas and raise the constitutional question: Can Congress impeach a federal judge for non-criminal conduct that it regards as non-good behavior? Initially, I would urge you not to let the legal question interfere with a personal evaluation of the charges made. Having no knowledge of the nature of the conduct charged, I am in no position to comment on that issue but I am firmly of the view that an evaluation of the factual allegations is or ought to be the first question you consider. Assume that Congress has the power to impeach a federal judge for any conduct it thinks improper—do you now believe the acts alleged concerning Justice Douglas would justify his impeachment? In forming a judgment on that question, you will, I am sure, give great weight to the principle of judicial independence. Indeed, unless you are persuaded that the reputation and integrity of the Federal bench and its judgments would be seriously compromised by Justice Douglas' continuance in office, I would urge you to vote against his impeachment.

Thus, I would reach the legal question of the power to impeach Justice Douglas for non-criminal conduct only after I had concluded that not removing him would be a major embarrassment to the administration of justice. Framing the legal issue in that factual setting does tend to prejudice its resolution (one does not lightly assume that Congress is impotent to preserve the quality of the judicial system), but it is, I believe, the only correct way to consider it. The alternative course is tempting in that if it could be decided that Congress lacks power to impeach for the conduct charged you would be spared both the task of evaluating the gravity of the charges and the pain of sitting in judgment on a person whose office, if nothing else, entitles him to great respect. But that very temptation may lead you to an unduly restrictive view of congressional power which may at some future time inhibit a clearly needed exercise of the power.

* * * * *

I. The Problem.

The relevant Constitutional provisions are:

Art. 1, Sect. 2: "The house of representatives . . . shall have the sole power of impeachment."

Art. I, Sect. 3: "The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside. And no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two thirds of the members present.

"Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States; but the party convicted shall, nevertheless, be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment, according to law."

Art. II, Sect. 4: "The President, Vice-President, and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors."

Art. III, Sect. 1: "The judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office."

The problem is easily seen. The argument for a restricted power of impeachment rests on Article II, section 4, which says that civil officers can be impeached for "treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors." That list, it is contended, restricts the power of Congress to impeach to the described types of misconduct, all of which, it is claimed, are crimes. The converse argument rests on Article III's provision, giving judges tenure in office "during good behavior". That tenure provision, unique to judges, implies that Congress has the power to remove from office a judge who has behaved in a non-good fashion; non-good is surely more inclusive than non-criminal. Or, to phrase it differently, with respect to judges, the word "misdemeanor" in Art. II means something more than that which is prohibited by the criminal law.

The issue of the power of Congress to impeach a federal judge for noncriminal conduct and the closely related question of the power to impeach any civil officer including judges for conduct (except treason and bribery), unconnected to the performance of his official duties, has been around since President Jefferson's time. If its correct resolution is defined as discovering the original meaning of the draftsmen, the right answer, if it ever existed, is now beyond us, since it depends largely on a correct understanding of 18th century usage.[1] If the right answer is what the Supreme Court has or would decide, we can only speculate since the Court has not spoken and, in any event, it is not at all clear that the Court is properly regarded as the final voice on this particular legal issue. The only authority which speaks directly to the point is congressional; twice, possibly three times Congress has impeached a federal judge for non-criminal conduct. Although much discussed in the briefs, I do not believe those precedents should be regarded as conclusive for at least three reasons: (1) the impeachments themselves are inherently ambiguous since we cannot be confident of the factual conclusions of the individual senators who voted to convict (some senators may have believed the Judge guilty of criminal behavior), (2) given that the precedents are now more than thirty years old on a doubtful constitutional issue, the doctrine of stare decisis even in a court would be less than compelling, and (3) assuming that Congress is a "court" of impeachment, the general rule that no Congress can bind a future Congress is not self-evidently inapplicable.

Some things are tolerably clear, although they do not advance us very far. A limitation on the power of impeachment was undoubtedly intended by the clause that "civil officers . . . shall be removed from office on impeachment . . . of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors." In England, private citizens could be impeached for anything and punished in anyway therefor. The "civil officers" and "removed from office" clauses were thus limitations on congressional power. It is plausible to suppose that the treason clause is similarly limiting, although that does not tell us what "misdemeanor" means, and it does not help much that the extradition clause (Art. IV, sect. 2) speaks of: "treason, felony or other crime." The "good behavior" clause was also a limitation. It is directly derived from the Act of Settlement and was designed to prohibit the executive (the Crown of England) from removing a judge from office. Was it intended to do more than that; to broaden, if you will, the impeachment power of Congress with respect to Judges—we do not know.[2]

a. The Original Intent.

Early drafts included broader language than that now in Article II, sect. 4. They spoke of impeachment for "malconduct or neglect", but that was felt to be too broad and to subject the President to congressional supervision. For present purposes, the shortcoming with the debate in the Constitutional Convention is that the participants were not focusing on judges, but on the executive. There was an effort to make the "good behavior" clause parallel the Act of Settlement by including removal by address. (Joint resolution of Congress.) It failed. That seems to me to cast no light at all on the problem.

The Federalist Papers are similarly opaque. The relevant one is No. 79 (Hamilton). Hamilton is clear that judges may only be removed by impeachment but in stating the impeachment power he uses the word "malconduct" which today we would understand as broader than criminal misconduct. He argues that "inability" is properly not made a ground for removal because the competence/incompetence line is too difficult to draw. He concludes that "The result (of permitting removal for inability) except in cases of insanity, must for the most part be arbitrary; and insanity, without any formal or express provision, may be safely pronounced to be a virtual disqualification." By definition, insane conduct could not be criminal, but whether Hamilton meant that an insane judge could be impeached or that the problem was too inconsequential to be of importance is uncertain. Some early commentators saw the problem (Story and Wilson, most importantly) but not much more.

b. The Impeachment Precedents.

Impeachment got off to a very poor beginning with the overtly political move by President Jefferson to clean out the federalist bench. To establish the precedent that impeachment would lie for abuse of power short of criminal misconduct, Jefferson started with a pathetic district judge from New Hampshire named Pickering who was either insane or a drunkard or possibly both. Pickering did not appear and was convicted (the main charge was that Pickering returned a ship to its owner without posting a bond as required by law and then refused to let the government appeal his ruling; he was also charged with being drunk and abusive on the bench). Whatever value a default impeachment can give as a precedent was rather weakened by the later acquittal of Justice Chase. The acquittal is, of course, ambiguous—more than a third of the senators may well have thought Justice Chase guilty of no serious misconduct and thus never reached the issue whether they could impeach for non-criminal misconduct.

Since then there have been six attempts to remove a judge by impeachment, three succeeded. The acquittals are necessarily ambiguous on our question. One of the convictions was by default and, in any event, probably charged treason. (The judge supported the confederacy.) The other two convictions are relatively recent; Judge Archbald in 1912 and Judge Ritter in 1936. In both a strong argument can be made that criminal misconduct was not the basis of the conviction. The question of impeachment for non-criminal conduct was debated at length in both cases and it seems likely that at least some senators voted for conviction because they believed they had the power to remove from office a federal judge who had acted unlawfully, although not necessarily criminally.

c. Policy Considerations.

The position of those who would limit the impeachment power as to judges to criminal misconduct rests ultimately on a fear, perhaps a belief, that Congress might use a broader impeachment power for political purposes. Certainly there is a danger of politically motivated reprisals against judges. Justice Chase is the worst instance in our history; Professor Kurland has found some others that did not actually reach the impeachment stage. Granting that the danger is a real one, the issue is whether constitutional language is an important protection. To my mind history suggests that at least since the Civil War Congress has been fully sensitive to the value of judicial independence. If, as seems most unlikely, the time should come when a powerful majority in Congress was prepared to disregard that value, I find it hard to believe that such a majority would be seriously discouraged by any constitutional language, certainly not by words as ambiguous and historically obscure as the "high crimes and misdemeanors" clause. The great protection against political encroachment on the judiciary is not the Constitution but a responsible Congress. If we posit a House and Senate indifferent to judicial independence, the Constitution will not protect judges—nothing can.

The proponents of a limited power consistently treat impeachment as if it were a criminal trial. That may mislead—the rhetoric is like criminal law, acquit or convict, for example—the objective of impeachment is not to punish but to protect the public service. The remedy is limited to removal from office and disqualification from holding any other office. Punishment, if any, is to follow an independent criminal trial. It is not clear who has the burden of proof on impeachment, or whether the proof has to be beyond a reasonable doubt. To my mind the criminal standard of proof is inappropriate for a process whose purpose is limited to protecting the public from unworthy public servants. It should be possible to lift a lawyer's license without being able to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he stole the client's funds.

If we consider impeachment as limited to protecting the public service it is odd to restrict the power to instances of criminal misconduct. What is to be done with the insane judge or the judge who ruthlessly disregards the plain language of the law for no reason beyond the psychic satisfaction he gets watching people squirm. Neither can be said to have committed a crime, the insane judge because he could not and the martinet because, by hypothesis, he was getting no personal profit. It is hard to believe that government is impotent to rid itself of such judges—that we have to endure them until they die or choose to retire.

On the other hand, the broad position that Congress may impeach for any conduct it regards as "non-good" is an extraordinary assertion of power that denies any limiting function to the "treason, bribery or other

Footnotes at end of speech.

high crimes and misdemeanors" clause. What is perhaps most troublesome is its violation of the spirit if not the language of the Bill of Attainder clause (Art. I, sec. 9); under the broad view a judge could be impeached for conduct which so far as he or anyone else could tell at the time was entirely proper. That possibility, however remote it may be as a practical matter, is so remote from our traditional notions of fairness that it is hard to believe it was intended. At the same time it should be remembered that in 1789 the concept of common law crimes was familiar and the use of common law crimes necessarily involves a constantly evolving or changing substantive criminal law with the bulk of the changing being done after the fact by judges. Nonetheless, there is, I think, at least a difference in degree between shifts as to what constitutes reliance for purposes of the crime of obtaining property by false pretences and deciding that a judge may be impeached for having a drink at a bar association convention.

It is possible to assume a middle ground between the extremes that Congress can impeach only for criminal misconduct on the one hand and on the other hand Congress can classify as non-good behavior anything it thinks evil. The trick is to read "misdemeanor" as including any substantial departure from the clear purport of the law regardless of whether that law is civil or criminal. Thus persistent neglect of duty (not a crime so far as I know) would be an impeachable misdemeanor. Similarly, Judge Pickering's wrongful release of a ship and arbitrary refusal to permit an appeal would be impeachable. At the borderline this could be a very difficult conception; only a shadow differentiates an erroneous interpretation of the law from a willful disregard of its terms. But there are clear cases of willful illegal behavior (but non-criminal) by judges that could reasonably be included in the range of matters for which a judge might be impeached. By making illegality an element of the standard for impeachment we would protect judges against whimsical after-the-fact determinations of wrongdoing.

The middle ground is where I ultimately come out for three reasons: (1) It is not inconsistent with history and the probable intent of the founders (which is not to say that the language of the Constitution or its history compels this result); (2) It recognizes a broad congressional power especially in the future (Congress can prospectively make impeachable anything it wishes); (3) This construction is somewhat protective of the judges' independence since it would permit impeachment only where the judge had been guilty of a fairly plain departure from the terms of the law whether it be criminal or civil.

As I indicated earlier, I am not familiar with the charges against Justice Douglas and thus I am unable to comment on whether any of the conduct charged (assuming it to be true) violates this standard.

Respectfully submitted,

PREBLE STOLZ.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Since this was written, I have read an early draft of what will ultimately be a chapter in a book on Impeachment by Raoul Berger. Mr. Berger, a personal friend and at one time a Regents' Professor at Berkeley, has done a most scholarly job of digging out the English precedents. The English law on impeachment stopped just about the time of the drafting of the Constitution and it is a fair question (which Mr. Berger fully recognizes) how much of the law he has been able to find now was known to the draftsmen of the Constitution in 1789. Assuming that they did know, Mr. Berger concludes that "high crimes and misdemeanors" were terms of art with a technical if not very precise meaning and which included: misapplication of funds, abuse of power, and neglect of duty. Plainly, these are broader than criminal misconduct as we understand those words today. I would encourage you to contact Mr. Berger if you are interested in exploring this point further. His address is: 140 Jennie Dugan Rd., Concord, Mass. 01742.

[2] Again, Mr. Berger has views on this question also. His discussion will be published in the next issue of the Yale Law Journal.

THE SHAPE OF TOMORROW LIES IN THE HANDS OF THOSE WHO ARE WILLING TO FIGHT FOR IT TODAY

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, among the great mass of events which blend together to form the present, there are many which tend in the direction of preserving national independence and freedom's spirit. Some of these occurrences have not received the mass media coverage they deserve.

The nonreporting of events which give heart to the enemy, or the misinterpretation of such events, is one of the basic weapons in any sophisticated psychological warfare campaign. Demoralization of the opponent is a primary aim in any effort to break down the enemy's resistance. Once a person feels there is no hope, that the situation is so bad that it cannot be rectified by anything he may do, he stops contending. He yields to a fate which seems preordained.

Just as one buries a social order by convincing its members that it is not worth defending, one also buries a society by convincing its members that it cannot be successfully defended. Recent events show that those who convince themselves of the truth of either of these twin pillars of defeat are in error.

Several of these recent "events" indicate that the United States may be adopting a more realistic attitude toward the United Nations.

For the first time in history, funds were cut to one of the subsidiary organizations of the United Nations—the International Labor Organization—ILO. The ILO was rightly denounced as an anti-American propaganda forum. For those of us who have never been able to understand why we should subsidize our slanderers, this action was most gratifying.

For the first time in history we said "No" in the Security Council. We voted against the use of armed force to "bring Rhodesia to heel." This is very significant.

For the first time in history we abstained when the vote was taken in the General Assembly budget committee in favor of a $192 million budget for United Nations operations. The United States also abstained on a Security Council vote which condemned Portugal for the alleged invasion of pro-Communist Guinea.

These occurrences, three of them historical precedents, are convincing proof that some headway is being made in the effort to show that the United Nations is more of a mental refuge for the moral cowards who refuse to accept the responsibility for beating down messianic communism than "mankind's last great hope for peace."

Another hopeful incident occurred in October of this year when we resumed full military aid to our NATO ally, Greece. A look at any world map will show the strategic importance of this nation on the northern shores of the Mediterranian. It would be a catastrophe of the greatest magnitude if this nation were to fall into Communist hands. The protracted leftist propaganda campaign against the present anti-Communist government did not bear the hoped-for fruit. National interest prevailed over emotionalized and misleading mass media agitation.

Many of you heard about the arrest of Special Forces Sfc. James R. Kerns for tearing down a Vietcong flag at the Vietnam victory rally held in Washington in October. Not so widely reported was the fact that not only were the charges against Sergeant First Class Kerns dismissed, but the judge who dismissed the charges told reporters after the trial that if he had been at the rally he would have helped Sergeant First Class Kerns take the enemy flag down. The judge then found Sergeant First Class Kerns in the lunchroom and shook his hand.

The outstanding recent event was the brave attempt which was made to free our men being held prisoner by the North Vietnamese Communists. Despite all the efforts being made to downgrade this fine and courageous operation, I think most Americans realize that this is an example of the spirit that made our Nation great.

In this endeavor perhaps we witness the beginning of a changed course for a great nation: a nation rising once again to meet the challenge which the era thrusts upon us. We must work to insure that events evolve in this direction.

APPEAL FOR ENACTMENT OF THE EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT OF 1970

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, time is running out on enactment this year of one of the most important pieces of legislation that we have had come through this House and sent to the other body, the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on General Education, it is my fervent hope that the other body will accept

this legislation and send it on to the President for signature.

The Washington Post this morning pointed out that one of the most important bills still awaiting action is the so-called Emergency School Aid Act of 1970. This is a $1.5 billion 2-year program, designed to assist schools undergoing racial desegregation. This measure was proposed by President Nixon last spring, and was approved by the House Committee on Education and Labor, and subsequently by the House itself.

The subcommittee has worked very hard to approve this bill. In my judgment it will go a long way. With all due respect to my colleagues in the other body, I do not believe that this bill is unacceptable as has been stated by one of the Senators. I believe that this bill was sent to the Congress by the President because the President recognizes, as we did in our committee, that one of the most serious problems in America today is the resegregation of schools. Testimony before our committee shows that schools which had been segregated all white, became integrated, and then resegregated within 36 months. This is a national crisis, and this legislation now before the other body would make a significant contribution toward dealing with this problem.

It is my fervent prayer and hope that the gentleman in the other body at this late moment will take another look at our bill and see that it does make a significant contribution toward the solution of this problem, pass it, and sent it on to the President for his signature.

NEW YORK COLLEAGUES THAT WILL BE MISSED

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues from New York in expressing my feelings about those members of the New York delegation with whom I have served over the past 2 years, and who are not only able colleagues but good friends.

I came to Washington 2 years ago as a freshman with ALLARD LOWENSTEIN who, because of his outstanding talent in mobilizing the anti-Vietnam war sentiment in this country, is probably one of the most well-known young men in the United States. His dedication to this major and overriding cause was seen during his term of office here in Washington and will be continued so long as the war continues. He is an extraordinary man who has performed a magnificent service to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, another colleague that I will miss and one of the first Members with whom I spoke when I came to Washington looking for guidance was RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, known by all as MAX. Prior to coming here I knew him only by reputation as a fighter against the highway trust fund. But I soon learned that he is also a gentle, considerate man with a marvelous sense of humor and in the short space of 2 years we became good friends and I value that friendship which I hope will long endure.

I know he will continue with the fight to prevent our landscapes and urban areas from being cemented over by the highway builders. I consider mass transit to be one of the major areas of need in this country and I consider MAX MCCARTHY a major leader espousing that concept.

Mr. Speaker, another colleague leaving and, one I have known for about 14 years is LEONARD FARBSTEIN. I came to know him even better since my election to the House in 1968. Few people in this country realize that it was LEONARD FARBSTEIN who first proposed the elimination by law of the polluting internal combustion engine and who last year introduced the first amendment to provide a time limit for Detroit to produce a nonpolluting vehicle. His amendment was rejected then as too visionary but, less than a year later it was incorporated in the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970 and now Detroit must produce a nonpolluting engine by 1976.

Mr. Speaker, one other good friend who will be leaving this House and whom we will miss is RICHARD L. OTTINGER. DICK involved himself in the environmental cause long before it was fashionable and was the first to invoke in the State of New York the little known Refuse Act of 1899. Fortunately for the country he is going to continue in the environmental area mobilizing public opinion in support of saving our water, air and land for the generations to come.

These men have made important contributions to improving the quality of life in this country and their presence will be sorely missed in this Congress. Fortunately they will continue to improve the quality of life in their new endeavors. I wish them well and all success.

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN's host of friends in expressing my regrets that he will not be a Member of this body during the 92d Congress.

Mr. FEIGHAN was an outstanding member of the House Judiciary Committee and assisted me on a number of occasions with problems confronting some of my constituents. His services will be greatly missed and I want to wish him and his family all the happiness possible in future years.

RESPONSE FROM SECRETARY OF STATE ROGERS GRATIFYING

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently I wrote to Secretary of State William P. Rogers to commend him for his initiative which has brought at least temporary peace to the Middle East, and also to urge that every effort be made by our country to resume diplomatic relations with the United Arab Republic. The response to my letter was gratifying, and I know it will be read with approval by Jews and Arabs alike who believe in and labor for a permanent peace.

Writing for the Secretary, his assistant, David Abshire stated plainly:

> We too would like to resume diplomatic relations with the U.A.R. We have let the Egyptians know, both publicly and privately on a number of occasions since 1969, that we would be prepared to reestablish relations at any time.* * * We have placed no preconditions on a resumption of relations, and are hopeful that the Egyptians will agree in due course.

This is the correct policy for the United States to follow. It is a policy which is in the interest of world peace. Formal diplomatic relations at the highest level would facilitate communications so essential to understanding and cooperative action.

The establishment of relations at the ambassadorial level is a step which many Americans and Arabs desire. Since my letter to the Secretary of State was written, prominent U.S. citizens sympathetic to the cause of the Arabs have written to me to state their own agreement.

The establishment of formal diplomatic relations between our two great nations is the next logical step which we must take. It is in the national interest of each, as well as of world peace. The sooner it is taken, the better.

I commend the Secretary of State for his constructive leadership in the cause of peace, and also for his labors to better relations between the United States and the United Arab Republic. I earnestly hope that the United Arab Republic will respond in the same spirit.

Below are the texts of the two letters:

DECEMBER 18, 1970.

Hon. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: In my view, the time has come for two great nations, the United States and United Arab Republic (Egypt), to resume normal diplomatic relations.

The severance in relations which occurred during the Seven Days War is now in its fourth year. Its continuation handicaps the United States in its efforts to be a force for peace and justice in the Middle East, because it makes awkward the communication, both public and private, so essential to understanding and cooperative action.

In both nations new leaders have taken office since the break occurred and I sense a greater inclination toward cooperation today than at any time in ten years. Your diplomatic initiative which has produced a cease fire in the Middle East has reaffirmed

America's desire for good relations with all States in the area.

Certainly, sentiment on Capitol Hill in Washington has moderated in recent years and normal diplomatic relations would, I believe, be welcomed by a majority of both Houses of the Congress.

The people of the United States recognize that Egypt has always been, and will continue to be, so to speak, the political center of gravity in the Arab world, and therefore of vast importance to our country. Our interests in the Middle East are not confined to Israel, and therefore it is highly important that we achieve the maximum understanding with the one country which is the acknowledged leader of all the Arab states and is so important to the aspirations of all the people in the Middle East.

Your fine leadership in this area is a credit to U.S. diplomacy, and I commend you for it.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., December 30, 1970.

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY: Secretary Rogers has asked me to answer your letter of December 18, in which you proposed that we reestablish diplomatic relations with the U.A.R. He also wanted me to thank you especially for the kind wishes you expressed in your letter.

We too would like to resume diplomatic relations with the U.A.R. We have let the Egyptians know, both publicly and privately on a number of occasions since 1969, that we would be prepared to reestablish relations at any time. Secretary Rogers said in a speech on December 9, 1969:

"We remain interested in good relations with all states in the (Middle East) area. Whenever and wherever Arab states which have broken off diplomatic relations with the United States are prepared to restore them, we shall respond in the same spirit."

We have placed no preconditions on a resumption of relations, and are hopeful that the Egyptians will agree in due course. However, they have told us on a number of occasions, the most recent since President Nasser's death, that they do not think that the circumstances are propitious for resumption of full relations.

In the meantime, as you know, our communications with the Egyptians are generally satisfactory and there are frequent high-level contacts between representatives of our two governments both here and in Cairo. We remain ready, however, to take any step to improve relations further when this desire is reciprocated by the UAR.

I hope this information will be helpful to you. If we can be of further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID M. ABSHIRE,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

TRIBUTE TO MR. FRANCIS J. KANE

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a statement in behalf of Mr. Francis J. Kane of Washington, D.C., who has just been reappointed for a 3-year term effective October 13, 1970, to serve on the District of Columbia Armory Board.

Mr. Kane has performed outstanding service for the people here in the Nation's Capital and it is refreshing to know we have people with Mr. Kane's standing in this community and throughout the country who will take their valuable time to perform the duties of a member of the District of Columbia Armory Board, a position which carries no salary.

It is my hope that all the good reputable citizens in the Nation's Capital will begin to take an active interest in the District government in an effort to see that all positions are filled by capable citizens of this community. I feel certain that if we can have more people of Mr. Kane's ability take an interest in the District of Columbia, we can substantially decrease the expenses of operating the government and give better services to the average citizen.

Again I want to congratulate Mr. Kane on his willingness to accept this position for another 3 years.

POLISH MIGRANTS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, at a time of great national stress in Poland, when Gomulka has been replaced by Gierek, and there is great economic stress within that country, it is interesting for me, as a member of the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, to look at emigration from Poland in a worldwide way. An excellent discourse on this subject appears in the November–December 1970 issue of Migration News. Migration News is a bimonthly publication of the International Catholic Migration Commission—ICMC—devoted to the subjects of migration, population, land settlement, and refugees. I call to the attention of my colleagues to an article in the publication by Dr. T. Stark of Geneva entitled "Polish Migrants Throughout the World." The article follows:

POLISH MIGRANTS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

(By Dr. T. Stark)

There are few subjects which give rise to greater controversy than the question of how many Polish migrants live outside Poland. Various figures are circulated and quoted in articles and reviews, and it would therefore be useful to examine what the actual number of Poles abroad might be and what criteria should be applied to determine it.

When migrant statistics are spoken of, the first source of misunderstanding is the definition of who is to be considered as a "migrant." Receiving countries maintain that those who leave their country of origin cease to be considered as migrants when they become socially or economically integrated into the life of their new country. Others consider as migrants those born in other countries. Others go even further, considering not only those of the first generation as belonging to this group, but also all their descendants who bear a foreign name, keep in touch with the country of origin or take part in the life of the foreign community. The broadest concept of "foreign origin" is that which goes back to second, third or even further generations.

On the other hand, the official statistics of immigration countries consider as "Polish immigrants" or "Polish population" only those who have Polish passports (Polish citizenship). They thus restrict the notion of "non-integrated migrants" to those who are not naturalized. However, population censuses are often based on sociological points of view and consider as "Poles" all those who declare themselves as such and express the desire to be considered as such. That would mean that this is a subjective notion and cannot be determined by objective signs such as a passport or birth certificate. However, it is also true that for reasons of opportunity and also psychological reasons, people sometimes avoid declaring their origins in a new country, preferring to be considered as "people of the country".

As far as Polish immigrants are concerned, for historical reasons further misunderstanding may arise. In the 18th and 19th centuries, indeed, right up to 1921, Poland was not a free country, as a result of its partition between Austria, Germany and Russia, and the Poles who emigrated traveled under the passports of these countries and appear in the statistics for these countries. After the Second World War, history repeated itself, as Polish emigrants from Europe were mostly refugees, already living outside their country. They thus appear as residents of their countries of departure or are counted as stateless persons.

The most interesting thing from a sociological point of view is, of course, the broadest notion of "origin" which does not take into account the aspects of either integration or citizenship. It is this notion that we shall adopt for this study, taking as the down limit of the cessation of "migrant status" the lack of desire expressed by the people themselves to be considered as Poles i.e. their lack of contact with Polish community life in immigration countries.

TRADITION OF POLISH EMIGRATION OVERSEAS

Emigration is of a long-standing tradition in Poland and reasons for it are mainly of an economical and political nature, i.e. precarious economic conditions, lack of religious freedom and political persecution.

The first Polish emigrants had already reached North America in 1608, when a group of Polish artisans arrived in Jamestown, Virginia, to work in the glass and soap-making industry. In 1762, Mr. Olbracht Zaborowski settled in New Amsterdam, thus creating the oldest Polish family in the United States. "Zabriskie". After the Wars of Independence, 1776–1777, in which the part played by two Polish generals, Pulaski and Kosciuszko is well known, it is estimated that some 10,000 Poles, former soldiers or newcomers resettled there. The first Polish priest emigrating to the States in 1808 was a Jesuit (Fr. Korsak). Another priest arrived in 1854, this time accompanied by a whole village from Silesia and founded, together with these hundred or so Polish families, a rural settlement called Panna Maria, Texas.

The success of this first attempt caused a chain reaction and led to a massive migration movement in the following decades of the 19th century and into the 20th century. The climax of these currents was reached between 1912 and 1913, when 175,000 Poles entered the United States.[1]

---

[1] Many peasants departed with German passports and were helped by *St. Raphaels-Verein*, the oldest voluntary migration organization in Europe and an affiliate to the International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC).

In Canada, the first Polish agricultural settlement—Wilno, Ontario—dates back to 1872 and was originally founded by 300 Poles coming from Northern Poland (Kaszuby).

Finally, the first settlers from Poland going to Brazil had already arrived in 1824, and were amongst the founders of the city of Santa Cruz do Sul. The first priests to accompany Polish peasants, arrived in Brazil from Cracow in 1849. From 1868 on, larger groups of immigrants began to arrive in the State of St. Catherina, then moving further on to Curitiba, the Capital of Parana. Some 16 families founded the colony of Pilarzino (Pilgrimage), which today is a suburb of Curitiba, and five years after this they were joined by 64 other Polish families. Hence, between 1875 and 1878 mass immigration into Parana took place and about 10 settlements were founded, officially called "Nova Polonia", (New Poland), a name given to it by the "Kolonial-Zeitung" published in Vienna. Already in 1894, during the Brazilian Wars, Polish migrants constituted a regiment which fought on the Federal side, and in 1911 the first Pole (E. S. Saporski) from Parana was elected as a Brazilian Congressman.

MAIN RESETTLEMENT COUNTRIES

This brief outline already shows that migration from Poland from the beginning chose two main overseas directions; towards North America, i.e. the United States and Canada, and towards South America, namely, Brazil.

The first movements were spontaneous rather than organized. The only possible organizer was a German ship-agent, and the movements therefore also follow the trends of German migration movements of that time, which were directed towards the United States and Brazil. Hence both Poles and Germans sometimes headed for the same destinations—Wisconsin, Illinois and New York in the States and Santa Contherina, Rio Grande do Sul and Parana in Brazil.

Between the First and Second World Wars, during the period of Polish independence, the Polish State took this immigration policy in hand and directed movements to new South American targets—Argentina, Uruguay and Paraguay.

The aftermath of the Second World War, with its thousands of refugees who found themselves outside Poland, added new countries to the existing trends of Polish migration, besides increasing the intake of "older" targets such as Canada, the United States and South America. Up to 1968 the fresh intake in Canada was 136,420 Polish immigrants and in the United States 192,903. Among the new destinations mentioned must be made of Great Britain, which became a resettlement country for numerous soldiers and their families from Poland. Indeed, as a result of World War II, Polish migrants spread themselves yet further, settling in some 11 European countries. Besides migration within Europe, this post-war period opened up two extremely important new migration destinations yet further afield; Australia and New Zealand have since the war absorbed altogether almost 90,000 Polish migrant refugees.

Let us examine the present numbers of these migrants, country-by-country.

UNITED STATES

Without a doubt, the United States is the first and most typical of Polish migration destination countries, and there are between 6 and 8 million Americans of Polish descent in the States. These Poles have already lived there for four or five generations and are generally conscious of their origin. Indeed, these immigrants now constitute an integral part of the vast American nation and only their names (if they have not been changed) bear witness to their past origins. In fact, according to official population censuses, of foreign white stock in the States in 1930, 3,342,000 were of Polish origin, and in 1950, 2,727,000, i.e., 8.4–8.5% of the total foreign white stock.

If we speak of those who actually participate in Polish community life and who speak or understand Polish, they number between 800,000 and 1,000,000. These are members of Polish organizations and Polish national parishes and preserve, more or less faithfully, Polish customs.

Two separate groups of Polish immigrants must here be defined; the so-called "old" migration, mainly rural in origin, but which today has reached a higher educational level, and "new" migration, composed of post-war refugees. This latter group numbers over 200,000, belonging mostly to the intellectual and professional categories.

In Polish community life, two organizations have played an important role; the Polish National Alliance and the Polish Roman Catholic Union, which each have a quarter of a million members. They find a useful complement in the Polish Women's Alliance, which has some 100,000 women members.

Poles in the States have no separate Polish church-structures, but are integrated into local American dioceses. However, there are a considerable number of priests of Polish origin serving Polish and American parishes. For an onlooker, the following figures seem almost unbelievable; there are 900 Polish-American parishes, served by 2,500 priests of Polish origin, and about 10,000 Polish sisters. They maintain some 800 parish schools and 100 lay schools. Among the present American Bishops, there are six of Polish origin and one Cardinal. The Polish Seminary in Orchard Lake has an excellent reputation for helping the American Church to preserve the faith of those Poles who were not at first able to take part in the English-spoken mass and confession. Up to now it has instructed over 2,000 priests for the care of Polish immigrants.[2] Yet another Polish religious center is the Pauline Fathers' Shrine of the Holy Virgin at Doylestown, which each year brings together over half a million Polish Americans on various religious occasions. The Pauline Fathers use 26 broadcasting stations to diffuse religious programs.

Indeed, this shows great dynamism on their part and also proves the contribution made by Polish immigrants to American Catholicism. They realise that they should maintain their national values, and integrate them into the American concept of life. One eminent American Bishop of Polish origin, A. J. Wycislo of Green Bay, Wisconsin, in the study he made in 1959, entitled "The Polish Catholic Immigrant" rightly stressed the fact that when we speak of Polish Americans, we think *ipso facto* of Polish Catholics. Indeed, the traditional faith of Poland has been a potent force in shaping Polish American life and providing it with a unitive power.

BRAZIL

The second agglomeration of Polish migrants is to be found in Brazil where there are some 400,000 persons of Polish descent. Of these, over 200,000 are still taking part in Polish community life. Many, however, do not speak Polish and are completely integrated into the Brazilian way of life.

The official population census of 1940 put the total number of foreign population of Polish stock at 250,000 persons. Of these, the largest number was settled in Parana (100,000) in the green belt around Curitiba, where many localities bear Polish names or the names of saints. The second state, Rio Grande do Sul accounted for some 80,000 immigrants of Polish origin, mainly agricultural workers and artisans. In Santa Catarina there were some 20,000, in São Paulo, 10,000. There are also numerous colonies of Polish origin in Espirito Santo, Minas Gerais, etc.

A further increase in these migrant groups was somewhat hampered by a lack of newly arriving immigrants from Poland and especially a lack of immigrants of a professional status. The International Refugee Organization (IRO) brought 8,000 Polish refugees to Brazil in addition to 500 former soldiers who arrived from the United Kingdom, France and elsewhere. However, at present, new immigration of Poles into Brazil has almost entirely ceased.

The former flourishing organizational life, which consisted of over 700 Polish organizations before the last war and some 300 Polish schools is now static. There are, nevertheless, at the moment over 90 Polish priests in Southern Brazil, most of whom are of the "priest-agriculture" type, since they are obliged to earn their living.

ARGENTINA AND OTHER LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

In Spanish-speaking Latin America there are at present about 150,000 immigrants of Polish origin. Some 100,000–120,000 of them live in *Argentina*. The official population census of 1960 gives the number of Poles in Argentina as 107,915 i.e. 4% of the total foreign population. This migration dates back only about 50 years and most of this has taken place in the inter-war 1919–1939 period It mainly consists of agricultural workers and almost all of these have settled near Buenos Aires, following the example of immigrants coming from Spain and Italy. Most of the others settled in Missiones (20,000), but some went to cities like Rosario, Santa Fe, Mendoza, Cordoba and Tucuman. In some of these cities even the third generation speaks Polish.

The post-war influx of Polish immigrants to Argentina has been rather limited, amounting to 6,563 refugees transported by IRO to Argentina from Germany or France during the years 1947–1951.

Paraguay and Uruguay also had small Polish settlements established before the last war. Post-war influx (with the help of IRO) has been fairly small; Venezuela 2,814, Paraguay 1,433 (of whom some went on to Argentina) and Chile 516. Small colonies of 200–300 persons exist in Uruguay and Peru. These are mainly composed of former members of the Allied Armies or refugees.

CANADA

Similar to the United States, Canada, already possessed a sound economy when the mass influx of migrants from Poland got under way, but various favorable factors, such as a small population per square kilometer and the numerical disproportion between the two main population groups—the British and the French—favored the acceptance of these new immigrants. Indeed, contrary to the etymology of its name, which Spanish scholars maintain evolved from the arrival of the first explorers from Spain, who, on discovering the country, went back to their ships saying, "Aca-nada"—"There is nothing here"—Canada has grown to be one of the most important economic powers of the world, thanks to its wealth of agriculture and raw materials. To show its population possibilities, its surface is 32 times that of Poland (311,000 square kilometers).

Thanks to these favorable conditions, Canada quickly acquired the third largest agglomeration of Polish migrants, who arrived there in three waves. After some more or less successful attempts at individual migration, the first main wave dates back to before the First World War and was chiefly of an agricultural and rural character. The second took place between the two World Wars and was composed of middleclass men, especially merchants. The last wave came after the Second World War, bringing with it

[2] All the figures quoted are taken from a report published in 1969 by Rev. W. J. Ziemba, Rector of the Seminary in Orchard Lake, Michigan.

mainly refugees of a higher education and professional status. Up to now, these migrants have converged on urban centers—63% are presently living in cities.

The total contribution of Poles to the demographic development of Canada is put at some 350,000 persons. The 1961 census spoke of 323,517 immigrants born in Poland. The present numbers of those keeping in touch with Polish community life are estimated at 230,000 persons, including the post-war intake of 136,420 (1945–1968). The International Refugee Organization alone resettled 47,000 Polish refugees in Canada up to 1951.

As to their actual location in Canada, the largest numbers are to be found in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec; Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa have the highest number. In the province of Manitoba, the largest concentration is to be found in Winnipeg (about 15,000), but others can be found in St.-Boniface, Transcona, etc. Here they often neighbor with Ukranian migrants who left Poland at the beginning of this century. It should be stressed that of the total Catholic population of Winnipeg, numerically the Poles hold first place, even ahead of French and British Catholics. Sixty-four churches have been built by Poles and 20 of these are still serving the purpose of Polish pastoral care.

Polish migrants are also to be found in Saskatchewan (Saskatoon), in Alberta (Edmonton—11,000) and Columbia (Vancouver—8,000), to mention only the most important centers. There are 75 priests of Polish origin taking care of these immigrants, dispersed over the whole of the country; many of them are members of religious orders.

AUSTRALIA

Polish migration here goes back only 20 years and accounts for some 85,000 persons who have been integrated into this newly constituted and growing Australian population. In fact, before 1939 there were only 1,000 Poles in Australia.

According to official statistics, of the intake between 1945 and March 1969 of 84,513 migrants born in Poland, 67,287 are now naturalized together with their children and possess Australian passports. However, the first generation of immigrants takes an active part in Polish community life. Most of them came from refugee camps in Germany, others passed through Russia, Iran and India; yet others were soldiers in Great Britain. Following two-year contracts to work on the construction of roads, railways and offices, most of these settled in towns.

Polish organizations are members of the Council of Polish Organizations, which has its seat in Sydney. Polish priests are also responsible for Australian parishes. St. Vincent de Paul missionaries evicted from China began this work and were later on supplemented by priests coming from Germany and France. The Polish shrine of Czestochowa was consecrated in 1966 at Marayong by Cardinal Gilroy in the presence of 18,000 Polish immigrants.

FRANCE

Recently, a member of the French parliament quoting the numbers of immigrants in France placed Polish migrant workers with their families in fourth place after Spaniards, Italians and Portuguese with a total of 300,000 persons. Before the last war, in fact, this was the largest Polish colony, which according to Professor Vernant consisted of 460,000 Poles. Professor Zubrzycki in "Population Studies" has analysed the influx of Poles between 1919 and 1938 and arrived at the net figure of 423,000 Poles in France before the war.

A recent inquiry made amongst Polish priests in 1965 in France revealed some 270,000 persons of Polish origin who keep in touch with Polish organizations and benefit from the pastoral care of Polish priests. Official statistics, which do not include those possessing French passports, do however, show a lower figure. Whereas the 1962 population census showed 177,181 Poles, the 1968 one indicated only 131,280.

The Polish group in France is mainly composed of workers, miners and rural migrants. They enjoy many facilities for their religious life and also for their traditional ceremonies to which they are very attached. The mere enumeration of existing Polish organizations would take some pages; suffice it to say that they can be found throughout the whole of France, though more especially in the North where the majority of Poles live.

GREAT BRITAIN

A distinction should be drawn between two separate regions here as regards Polish settlement; England and Wales on the one hand, and Scotland on the other. Migration to these areas has taken place in the post-war era, and as a result of the war in which the Polish Army took part in Great Britain, remaining behind when it was over.

At present, of the 162,000 Poles of the 1959 census and 127,000 of the 1961 census, some 75,000 take part in Polish community life in England and Wales. Another 6,000 are to be found in Scotland, but only half of them remain in touch with Polish community life. A specially organized Medical Faculty has educated 400 Polish doctors and 160 other graduates. There is a Polish priest in Edinburgh, Falkirk, Glasgow and Kirkcaldy.

Community life in England and Wales is very active thanks to over 100 Polish priests serving in 72 parishes. There are in all 13 Polish churches in England, namely two in London, one in each of Bolton, Bradford, Coventry, Hereford, Huddersfield, Kidderminster, Leicester, Manchester, Melton Mowbray and Northwich. Some 30 Polish Parish Houses (4 of which are in London) gather Poles together every day from the surrounding districts. Some 30% of all Polish migrants live in London.

From the beginning stress was placed by the Poles in Great Britain on the education of youth and therefore many schools were organized for boys and girls, mostly run by Catholic nuns and priests. Among religious orders, mention should be made of the Polish Marianists, Jesuits and Societas Christi, and the Sisters of the Holy Family of Nazareth and of the Resurrection. A Polish College has been established at Fawley Court, Oxon, for boys and at Pitsford Hall, Northampton, for girls. Many publications are printed, chiefly in London—Veritas Publications, the Sunday Gazette, Sodalis Marianus; others are published in Hereford and Brighton.

OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

It was stressed at the beginning of this article that after the Second World War Polish refugees and migrants resettled in more than 10 European countries. Here is some estimated data, according to official and unofficial sources:

Federal Republic of Germany (of whom 35,000 stateless of Polish origin)	53,000
Belgium (of whom 24,000 Polish refugees)	34,000
Sweden	8,000
Denmark	6,000
Netherlands	4,000
Austria	3,500
Switzerland	2,000
Italy	1,500
Luxembourg	1,000
Turkey	300
Spain	300
Portugal	200
Total	111,800

Most of these are former refugees who are now integrated into the economic life of the above countries. In Germany, some of them still belong to the American Guard Companies as a part of the U.S. army. Pastoral care is well-organized in Germany and there are over 30 Polish priests there. In Belgium there are 17 priests and 200 sisters. There are also small numbers of migrants in the Lebanon (3,000), South Africa (2,000), Israel and India.

POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION OF IMMIGRANTS

Many publications dealing with the contributions of Polish immigrants to the social, religious and economic life of the receiving countries, speak of them as "positive assets" in resettlement countries.

It can be said that of the several millions who emigrated either directly from Poland or from refugee camps outside Poland, some two million have maintained contact with Polish community life and still speak Polish. Over a million live in North America (U.S. and Canada), some 500,000 in South America (mainly Brazil and Argentina) and a further 400,000 in Europe (France, Great Britain, Germany and Belgium). Their children are, of course, integrated into the new life. The positive contribution made is based on the fact that, if these immigrants tried to maintain their original characteristics and traits in the first two generations, it was not for political reasons, such as secession, but for religious reasons, because for them original nationality and religion are often one and the same thing.

MENACE ON THE HIGH SEAS

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, increasing attention is being directed to the build-up of Soviet naval power. The following newsletter from the American Security Council shows why there is real reason for concern about this increasing threat and, therefore, I bring it to the attention of the Members:

THE GLOBAL SOVIET NAVAL CHALLENGE

Despite the tremendous technological progress made in air transportation and stategic weapons systems in this country, free use of the seas which cover three-fourths of the earth's surface—continues to be essential to the security of this country, whether to defend ourselves or our allies. Ninety-seven percent of all the material sent to Vietnam has gone by sea.

Fully cognizant of our dependence on seaborne transportation, the Soviet Union has developed a naval strategy aimed at interdicting our sea lanes. Since World War II they have placed increasing priority on submarines, aware of the fact that the last two world wars were almost lost because of the Allied problem in keeping the sea lanes open.

EXPANDED ROLE OF THE SUBMARINE

With the rapid advancement of technology since the end of World War II, the role of the submarine in naval warfare has expanded. Nuclear power, long range missiles, sophisticated electronics, computers—all combine to make the submarine many times more potent and versatile than before. The nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarine has become our most viable deterrent strategic weapon. The Soviets are presently engaged in a massive construction program to build a fleet of similar submarines, and a part of

this fleet is now on station off our coasts. Present projections indicate that by mid-1974 their ballistic missile submarine fleet will equal ours. The Soviets are also building large numbers of high-speed, torpedo-firing nuclear-powered submarines which can fire long-range cruise missiles, capable of being armed with conventional or nuclear warheads. Ships of the Soviet Navy are systematically present in all oceans, challenging the Allied control of the seas.

SOVIET CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM EXCEEDS OURS

Starting with 200 diesel-powered submarines at the end of World War II, the Soviets embarked on the largest "peace-time" submarine construction program in history, producing over 570 modern submarines in 25 years most designed for long-range operations. During the same period we built 105 submarines. In two years alone—1955 and 1956, the Soviets completed 150 submarines, one and one-half times the total number of submarines produced in this country during the past 25 years. The Soviets now possess the largest and most modern submarine building yards in the world, giving them several times the nuclear submarine construction capacity possessed by the United States. In addition, ten times as many naval architects and marine engineers are graduating in the U.S.S.R. than in the U.S. According to the latest unclassified data the Soviets now have between 355 and 363 submarines, all built since 1945, with at least 75 being nuclear-powered. The total U.S. force is 147, of which 88 are nuclear-powered. Based on current force levels and estimated Soviet nuclear submarine building rates, they will be ahead of us numerically by the end of this year.

One of the new Soviet sub designs is the Yankee class nuclear-powered ballistic missile boat, introduced in 1968. These submarines are very similar to our Ethan Allen Polaris submarine, and are capable of launching 16 ballistic missiles submerged. The Soviets now have 13 of the Yankee class operational and they are building 12 a year. It is estimated that they will surpass our Polaris fleet by mid 1973.

SOVIET NAVY A WORLD-WIDE FORCE

The Soviet submarine force, like the entire Soviet Navy, has become capable of sustained open-ocean operations and is being used in support of foreign policy in many areas of the world. During the recent large-scale naval maneuvers that included over 200 ships in both Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and nine adjoining seas, the Soviets deployed a large number of nuclear submarines away from their home bases, supplied by large sea-going tenders capable of remaining at sea for six months, servicing and repairing submarines while underway. Commenting on these maneuvers, Soviet Admiral Gorshkov, Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Navy declared: "Whereas until quite recently some areas of the world's oceans were considered restricted areas in which the navies of the imperialist powers ruled supreme and where our ships seldom ventured, now there are no such areas."

The Soviet are pulling ahead both in the speed of their submarines and in submarine weaponry. They possess a torpedo capability comparable to our own, and they have also successfully developed and put to sea some 65 submarines capable of firing long-range cruise missiles. These boats represent a threat to our world-wide surface shipping, our naval surface forces, and our free use of the seas. We do not possess a comparable weapons capability.

By the end of 1975, when we put into operation the last submarine currently authorized, the United States will have a total of 109 nuclear submarines. During the same period the Soviets will probably add at least 70 nuclear subs for a total of between 145 and 153—giving them a numerical superiority of fifty percent in nuclear submarines. We are building only three submarines a year, while the Soviets are building ten to twelve.

Admiral Hyman Rickover, among others, have recommended that the current high speed attack submarine (SSN 688 Class) building program be increased from three to at least five per year. He also recommends commencing on a new design high-speed submarine capable of firing long-range submarine-to-surface cruise missiles. To increase the invulnerability of the Polaris submarine, Admiral Rickover advocates increasing the range of the missile—thus providing greater ocean areas to hide in. This means pushing ahead with the development of the Underseas Long Range Missile System (ULMS).

There is some evidence that the Soviets have developed a base in Cienfuegos, Cuba, which can service its submarine fleet in this part of the world. One of the many advantages of the base would be facility for the repair and adjustment of ballistic missiles carried by the Yankee class sub. The development of this base provides the Soviets with an additional option for offensive strategy.

With the achievement of superiority in ICBM's, the development of space weapons, the rapid build-up on the seas and the elaborate and sophisticated support given to subversive movements in this hemisphere, the Soviets would appear to be on the threshold of a major break-through, far exceeding the temptation of 1962 which led to the Cuban missile crisis.

SEA-BASED ESPIONAGE

For some time now, the Soviets have been conducting an elaborate program of espionage against our military and space installations all along the Atlantic coast. The port of Charleston is one of the bases for our Polaris nuclear submarines. Soviet spy ships have been repeatedly sighted near the harbor waters at Charleston, sometimes anchoring right by the harbor buoy at the entrance to the port, to record the "sonic signatures" of the Polaris submarines and other U.S. naval vessels entering or leaving the port. A notorious case concerns the activities of the Soviet trawler *Laptev*, in its efforts last July and August to monitor the test firings of the Posiedon missile from the U.S.S. *Madison*, based at Charleston. The harassment by the *Laptev* actually caused the postponment of the Poseidon test launch, and almost involved a serious accident at sea.

The *Laptev* is a Soviet intelligence collection ship—AGI—and only nominally a trawler. Designated as the *Khariton Laptev*, this vessel is listed by Jane's[1] as an oceanographic survey ship of the *Nikolai Zubov* class. The Soviet Union has deployed intelligence collection ships in electronic surveillance operations against U.S. naval and land targets since the end of the Korean war. Soviet AGI's have operated along the east coast of the United States with patrols lasting about two months. Their main area of interest has been the Virginia Capes, amphibious training areas off the North Carolina littoral, naval operating areas off Charleston, and Cape Kennedy. Such patrols also cover the Puerto Rico naval operating areas and U.S. space vehicle recovery areas. Soviet AGI's which have operated off the east coast during the past year are as follows: *Teodolit* (12 Aug. 1969 to 1 Nov. 1969), *Krenometr* (28 Oct. 1969 to 3 Jan. 1970), *Lotlin* (20 Jan. 1970 to 2 April, 1970), *Teodolit* (31 March, 1970 to 13 June, 1970), and *Laptev* (2 June, 1970 to present).

THE CARIBBEAN

With respect to the Cienfuegos submarine base, when it becomes fully operational, the Soviets will have the capability not only of reaching our south, southwest and midwest, but also the Panama Canal and much of central and South America. Nuclear missiles fired against the United States from a Caribbean launching area would, of course, outflank our IBM defenses in Montana and the Dakotas. Thus all the more urgency to place part of our IBM defenses at sea in the Navy's mobile Sabmis[2] system.

The threat of Soviet subs in Cienfuegos is not limited to that posed by Yankee class missile boats. The Caribbean is our principal highway for transportation of South American strategic raw materials to this country; it is also the Atlantic approach to the Panama Canal, as well as the route that tankers must traverse to move Venezuelan oil to the United States and Europe.

Those who forever argue against any strengthening of our armed forces to meet Soviet escalation have said: "How can we blame the Russians for the Cienfuegos base if we have Polaris bases in Scotland and Spain?" One answer is that Holy Loch (Scotland) and Rota (Spain) are a thousand miles from the U.S.S.R. while Cienfuegos is but 150 miles from the United States. In 1962 the doves equated our belated response to the Soviet build-up in Cuba to the initial placement of IRBM's[3] in that country. They fail to distinguish between the use of force for offensive and defensive purposes.

THE MEDITERRANEAN

Of almost equal concern is the Soviet naval build-up in the Mediterranean. The Soviet fleet has port facilities at its disposal in Port Said, Alexandria and Latakia (Syria). It has also made use of facilities in Algeria. Thus far Soviet fleet activities appear to have primarily political and intelligence objectives. But there are situations where the Soviet fleet could threaten vital communications routes of the three southern flank countries—Greece, Italy and Turkey—which depend on sea routes to carry the great bulk of their imports and exports. The Soviet fleet is in a position to hinder British, French and American submarines and the Sixth Fleet. The presence of landing vessels in the Soviet fleet gives it the capability of carrying out operations which could adversely affect Albania, Yugoslavia, Israel and Lebanon. Finally, increased Soviet activity in the Persian Gulf and in the Middle East oil-producing states and the presence of the Soviet fleet in the Mediterranean could be viewed as part of a long-term strategy aimed at establishing a major influence in the oil-producing states.

Soviet activity in the Mediterranean has not been confined to the build-up of a permanent fleet. Soviet technicians and military advisers have been placed in Egypt, Syria, Algeria, and perhaps Libya as well. The post-1967 build-up in Egypt has led to the present crisis, including the Egyptian violations of the cease-fire. The strategic naval base of Mers-el-Kebir could be used by Soviet submarines and naval vessels to track the passage of western submarines and naval vessels between the western Mediterranean and the Atlantic

Soviet naval expansion in the Mediterranean is part of a new Soviet global naval strategy, which encompasses the North Atlantic, Caribbean and Indian oceans and the Persian Gulf. Soviet naval strength has changed in recent years from being primarily a defensive fleet to being a more aggressive one, particularly in view of the greater emphasis on long-range submarines, landing craft and the introduction of Helicopter carriers.

Soviet Fleet Admiral Gorshkov said recently: "The pride of our navy is atomic submarines, which are fitted out with missiles of various purposes which can be

[1] Jane's Fighting Ships, 1970.

[2] Sabmis—Seaborne Anti-Ballistic Missile Intercept System.

[3] IRBM's—Intermediate Range Ballistic Missiles.

launched from under water. The submarines, together with naval missile-carrying and anti-submarine aviation having high-speed, long-range airplanes, are the basis of the striking might of the Navy."

The Soviet challenge is there for all to see. What will our response be?

KISSINGER'S STAFFER HOLDS TROUSERLESS ORGY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the District of Columbia social event of the year was a trouserless orgy and was held by a member of the staff of Dr. Henry Kissinger, special assistant to President Nixon for national security affairs.

This immodest event was reportedly attended by Adm. Rembrandt Robinson of the staff of the Chief of Naval Operations, a large number of Kissinger's national security affairs staff, other White House staffers and some employees from Capitol Hill and other branches of government.

One of the suspect perverts was so unpatriotic and shameless that his underwear was made from an American flag.

It is little wonder that our young people over the country have become disillusioned with this so-called establishment, when such total disregard for decency and morality is flaunted by people who are related to as representative of our Government. If the other members of the Paris peace talks delegation are of the same character as exhibitionist Richard Smyser, we can now begin to understand why even the Vietcong cannot communicate with them.

And this is the way servants of U.S. taxpayers entertain?

I insert the story of this recent debauchery at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 25, 1970]

BLACK TIE, BUT NO PANTS

(By Maxine Cheshire)

The engraved invitation read: "Black Tie, *sans pantalons*"—meaning that male guests should arrive without trousers.

The party was given two weeks ago by John Lehman, a member of the staff of Dr. Henry Kissinger, special assistant to President Nixon for national security affairs. Kissinger did not attend.

The event should be forever memorable in an administration where the social highlight of the week can be Julie Eisenhower having her girl friends over for an afternoon cup of tea and a movie showing of "Othello."

Visualize, if you can, Adm. Rembrandt Robinson, Kissinger's liaison with Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Thomas Moorer, resplendent topside in gold braid and artistically attired below in flower-bedecked skivvies trimmed in ruffles.

There was Richard V. Allen, key Nixon campaign adviser on foreign affairs and formerly deputy to Kissinger, wearing a tuxedo jacket over a pair of women's knee-length bloomers dyed psychedelic colors.

A stockbroker from Villanova, Pa., Lehman noted, wore a costume that could get him arrested in some states. His underwear was made from an American flag.

Richard Smyser, Kissinger's Vietnam expert and former member of the Paris peace talks delegation, wasn't trying to remain anonymous in the crowd.

He had his name stenciled in large letters across the back of his shorts.

The host, John Lehman, wore his Cambridge University rowing blazer over a pair of boxer shorts that had been tie-dyed and then stitched strategically by his girl friend with a toad in needlepoint.

The toad is the emblem of the Cambridge dining society to which Lehman belonged in his student days, the Ancient Order of Gonville Loungers.

Trouserless parties are a tradition with that group according to Lehman a former University of Pennsylvania faculty member and a cousin of Princess Grace of Monaco.

The Gonville Loungers, whose members include television's David Frost, recently celebrated their 511th anniversary at a *sans pantalons* gathering for which Lehman flew to England.

This is the second trouserless party that Lehman has staged in Washington with the help of two bachelor roommates who share his Georgetown row house.

Last year's was held in December. "But some people complained of getting a little chilly," Lehman explains. "So this time we moved it up to a warmer month."

He had a six-piece rock band and most of his guests had a rollicking time. "But there is always someone," he says, "who stands around looking very sheepish in his garters."

Women guests all wore elegant long dresses. Men who did not take the invitation's wording seriously were met at the door by a maid who insisted they remove their trousers. She provided boxer shorts for those who came in briefs.

Only one man resisted. Kent Crane, of Vice President Agnew's staff, firmly refused to shed his dignity or anything else.

The guest list included a large number of Lehman's colleagues on Kissinger's National Security Affairs staff, various other White House staffers, plus a few from Capitol Hill and other branches of the government.

Kissinger, who gets asked almost everywhere else in Washington, did not get an invitation. "I knew he was going to be out of town," said Lehman.

ANNAPOLIS MIDSHIPMEN AID PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the concern that all Americans share relative to the treatment of our men held as prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese is shared by our midshipmen at Annapolis.

These young men, all potential naval officers, have organized an effective campaign of letters to Hanoi urging more humane treatment of these prisoners.

The response from all over the Nation to their efforts has been superb. They have been receiving thousands of letters of support.

One of my appointees to the Academy, Midshipman Mark Pistochini, has been active in this worthwhile endeavor. Mark put it well to me in a recent letter when he said:

This campaign will work with proper support and a little help from God.

My congratulations to all the midshipmen at Annapolis and my prayers that they and our men held as prisoners receive that "help from God."

TROOP WITHDRAWAL IS GOING WELL AND SHOULD DO EVEN BETTER

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. Speaker, in all of the controversy over the war in Vietnam there is one fact that is not debatable: President Nixon is withdrawing our troops from Vietnam. He has already reduced our forces in Vietnam by 37 percent since he took office and another 60,000 are scheduled to be out of that country by May 1.

On December 17, 1970, the Kansas City Star discussed the withdrawal situation in a concise and factual editorial entitled "Troop Withdrawal Is Going Well and Should Do Even Better." I include this editorial in the RECORD:

TROOP WITHDRAWAL IS GOING WELL AND SHOULD DO EVEN BETTER

It appears to be straight ahead for the Vietnam troop withdrawal of the Nixon administration. The latest troop level figure shows a drop to below 344,000. This means that President Nixon was able to beat his own pullout timetable by three weeks before the next deadline on January 1. In reaching the lowest level in more than four years, the U.S. military establishment in Vietnam is approximately 200,000 smaller than it was at its all-time peak of 543,000 in April of 1969.

Moreover, the reduction process will continue although it may slow to a trickle in the weeks immediately ahead. The slowdown that has been hinted at would be a hedge against a potential offensive by the enemy during the Tet lunar year holiday at the end of January. U.S. officials have come to regard this as the most dangerous time of year since the Communists' damaging Tet assault in 1968. But the enemy was left weakened by its heavy casualties and has mounted no major offensives since then. The hope is that the Communists are incapable of another Tet-type blow. But our side cannot count on it.

Yesterday, Melvin R. Laird, secretary of defense, noted that the infiltration of men and supplies from North Vietnam was higher last month than in November a year ago. But he also said that the level of infiltration and fighting for this year as a whole has been lower than that of 1969.

Thus the withdrawal program moves ahead with some apprehension that Hanoi might try to change present battlefield conditions. If so it would not be the Communists' purpose to interefere with the U.S. pullout but to disrupt the related Vietnamization program. The South Vietnamese are now doing most of the fighting for the allied side and bearing most of the casualties. A stronger South Vietnam is bad news for Hanoi—and the army of Saigon, on the basis of its combat record since last spring, shows increased strength. Whether it has the will to fight on indefinitely is the main question ahead.

As for the United States, Secretary Laird said yesterday that this country will maintain its military "presence" in South Vietnam as long as U.S. prisoners are held in North Vietnam. But the size of that force will

continue to decline. In addition to the 37 per cent reduction already carried out, a further cut of 60,000 men is to be accomplished by May 1. According to unconfirmed reports, all U.S. combat troops will be out of Vietnam by the summer of 1972. Only air and ground support units would remain after that, but in as yet unannounced numbers.

President Nixon has recognized a mandate to extract the U.S. from its war entanglement in Southeast Asia as rapidly as seems prudent and feasible. His continuing success in doing just that will measure also the continuing neutralization of the war in Vietnam as a divisive national issue.

JACK GORE

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 14, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is tempting to say that Jack Gore died at the very moment when he was most desperately needed, but it would be more accurate to say that Jack Gore was the kind of man who would have been desperately needed whenever he died. It is the fact of his death that is so hard to accept, for he was a vibrant and giving man, and he was so important a part of everything that was most hopeful in the political life of the country.

That that importance was recognized most clearly in his home State of Colorado simply means that more people there had come to be aware of his achievements despite his indifference to credit or fame. But his impact was national, and we have a better chance of making America the land it ought to be because of his efforts. We would have an even better chance if we would learn more from his example and his vision: His example of a single individual applying enormous energy and intelligence to help the common good, working quietly and unselfishly at tasks where noise and flash so often substitute for results; his vision of a strong and just America living up to her pledge at home, and leading the way toward peace on this tormented little globe.

What a man this was: tough, kind, organized, and spontaneous, a man who could see beyond the immediate to know what needed to be done, and a wizard at the mundane daily chores that make things get done. He charted how to do what is possible on the way to doing what was necessary even if it seemed impossible. Because he wanted nothing but the public good, he embarrassed political tinkerers and cynics into considering the public interest. Because he wanted results for the public good, he prodded the diverse energies of crusading reformers into rational and constructive effort. As I have said, it is hard to think when such a man would not be desperately needed; it is in fact hard to think what sort of man is more desperately needed.

We grieve for his beautiful family that shared him so generously with their country, and that now bears this awful loss that none can share with them. We grieve for the institutions and organizations he loved and helped the most—for the University of Colorado, for the Democratic Party of Colorado, for SANE, for the new Democratic coalition, all of them now shorn of a great and irreplaceable asset. Most of all, we grieve for his country, which he loved so dearly and served so indomitably.

But grieving is not enough, or it becomes an excuse, an evasion of what Jack Gore spent his life trying to tell us. So in our grief and beyond it, we set out to work harder and do better for peace and for social justice, wiser in our course for his example, clearer in our purpose for his vision. And we recall the lines of Alfred Lord Tennyson:

Come my friends,
'Tis not too late to seek a newer world.
Push off, and sitting well in order smite
The sounding furrows; for my purpose holds
To sail beyond the sunset, and the baths
Of all the western stars, until I die.
It may be that the gulfs will wash us down:
It may be we shall touch the Happy Isles,
And see the great Achilles whom we knew.
Tho' much is taken, much abides;
and tho'
We are not now the strength which in old
days
Moved earth and heaven; that which we are,
we are;
One equal temper of heroic hearts,
Made weak by time and fate, but strong in
will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.

(From "Ulysses" by Alfred Lord Tennyson.)

I include at this point in the RECORD an address by Jack Gore to the Boulder, Colo., Democratic Women's Committee Conference, and a tribute to him that appeared in the same publication:

ADDRESS BY JACK GORE: BOULDER DEMOCRATIC WOMEN'S COMMITTEE CONFERENCE, JANUARY 31, 1970

Twelve years ago this fall I moved to Boulder and I have participated actively in Boulder, Colorado, and the United States' five general elections of 1960 through 1968. Two (1960 and 1964) were significant national Democratic party victories, but only one out of five (1964) was a significant victory for Colorado Democrats. The question is why? Was it communication, organization, candidates or issues, or money? I submit that while all are important and in fact indispensable, the crucial variable in 1964 and for the future is issues.

Why is this so? Several basic political facts of life are too little known by our democratic activity and should be listed. (Nationally about 45 per cent are registered Democrats, 30 per cent Independents, and 25 per cent Republicans.)

First, not more than 5 per cent of the population participated in the political process of both parties actively, including financial contributions, outside of voting and even were only 61 per cent participated in 1968. The democratic primaries of 1968 were very exciting precisely because hundreds of thousands of new youth and adults participated for the first time, primarily because they had a stake in the issues. We are now in the process of squandering this capital by not moving fast enough to enfranchise the 18 year old youth and bring major democratic procedural reforms in opening up the party structures and broadening the franchise.

Second, millions of people interpreted the primary victories of Kennedy and McCarthy as a referendum to end the war in Vietnam which was won in the primaries and lost in the Nixon policy of "Vietnamization" or winning by proxy and continuing an open-ended involvement of the United States indefinitely—Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, and possibly other places. The Gallup and Harris Polls in the Poll of 1969 and the October 15 Moratorium clearly demonstrated a majority position for rapid withdrawal. The fact that the present pace of withdrawal and disengagement will take a minimum of six years has left a bitter and cynical taste in many people's mind about the working of the political process.

Third, the Phillip's strategy of a Southern-Heartland coalition of conservative forces in America seems extremely possible and discouraging to many who have studied how realistic this possibility is. (For those not familiar with the Southern-Heartland strategy, this simply calls for Nixon to erode the Southern Wallace vote, carry practically all the states West of the Mississippi and ride back into the White House in 1976. It means further that Nixon, being a political Republican, unlike General Eisenhower, will lay the organizational base for a conservative Republican-Dixiecrat-Military coalition that will continue to control the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Federal Government for at least a generation.)

This is a realistic and dangerous possibility. The counter-strategy of building a youth, black, brown, intellectual and minority blue collar change coalition, against Mr. Nixon's status quo or "no-change coalition", appears very difficult to achieve, not the least of the problems being that national Democratic leaders like Humphrey, Muskie and Harris have accepted Mr. Nixon's Vietnamization strategy almost uncritically and have moved very slowly and ineffectually to champion the rights of blacks, chicanos, youth and a more open electoral system.

The "loyal opposition" of the Democratic Party has predominantly failed to give vigorous and creative leadership to tax reform, proposals to end inflation (by dramatically cutting back the military), proposals to end the crisis in health care, proposals to deal with pollution which we only have 10 to 20 years to solve, radical reforms and restructuring of educational institutions and labor markets to invest 100 billion over a decade in the poor, particularly our black and brown fellow citizens, and most important, a dramatic cut-back in the military expenditures to $30–40 billion, or none of the above can be accomplished! As Profesor Boulding said three weeks ago in Denver at a Hearing on National Priorities of Colorado Citizens, it is simply a myth that America has all the resources to do whatever it wants to do. The wasteful space program must be abandoned or cut 90 per cent, the 50 per cent of our scientific and engineering personnel involved in space and military work must be transferred and their considerable skills applied to problems of mass transportation, air and water pollution, education, medical research and application, and a thousand and one domestic needs. The cold war myths of dangerous and imminent attack from the Soviet Union and now China must be destroyed (Communist China's entire national output (GNP) is less than our military budget, and Nixon this morning has announced support for the second phase of an open-ended 40 billion plus military commitment.)

Does the United States and the Democratic Party as an instrument of public policy change have the necessary time to turn around before an atomic war and/or the pollution strangulation of our people? The answer, it seems to me, is neither sure nor clear. Only if a rebirth of hope in the political process takes place! Only if a political leadership emerges with guts enough to raise the hard questions taking on the military-indus-

trial-complex head on and educating the American electorate.

In this context the Boulder Democratic Women Clubs, the Young Dems in Western States, the New Democratic Coalition in some states, the McGovern Commission on Party Reform and similar groups, along with some peace, business, youth, religious, black and brown organizations (i.e., Mexican American Political Association) offer hope for creating the demands and the leadership to lead us out of the woods.

Will we do it? Only if there is much more dedicated involvement of many more grass roots leaders like those here today in the political process, with a greatly increased financial commitment (all Dems, McCarthy, Humphrey, Kennedy, spent approximately 30 million in 1968 while the Republicans spent near 100 million) can we hope to turn the country around!

JACK GORE: 1924–1970

It is uncommon for SANE World to publish an obituary. Only when a very rare human being who has made a special contribution to the cause of peace passes from the scene do we review his life's work. Jack Gore was such a rare human being, but his work was largely unsung.

Organizer of the Colorado Citizens Committee on Vietnam, a founder of the "Dump Johnson" effort, a member of the SANE staff during the 1968 election year, and leader of an informal network of activists throughout the western states, Jack Gore occupied a unique place in the American peace movement. At the memorial service for Jack in Boulder on February 11, Arnold Kaufman recalled:

"I remember his telling me once that 40% of the SANE literature used nationally was distributed among the 2% of the people who reside in Colorado. His method was to take aim at one group of opinion-makers after another—doctors, businessmen, clergymen, trade unionists, teachers—any group that he could reach with his arguments and his moral passion. David Schoenbrun spent a brief period in Colorado in 1966, and came away convinced that Jack was an authentic political genius. Only a few weeks ago Sam Brown told me that Colorado had been the most responsive state in the nation during the drive to have anti-war messages sent to Nixon. And he added. 'We both know why.' Neither of us had to say the name, 'Jack Gore.'"

On the same day, political columnist Tom Gavin of the Denver Post wrote: "He never gained great celebrity—or notoriety—in his home state. But Jack Gore was one of the national leaders of the long fight against the war; an effort which, no matter what he says to the contrary, brought down a sitting President and forever altered a great political party which had once thought to ignore their challenge."

Now, Jack Gore is dead by his own hand at the age of 45. His act stunned thousands of his friends throughout the country. But no one outside his immediate family knew of the deep inner torment and physical disability which he suffered for years. His well hidden suffering had nothing to do with politics, except in the indirect sense that his extraordinary capacity to identify with the plight of others made it impossible to refuse claims upon his energies. He gave of himself until he had no resources left to fend off the agony.

His act was not a judgment upon the causes to which he devoted his genius or the possibilities of bringing change through the political process. In his last conversation with Sanford Gottlieb, in mid-January, he offered to help organize more SANE chapters in the West. His plane and hotel reservations had been made in anticipation of the NDC convention in Chicago. The day he died, he made plans to meet with the new Vietnam Moratorium staff in Denver.

In his last public address, on January 31, Jack Gore asserted:

"We must continue to have faith in the political process;

We must continue to have a dedicated involvement at the grass roots;

We must continue to demand political leadership with guts enough to raise the hard questions.

As we do these things we can avert atomic war; prevent the strangulation of our people by pollution; and successfully confront head-on the military-industrial complex.

It is those of you who are here today that offer the hope of fulfilling these demands and finding the leadership to get us out of the woods."

There is only one fitting memorial to Jack Gore, a very personal commitment by each of us to carry on his work to get us out of the woods.

CONGRESSMAN MURPHY

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, this session marks the culmination of 12 years of outstanding service in the House of Representatives by our distinguished colleague and my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY). I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to BILL and say to him and his wonderful family that we shall miss them when the 92d Congress convenes.

As a fellow member of the Eighty-sixth Congressional Club I have enjoyed BILL MURPHY's friendship for 12 rewarding years. As a colleague on the House Foreign Affairs Committee I have appreciated his extensive knowledge of foreign affairs, and I realize more than most how much the Congress and the country will miss his service and his expertise. His depth of understanding, his thoroughness, and his commitment to the development of a responsible American foreign policy have been vital elements in Foreign Affairs Committee operations. Nowhere was this more evident than in his 2 productive years during this Congress as chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs. He is the greatest expert on Africa that I have ever met and his knowledge of Southeast Asian politics, history, and economics is extensive and profound.

After putting himself through law school, BILL gave 24 years of dedicated service to the Chicago city government as an alderman. He was successful in his first try for the Congress in 1958 and has served in that capacity ever since. He now retires of his own volition, which in and of itself is a step to be admired and applauded.

I should like on behalf of my wife, Rosemary, and our family to join all Members in wishing our dear friends, BILL and his wife, Rose, many years of happiness and success in their future pursuits.

LATIN AMERICA: SHAKY IN THE 1970's

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Writer James Nelson Goodsell of the Christian Science Monitor has written a penetrating series of six articles entitled "Latin America: Shaky in the 1970's." The topics covered include nationalism, the church, the military, population control, urbanization, and economic/political integration. I recommend the series to my colleagues:

NEW NATIONALISM SHOWS WIDE IMPLICATIONS: REVOLUTIONARY FERMENT AGITATES LATIN AMERICA

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—One year into the 1970's, Latin America is being shaken with vigorous revolutionary ferment.

Moreover, there is every evidence that the shaking will mount as the decade progresses, with broad implications for Latin America and its millions and for the United States and its hemisphere policies.

Already, a Marxist-oriented government has taken powei in Chile via the ballot box. Military regimes in Peru and Bolivia are maneuvering to undercut the traditional economic power structures in those two Andean nations. And rumblings of social change can be heard in many other countries.

At its core, this ferment involves a new sense of economic and social nationalism—sometimes seen as a search for national identity—on a scale unprecedented in Latin America's 150 years of independence.

The region's fast-growing population, now totaling 290 million and increasing at 3 percent a year, is inexorably linked to this new nationalism. In fact, it is perhaps the most essential ingredient—for Latin America's population surge affects virtually every aspect of life in the hemisphere.

How Latin America manages to feed, clothe, house, educate, and find jobs for the burgeoning population will remain the major issues of the 1970's.

BEYOND IDEOLOGY

There is, of course, the growing clash of ideology between traditional approaches linked to Western European and United States democracy and the newer calls of Marxism in a variety of forms. This has made the region an important battleground in the East-West confrontation.

But the current ferment is far deeper, more important that the ideological confrontation.

To be sure, some of the violence that erupted in the late 1960's had its origin in the ideological struggle. Yet there is a tradition of violence in Latin America, and the evidence of turmoil in the past decade springs only in part from calls for violent overthrow of the existing order such as those made by Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro.

Since the end of World War II, the ferment for change and reform has grown markedly throughout the hemisphere. In Cuba it reached a peak in the victory of Dr. Castro over the dictatorial regime of Fulgencio Batista. It garnered strength and new focus in the early years of the 1960's under the Alliance for Progress and with the forces of the democratic Left in Venezuela, Colombia, Costa Rica, and other nations about the same time as Chile's Christian Democratic advent under Eduardo Frei Montalva in the mid-1960's.

CALM VERSUS CATACLYSM

During the last half of the 1960's, the story of Latin America's search for change is wrapped up in the contrast between the violent change espoused by Dr. Castro and the peaceful revolution urged by Mr. Frei.

But as the new decade dawns, the focus is again shifting. It shows itself in the nationalistic, reformist military governments in Peru and Bolivia, where social and economic change affecting business and industry, as well as foreign capital investment, is under way.

It comes out in Chile, where a leftward-moving electorate has chosen a Marxist government to rule for the next six years. And it evidences itself in half a dozen other nations where the clamor for national purpose and identity is leading to changes within governments and national policies in a degree seldom reached in years past.

"We are reasserting our rights to the land and all that lies underneath the ground," a Peruvian colonel in the Foreign Ministry says.

In Brazil, his counterpart notes: "No one, no nation is going to tell Brazil what is best for Brazilians. That's up to us to decide! . . . We're nationalists; we're Brazilians; and we're free!"

CONCERN FOR THE LAND

These shrill voices of nationalism are ever more insistent. The prime focus centers on land and what lies under the land. There is much to suggest that the era of foreign control of mining and large business and industry in many of the hemisphere nations is coming to an end. Peru, Bolivia, and Chile—constituting what some regard, albeit perhaps too quickly, as a "west-coast axis" in South America—are all moving to take over foreign-owned—principally United States-owned—land and mineral holdings. The trend clearly shows signs of spreading and could with time engulf most of the hemisphere south of the Rio Grande.

Actually, there is nothing new in this trend. But what is new is the fervor with which it is being implemented in the west-coast nations.

As the decade of the 1970's gets under way, here are some of the more important ingredients of the Latin-American story:

A spiraling population growth, which if the present 3 percent rate holds, means the population would double in 20 years. Moreover, at present 1 of every 2 Latin Americans is under the age of 18, a trend which will be even more impressive at the end of the 1970's, when 1 of every 2 will be under the age of 14.

URBAN MAGNET INTENSIFIED

A continuing urbanization, which at the moment shows that almost 50 percent of all Latin Americans live in cities, with the migration from the countryside to the glitter and glamour of the city expected to mount in the years ahead. By the end of the decade, urban populations will total about 60 percent of all Latin Americans.

A growing militancy on the part of the Roman Catholic clergy, with many churchmen in the vanguard of the revolutionary changes going on. Yet with the militancy of the churchmen, there is evidence that the church itself is having less and less influence over the lives of the hemisphere millions who are nominally Roman Catholic.

An evolving military structure in many countries, which suggests that the hemisphere's military leaders are more and more inclined to take the lead in espousing change and reform. While there is some cynicism about the reasons for the nationalistic bent of Peru's military leaders, there is little doubt that they are changing Peru in a way in which the nation will be unable to return to traditional political and economic forms.

An increasing sense of unity of purpose on the part of many Latin-American nations, spawned at least in part by the similarity of the calls for nationalism in most of them. This unity, if it continues to show itself, will have profound effect on relations with the United States to the point of setting up a major power bloc often opposed to Washington's ideas for the world.

CHURCH IN LATIN AMERICA: A RISING TIDE OF CHALLENGES AND QUESTIONS

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

RIO DE JANEIRO.—A furtive figure crouched against a wall, looking both ahead and behind, then darted into a doorway and up a flight of stairs to a darkened corridor.

With a quickness born of experience, the individual reached a darkened door on which he rapped six times rapidly and six times slowly. The door was unbolted on the inside, then swung open and shut with just enough time for the individual who knocked to enter.

That scene which took place here recently was the arrival of a Roman Catholic priest to a cell meeting of a far-left radical-guerrilla group bent on disrupting the government of Gen. Emílo Garrastazú Médici. The priest, known simply as "Father X," has committed himself to the guerrilla cause because, as he puts it:

"There is no other way for us to bring about the social justice upon which Christianity is founded."

He went on: "A military, imperialist regime won't do it. The exploiters—Brazilian and foreigner—won't do it, for all they want to do is get rich on the backs of the millions of poor people. The church itself won't do it, for it is little more than an imitation of what Christianity is all about."

And so Father X, like so many other Roman Catholic churchmen in Latin America, has cast his lot with the extreme Left. In his case, Father X writes much of the propaganda material which his fellow guerrillas distribute among Rio de Janeiro's poor. And once, he says, he drove a getaway car for cell members who had robbed a bank.

In an era when the influence of the Roman Catholic Church throughout Latin America is being challenged and questioned, churchmen like Father X are engaged in a variety of activities which the church hierarchy often views as tantamount to heresy. Numerous priests have been defrocked because of these activities; others have been censured and disciplined; and many have left the priesthood of their own volition because formal religion does not, in their view, offer the avenues for bringing about reform and change in Latin America.

OPEN ALLIANCE URGED

Fully one-third of all Roman Catholic churchmen, as evidenced in church gatherings and borne out by interviews with the hierarchy in half a dozen key countries, could well be called left of center in political and economic ideology, and many of these believe in an activist role for the churchmen.

Some go so far as to espouse open alliance with Communist and Marxist elements; and some even claim to be Communists.

While Father X here in Rio de Janeiro has chosen to practice his activism in a clandestine way, many another churchman has gone the road in the spotlight of public attention. The Rev. Camilo Torres Restrepo, the Colombian priest who was killed in a clash between soldiers and guerrillas in 1966, had been the chaplain of students at the National University of Colombia in Bogotá in the early 1960's.

His contact with students and professors, concerned about Colombia's social and economic backwardness, fueled his own concern about these issues and he became increasingly radicalized. He eventually joined forces with the Ejercito de Liberación Nacional (ELN), a leftist guerrilla group and went into the countryside with them to combat Colombian soldiers.

In the hagiography of guerrilla warfare in Latin America, the Camilo Torres name is high on the list, rivaling that of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro and the Argentine-born Castro associate and friend, Ernesto (Ché) Guevara, who was killed in Bolivia in 1967.

But if Fr. Torres became the most noted revolutionary priest of modern times in Latin America, others have done as much. In Colombia, Guatemala, Ecuador, Peru, Brazil, Argentina, and other countries, churchmen have with increasing frequency aligned themselves with forces opposed to the government in power.

Here in Brazil, the church is the one element in society providing a base for opposition to the military government. Almost all traditional politicians and all political parties have been banned, and the military brooks very little opposition. So far it has not been able to silence the churchmen who want to oppose it, although some claim to have been tortured for their beliefs.

Moreover, it is in Brazil that Dom Helder Câmara, perhaps Latin America's most quoted churchman, operates as the Archbishop of Recife and Olinda in the north of this vast nation. Dom Helder is clearly a churchman of radical bent, although his own religious nature often tends to downplay this aspect of his makeup.

Dom Helder, who was considered for the Nobel Peace Prize this year, has been an outspoken critic not only of the present government in Brazil, but also of the present establishment in most Latin-American lands. His controversial opinions are well known and quoted throughout Latin America.

POLITICAL POSTS REFUSED

But this controversy has not in the past prevented him from being considered by Janio Quadros as his vice-presidential running mate and by Juscelino Kubitschek as his minister of education—both posts he turned down, arguing that his place was in the church and not in politics.

Yet his beliefs and his call for radical economic and social change have clearly been factors in Brazilian politics.

Dom Helder, for example, wants a form of socialism adapted to the Latin-American scene as the economic vehicle for these underdeveloped nations. He says that a mixture of capitalism and socialism as now practiced in Brazil and in other Latin lands will not work.

"Capitalism is not the line of development for my continent, nor is socialism as it is at present," he says, "I want for my continent socialism without liaison with the great powers and materialism without models."

Actually for Dom Helder, the great powers have perpetrated the "economic imperialism of neocolonialism," and Brazil's present government has supported this situation. Even his own church, he says, is responsible—a sort of "internal colonialism," is the way he puts it. Without this internal colonialism, there would be less threat from the economic imperialism of the great powers, an obvious reference to the United States, but Dom Helder would also include the Soviet Union in this.

Dom Helder does not hold out much hope for Marxism per se as an instrument for bringing about social change. Thus he is anathema to many of the leftist guerrillas and revolutionaries who call on churchmen for assistance. In fact, many a revolutionary regards Dom Helder as reactionary.

Actually Dom Helder represents the stand of a growing number of Brazilian bishops who began to speak about reform in the mid-1950's. They were particularly incensed

over the failure of governments to take care of the countryside while spending large sums on public works in the cities.

The church hierarchy, with Dom Helder a leading figure in the movement, called for land reform, basic education for the peasants, and peasant trade unions. This latter call came after Marxism began to organize the sugarcane workers in the northeast of Brazil.

In the process, young priests and Catholic students in the universities began to push for reform and to take a more active role in political movement known as Ação Popular, springing from the Catholic youth organization, began to make itself felt in the universities and eventually won electoral control of the National Student Union. Moth Ação Popular and the National Student Union have been banned by Brazil's military government which regards them as subversive.

"MOST NOVICES ARE RADICAL"

In some instances, the radical church stand taken in countries such as Guatemala springs from the presence of foreign priests in those communities. In Guatemala, Maryknoll priests were particularly active in the 1960's until their activism was stalled by expulsion and threats from the government.

But such expulsions and threats are, in the view of observers of the church, only a temporary situation.

"If the church is temporarily kept from exercising itself in social and political ways," says a Guatemalan bishop, "it is only a question of time, and when it again begins to operate in these areas, the force of its intention will be felt all the more."

There is a consensus in Latin America among knowledgeable church officials and observers that the increasing radicalization of the church will be seen throughout the 1970's. In fact, the general view is that the church as an institution may well suffer losses in the coming decade, but that churchmen will have an impact far exceeding that of the past decades of this century.

"Most of the young novices we are getting for training," says a bishop in Colombia, "are radical and determined to take the ministry to the people who need it most and get them to work for themselves against the established order which so often has held them down."

That bishop is obviously committed to the radicalization of the priesthood, but his observation is also borne out in the words of a very conservative bishop in Brazil who has been responsible for the training of young priests:

"We don't get very many novices these days for the priesthood is not held in the high esteem of earlier years, but those we get are not like the novices of earlier years. These young men want to make the church more of a social instrument and use it to solve the vast number of social and economic problems facing Latin America. We ought to be more involved with saving souls than saving bodies, but that isn't the way we are going."

This sort of churchman, however, is less and less in the majority.

A growing number of churchmen, for example, would probably agree with a Roman Catholic archbishop who said without equivocation: "When it comes to a choice between the dictates of the church heirarchy in Rome and the needs of my people, I'll choose the needs of my people. They are uppermost in my thought and they are the reasons I am in the church."

This churchman added significantly: "They need to have society reformed—and not tomorrow, but today."

That sort of injunction seems to motivate the churchmen who have adopted this more militant role in the past decade—and it will likely be the sort of motivation that will be predominant in the decade ahead.

SOCIAL ACTION ON THE MARCH: PERUVIAN MILITARY ADDS REFORMIST GROOMING

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

LIMA, PERU.—Almost all top government posts in the military regime here in Peru are held by Army officers who have gone through what must be the most unique military school in Latin America.

The influence of the school stretches far beyond the normal role of military schools, with their standard courses in battlefield tactics. This unusual school, known as the Centro Avanzado de Estudios Militares (or CAEM, for short), is giving officers broad training in social and economic change.

With courses in Marxist theory, developmental economics, social planning, reformist politics, Peru's military is being exposed to a variety of solutions to national problems.

Located in a quiet Lima suburb amid a very unmilitarylike atmosphere, the school has played a significant role informing a generation of Peruvian officers to a social responsibility beyond that of the military elsewhere in the hemisphere.

And the military appears to be taking the training to heart.

The government of Maj. Gen. Juan Velasco Alvarado has a sharply nationalist tone—with strong reformist touches to it. Already, it has embarked on a wide-ranging program of economic and social reform, including the expropriation of the International Petroleum Company, a subsidiary of Standard Oil Company (New Jersey), a sweeping agrarian-reform program, changes in the nation's banking system, and a number of other economic changes designed to help in redistributing wealth here. What is perhaps most significant in all this is a new role for the military. No longer does the Peruvian military appear to be aligned with the traditional economic power structure of the country.

CHANGE OF COURSE INDICATED

Moreover, in reshaping many of Peru's institutions and traditions, the military seems to have embraced a new mentality. There is much talk of a "new military" not only in Peru, but elsewhere in Latin America. While only time will tell how valid this judgment is, there is little doubt that the actions of Peru's military and those of similar forces in half a dozen other Latin-American lands suggest the military is indeed embarking on a new course.

Here in Peru, a certain elite spirit surrounds the actions and attitudes of the officers who are graduates of CAEM. In sparking the coup d'etat of October, 1968, which toppled the civilian government of Fernando Belaúnde Terry, they acted—according to General Velasco—"to save the nation from chaos."

Those words are similar to the language so often used by military leaders when they seize power in a Latin-American land. But few such take-overs have spawned so much basic change in a nation's economic and social structure.

Hemisphere military leaders have often gone the way of coups d'etat when a civilian government, or in some instances a military government, did not do things the way the leaders felt they should be done. During the 1950's, military take-overs were frequent. In the early 1960's, the number dwindled. But as the 1970's get under way, half the nations of Latin America are ruled by military governments or are under strong military influence. In some instances, as in Peru, this military trend is reformist in character; in others, as in Paraguay, it is more the traditional military dictatorship.

LINEUP SKETCHED

In almost all cases, a military government rules in a somewhat dictatorial fashion, limiting opposition, and forcing through its measures either with or without a legislature.

The lineup today:

Seven nations have military governments that came to power through the overthrow of existing governments—Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Honduras, Panama, Paraguay, and Peru.

Three nations have elected military leaders—El Salvador, Guatemala, and Nicaragua.

One nation has a civilian government, but currently operates under military controlled martial law—Ecuador.

One nation has a civilian government that seized power and is propped up by military and paramilitary forces—Haiti.

One nation has a civilian government that seized power and has the most impressive military forces in Latin America—Cuba.

This sort of breakdown is, at least in part, an artificial one and somewhat arbitrary. A great deal, for example, separates the military governments of General Velasco in Peru and Gen. Alfredo Stroessner in Paraguay. There are, for another example, great differences between the rightist repressive government of Dr. Francois Duvalier in Haiti, which is kept in power by military and parliamentary might, and the leftist government of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro, which enjoys considerable support from the populace though it has military underpinnings.

NEST FEATHERING PREVAILED

Traditionally, military governments have come and gone in Latin America with considerable frequency. Few instituted reforms. Most seemed to feather their own nests against the time that they, too, would be overthrown. And this trend could become a factor even in some of those nations, such as Peru, where a new military does appear to have emerged.

Yet there is a sharp difference in approach by the new military, which is best seen here in Peru.

If CAEM here in Lima is important, so are other factors. Most of Peru's senior and junior-grade officers come from a provincial, middle-class background. They have had only limited contact with the traditional elites and forces of economic power. For the most part, these officers have risen or are rising through the ranks. That is certainly true of General Velasco and his key aides. They feel little closeness with, or evidence little fondness for, the urban elite of the coastal areas, particularly that of Lima, and are by nature suspicious of civilian politicians. Moreover, and this is perhaps one of the most significant aspects of their makeup, they are suspicious of the foreigner.

SUSPICION SPREADS

More and more as one travels about Latin America, this suspicion of the foreigner comes through, particularly when the foreigner is from the United States.

Military men are suspicious of foreign economic domination of their nation's business and industry; they are suspicious of the motives behind North American urgings on birth control ("a plot to keep us in a client state with small populations" is how a Brazilian general phrased it when talking of Brazil's almost 100 million people); they are suspicious of church groups, Protestant and Roman Catholic, that preach reform, for these groups are linked with church bodies outside Latin America; they are suspicious of diplomats, the Peace Corps and similar groups, and other officials from abroad, and this extends to their participation in inter-American gatherings through the Organization of American States, although it does not apply to the United Nations.

What it amounts to, at least in the case of Peru, is a sharply nationalistic tone to government and an orientation of national development. "Make no mistake about it," Francisco Morales Bermúdez, Peru's Finance Minister said, "we are out to recreate Peru in more positive terms." Like many another officer in Peru, he is firm on this point. And observers here tend to agree that no individual, group, or nation can intimidate Peru's military.

VACILLATION VERSUS WEAKNESS

The military may tend to vacillate on the course to take in specific issues. But this vacillation "should not be seen as evidence of weakness," a longtime European diplomat here said. "It is just the response to diverse opinions within a general concept of national solidarity among the military on the broad outline of what needs to be done. When pressed by outside influences, the military coalesces and responds in unison."

While such a response does indeed seem true here, Brazil's "revolutionary government" across the continent is clearly much less cohesive, although it talks a sharp nationalist line. Many of its top officers are more oriented to traditional power blocs, while the junior officers are similar to those in Peru—a fact that suggests that Brazil could, with time as the younger officers advance, adopt a more reformist tone. Argentina's military is also undergoing change, though the eventual outcome is not clear. Bolivia's military talks a nationalistic, reformist line, but the actions of the military have not led to the sort of changes underway in Peru.

One thing seems certain: More Latin Americans today live under military rule than live under civilian, constitutional governments. And the destinies of these people are therefore in the hands of military men who seem bent on reform and change in an increasing degree.

If there is then a new military developing in Latin America, as is suggested in Peru and elsewhere, this fact alone could mark a significant change in the lives of millions of Latin Americans, something which could not be said with traditional military take-overs of the past in the hemisphere.

EIGHT MINUTES: 100 MORE PERSONS: A CONTINENT RESISTS BIRTH CURBS

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

BOGOTA, COLOMBIA.—Estela Jaramillo was expecting her 12th child earlier this year. When asked how she and her illiterate, jobless husband would be able to support another child, she looked uncomprehendingly.

"The more children I have, the more security I will have in my old age," she said. "There isn't much money in these parts, but the children are a hope to me that I will be cared for when I am no longer able to work."

Her answer to the question of having more children is common in this country, where the annual population growth rate of 3.2 percent matches the overall Latin-American increase. If the hemisphere rate continues through the 1970's and '80's the population south of the Rio Grande will double.

By 1990, if present projections hold up, there will be close to 600 million Latin Americans—aggravating every economic and social problem now facing the hemisphere. How to feed, clothe, house, educate, and find employment for the growing legion of young people are the essential questions in the 1970's.

At this moment, 1 of every 2 Latin Americans is under the age of 18; by the 1980's 1 of 2 will be under 14.

Mrs. Jaramillo here in Colombia, and countless others like her not only in Colombia but in virtually every one of Latin America's 24 independent nations, are fueling this tremendous population explosion. Only in Argentina, Barbados, and Uruguay is population relatively stable from year to year.

The increasing number of births is obviously the key factor. But of immense importance also is the sharp cutback in the 1960's in the rate of infant mortality due to better health and sanitation methods. Here in Colombia, for example, infant mortality was cut 70 percent during the decade. Now fewer than 40 children per 1,000 fail to survive their first birthday.

A less important but nevertheless significant factor in the population increase is longevity. Colombians, like all Latin Americans, are living longer. Life expectancy here is running to 55; a decade ago it was 47.

NATIONAL "PUTDOWN" CHARGED

Though a few countries, and Colombia is one example, have tried family-planning arrangements to cut back on the number of new births each year, these efforts are only just beginning.

Moreover, a number of Latin-American nations actively oppose birth-control efforts. Brazil's military government sees family planning as an effort of the more industrialized nations to keep Brazil in a semideveloped state of bondage to the more developed nations.

"Birth control is the work of American imperialists," insists a colonel attached to the staff of Gen. Emilio Garrastazu Medici, Brazil's military President. "We have plenty of unused land and we need more people to populate it."

There is considerable criticism from within Brazil over this policy—calling it "rabbit arithmetic"—but the government is oblivious to the criticism and calls officially "for a growing population of young people to populate the interior."

OPPOSITION IS MANIFOLD

A similar opposition to birth-control practices comes from Mexico, where Luis Echeverria Alvarez, the new President, has taken a strong stand against promoting birth control for his country of nearly 50 million people.

Like Brazil, where the population is nearing 100 million. Mexico's growth rate in population is 3.5 percent a year. At that rate, Mexico, as well as Brazil, can expect a doubling of its population in less than 20 years.

Opposition to birth-control practices, or family planning as many Latin Americans term it in deference to local sensitivities, comes from a variety of sources:

Estela Jaramillo's view that more children constitute security. This widespread belief results from the fact that most Latin Americans are poor and that social security or other welfare measures are only faintly developed. There is little security outside the family for millions of Latin Americans.

Traditional Roman Catholic opposition to birth control. This opposition, however, is withering on the personal level, though Roman Catholic official practice in Latin America adheres to the Vatican dictates on the question. At the local level, many priests and bishops actively urge family planning for their communicants.

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE LACKING

Lack of funds and support from either governments or private groups. Only a few nations actively assist governmentally in birth-control clinics. Colombia is an example, as is Chile, where government-sponsored efforts are advanced enough to cut back on the population spiral. Jamaica has a similar program, and huge billboards around Kingston, the capital, tell Jamaican women in large letters: "You don't have to get pregnant."

Ignorance and backwardness, which make difficult the use of contraceptives and other birth-control devices. Moreover, it is generally the woman who must engage in birth-control practices, as Latin America's traditional "machismo," which translated means manliness or male virility, prevents the man in Latin societies from engaging in birth control.

Yet, despite these difficulties encountered in one degree or another, there is considerable success in the fledging efforts at birth control across the hemisphere.

CLINICS SPREAD

Here in Colombia, Dr. Fernando Tomayo, a pioneer in family planning, has developed a program called Pro-Familia, a private agency that fosters birth control. Since 1965, when he first began disseminating information and contraceptives once a week at a special clinic in his office, the Pro-Familia clinics now number 26. Last year 42,000 Colombian women in Bogota participated in the program.

In addition, under arrangements with the Pan American Health Organization, 340 government clinics now offer birth-control information and contraceptives and 20 major hospitals are offering planned-parenthood programs.

Much of the work here is with the lower classes. Dr. Tomayo, for example, says 85 percent of his patients have family incomes of less than $50 a month.

The privileged few, the wealthy and the educated, have long practiced birth control. But the poorer classes have only had it opened to them in recent years in limited measure and only in a few countries. Where it has been offered, it has been accepted with relative success.

A PRIEST SPEAKS OUT

Even the Roman Catholic Church through individual clergymen has come out in support of family planning. A priest in Ecuador, who has long urged family planning on his communicants, was recently urged by his bishop to preach against birth control. He thought about the order for some time. He went to a deserted chapel and delivered a long, fiery sermon against birth control, then went on to his other church and there counseled for family planning.

It is obvious then, that family planning is beginning to have an impact, albeit limited. Perhaps, if the impact grows, the forecasts for a doubling of the population will not prove true. But at this point the forecasts still appear valid.

Put another way, perhaps more dramatically, in the time that it has taken to read this article (average speed, about eight minutes), the population of Latin America has grown by about 100 persons. No other statistic can illustrate as vividly the impact of Latin America's population dilemma.

1970'S SEES GROWING NATIONALISM: LATIN-AMERICAN INTEGRATION?

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

BUENOS AIRES.—Latin America moves into the 1970's hopeful of greater economic and also political integration.

Such togetherness has in the past proved illusive despite a long history of efforts at cooperation. During the 1960's, the efforts were often frustrated by crossfire from Left and Right, warfare, civil strife, and outside interference.

Latin Americans are under no delusions that the 1970's will offer a millennium in regard to political and economic integration.

The mood at the outset of the 1970's is one of growing nationalism, Latin American solidarity, and a feeling throughout the hemisphere of letting Latin America be responsible for its own destiny.

This might suggest that Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro's call for a break with

the United States political and economic domination had been successful. But at the same time, Latin America has not gone the way of violent revolution and a complete social and economic change that was an integral part of Dr. Castro's call. The United States call for peaceful change and major reform, embodied in the Alliance for Progress, has characterized the many innovations of the 1960's.

POLITICAL CHANGE CATALOGED

The 1960's were also characterized by intense political change that included one war, 18 border disputes, one civil war, one major United States military intervention and another United States-sponsored invasion attempt, 21 military coups d'etat, and almost 60 changes of government in the 24 nations of Latin America.

"That is a record we do not want to repeat in the 1970's," a leading hemisphere statesman said here. "We would hope that the 1970's would be a period of peaceful changes in government without internal violence and outside interference."

A survey of leading Latin-American statesmen, politicians, and other thinkers suggests there is some unanimity on these points:

Latin America is more unified today on how to deal with the United States than it was in the early 1960's. In fact, Washington probably will be presented with a more united Latin America on political and economic issues than in the 1960's.

Efforts at economic integration throughout the hemisphere most likely will proceed on a regional level, with considerable success, as in the Andean bloc of five West Coast South American nations—Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, and Chile.

CUBAN REINTEGRATION SEEN

The reintegration of Cuba into the hemisphere system will almost certainly be a step in the 1970's. Already Chile, first with economic and now with diplomatic ties, has broken the hemisphere isolation of the island. Other nations are preparing to do the same despite strong pressures from Washington.

The presence of a Marxist government in Chile, while upsetting in some degree to many of Chile's neighbors, has not caused the consternation that was forecast when Salvador Allende Gossens won the presidency. And while there is little expectation that other nations will follow Chile's example, there appears to be a willingness on the part of other Latin lands to live and let live with Dr. Allende's government.

A growing integration of the Caribbean into Latin America's political framework and economic setup can be expected. The English-speaking nations—Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago, and Jamaica—are calling themselves "Latin American." As strange as this sounds to many, there is a growing acceptance of these island nations as part of the Latin-American picture. This will continue in the 1970's for these three nations as well as for whatever other constitutional arrangements develop over the remaining English-speaking island dots of the eastern Caribbean. Some sort of economic regional integration of the Caribbean may well emerge also—to include not only English-speaking areas, but also Spanish- and French-speaking islands.

EUROPEAN INVOLVEMENT TO GROW?

European involvement in Latin-American economic matters is expected to grow, perhaps cutting back on United States economic domination of the hemisphere. Investment, technical assistance, and other foreign aid from Europe will increase, as it will from Japan and Canada.

United States influence in the area will probably be less and less effective, partly because of President Nixon's own low-profile image and more importantly because of Latin America's own desire to free itself from the coattails of the United States. This does not mean that anti-Americanism per se will grow, but that there is a mounting feeling in the hemisphere that only Latin America should look after Latin-American interests—political and economic.

All of this is bound to have a profound effect on the relationships that Latin America has within the region and without. If the view of these Latin-American leaders is correct, then the character of Latin relationships at the end of the 1970's should be considerably different from what it is today.

The Organization of American States (OAS), the regional grouping that binds the actions of the Western Hemisphere together, could become a more effective sounding board for Latin-American desires and aims than it is today. In such a process, United States influence in OAS deliberations certainly would be lessened.

IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICTS

It seems obvious to many observers of Latin America that the region is tired of the conflict of ideologies that characterized much of the 1960's, a conflict in part characterized by the struggle of Cuba and the United States for influence in the area. As many observers look back on the past decade, that struggle was inconclusive and far from a success for either side.

What seems to characterize much of the Latin-American hope for the 1970's is a desire to be free of all outside influences—from the United States, the Soviet Union, or elsewhere. This desire has been present before. But there are clear signs that this time, a growing Latin-American unity and solidarity may make it possible.

There are of course major question marks on the horizon: What of Cuba and Chile? Both have Marxist governments, although the one in Chile came to power through the ballot box and therefore is on balance more acceptable to Latin Americans than the one in Cuba. Do these governments pose a threat to the rest of Latin America? Is Cuba still bent on exporting revolution? Whether they are correct or not, the majority of Latin Americans tend to believe that it is up to Chile and Cuba to follow their own courses and that their forms of government will not have too much of an impact on the rest of the hemisphere.

WHAT OF DEPENDENCE?

What of the dependence of Latin lands on the whims of the international market? Of the world supply and demand requirements for the raw materials upon which Latin America heavily depends for export earnings? Of the world market price for these raw materials? If prices fall, as they appear to be doing in copper, what will this do to the copper-dependent economies of Chile and Peru?

There is some concern that such falls could shove either nation into more extreme positions that could cause ripples across the hemisphere and, in the case of the West Coast Andean regional economic bloc, could upset efforts at economic integration.

What of growing agitation on the part of the people of Latin America for a better life? Can the governments now in power—civilian as well as military governments—answer the expectations that have been aroused in the peoples of Latin America through the 1960's, with the Alliance for Progress, and the very heavy emphasis on change and reform? There is obviously a concern among Latin leaders that the expectations are so great that no achievable amount of change can measure up. Already there are signs that this is the case in Cuba as many original supporters of Prime Minister Castro question whether his government has achieved as much as it promised.

CASTRO STILL IN POWER

Interestingly enough, however, Dr. Castro is one of the few leaders in power in the early 1970's who was in office when the 1960's began. The other two are Haiti's President for life, François Duvalier, and Paraguay's strongman President, Gen. Alfredo Stroessner. Trinidad and Tobago's Prime Minister Eric Williams was in power before independence in 1962 and has remained so since.

This suggests the frequency with which Latin lands change their leaders and their governments. The same can well be expected in the 1970's. With a younger generation pressing for political and economic power, it is likely that the leaders of the 1970's will be a younger group than those of the 1960's. Yet, a contrary trend is worth noting: In both Argentina and Colombia, younger people have aligned themselves with elderly former dictators—Juan Domingo Perón, the 74-year-old Argentine now in Spanish exile, and Gustavo Rojas Pinilla, the 70-year-old Colombian who almost won a comeback in last May's presidential vote.

Thus, no absolute can be valid in looking ahead at Latin America in the 1970's. But change and growing independence on the part of the diverse 24 nations—speaking Spanish, Portuguese, French, and English—in Latin America are certain.

And there is a determination that the 1970's are used to live up to the goal set by OAS Secretary-General Galo Plaza Lasso for Latin America by the year 2000: "I believe that by the turn of the century Latin America will be master of its own destiny and a strong, prosperous partner in the world community."

LATIN AMERICANS FLOCK TO CITIES

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

MEXICO CITY.—Each year, this capital city grows by more than 350,000 people.

If the rate continues, the present population of 8 million will just about double in 20 years.

Of course, there could be a slowdown in the population growth, but the statistics and projections suggest something of the growing urbanization dilemma facing not only Mexico City, but also Latin America as a whole.

For over the whole hemisphere, slightly more than half of the population live in cities. By 1980, the total will be 60 percent; and by 1990 or a little thereafter, it will be 75 percent.

Galo Plaza Lasso, secretary-general of the Organization of American States (OAS), said recently that while the needs of yesterday were in the countryside, the needs of today are in the cities.

"Let's begin by facing the fact that current rates of urban growth will not decline within our generation," he said. "The prospect is that they will continue to rise even more rapidly in the foreseeable future."

FROM 50 PERCENT GROWTH TO 100 PERCENT

Putting it another way, Mr. Plaza stated: "Latin America's urban population increased by 50 percent in the past 15 years.

"But in the next 15 years, it will double. Latin America, which is already more urbanized that Europe, will add 100 million city dwellers in the next decade and a half."

The root of Latin America's urban dilemma is too many people. While the population of the hemisphere overall is growing at the rate of 3 percent a year, the population of the cities is growing at the rate of 5 to 7 percent a year.

There is, moreover, small comfort in Latin America, an area of developing economies, that the plight of the cities is universal. Some Latin Americans may realize that the cities of the United States are also faced with decay and poverty. But they are more impressed with the problems they them-

selves face: the growing population with an inability to cope with this rise economically or socially.

All Latin-American cities have slum conditions and problems that would stagger U.S. city planners. With the unchecked population spiral and the massive migration of country folk to the glamour and glitter of the cities, these slum conditions have gone from bad to worse.

"FROM BAD TO WORSE"

Again Mr. Plaza: "In Latin America, the slum problem is passing from bad to worse, and we lack the capital to cope with it."

Millions of Latin Americans in Mexico City, in Rio de Janeiro or São Paulo, in Buenos Aires or Santiago, in Lima or Bogotá, live in poverty conditions which are unacceptable by any standards. The OAS estimates that fully half the population of Latin America's cities are in sub-subsistence situations and that this percentage will grow in the next decade.

For Mr. Plaza, the time has come to do something about the situation. "It is time to say bluntly that Latin America cannot hope to achieve the economic development and the social well-being it seeks under the banner of the Alliance for Progress unless it arrests the decay of its cities."

He has some solutions, but he admits that these are only partial answers. However, like many another thinker on the urban problem, Mr. Plaza would urge quick action to meet the dilemma with whatever solutions are available now and hope for others.

SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED

Here are some of the solutions now under consideration.

Solve the housing shortages. Latin American nations must construct 1 million dwellings in urban areas each year during the next five years to overcome the present housing gap. By 1975, this will need to rise to 1.5 million dwellings a year. The cost of such construction could mount to $50 billion by 2000, a large portion of which would have to be financed from outside the area.

Integrate urban problems into overall national goals. More international money must come into housing, schools, and transportation being diverted from the huge infrastructure projects of the 1960's.

Redistribute population. Latin-American nations are going to have to go the way Mexico has already begun moving—the cluster city outside the major metropolitan areas, where all essential services and jobs are available.

Admittedly, these are only partial answers. But they are at least starts. Latin America is suddenly aware of the problem that has been growing within its midst for several decades and is scurrying about to find solutions. São Paulo, the Brazilian city which had 800,000 people in 1940 and expects 13 million by 1990, has a master plan. But it is only now being put into operation, and Paulistas, as residents of the city are called, will not hazard a guess about its success. Yet the most basic problem—finding ways to keep people from coming to São Paulo—has not been found.

PATTERN INTERLOCKS

And there is little likelihood that the urban population spiral in São Paulo will be met any sooner than the overall national population spiral in Brazil. Thus in the question of family planning, the urban areas are intertwined with the nation as a whole. The same pattern is true in other cities and countries.

Some city planners, including members of the staff of former Mexico City Mayor Alfonso Corona del Rosal, wonder if migration from the countryside to the city can be curbed.

Unhappily, this seems unlikely simply because the countryside in many instances is overpopulated. Farm families have large numbers of children, many of whom cannot be effectively employed on the farms, and agricultural mechanization is increasingly cutting back on the number of farm workers needed.

Moreover, the city continues to have its glitter for the farm family. For a young boy, perhaps watching his father eke out a poor income on marginal land, there is little desire to follow in his footsteps and the distant, albeit with uncertainties, looks more promising.

This reporter remembers talking to one such youth in Colombia several years ago. He was having a difficult time in the city. Work was scarce; his housing in a slum area was inadequate; there were no schools for his three youngsters; and health and social care was minimal. Yet he would not go back to the soil near Ibaqúe, where his father still worked.

"I cannot return to that life with its certainty of no rewards," he said in effect. "At least here in the city there is hope."

That "hope" is elusive to so many millions. Still, the migrant keeps coming. He is simply not content with his rural lot. He wants something better for himself and his family. Uncertainties of city life seem less real and overpowering than those problems of the countryside.

More likely than not, the migrant simply moves into a slum area—call it a "callampa" (literally a mushroom) in Chile, a "favela" in Rio, a "barriada" in Lima, a "villa miseria" (misery town) in Argentina, or whatever, the slum is much the same from city to city.

That elusive hope is perhaps less elusive in Mexico City than elsewhere. Here in Mexico, it is possible for a child born into poverty to lift himself out of poverty in a lifetime, for there is opportunity.

SOVIET JEWRY

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, prior to the commutation of the death sentence of the condemned Soviet Jews, I stated:

No voice can be too loud in condemnation of the Soviet Union imposition of the death penalty on two Soviet Jews alleged to have planned to hi-jack a Soviet airliner. No civilized form of jurisprudence would permit that kind of barbarism. It is altogether understandable that heads of governments have directly expressed their shock at such horror.

There was no overt act; no plane was hijacked. The 11 in the Leningrad case were arrested as they were about to board a small Aeroflot plane for which tickets had been purchased. No other passengers were scheduled to be on that plane.

The plan of the Soviet Union is clear. It is all part and parcel of the anti-Jewish campaign to intimidate both those who wish to leave the Soviet Union, and those who seek, at the very least, their cultural self-expression within the Soviet Union. Is it a crime for people to wish to retain their religious identity? What comprehensible reason exists for any country to refuse exodus to people who wish to emigrate?

It is believed that 20 other Jews are in custody on similar charges, and 12 other Leningrad Jews are awaiting trial for anti-Soviet propaganda and anti-Soviet organizational activity.

I recommend that the Soviet Union send some of its citizens to the United States to learn how a truly open society conducts an open trial in open court so that all the world may see and judge.

The world dare not ignore so patent a design to crush the spirit of the Jews in the Soviet Union.

It is sentiment such as I expressed above, shared by all civilized men commingled in a chorus that emerged as a single voice, which resulted in the commutation of the sentence. May the voice of humanity never be quiet.

EDITORIALS HAIL HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT CLEARING JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, recently, the House received a report from a special House subcommittee which inquired into allegations made against Justice William O. Douglas. That report effectively refutes the contention that grounds exist for impeachment of that distinguished jurist.

The subcommittee inquired into the allegations against Justice Douglas with thoroughness. As the Washington Post said editorially, the report "makes it clear that the congressional attacks on him were politically motivated and full of demonstrably false statements and malicious innuendos."

The New York Times commented:

When the history of his more than thirty years on the bench is written, he will be regarded as a judge of constructive and forceful influence on the judicial issues of his time.

Mr. Speaker, a number of similar editorial comments have been circulated by America's most distinguished newspapers and commentators. I insert some of them in the RECORD in order that they will be available to all the Members of the House:

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

THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST DOUGLAS

The finding of a House Judiciary subcommittee that no convincing basis exists for the impeachment of Associate Justice William O. Douglas should bring to an end this sorry episode in the relationship of the Nixon Administration, the House of Representatives and the Supreme Court.

An aggressive though covert effort to drive Justice Douglas off the bench began with a press campaign nourished by "leaks" from a White House aide. Then, a year ago, Representative Gerald Ford, the House Republican leader, urged Justice Douglas' impeachment. Last April, Vice President Agnew announced his belief that Justice Douglas should be investigated. On April 15, Representative Ford returned to the attack. In response to this and other pressure, a House Judiciary subcommittee—working with two counsel, one appointed by the Democrats and one by the Republicans—has spent months exhaustively following up every lead. No evidence has been found of any corruption, wrong-doing or conflict of interest.

The accusations against Justice Douglas have two main themes. One is his service for several years as the paid president of the

Parvin Foundation, which gives fellowships to foreign students. The foundation was established by a businessman who has had investments in Las Vegas and associations with figures in the gambling fraternity. But Representative Ford's innuendos notwithstanding, no link has been found between the Parvin Foundation's innocent activities and Mr. Parvin's business activities. The other theme of the attack is that Justice Douglas has permitted his book publisher to reprint excerpts of his writings in magazines like the Evergreen Review, which also publishes erotic stories and illustrations.

Justice Douglas has a free-swinging style which does not always commend itself to us or to many other people. He has always asserted his view that judges should not dwell in ivory towers and that when he became a judge he did not forfeit his right as a citizen to speak out on conservation, foreign affairs and other nonjudicial issues. This is a tenable view of the judge's role, although it is much more difficult to sustain than the self-denying, self-limiting role which most judges prefer to adopt. Granting his conception of his role, Justice Douglas still made a serious error of judgment in accepting a salary for any outside activity. Furthermore, he could have been more discreet in deciding where to permit his writings.

The central issue in this affair, however, does not lie in the realm of prudence or discretion. The issue is whether an ugly, persistent effort to intimidate Justice Douglas can be permitted to continue. He is under reactionary fire because he is an extreme liberation and a radical. Those are rare attributes in a Justice of the Supreme Court and are certain to invite attack. It is not necessary to agree with all of Justice Douglas' opinions to recognize that when the history of his more than thirty years on the bench is written, he will be regarded as a judge of constructive and forceful influence on the judicial issues of his time.

There is no need for further investigations or for public hearings. It is time for President Nixon and Representative Ford to call a halt to this squalid campaign, which threatens the integrity and the independence of the Supreme Court.

EXCERPT FROM CBS EVENING NEWS WITH WALTER CRONKITE

SEVAREID

Little is certain or fair in love, war and politics, but there seems a reasonable prospect that the Supreme Court can now find shelter from the harshest winds of political controversy and get about its business. Already the post-Warren Court has handed down two rulings that partly nullify previous opinions expanding the rights of defendants in criminal cases, and now the House subcommittee investigation of Justice Douglas repudiates the various personal charges leveled against him by congressional conservatives.

For several years Warren Court liberalization of the rights of defendants was a hot political issue, and millions were apparently persuaded these rulings had a causative relationship to the national rise in crime. This was always a highly dubious and debatable proposition; the scandalous condition of delay and case congestion in many courts in many cities is a far more obvious contributing factor. Now the Court has changed, its line of reasoning is changing to some degree, and this issue may well fade away.

The Douglas issue has faded, with the subcommittee report, but not yet away. It can be and may well be raised again on the House floor, though the long odds now are that the accusations will get nowhere in particular. Anyone seriously trying to impeach Douglas would have to go beyond the work of the House subcommittee, whose report runs to nearly a thousand pages, whose investigators spent seven months at the task, in the course of which they went through the whole of Douglas' personal files, totaling around a half million pieces of paper, and Internal Revenue agents spent 30,000 man hours checking the Parvin Foundation, of which Douglas was the paid president. The subcommittee majority finds him clean. Even the dissenting member finds no case for impeachment but thinks the group should have considered whether Douglas did not deserve some kind of official scolding from the House.

Justice Douglas' life style, with his passionate interest in civil rights, exploring, botany, folk music, conservation and foreign policy, is by no means everybody's idea of what a Justice should be doing in his spare time. But it's his style, and it's not likely to change. In the meantime his critics are calling the committee report a whitewash, while his defenders call the original charges a blackwash.

The overall drift of the Court, however, is toward greater circumspection. Appearances, for this Court, are important, and the best condition probably ought to be one in which no Justice holds any outside investments or paid positions of any kind.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 18, 1970]

THE COMMITTEE REPORT ON JUSTICE DOUGLAS

The report of the House special subcommittee that has been looking into the affairs of Justice William O. Douglas needs to be read from two quite different perspectives. One would relate its findings to the proper standard of conduct for a member of the Supreme Court; the report makes clear in this regard that Justice Douglas did things off the bench that no member of the Supreme Court should do. The other perspective would relate the committee's work to the charges made against Justice Douglas last winter and spring by Rep. Gerald Ford, the Republican Leader in the House, and other members of Congress. Viewed from this perspective, none of the things Justice Douglas has done provides any legitimate ground for his impeachment and the documentation in the report makes it clear that the congressional attacks on him were politically motivated and full of demonstrably false statements and malicious innuendos. Indeed, Mr. Ford's speech of April 15, when examined alongside this report—both quoted elsewhere on this page—is an example of this technique.

Justice Douglas' extra-curricular activities, in our view, demonstrate deplorable lapses in taste, sensitivity and judgment. A justice of the Supreme Court ought not to engage in partisan political debate, ought not to take on major non-judicial activities, and ought not to add substantially to his income by accepting pay for his outside activities. There is no doubt that Justice Douglas has done all these things. He has argued publicly and passionately for policies in national and international affairs which he believes are right. He has spent much time on such things as the Parvin Foundation and the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. And he earned more money off the bench than on it during the 1960s. It is easy, therefore, to find documentation in this committee's report of a course of conduct that we and, we suspect, most Americans find deplorable for a member of the Supreme Court.

It is impossible, however, to find in all that we deplore even the smallest bit of evidence that Justice Douglas has done anything for which he could properly be impeached and that, after all, is what this investigation was about and what Mr. Ford and others demanded last spring. Indeed, the dissenting member of the House committee, who wants the investigation to continue, does not argue that impeachment is even a remote possibility; instead, he argues for further study looking toward censure. And in doing so, he never even mentions the heart of Mr. Ford's attack on Justice Douglas—a charge that cleverly linked the Justice and the Parvin Foundation (of which he was president) with Bobby Baker, Nevada gambling, specifically named members of the organized crime syndicate and efforts by that syndicate to penetrate the Dominican Republic. It is worthwhile, it seems to us, to explore briefly that particular charge for the light it sheds on the methods used in this attempt to drive Justice Douglas from the bench.

We will deal here with two of the specifics that Mr. Ford used to document his case cited elsewhere on the page. He said that Mr. Baker was in Las Vegas in 1962 when a hotel employee wrote on his registration card "is with Douglas." From this, Mr. Ford concluded, "So it is unclear whether the note meant literally that Mr. Justice Douglas was also visiting Las Vegas at that time or whether it meant only to identify Baker as a Douglas associate." Note that Mr. Ford did not provide for a third possibility, that one the House committee says is right—the name on the card was not that of Justice Douglas. Indeed, the hotel, the card and Baker were in Los Angeles not Las Vegas and Justice Douglas not only was in Chile at that time but had never been to Las Vegas. Mr. Ford's second specific was that the assertion that Mr. Baker, Justice Douglas and Mr. Parvin were all in the Dominican Republic at the same time in 1963; he said he didn't know why the justice was there but added that the gambling figures were there to get gamblinig concessions from Douglas's friend, Juan Bosch. The facts are that the justice was in Washington when Mr. Baker was in Santiago and that when the justice went there a week later it was to discuss a literacy project that had the blessing and financial support of the American government.

These are simply examples of how the critics of Justice Douglas have used coincidences and non-facts to manufacture a case against him. Indeed, it has never been clear why Mr. Ford regards the Parvin Foundation as "mysterious." Its principal function in its 10 years of life has been to fund fellowships at Princeton and UCLA for graduate students selected by the universities from foreign countries. Its first trustees besides Justice Douglas and Mr. Parvin were Robert M. Hutchins of the Institute for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Robert F. Goheen, president of Princeton, and Judge William J. Campbell of Chicago.

This discredited effort to link Justice Douglas with organized crime was only part of the charge aimed at him by those in the House who sought his impeachment. The other accusations fall into two general categories. One is that it was unbecoming for the justice to publish articles in certain magazines regarded by the congressmen as offensive. The other is that he holds "inflammatory" political opinions. The notion that either of these is grounds for impeachment is absurd. The final word on this score was spoken in defense of Justice Samuel Chase during his impeachment trial: "Is it not lawful for an aged patriot of the Revolution to warn his fellow-citizens of dangers, by which he supposes their liberties and happiness to be threatened?" Surely an American citizen does not forgo the right of free speech by ascending the bench, even though, in this particular case we agree that Justice Douglas exercised that right too freely.

The fundamental trouble with this entire investigation by the House into the affairs of a justice is that it was born out of political pique. Irate at the liberals for opposing the confirmation of Judges Haynsworth and Carswell, Representative Ford and others set out to remove a liberal from the bench. In their eagerness to do so, they paid no heed

to the common decency that should guide the affairs of men and they have indicated no regret for slandering a distinguished official. Fortunately for the country, this political vendetta has been carried on with all the finesse of a baby elephant and the committee's report makes it only too clear how clumsy that can be. Unfortunately for the country, the leaders of the impeachment party have deprived the House of an opportunity to help set the standards that should guide judges. Instead they have turned the whole affair into a Roman circus.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Dec. 21, 1970]

CALL OFF THE HOUNDS, GERRY

A special House subcommittee spent a year investigating Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas and put its findings into a 924-page report. The upshot was that the principal allegations of improper conduct off the bench were not supported by the evidence. True. Douglas had accepted $12,000 a year in salary from the Albert Parvin Foundation, for various writing chores and counsel on foreign affairs. Parvin has an interest in Las Vegas gambling casinos. In nine years Douglas also earned $377,260.19 in fees for other writing and lecturing. One article appeared in a "mod" magazine that also had pictures of nude women.

While Douglas has established that the magazine article was used without his permission, there is little doubt that his discretion has frequently not been up to the standard expected of Supreme Court justices. He has been obliged to disqualify himself in numerous cases before the Court to avoid possible interest conflicts. Supreme Court justices are paid to put their full-time talents at the disposal of their country.

But House Republican leader Gerald Ford, howling for vengeance for the Senate's rejection of two Nixon nominees to the Court, has demanded Douglas' impeachment and pledges to keep up the fight to get it.

Justice Douglas' indiscretions are simply not impeachable offenses. There has been absolutely no showing of misfeasance, malfeasance or corruption of any kind. Meanwhile Justice Douglas' conduct on the Court has uniformly reflected a deep understanding of the law and a profound respect for the Constitution and the freedoms it ensures.

For Ford and his bassett hounds to go on baying through the woods is therefore silly and must be starting to seem so even to Ford's fellow Republicans.

EXCERPT FROM ABC EVENING NEWS WITH HOWARD K. SMITH

With great respect to Congressman Gerald Ford, who has led his party in the House skillfully in hard times, one hopes he now leaves Justice Douglas and the Supreme Court alone.

One suspects the cause of the attack on Douglas was anger at a Liberal court. Well, yesterday's ruling shows the desired end has been obtained: the Court is less liberal.

As for Justice Douglas, the study of his alleged misdemeanors was exhaustive. It took seven months. Mr. Douglas opened every letter and file of his own to the search. The FBI, the CIA, and Internal Revenue all joined the hunt.

Internal Revenue alone spent 30,000 man-hours on the investigation. That, we are told, is equal to one agent spending more than 15 years doing nothing else.

The conclusion was "not the slightest evidence of any wrong-doing."

That is more generous than even I would be. In fact, he has done two wrong things. He chronically languishes unquestioning praise on today's youth, abetting the present epidemic of youthful self-righteousness. I think I know them better than he does, and they are not that good—not 'til they prove it, which they haven't done, yet.

Also, he has written a perfectly lousy book on rebellion.

However, if poor utterances is actionable, every politician who gets his speeches into print would be liable to impeachment.

To promote governmental harmony, I am prepared to launch a Don't-Impeach-Gerald-Ford-For-His-Speeches campaign. . . . if Congressman Ford will join my Leave-Justice-Douglas-Alone group.

[From the Evening Star, Dec. 15, 1970]

WISE MOVES ON DOUGLAS

A special House Judiciary subcommittee has, we believe, acted prudently in dampening the move to impeach Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. If its report is accepted by the full Judiciary Committee, a distractive and unnecessary hubbub will be avoided, and the country will be better off for having missed the spectacle.

The subcommittee decided that it had uncovered no evidence to justify the impeachment and removal of Douglas from the court. There have been hints that its official report, still to be released, nonetheless will be sharply critical of the justice, and that certainly would be justified.

He is not our model of a Supreme Court justice. Some of his extra-judicial excursions have been offensive, but we doubt that they warrant an ouster proceeding. The Constitution's stipulation of "good behavior" for justices is nebulous, and none has ever been removed under it. Such an attempt would almost certainly prove futile in this case, and the only returns from the effort would be more division in the country and diminished respect for one of its main institutions.

Douglas has been conspicuously overactive off the bench. He is accused of writing "revolutionary" material which was published in a "dirty" magazine, but disgusting and improper as that might be, in the view of some citizens, it is no ground for action under the law. More serious are charges that he used his position for profit, deriving considerable off-bench income. His salaried leadership of the Parvin Foundation, which received some financing from gambling interests, assuredly merits some chastisement.

Probably Douglas' greatest weakness is that his passion for causes gets in the way of the judgment which is expected of a Supreme Court justice. Even in his seventies he is a man of extraordinary energy and mental vitality, but perhaps this flurry in the House will cause him to curtail his pulpiteering. We hope so.

Clearly, there never was more than a wisp of a chance that the required majority of the House and two-thirds of the Senate would vote for his impeachment. Hence the ouster effort by House Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford and others has appeared to be feverishly political, stemming from pique over the failure of the nominations of Judges Haynsworth and Carswell. Probably there also was the thought of putting liberal congressmen on the spot in advance of this year's elections.

Now the elections are over, a new justice has been confirmed, and it is time to call off the chase after Douglas. Congress has mountainous piles of much more urgent business.

HON. MICHAEL FEIGHAN

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleagues in tribute to our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Although I have had the privilege of knowing MIKE FEIGHAN only during this 91st Congress, even such a short time was sufficient to bring about a genuine feeling of respect and admiration for him.

I wish for him and his family every happiness that the future might bring.

WASTE IN THE POVERTY PROGRAM

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I have tried in the past to support programs which appeared to be worthwhile, oppose those which appeared to be wasteful. All of us want to help our poor, particularly our poor children, and I have always supported programs whose avowed purpose was to break the devastating cycle of poverty causing ignorance causing hopelessness causing poverty. To this end the Congress, in the past decade, has voted billions of dollars and I have joined in those votes.

As I watch some of the results of the program in my own area, however, I have become increasingly concerned about the waste which is so obvious. From the window of my own home I have watched excellent and expensive playground eqiupment, slides, swings, seesaws, jungle-gyms, and so on, bought for the benefit of children with OEO money, lie rusting, abandoned, and uncared for, but this is a small item. Today I have knowledge of a large one.

At this time the OEO conducts its program for farmworkers in my district in five buildings which it rents for a total of $20,500 per year. The buildings contain, OEO says, 13,500 square feet. OEO now proposes to "conserve approximately $20,500 per year" by taking over the following from an abandoned Air Force base: one bowling alley, one gymnasium, one NCO club, one service station, one water treatment facility tennis courts—number unknown—one swimming pool, one wading pool, and one bathhouse for the swimming pool.

Omitting from the calculations the swimming pool, wading pool, and tennis courts, they will have gone, in their effort to conserve the taxpayers' money, from 13,500 square feet of space to 29,387 square feet. They will have acquired facilities greater than those owned by most schools in our district, facilities which have cost the taxpayers $716,100. They will not have begun to consider the cost of maintaining those facilities, and if the past is truly prolog, they will probably simply let them run down.

The OEO, in its correspondence to me seeking to justify this egregious empire-building, says:

> The savings to be gained by concentrating all program operations in one geographic area are obvious.

Obvious poppycock. The farmworkers are spread out where the farms are. Transportation needs will be greater, time on the road will be greater, costs will be greater. One might say the log-

ical conclusion of this particular fallacy would be to concentrate all program operations in Washington, D.C. This would hardly help the farmworkers or their children.

Reluctantly, I conclude that while the adults on the payroll of the poverty program would undoubtedly love to see the taxpayers' money spent in this manner, the vast majority of the people whom I represent would not, and if OEO persists in acquiring luxuries beyond the happiest dreams of average taxpayers under the label of caring for the poor, they will have to do it without my support.

SOVIET TREATMENT OF JEWISH CITIZENS

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I am heartened to hear of the recent commutation of the death sentences for the two Soviet Jews accused of attempted air hijacking.

And I was proud of the role played by the administration, in the person of Secretary of State Rogers, in expressing the strong U.S. sentiment against the previously announced death penalties.

However, this certainly does not settle the affair. The central issue, in my opinion, is not the sentences imposed in these show trials, but rather the evidence presented to determine the innocence or guilt of the accused. For in fact, as we all know, these hijackings did not occur. The crime was merely alleged conspiracy. And to anyone moderately familiar with Soviet jurisprudence, the trials of over 30 people, the very vast majority of whom were Jewish, indicates that these trials were in actuality just further examples of anti-Semitism as practiced by the Soviet Union.

Such actions are directly in opposition to stated Soviet policy. In January of 1969 the Soviet Presidium approved the provisions of the International Convention on Racial Discrimination. And it has always been a stated Soviet objective to reunite the Jewish families that were scattered throughout the world during and after World War II.

Yet, at the same time, the Soviet Union has all but completely cut off the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel.

It is obvious that the real Soviet policy toward Jews is one of systemic repression. And such a policy is repulsive to every sensitive human being.

It is good to hear that the death sentences in the recent trial were rescinded. But the Soviet Union still has a long way to go in assuring equal rights to her Jewish citizens.

It was encouraging to note the concern expressed by so much of the American Jewish community. Their concern for the ideals of justice and freedom for all is most gratifying. Hopefully, one day soon, such conditions will exist throughout the world for all citizens, regardless of their race, religion, or nationality.

A TRIBUTE TO HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is always a sad and difficult task to pay tribute to a departing colleague. But I find my task especially difficult in bidding farewell to one of the most talented and effective Members of this Congress—the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, who is retiring after serving 28 long and dedicated years.

I have been privileged to know Mr. FEIGHAN, both as an associate and as a friend, for many of those years, but I would like to speak for a moment about his distinguished service on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. As chairman of that committee, I have been personally aware of the contributions this talented man has made—both to the maritime industry and to the State of Ohio, which he has so ably represented.

An excellent example of how Congressman FEIGHAN fought for his constituents and his State can be provided by a brief discussion of the so-called Merchant Marine Act of 1970, which was signed by the President October 21, 1970. The original legislation to implement this long-range program to revitalize the American merchant marine was submitted by the President to the Congress in October 1969. When our committee proceeded to hold extensive hearings on this administration bill, it became clear that one important aspect of that bill, which provided certain tax benefits to certain segments of the American maritime industry, did not provide this benefit to owners of vessels operating in the Great Lakes.

This tax deferment plan was designed to permit ship operators to place in a reserve fund a certain portion of their profits, and taxes on these funds would be deferred, as long as this money was used to construct new replacement vessels in American shipyards. But the administration bill proposed to make this benefit available only to those American steamship operators participating in the foreign commerce of the United States, and such a provision would, naturally, exclude most of the Great Lakes operators.

During extensive hearings held by my committee on the maritime program, industry representatives from the Great Lakes area testified and argued that they urgently needed this tax benefit in order to replace their obsolete vessels. Congressman FEIGHAN immediately took up the fight to gain this benefit for Great Lakes operators. Despite strong administration opposition to extension of this privilege to the Great Lakes, the congressional pressure exerted by Congressman FEIGHAN and other members representing Great Lakes areas finally overcame the Executive opposition, and this privilege was included in the final version of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970.

I could cite many other illustrations of this Representative's tenacity and dedication—including his work to produce much significant legislation designed to protect our environment and to conserve our great natural resources. He has sponsored some of the most important conservation and environmental legislation introduced into Congress in many years. Foremost among these are the Endangered Species Act, Public Law 91-514, which will help enforce our 12-mile exclusive fishery zone and help conserve and protect America's invaluable fishery resource; and the bill to establish a National Environmental Data System, which has passed the House and is now pending in the Senate. He has also enthusiastically supported other landmark conservation measures, such as the National Environmental Policy Act, the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act and the Water Bank Act.

These are a few of the many contributions this distinguished legislator has made to this Nation and his State, and I am sure the people of Ohio appreciate the value of this outstanding public servant.

As chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I want to personally say that I shall miss the support of MICHAEL FEIGHAN, and I wish him the best of success in all of his future endeavors.

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

SPEECH OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I join my colleague and neighbor, Congressman CHARLES VANIK, in expressing my best wishes to Congressman MICHAEL FEIGHAN on his last day in Congress.

The name of MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN has stood for honesty, integrity, and dedication to public service in northern Ohio for many decades. The Feighan family were outstanding leaders in the Cleveland metropolitan area long before I ever knew there was a Congress of the United States. They have served their fellowman in the judicial and legislative branches of local, State, and national governments with a sense of dedication that has earned them universal respect.

MIKE FEIGHAN was a close friend of my father over 40 years ago. The friendship of the Stanton and Feighan families always transcended partisan political considerations. Congressman FEIGHAN's devotion to our Catholic faith has been an inspiration to all of us. His lovely wife, Florence, has shared so meaningfully these years of public service and together, they have made a team that has not only produced an outstanding family, but has also shared their blessings with hundreds of fellow Clevelanders.

Mr. Speaker, to Mr. and Mrs. Mike Feighan, I extend Peggy's and my sincere best wishes for the years that lie ahead. All of us who know MIKE know

that they will be active and productive. Congressman FEIGHAN's 28 years of service in the Congress of the United States shall long be remembered.

A TRIBUTE TO DAN GURNEY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, during the decade of the 1960's when American technology and brave, dedicated men were putting our astronauts on the moon, Daniel Sexton Gurney was pushing our technology into a different field—international auto racing.

Gurney was born on April 13, 1931, in Port Jefferson, N.Y., the son of Metropolitan Opera bass John Gurney. When Dan grew up in Riverside, Calif., after his father's retirement, he found his music in the highly tuned notes of a racing engine.

After 18 months of combat duty in Korea with the Army, Gurney returned to Riverside in 1954 and went to work for a small engineering firm. He had no degree in engineering, but quickly demonstrated his natural aptitude for research and development by working the bugs out of a continuous casting machine for sheet aluminum.

Gurney was also applying his mechanical skills in another direction—repairing his own cars for amateur sports car racing. Late in 1958, he was offered a sponsored ride in a Ferrari for the first Los Angeles Times Grand Prix and finished second in the race. That race at Riverside Raceway was the turning point that sent him to Europe as a contract driver for the Ferrari team.

From 1959 to 1965, Gurney drove for four of the best teams in international racing—Ferrari, BRM, Porsche, and Brabham—but one thing continued to disturb him. All of the cars were made in Europe, a galling thought for as proud an American as Dan Gurney. In 1966, he launched his own All American Eagle Team. A year later he made history by becoming the first American in 46 years to win an international championship race by driving an American car. Incidentally, he designed and built the car himself.

In 10 years on the Formula One Circuit, he won seven grand prix races—more than any other American driver has ever won. He is also the only driver to have scored major victories in each of the four principal types of auto racing—Formula One, USAC, in the Indy-type championship cars—stock cars, and sports cars.

Dan Gurney drove his final race earlier this year, but he will not be leaving racing entirely. Although he has retired as an active driver, he will continue as president of All-American Racers, Inc., of Santa Ana, Calif., to build USAC championship cars, and will be the owner-manager of his Eagle Racing Team.

On January 10, 1971, Gurney will be honored with special ceremonies at the "Motor Trend 500" stock car race at Riverside International Raceway. No more appropriate race could have been selected to pay tribute to Gurney since he has won this event five times in its 7-year history and Riverside has long been considered his hometown track—even though he no longer lives in Riverside but is now claimed by nearly all of California.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that we join in saluting Dan Gurney who has become an authentic American hero, especially to the younger generation. He has set an example of courage, individual accomplishment, and of true patriotism which can be proudly recommended to all Americans.

AMERICA'S FARMERS ARE CONCERNED

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the discontent among our rural people over low farm prices is very aptly illustrated in a clipping I received the other day from Cliff Mitchell of KASM radio in Albany, in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

I insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and urge my colleagues to read it:

The pot is starting to boil! America's farmers and ranchers and feeders are concerned. They are worried. They are approaching the position of being forced into fighting for survival and you know what kind of a fight that is.

The red meat industry in the last six months has suffered the worst blows it has seen in years and years. Hog feeders and hog men, cattle feeders and cattlemen, bankruptcies are occurring all over the place. Why? Because our government insists upon a cheap food policy that does not produce cheap food. All that it is doing is allowing for an exhorbitant profit picture to the big food chains of America.

I'm sure that any of you who may be sports fans or follow sports will agree that when you have a constantly losing team; when the players aren't strong enough, when the coaching staff is inadequate, that in order to get on the winning side, you rejuggle both players and coaches and tactics. It's as simple as that.

And many in agriculture today are screaming for new players, for new tactics. Time is very short. The farmers and ranchers who have bought tickets to attend this game are broke. They do not have any more money to buy any more tickets. They are tired of supporting a losing team. They are demanding better results and they are entitled to better results.

America's farmers and ranchers and feeders are sick and tired of the political handling that America's largest industry receives. They are sick and tired of being used as a price depressant at every turn. And they are, by golly, mad that administration after administration as a head coach continues to use a cheap food policy.

Costs and services to America's largest industry rise, the products that this industry sell bring less and the American voter and worker and urbanite continues to pay more for food at the retail level when she and he ought to be paying less. We have been very poorly coached, ladies and gentlemen, and our players who represent the farm and ranch organizations are weak and out of shape.

Name me one major farm ranch or feeder group that came forward last June or July and argued and asked for facts from the USDA when they released two very unfair, inaccurate and yes, unneeded big livestock reporting intentions. One was in February and one was in July. They're the two reports that broke the pork industry's back.

Facts and figures will show you that the kill up through September 1970 was actually less than a year ago. And pork prices plummeted in that same period because of the psychological warfare the chain store meat buyers could use on the supplies saying this great huge amount of meat coming was going to break their back.

Have the chain stores had any trouble selling meat? Have they been giving it away at bargain prices?

I'll tell you and the world, they have not! Is there a huge backlog of beef in freezers across the country in the last six months when fed cattle have dropped $4 to $7 a hundred. I'll tell you there isn't. There is in fact, 32% less in cold storage than there was a year ago.

I'm like Eddie Collins of the Garden City Telegram, Kansas, when he says, "Just one time before I die, I'd like to see the leader of any University Ag system or the Extension Service or the USDA fight for the farmer. I'd like to see one leader not afraid to face up and tell other Department Secretaries and political VIP's in Washington to go to Hades to face up to represent their people, to tell them that high farm prices are for the betterment of the USA. Truthfully, I'm tired of bungling lawyers and inexperienced educators laying a role of compromising Ma Perkins."

This man, Eddie Collins is on the mainline and he has my respect.

President Nixon now is changing his players and he is changing his coaching staff. Hickel was the first weak sister, he thought, that had to go. Many think that Hardin, Secretary of Agriculture, is the next one because Hardin does not agree with the cheap food policy and Nixon does. Rogers C. B. Morton, Republican National Chairman may be relieved of his playing position, because Nixon is discouraged with the 1970 Republican loss.

Secretary of the Treasury, David Kennedy is on thin ice, George Romney is also on thin ice and could be replaced with a new player because his wife got whipped in Michigan, and so it goes.

Well, as the administration is changing their coaches and their teams, don't you think that agriculture should get some new coaches, some new players who have new tactics and enough guts and intestinal fortitude to take a swing at the opposition.

Really folks, agriculture must win in the next game or two or there won't be anymore games.

HON. BILL AYRES

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, all who have known and worked with BILL AYRES are singularly impressed by his affable manner and exceptional ability.

In his 20 years in Congress, BILL has represented the people of the Akron area with an unswerving dedication and concern. The oft voiced slogan, "Ayres Cares" had particular meaning for the constituents of Ohio's 14th District.

As the ranking minority member of the House Education and Labor Committee, he was a persuasive spokesman for the hard-working, taxpaying public. A man of reason and responsibility, BILL AYRES has left his mark on much of the legislation that has emanated from this committee during his membership. His stamp of approval was a significant step in gaining final House approval of many measures which would otherwise have been doomed to failure.

Ohio and the Nation owe a great debt to BILL AYRES. He knew his job and he did it well. I would like to close by wishing BILL well in his future endeavors. I am confident he will bring to them the same spirited enthusiasm and farsighted expertise he has displayed as a Member of this body.

THE MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PROGRAM MAKING SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, while it has been little heralded, the evidence is clear that substantial progress is being made in aiding minority businessmen under the minority business enterprise program established by President Nixon.

In an Executive order dated March 5, 1969, the President directed Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans to oversee and coordinate all Federal programs—and to the extent possible, all private programs, too—which could help promote the economic status and the pride of minority group members by involving them more fully in our private enterprise system.

Recently Secretary Stans reported to the President on progress being made under the minority business enterprise program.

While much remains to be done, the accomplishments through June of 1970 are indeed significant and reflect the administration's determination to dramatically increase participation by minority groups in the Nation's free enterprise system. A few highlights of the report will serve to demonstrate this point:

In financial grants, loans, and guarantees, $315,236,045 were made by Federal agencies to minority business enterprises. This compares with an estimated $200,000,000 in the preceding year.

Government procurement contracts worth $21,814,292 went to minority firms through SBA's 8(a) program, compared with $8,884,141 in the previous year.

In an entirely new effort starting at midyear, 100 private commitments were obtained to create Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Companies (MESBIC's). Twenty of these are already operational with an average capital of almost $90,000,000 for minority investments, with much more to be available when the others are operative.

SBA direct and guaranteed minority business loans were 8,432 in number, compared with 4,930 in the previous year.

In a completely new program, following efforts to stimulate minority-owned franchise, 114 of the 230 franchising Companies actively solicited have reported that the number owned by minority individuals grew from 405 to 743. The estimated total increase in all minority franchise holders for the year is about 500.

Similarly, the number of minority-owned service stations increased from an estimated 10,800 to over 13,000 within the year, based on reports from the oil companies enlisted in the program. Automobile manufacturers have reported an increase from 14 to 82 in the number of minority-owned automobile dealerships.

Thirty local community organizations located in 25 major cities have been financed to serve as local affiliate offices for the Office of Minority Business Enterprise, to "deliver" the resources of the program to these cities.

The Economic Development Administration to conducting an Indian program at a cost of almost $20 million which has already helped over the 50 tribes in establishing minority enterprises.

A major legislative program to assist minority enterprise has been submitted to the Congress by the administration and awaits enactment.

A census of all minority businesses in the country is now under way and will be completed in 1971. The Office of Minority Business Enterprise has also completed a series of opportunity books identifying Federal assistance programs, franchise opportunities, local assistance centers, educational aids and many other minority enterprise tools.

In reporting on the Minority Business Enterprise Program to President Nixon, Secretary Stans said:

There were no precedents for this kind of coordinated effort. There was no rule book (no existing plan of action). We had to start by composing a whole set of guides. During the first 15 months we found ourselves continually revising our efforts as we learned from our own experience and listened to those who worked and participated with us. Fifteen months of study, self criticism and very hard work have gradually produced the solid beginning for a serious long-range undertaking. As this report shows, there has been progress—dramatic progress in terms of the base from which we started, however limited we might consider it in comparison to the road we still must travel.

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the close of the 91st Congress will bring the departure from our ranks of a very close friend and fellow member of the Eighty-Six Club.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY) was first elected to Congress in November 1958, at the same time I first was elected. Thus, we entered the House together in January 1959 and became members of the Eighty-Six Club.

BILL MURPHY has achieved a fine record as a legislator, both in devotion to his duties here in the House and in his service to his constituents.

He has been an active member and a subcommittee chairman on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, where he has distinguished himself in this important field.

BILL and I came to the House with similar credentials. Both of us had served previously in elective municipal office—he as a member of the Chicago City Council and myself as a member of the Buffalo Common Council. This, I submit, is excellent background for a Congressman whose responsibility is to serve his municipality and its residents at the Federal level.

It has been a great privilege to work with BILL MURPHY in this House.

The Eighty-Six Club and this House are losing a valuable friend and colleague from active membership.

My best wishes go to him and to his lovely wife.

REPORT TO THE NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS—JANUARY 4, 1971

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following observations on the 1970 elections—the second of two weekly reports:

WASHINGTON REPORT—JANUARY 4, 1971

(By Congressman LEE H. HAMILTON)

EDITOR'S NOTE—This is the second of two weekly reports dealing with my observations on the 1970 elections.

The results of the 1970 election perhaps can best be described as a "mixed bag".

The Democrats showed a net gain of 11 governors, nine members of the U.S. House of Representatives, and 244 seats in State Legislatures. The Party gained control of four State Legislatures and retained control in 23. The Republicans showed a net gain of one U.S. Senate seat.

In the U.S. Senate before the election, there were 57 Democrats and 43 Republicans. After the election there were 54 Democrats, 44 Republicans, one independent and one conservative. The Democrats lost three and the Republicans gained one.

In the U.S. House of Representatives, there were 246 Democrats and 189 Republicans before the election. This Session, there will be 255 Democrats and 180 Republicans, a gain of nine for the Democrats.

In the States before the election, there were 32 Republican governors and 18 Democratic governors. After the election, there were 21 Republican governors and 29 Democratic governors, a gain of 11 for the Democrats.

Obviously, the most significant shift in political power was in the State Houses. In

the gubernatorial races, however, the Democrats had no place to go but up. In the same sense, the Republicans had no place to go but up in the Senate races.

The results—at least in my view—do not justify either party's claim to a smashing victory. As a politician, I did not see that the voters gave any mandate for any candidate in the past election. I did not detect a tide of conservatism or liberalism. The Senate may be a shade more conservative and the House slightly more liberal, but it would take an expert to detect it.

If there was a Party edge, it was in State House turnovers. Political observers should be careful, however, in relating state shifts in voting to national issues. Local issues generally control gubernatorial races, and this year, local issues centered on such fiscal matters as property taxes, income and sales taxes, and a general range of local economic issues.

I think the Republicans plainly underestimated the economy issue in the election. Inflation and unemployment cut more deeply than they realized, and they failed to sense how fast the issue was growing.

People these days are putting more and more of the responsibility for economic progress upon the President. The impact of the Federal budget and the publicity attending the economic decisions in Washington make the President a target for both praise and for blame.

One of the lessons the President will have drawn from the election is that he's got to pay more attention to the economy. Indeed, this already is evident in the actions he has taken to expand the economy and to fight unemployment.

Nationally, the vast majority of the Democratic Congressmen ran stronger in 1970 than in 1968. Without doubt, it is giving rise to optimism about the Presidential race in 1972.

Senator Edmund Muskie of Maine now emerges as the No. 1 challenger to President Nixon. The nomination will not be handed to him, however. There are plently of traps along the way. Without taking anything away from the Senator, I think one of the reasons he has a lead is because the public generally has no clear idea of where he stands on many important issues.

The public does have a better idea where Senator-Elect Humphrey and Senator Kennedy stand, and these two men—although they have strong support—also stir great opposition. Senator Muskie doesn't—as yet, anyway.

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, PHIL PHILBIN was not only my colleague, we were office neighbors for several years, and we have been personal friends since we came to Congress in 1943. I have always had high regard and great admiration for PHIL for his total dedication to his constituents, for his patriotism, and for his devotion to his official duties as a Member of this body. He was a most valuable member of the Armed Services Committee, and as a veteran of World War I, he had an especially keen grasp of complex military problems and the hardships of military life endured by our servicemen.

PHIL PHILBIN'S interests ranged over a broad field of subjects. He was an articulate and knowledgeable legislator, and an able lawyer. He came to Congress well equipped by experience in the several high offices he had held in Massachusetts. He enjoyed the confidence and respect of his constituency, and was courageous and faithful to the trust with which they had honored him.

PHIL PHILBIN has been a popular Member of this body and he has left his mark in these halls, where he will be sorely missed. I know PHIL will be successful in any undertaking he decides upon and I hope our paths will cross in the future.

To PHIL I wish many years of good health and happiness and as we part, I want him to remember that he takes with him my deep appreciation for his warm and steadfast friendship.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION SCHEDULE FOR JANUARY 1971

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the schedule of events for the Smithsonian Institution for the month of January 1971.

Once again visitors to the Smithsonian will find a great variety of outstanding exhibits and programs, and I urge those who can to visit the Smithsonian Institution during this coming month.

CALENDAR OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Continuing Exhibitions

TWO FAMOUS PLANES EXHIBITED AT SMITHSONIAN

(By Tom Haney)

Two graceful airplanes of the 1930's that made pathbreaking polar flights—*Sirius* and *Polar Star*—are on exhibit in the East Hall of the Arts and Industries Building through March.

Polar Star, a Northrup Gamma monoplane, flown by the American explorer-flyer Lincoln Ellsworth and a Canadian, H. Hollick-Kenyon, made the first trans-continental hop across the Antarctica continent in 1933.

Sirius, a Lockheed floatplane, was flown by Charles A. Lindbergh and his wife, Anne Morrow Lindbergh, on their famous 1931 Great Circle survey hop across Canada and the North Pacific to Japan, to gather first-hand information on possible trans-Pacific airline routes for the future. The directions they charted are still flown by Pan American Airwest Airlines. *Sirius* was on display last summer at Osaka's Expo 70.

Both planes are in the collections of the Smithsonian's National Air and Space Museum. In storage for many years, neither has been exhibited before in Washington, D.C.

ARTS AND INDUSTRIES BUILDING

World Bazaar, Museum Shops sales/exhibition featuring many one-of-a-kind objets d'art and crafts from 50 countries.

Pakistani Prints. Prints resulting from a creative printmaking workshop held in Pakistan during 1967. Sponsored by the International Art Program of NCEA. Through Jan. 31.

Hand of Man on America. Photographs by David Plowden depict man-made objects and their impact on the American continent—past, present and future. Through Jan. 31.

The Genteel Female. Lithographs depict the romantic view of the American woman of the 19th century. Through Jan. 31.

Early Bird Replica. An operating backup model of the world's first communications satellite. On display indefinitely.

Beechcraft. The history of the Beech Aircraft Co. traced through the use of scale models. On display indefinitely.

SNAP–27. A duplicate of the nuclear device that supplies electric power for the package of experiments placed on the moon by Apollo 12 astronauts. On display indefinitely.

Astronautical Art. From the collection of the Air and Space Museum, including works by Norman Rockwell and other well-known artists. On display through Easter.

FREER GALLERY OF ART

Whistler's Landscapes and Seascapes. Forty paintings show Whistler in his forgotten role as an avant garde artist. On display indefinitely.

Whistler's Etchings. Twenty-six prints and 16 canceled copper plates. On display indefinitely.

MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY

Founders Day. Commemorates 350th anniversary of the pilgrims landing in North America.

Do It the Hard Way: Rube Goldberg and Modern Times. Featuring cartoons, writings, sculptures and cartoon "inventions." On display indefinitely.

Contemporary Counterparts of Early American Craftsmen. Jeweler Merry Renk is featured. Hall of Everyday Life in the American Past. Through Jan. 31.

Iron and Steel Hall. Exhibit of the American iron and steel business dealing with modern practices and some of the historical background. On display indefinitely.

MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY

Moon Rock Research. Finds of research on lunar samples by Smithsonian scientists. On display indefinitely.

NATIONAL COLLECTION OF FINE ARTS

Paul Manship: Drawings and Sculptures. Fifty drawings and 15 small figurative and animal sculptures. Through Jan. 31.

Winslow Homer. Fifty-one oils, watercolors, drawings, and graphics, mostly from the artist's popular early period. On display indefinitely.

A Look at the World: Mid-Century. Twenty-six American paintings and small sculptures give an individualist view of the 1950s. On display indefinitely.

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY

Pres. Monroe Portrait. A recently acquired painting by John Vanderlyn. One of only six life portraits known to have been painted of Pres. James Monroe. Permanent.

Along This Way. Portraits, photographs, death mask, and other artifacts of black culter exponent James Weldon Johnson. A teaching exhibition. Through June 30.

Tuesday, January 5

Lecture-discussion: Order and Disorder by eminent dancer-choreographer Paul Sanasardo. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates: 8:30 p.m. Natural History Building auditorium. Public invited.

Wednesday, January 6

Exhibition: East 100th Street—Bruce Davidson. An exhibition of 80 photographs by Davidson taken during 1967–68 of East 100th Street between First and Second Avenues, New York City. These pictures, in addition to their photographic interest, constitute a significant social document of the area, much of which has since been renovated. Arts and Industries Building through March 8.

Lunchbox Forum: The U.S. Buzz Bomb of World War I. An informal presentation and discussion led by Cole Morrow, Chief of Planning Research at the Federal Aviation

Administration. Sponsored by the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum. Noon. Room 2169, Arts and Industries Building.

Thursday, January 7

Creative Screen: Two Castles, produced by Bruno Bozzetto of Italy—A wry, little animated film in which a determined knight encounters something he did not expect; Since Time Began, produced by Time Magazine—the most important happenings in history and communication between 1923 and 1970 presented with musical backgrounds of the times. Continuous half-hour showings beginning 11 a.m.; last showing at 2:30 p.m., National Collection of Fine Arts.

Saturday, January 9

Afro-American Poetry: a program by Joanna Featherstone. As well as appearing in the United States and on National Educational TV, Joanna Featherstone has performed in London, Paris and Liberia. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates and the Division of Performing Arts in the Natural History Building auditorium, 8:30 p.m. $2.75 Associates; $3 non-members. For information call 381–5407.

Creative Screen: Two Castles; Since Time Began. Repeat. See Jan. 7 for details.

Tuesday, January 12

Illustrated Lecture: The Drinking Vessels of Persia by Charles K. Wilkinson of the Brooklyn Museum. Final lecture in the 1970–71 series on Oriental art. Freer Gallery of Art, 8:30 p.m.

Illustrated Lecture: Songs of the Humpback Whale by Dr. Roger S. Payne, Asst. Prof., Rockefeller University, Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates. 8:30 p.m. Natural History Building auditorium. Public invited.

Wednesday, January 13

Lunchbox Forum: When Jets Joined the Navy. An informal presentation and discussion led by Rear Adm. A. B. Metsger (Ret.), president of Technology Services, Inc. Sponsored by the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum. Noon. Room 2169, Arts and Industries Building.

Friday, January 15

Exhibition: John Muir, 1838–1914. In teaching something about the conservation movement in the United States at the turn of the century, this exhibition relates to the present concern about ecology. The display is centered around Muir, a Scotsman who immigrated to the United States at age 11 and became known as a great naturalist and the father of the National Park Service. National Portrait Gallery through June 1.

Saturday, January 16

Exhibition: . . . Toward Freedom. The civil rights movement from 1954 to the present time is covered in observance of the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, 2405 Nichols Avenue, S.E. Through March 15.

Panel Discussion: The Art of Print Collecting. Moderator, Clifford T. Chieffo, Chairman of the Fine Arts Department, Georgetown University; panel members, Franz Bader, Barbara Fendrick and Sidney Michelson. 3 p.m., Lecture Hall, National Collection of Fine Arts.

Wednesday, January 20

Lunchbox Forum: *Japanese World War II Bombing Balloons.* Informal presentation and discussion led by Robert C. Mikesh, Curatorial Assistant of the Aeronautics Department, National Air and Space Museum. Noon. Room 2169, Arts and Industries Building.

Exhibition: American Impressionists. A newly opened gallery in the National Collection of Fine Arts will display approximately 30 paintings by 10 artists, most from the late 19th century with a few from the early 20th. 2nd Floor, East Wing.

Thursday, January 21

Creative Screen: *Little Blue Apron*—a whimsical animated commentary that was the 1967 Academy Award nomination from Czechoslovakia; *Calder: From the Circus to the Moon*—Alexander Calder creates a bizarre circus and with the witchery of his camera, Hans Richter touches it with moon-beams. Continuous half-hour showings beginning 11 a.m.; last showing at 2:30 p.m., National Collection of Fine Arts.

Friday, January 22

Perceptions 3: *The Paul Sanasardo Dance Company with Manuel Alum.* One of the leading modern dance companies in the *Footnotes*, and *Cut Flowers*, with an additional work to be announced. Presented by the Smithsonian Division of Performing Arts and the Smithsonian Associates. 8:30 p.m. Lisner Auditorium, 21st and H Sts., N.W. $3 and $4 Associates; $3.50 and $4.50 non-members. For information call 381–5407.

Saturday, January 23

Creative Screen: Little Blue Apron; Calder: From the Circus to the Moon. Repeat. See Jan. 21 for details.

Monday, January 25

Audubon Lecture: Birds of the Southern Ocean, by Dr. George E. Watson, Chairman of the Smithsonian Department of Vertebrate Zoology and a Director of the Audubon Naturalist Society. Dr. Watson will introduce some of the current research efforts in the Antarctic and the sub-Antarctic being made in determining the evolutionary and ecological relationships of Southern Ocean sea birds. Sponsored by the Audubon Naturalist Society. Natural History Building auditorium. 8 p.m. only. Open to the public.

Wednesday, January 27

Lunchbox Forum: A Decade of Ocean Engineering. Informal presentation and discussion led by William L. Sparks, Marketing Manager of the Underseas Division, Westinghouse Ocean Research and Engineering Center. Sponsored by the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum. Noon. Room 2169, Arts and Industries Building.

FOREIGN STUDY TOURS

Tours concerned with archaeology, the arts, museums, private collections and natural history are available to national and local Associates in 1971.

Sicilian Archaeological Sites and Opera in Italy: Feb. 1–22. Directed by Mrs. Constance Mellen of the Washington Opera Society and Dr. R. H. Howland. A few spaces still available.

East African Safari and Cruise: March 20–April 15. Five days in game reserves; two-week cruise from Mombasa to islands in the Indian Ocean. A few spaces still available.

Cyprus and Turkey: May 11–June 1. Archaeological sites in central and southern Turkey, as well as better-known excavations near the west coast. Waiting list only.

Architectural and Historical Tour in Scotland, Wales and Ireland: May 31–June 20. Visits to private properties in conjunction with the Irish Georgian Society and the Scottish National Trust. Directed by Dr. R. H. Howland. Waiting list only.

"No-Tour" Tour. May 26–June 16. Air France Excursion-Dulles/Paris/Dulles. Members make their own arrangements for travel in Europe. $270.

Roman Archaeology: July 1–22. Inexpensive excursion for students, teachers and parents.

South America: Aug. 2, 21 days. Brazil, Peru, Ecuador and Colombia, with emphasis on archaeology, old and new architecture, museum and private collections plus a short visit to the upper Amazon.

Russia. Sept. 20–Oct. 12. Samarkand, Kiev, Vladimir, and Novgorod, with extended visits to Moscow and Leningrad. Directed by Dr. R. H. Howland and Prof. George Riabov. Tour full. Second group departs Oct. 15 (through Nov. 19).

For itineraries and details, please write to Susan Kennedy, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, or call 381–5520.

RADIO SMITHSONIAN

Radio Smithsonian is broadcast every Sunday night on WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5) from 9–9:30 p.m. This weekly program presents conversation and music growing out of the Institution's exhibits, research, and other activities and interests. Program schedule for January:

3rd—*The Jazz Scene.* Part I. Julian Euell, former bassist, sociologist, and now Special Assistant for Public Service at the Smithsonian, and Dr. Donald Byrd, noted jazz trumpeter, composer, and Chairman of the Department of Jazz Studies at Howard University, in a musicated conversation about jazz and jazzmen—a major aspect of American cultural history past and present.

10th—*The Jazz Scene,* Part II.

17th—*The Jazz Scene,* Part III.

24th—*Bugging the Bugs,* Dr. Barnard Burks, Research Entomologist in Systematic Entomology Laboratory; *Curtain Going Up,* William Blair, General Director of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

31st—*Talking to the Animals,* Warren Iliff, Special Assistant to the Director, National Zoological Park; *Commodore Perry: East to the Rising Sun,* Roger Pineau, Managing Editor of the Smithsonian Press.

Also heard on WAMU–FM (88.5) Tuesdays at noon; WETA–FM (90.0), Mondays at 9:30 p.m.; and on WNYC–AM/FM in New York City.

CLASSES AND TOURS

Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates

Winter classes for adults and young people begin in January and continue for adults for 10 weekly sessions and for young people, 8 weeks. All are by subscription only (call 381–6159). Adult classes (unless otherwise stated) and beginning dates are:

Jan. 11: Art and Archaeology of Egypt; Basic Photography.

Jan. 12: History of Photography; Intermediate Film Making; Stitchery.

Jan. 13: Basic Photography; Fabric Design and Decoration; Fabric Construction; American Democracy.

Jan. 14: Spaceflight—Past, Present and Future; Intermediate Photography; World of Sculpture.

Jan. 15: Basic Photography, Animal Behavior; Photography Workshop; Basic Film Making; Jewelry Making Workshop (one day).

Jan. 16: Jewelry Making Workshop (one day); Film Making for Teenagers; Photography for Teenagers; Film Making for Young People (ages 6–10). Information is also available on other classes for young people in art, birds, minerals, astronautics, aeronautics, sea life, electronics and earth science.

Jan. 17: Basic Film Making.

Jan. 20: Creative Cinema.

Jan. 29: Traditional Crewel Embroidery Workshop (one day).

Jan. 30: Traditional Crewel Embroidery Workshop (one day).

Tours. By subscription only (phone 381–5159)

Jan. 22–24 *Associates Winter Weekend.* "Open fires—roasting chestnuts" and other amenities of 19th century hospitality at Old Sturbridge Village, Mass. Associate members.

Feb. 21–26 *Our Natural Heritage.* Six-day study trip to Arkansas National Wildlife Refuge, Padre Island, and selected private areas in southern Texas. The unique bird population of south Texas will be emphasized.

HOURS

Smithsonian Museums: 10 a.m.–5:30 p.m., 7 days a week.

Cafeteria: 11 a.m.–5 p.m. daily, MHT.
Snack Bar: 10 a.m.–3 p.m. daily, MHT.
National Zoo Buildings: 9 a.m.–4:30 p.m., 7 days a week. ZOO CLOSED NEW YEAR'S DAY.
Anacostia Neighborhood Museum: 10 a.m.–6 p.m., weekdays; 1–6 p.m., weekends.

DEMONSTRATIONS

Museum of History and Technology

Musical Instruments—from the Smithsonian's collection. Monday, Wednesday, Friday, 3 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, 3rd floor.

Power Machinery—steam engines and pumping engines. Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, 2–3:30 p.m.; Saturday and Sunday, 10:30–noon and 1–3:30 p.m., Power Machinery Hall, 1st floor.

Spinning and Weaving—Tuesday and Friday, 10–noon, Special Exhibits, 1st floor.

Dial-a-Museum—737–8811 for daily announcements on new exhibits and special events.

Dial-a-Phenomenon—737–8855 for weekly announcements on stars, planets and worldwide occurences of short-lived natural phenomena.

The Smithsonian Monthly Calendar of Events is prepared by the Office of Public Affairs. Editor: Lilas Wiltshire. *Deadline for entries in the February Calendar: January 6.*

MUSEUM TOURS

Walk-In Tours (beginning Jan. 6)

Museum of History and Technology (meet in Pendulum area): Tues.-Fri. 10:30, 11:30 a.m., 1 p.m.; Sat. and Sun. 10:30 a.m., noon, 1:30, 3 p.m.

National Collection of Fine Arts—Mon.-Fri. 11:30 a.m., 1 p.m.

School or Adult Group Tours by Appointment

Museum of History and Technology, Museum of Natural History, National Collection of Fine Arts—381–5019; 381–5680.

Freer Gallery of Art—381–5344.

National Portrait Gallery—381–6347.

National Zoological Park—332–9322.

Mailing list requests and changes of address should be sent to the Smithsonian Calendar, 107 Smithsonian Institution Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20560.

GODSPEED FOR THE DEPARTING MEMBERS OF THE NEW YORK DELEGATION

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of sadness that I view the departure from Congress of some of my colleagues from New York. They served their State and country well. Representatives LEONARD FARBSTEIN, JACOB H. GILBERT, ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN, RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, and ADAM C. POWELL shared a common goal, the uplifting of mankind to a life deeper and richer than it had known before, and they understood together that in my Father's house there are many mansions. We can only be grateful for their diversity in personality and outlook, because in that diversity they were truly representative of the shadings, the colors, and variety which bespeak the vitality of a people. We did not always agree, but we respected our differences.

Certainly I shall miss the persistent fighter in LEONARD FARBSTEIN, who was outraged by any kind of injustice; the lucid, clever understanding which JACK GILBERT brought to every issue enhanced by his contagious sense of humor; the intensity of the idealism of ALLARD LOWENSTEIN; the earnest, quiet selectivity of RICHARD MCCARTHY; the challenger in DICK OTTINGER, unawed by the powerful; and the insouciant flair of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

For me, the 92d Congress will be a little lonelier because their faces, their voices, and their individual flavor will not be with us.

I wish them Godspeed. May they each, in their own way, continue to serve the ideals which formed them and, in turn, helped form the House of Representatives, so much a basic part of their lives.

RUDY LAMONICA

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Rudy Lamonica was the pride of his village of Oceanside, N.Y., not just because he was a great athlete who brought luster to her teams. He was as unassuming and gentle as he was talented and tough, and his courage and goodness were contagious blessings on all who knew him. That so rare a human being should have contracted cancer and then died so soon in life is a tragedy beyond words. It could overwhelm us if we did not keep reminding ourselves how fortunate we are that we had him in our midst for a few years at least.

When a whole community feels a loss so powerfully, it is heartbreaking even to try to contemplate what the burden must be on the bereaved family. Our prayers go especially to Rudy's parents, themselves people of remarkable strength and spirit. I include at this point in the RECORD the beautiful message they have written in response to the outpouring of the grief that has come to them since Rudy first had to have his leg amputated when he was 16 years old:

A MILLION THANKS TO YOU

Rudy's recent illness has shown to us that in time of need the whole human race will rise up to help. The whole community of Oceanside opened up their hearts to us, but we were also aided and encouraged by many people from neighboring villages. We also received letters and calls from people all over Long Island. The response was world-wide as a Polish soccer team donated their services to play against a New York City all-star team which also played free of charge in a benefit game at Hofstra College.

The aid and comfort that we received from you was overwhelming. Your prayers, the steady stream of visitors to the hospital and your words of encouragement were a great comfort to us. The college scholarship fund that was created by you for Rudy was looked upon by all of you as a personal thing. Everyone helped in their own way to contribute to it. Coaches, classmates, teammates, adults, teen-agers, fraternity brothers, civic leaders and business people all did their utmost to help make it as successful as it turned out to be.

As we now settle to resuming as normal a life as possible, our hearts are gladdened to know that you wonderful people forgot your troubles and did your utmost to lessen ours. The smiles that we greet you people with have been put their mainly by you.

We now take this opportunity to thank everyone for all that they have done for us and we give a special thanks to the people of Oceanside. God bless you.

PHIL and BESSIE LAMONICA.

Rudy was fortunate that he did best what he loved most—playing soccer. There was a harmony in his life that few achieve, and he knew what he wanted to do with his life long before most boys have even started to think about such matters. But it is exactly this single-minded devotion to soccer, and the great successes that marked his brief playing career, that made the last months of his life so remarkable. After his right leg was amputated, and with it his dreams, Rudy showed no bitterness, no discouragement, no self-pity. He kept on cheering up those around him, and made plans for the future with a zest for living that seemed undiminished. He learned to swim and drive, and was thrilled when his soccer coach, Arthur Wright, of Oceanside High School invited him to be assistant coach of the team he had led to the Nassau County championships for 2 consecutive years.

The gallantry of his response to the loss of his leg made him even more of a hero and inspiration that he had been when he was simply setting soccer records. Oceanside students staged a marathon 537-inning softball game to help a college scholarship fund for him, taxing themselves for every hit and run. The Southern New York Soccer Association staged a benefit game between the New York All Stars and a championship Polish team for that fund, and soccer players from all over the State helped raise money for it. Among the thousands of fan letters he received was the following one from President Nixon himself:

THE WHITE HOUSE

DEAR RUDY: Mrs. Nixon and I were saddened to learn of your illness but we were assured that the same courage and determination you always displayed on the soccer field has made you an inspiration to others as you get well.

You have many friends cheering you along the road to recovery and our family just wanted you to know we are among them.

With our best wishes.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. Speaker, Rudy Lamonica brought glow to all who knew him. He has left those who survive an extraordinary example of joy in living and of self-discipline to learn from. He showed a generation of his peers that great achievements and real humility are partners, and he led a polarized community toward better understanding, by uniting it in admiration and love for a favorite son who transcended division of age, attitude, and background. His vibrance and his skills are needed desperately in the land, but the memory of his life will long inspire in men a new appreciation of their great

good fortune at being alive and in America at a time of such opportunity and challenge.

I am grateful that so many Members of the House have joined in this moment of thanks to God for the life of Rudy Lamonica, and I know they join now in my salute to his remarkable family.

SOVIET DEFEAT AT U.N.

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, some mortal enemies of the United Nations continue to argue that the United Nations is dominated by the Soviet Union—indeed is part and parcel of the international Communist conspiracy. The facts are that over the years the Communist bloc has suffered many defeats at the United Nations—in the General Assembly and other bodies. The following article of December 12, 1970, in the New York Times illustrates the point:

SOVIET BLOC LOSES SPACE PACT VOTE—U.N. PLAN COVERS DAMAGES FROM LAUNCHED OBJECTS

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—An isolated group of Soviet bloc states voted today against a proposal urging speedy completion of a treaty covering damages caused by objects launched into space. But the proposal was approved by the General Assembly's top political committee in an 85-to-8 vote.

Soviet objections were directed at key provisions saying that a "full measure of compensation" should be paid to victims of space mishaps and claims should be settled quickly.

The Soviet Union during seven years of drafting work on the treaty by committees, subcommittees and the Assembly, has continued to object that the provisions relating to compensation clash with the Soviet legal system.

The Russians have not elaborated on their objection. The United States, however, has warmly endorsed the rapid completion of such a treaty.

Resentment against the Soviet position has become increasingly outspoken from small countries, in particular, which regard themselves as possible victims of the space activities of the superpowers.

Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden voiced this anxiety, remarking that the arguments given for opposing agreement after seven years had remained unconvincing.

During discussions, the smaller countries have been insistent that as space launchings increase, the danger of injury to citizens and damage to their properties also will increase.

The discovery of space debris has been reported by Japan, Nepal and Colombia, among other countries. The United States is still waiting for the Soviet Union to collect four fragments that have been recovered in the last few months. One, a 600-pound piece, fell last August in the Middle West.

A particular source of resentment among the small powers is that they feel they cooperated by agreeing to a treaty concerning the rescue of astronauts in case of accident, which the space powers desired. As the small powers see it, the space powers are now under a moral obligation to complete the present text, which, they argue, protects their interests. India, the United Arab Republic and Lebanon all have complained about the seven year delay.

The next round of meetings on the incomplete treaty is scheduled for June in Geneva by the Legal Subcommittee of the Outer Space Committee.

DEPARTURE OF NEW YORK CONGRESSIONAL MEMBERS

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, with the closing of the 91st Congress, several of our colleagues from New York will be leaving this Chamber. I want to take this opportunity, then, to express my regard for them, and to extend my best wishes for their future endeavors.

From my own city of New York, three Members are departing—LEONARD FARBSTEIN, JACOB GILBERT, and ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. Each of them has, in his way, contributed much to this House, and thereby well served his constituents, as well as the country.

LEONARD FARBSTEIN has been particularly significant in the field of foreign affairs, working both within in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, where he has served as chariman of the Subcommittee on Europe, and on the floor. In addition, he has been a leading Member in the fight to enact strong, meaningful antipollution legislation.

JACK GILBERT has served ably and with dedication in the House. As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, he has been involved in the drafting and enactment of some of the most significant legislation to come before the House—legislation concerning social security, taxes, and trade.

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL leaves the House after having been involved in some of the most vital issues of our times. His service on the House Committee on Education and Labor, of which he was chairman, was extremely instrumental in producing the innovative, seminal legislation which has been passed in the fields of education and labor.

Two Members from areas close to my own district are closing—at least temporarily—their congressional careers this year: ALLARD LOWENSTEIN and RICHARD OTTINGER. Both have clearly left their mark on this House. AL LOWENSTEIN has always been in the forefront on the issues of justice and peace. I am confident he will continue to be there.

DICK OTTINGER has been one of the chief spokesmen in the House for halting the degradation of our environment. I know that DICK intends to continue speaking out and working against the tide of pollution which is degrading our water and air, and I know that the country will be the better for that.

RICHARD D. "MAX" MCCARTHY leaves the House, but he certainly can feel proud of his service here. His efforts were instrumental in arousing the Nation to the terrible tools of chemical and biological warfare which the Defense Department has been amassing. Today that same Department claims to have foresworn its previous activities, and "MAX" MCCARTHY can take satisfaction in that.

DANIEL BUTTON has been one of our most enlightened and progressive Members. His service in the House has been marked by a sincere commitment to justice, to peace, and to the betterment of the lot of all Americans.

Finally, I should like to note the departure of one of our former colleagues, now a Member of the U.S. Senate, from Congress—CHARLES GOODELL. He, too, will be missed, but I am sure he will not remain unheard from. And for that the country will be the better.

To all these men—my colleagues and my friends—I wish the best in the future. They have served well, and they should be proud of that. They will be missed.

STEPHEN A. POLLICINO

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 14, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, we sometimes forget what blessings one active and generous citizen can bring to his community. Today I want to call to the attention of Congress the remarkable contributions of Mr. Stephen A. Pollicino to the village of Island Park, whose fine public library stands as a monument to his dedication and vision.

Mr. Pollicino was instrumental in establishing the Island Park Library, and served as a trustee for 32 years. He was president of the board from 1939 to 1954, and guided the library's growth from one room in the village's first elementary school to its present modern quarters, housing a full range of services for all ages and interests.

Largely as a result of his work, Island Park, although one of the smallest communities on Long Island, maintains a dedicated and qualified library staff and an unusually fine collection of books and other materials. It is humbling and enormously encouraging, both, to think of the educational and cultural advantages that have been brought to the people of Island Park, and how many lives have been enriched, as a result of his efforts.

Now Mr. Pollicino is retiring, and it is good that his friends and neighbors have paused to honor him for all he has done so selflessly for so many years. But he has never rested on past achievements, and he will of course keep right on helping to maintain the dynamic approach that led Island Park to become one of the charter mebers of the Nassau County library system, and to participate in several pilot projects that were to become standard services throughout the county.

America needs more men like Stephen Pollicino whose love for books and people have done so much for his community. I am glad so many Members of the House have joined to wish him well and to tell him how grateful we are for the example he has set of public service at its best.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONFUSION ON VOTING AGE STATUTE

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, the recent fragmented opinions handed down by the Supreme Court on the voting age statute have done nothing to clear up the constitutional question of who, exactly, holds the power to set voting age qualifications.

The Justices' decision to lower the eligible voting age to 18 years only for national elections confirms my strong opinion that Congress does not have the power to set age eligibility for the several States. Any change of voting age requirements instituted on the National level should be attempted only by constitutional amendment.

Let me add, I am not opposed to lowering the voting age, but I do decry the manner in which the recent change was effected. Hopefully, the 92d Congress will take prompt steps to provide a constitutional amendment which can be submitted to the States for ratification and can clear up the constitutional confusion which now clouds this issue.

At this point, I insert an article which appeared in the Washington Post on December 30 in the RECORD. Written by Mr. Merlo J. Pusey and entitled "Court's Clouding of the 18-Year Vote," it presents an excellent analysis of the ramifications of the Court decision on the voting age statute, and well represents my own views on the matter. I commend it to everyone who is interested in this important legal question.

COURT'S CLOUDING OF THE 18-YEAR VOTE

(By Merlo J. Pusey)

Will the Supreme Court's decision in the 18-year-old vote case prove to be another "self-inflicted wound"? That term was originally used by Charles Evans Hughes, later Chief Justice, to describe the consequences of the Dred Scott decision and various others that brought disrepute upon the court. The current decision has proved to be popular, insofar as it permits citizens aged 18 to 21 to vote in national elections, but five wide-ranging opinions from the justices have churned the law on voter qualifications into a chaotic state.

The decision had to be communicated to the public with no one really speaking for the Supreme Court. Justice Black announced the judgment that 18-year-olds could vote in national but not in state and local elections; not one of his colleagues joined him in the opinion he wrote. Justices Brennan, White and Marshall (and Justice Douglas in a separate opinion) argued with considerable force that the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment is broad enough to allow Congress to override all laws fixing the voting age at 21. Justice Stewart, with the support of Chief Justice Burger and Justice Blackmun, accepted the Black thesis that the Constitution obviously leaves voter qualifications in local elections to the states (except in cases of invidious discrimination) but they parted company with Justice Black by insisting that the Constitution means what it says in providing that voter qualifications in congressional elections shall be the same as those for the most numerous branch of the state legislature. Justice Harlan rejected the basic idea of applying the equal protection clause to voter cases.

The effect is to leave the 18-year-old vote law hanging by the flimsiest thread. Justice Black acknowledged that the founding fathers had tied together voter qualifications in congressional elections and in state elections. Then he proceeded to pull them apart. His performance must be regarded as one of the strangest feats in the long history of American jurisprudence.

Where did the justice find authority for this bizarre conclusion? Article I, Section 4, of the Constitution provides—

The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each state by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations . . .

Justice Black read this as giving Congress sweeping authority over federal elections. But is says nothing whatsoever about any authority for Congress to change the qualifications of voters in defiance of the language in other parts of the Constitution.

Justice Stewart pointed out that the founding fathers were well acquainted with the world "qualifications." They used it in Article I, Section 2, when they said in very specific terms who was entitled to vote in congressional elections. They did not give Congress any authority to alter this section. Madison, Mason and others argued vehemently in the Constitutional Convention against giving Congress power to fix voter qualifications, and the Committee on Detail voted seven to one against a motion to let Congress exercise such power. On the basis of this Hamilton noted in "The Federalist" that the qualifications of voters in congressional elections "are defined and fixed in the Constitution and are unalterable by the legislature."

In the face of this history and the unquestioned language of the Constitution itself, the real question before the Court was whether enactment of the Fourteenth Amendment gave Congress power it did not previously have to fix a national and state age limit for voters. Justice Brennan and his supporters did not pretend to find anything specific in the Fourteenth Amendment giving Congress such power. They acknowledged that the authors of the equal protection clause "papered over their differences with . . . broad, elastic language." These justices were willing to let Congress inflate that "elastic language" into a balloon because they believe in the primacy of federal power.

Justice Black, to his credit, was not willing to go that far. But having substantially deflated the balloon fashioned from "elastic language," he turned and seemed to cut the ground from beneath his own position:

As broad as the congressional enforcement power is, it is not unlimited. Specifically, there are at least three limitations upon Congress' power to enforce the guarantees of the Civil War Amendments. First, Congress may not by legislation repeal other provisions of the Constitution.

Congress has, however, with Justice Black's approbation, repealed that portion of Article I, Section 2, which prescribes the qualifications of voters in congressional elections. The whole thrust of Justice Black's lone opinion is to allow Congress to do what he later says that it may not do. He goes on to recognize that "Congress has exceeded its powers in attempting to lower the voting age in state and local elections," without acknowledging that the Constitution puts federal voting qualifications in the same package. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that he is willing to stretch with the elasticity school in the case of national elections because he regards congressional control over national voter qualifications appropriate in 1970 regardless of what the founding fathers may have written into the Constitution nearly two centuries ago.

In any event, the performance of the Supreme Court is a shabby sequel to a shabby gesture in Congress. The clean and proper way to lower the voting age to 18 was, and is, a constitutional amendment. After all the squirming and twisting and inflation of elastic language, an amendment is still necessary. Much confusion and weakening of constitutional safeguards could have been avoided by approaching this reform in the right way in the first place. The court should have been spared the unquestioned wound it has inflicted upon itself.

JERUSALEM'S STATUS AND FUTURE DISCUSSED

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the foremost stumbling blocks to any stable Mideast settlement is the city of Jerusalem. Writers of the Christian Science Monitor discuss the present status of and future prospects for this city, which is hallowed ground for both Moslem and Christian, in the pair of articles that follow. I recommend them to my colleagues:

ISRAELI VIEW OF JERUSALEM: NATIONAL AND SPIRITUAL CAPITAL

(By Francis Ofner)

JERUSALEM.—On the via Dolorosa in the Arab sector of Jerusalem is the solid stone building of the Sisters of Zion. About 100 persons, mostly young men, were sipping tea and milling about on the roof terrace of the building.

It was an intermission between some evening courses—Hebrew language courses for Arabs and Arabic for Jews.

Five thousand students have attended these courses since they began about three years ago, Kalman Yaron said. He is the initiator and the driving force of the project which also includes social meetings as well as outings of mixed Arab-Jewish groups.

So far, about one thousand Jewish adults have attended the courses.

"This shows the Arabs that the 'victors' too take the trouble to learn the language of the other side," Mr. Yaron remarked.

"It may help us to understand one another," a middle-aged Arab student said.

"My learning has nothing to do with politics," another one added.

"I just want to know Hebrew so I could talk to my customers better in my souvenir shop," a young man explained.

REASSURANCE SENT

The idea for the project was born on the day when Israeli troops conquered the Jordanian town of Ramallah, some 20 miles north of Jerusalem, in the 1967 war. "A lone Arab, carrying a white flag, appeared in the deserted streets," Mr. Yatron recalled.

"I have a sister in San Francisco with serious heart trouble," the Arab told Mr. Yaron. "Worrying about the family could make her condition critical. Could you please send her a cable telling her that we are all safe?"

"He eagerly dug into his pocket and offered me a few dollars, but I refused to take them until I had sent the cable. I took his address and visited him after having reassured his sister."

This episode sparked a friendship between

the Jordanian, Yussaf Michael, and Mr. Yaron. In those days, immediately after the six-day war, hopes began to emerge on both sides. The Israelis believed that their Arab neighbors were ready to accept them and peace would come. And the Arabs in occupied territories were pleasantly surprised to see that, contrary to their expectations, the Israelis were not raping their women nor massacring the men.

OBSTACLES TORN DOWN

The climate of goodwill reached its peak after the Israeli Government tore down barbed wires and other physical obstacles which had previously separated the Jewish and Arab parts of Jerusalem for 19 years. A great number of Israelis began pouring into the Arab-inhabited old city on sightseeing and shopping treks. And entire Arab families, in a relaxed picniclike mood, were flooding into the new city, where the Jews live.

But the honeymoon was over by the end of the same year. Soon Palestinian guerrillas were again fighting the Israelis.

Several Jewish-Arab-owned restaurants have been among the places bombed in the old city. But the owners continue to operate their businesses.

The Israeli authorities clamped down by expelling to Jordan a number of prominent Arabs. These were accused of inciting the Arab inhabitants and organizing underground resistance against the Israelis.

But the friendship between Yussuf Michael and Kalman Yaron continued almost undisturbed. They went on visiting each other in their homes.

GOODWILL "BATTLE" WAGED

Another Israeli who is waging his personal goodwill battle among Arabs in Jerusalem is Zvi Arie Sebald, a social welfare officer of the municipality. Born in the Jewish quarter of the old city nearly half a century ago, Mr. Sebald was already a grown man when the Jordanians drove out the Jews in 1948.

"Under Israeli administration, nine times more people in the Arab parts of the city receive aid than they did under Jordanian rule," Mr. Sebald said. Then 73 families were on welfare, "and not one of them Christians." Now there are some 620 families who are receiving grants, and about one-sixth of them are Christians, he says.

Nearly 100 of these welfare checks go to families of Arab guerrillas detained by the Israelis.

Not only in social welfare and language courses, but in many other spheres too, Israeli Jews and also some Israeli Arabs are persistently trying to plant the seeds of goodwill in the ocean of Arab-Israeli hostility.

YOUTH CLUBS ESTABLISHED

To keep teen-agers off the streets, youth clubs have been set up by the Israelis.

The Histadrut, Israel's trade union federation, has organized 6,000 Arab workers from East Jerusalem into its ranks, and is striving for better wages and work conditions.

The most dynamic fighter in Jerusalem for better Arab-Jewish relations is Mayor Teddy Kollek. Vienna-born Mr. Kollek, who for many years was former Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion's right-hand man, is fearless in fighting both Arab and Jewish extremism.

The Mayor had just come from a round of courtesy visits to Arab mukhtars (head men) on the occasion of the Moslem Id el-Fitr feast when he received this reporter in his office.

"'Where do I have my greatest difficulties?' you ask. Not with the Arabs, but with Israel's Finance Minister, who will not give me all the funds I would like to have to develop Jerusalem," Mr. Kollek said with a broad smile.

Municipal development, however, is not Jerusalem's biggest problem. The question of Jerusalem's future looms as one of the most controversial issues in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

POLICY SPELLED OUT

The official Israeli policy was defined by Foreign Minister Abba Eban in a statement to the United Nations General Assembly: "Israel does not seek to exercise unilateral jurisdiction in the holy places of Christianity and Islam."

"We are willing in each case," Mr. Eban went on, "to work out a status to give effect to their universal character. We would like to discuss appropriate agreements with those traditionally concerned. Our policy is that the Christian and Moslem holy places should come under the responsibility of those who hold them in reverence."

Officials of the Israel Ministry of Justice point out that, contrary to general belief, East Jerusalem—the Hebrew name for the Arab parts of the city—was never formally annexed by Israel.

Under Israeli law, Arab inhabitants of East Jerusalem continue to be regarded as Jordanian citizens. They continue to retain their Jordanian passports and use them for traveling to Arab countries. The Israeli changes entitled Arab Jerusalemites to vote in municipal elections but not in elections for the Israeli Parliament.

RECOGNITION NOT GRANTED

At the same time, officials here point out that Jordan's own annexation of East Jerusalem, following its occupation of the city in 1948, has never been recognized by the world. The only countries which did extend formal recognition to Amman for its annexation of Jerusalem were Britain and Pakistan.

Whatever a future peace accord may bring, the Israelis are determined to prevent a renewed partition of Jerusalem and are opposed to returning the Arab part of the city to Jordan. The Israeli stand is based on several considerations:

They want to make it impossible that Arab soldiers would once more be capable of shooting from the old city wall at Israeli passers-by, as they did before the 1967 war.

They seek ensuring unhampered access to the Wailing Wall and other places of worship for Jews, who were forbidden to pray there during the years of Arab rule.

They aim at preventing additional destruction and desecrations of places of religious importance for Jews. According to official Israeli findings 35 synagogues and houses of worship were razed, hundreds of Torah scrolls burned, and thousands of tombstones broken to pieces and used as building material for Arab houses during the years of Jordanian rule.

CEMETERY LEVELED

Part of the cemetery on the Mount of Olives—throughout ages the most sacred burial place for pious Jews—was leveled and converted into a filling station and a parking lot.

Although Israelis are quick to disagree on many an issue, there is a surprising degree of consensus regarding the government's insistence on bringing Jerusalem under full Israeli sovereignty in any peace settlement.

The prevailing view was summed up by Rabbi Ezra Spicehandler, Director of Jewish Studies of the Hebrew Union College here.

"A renewed partition of Jerusalem? An Israel-Jordanian condominium? The internationalization of the city or part of it? Which is the suitable solution?" Rabbi Spicehandler asked. "The Jordanians disqualified themselves from administering this city of universal importance," he answered.

Furthermore, there is no precedent for a workable condominium or internationalization, at least not in our age, he pointed out. Not only Israel but Jordan, too, has opposed internationalization.

ARABS HOLD MAJORITY

The Arabs have a case for their control over East Jerusalem, many an Israeli acknowledges. They are the majority in the old city. The Harem es Sherif in Jerusalem is one of Islam's three holiest places. And third, East Jerusalem was under Arab rule for 19 years, between 1948 and 1967.

Jewish claims, however, are stronger, Rabbi Spicehandler said:

"Every Moslem or Christian nation has its own national capital: and has in addition to it also Rome or Mecca. But for the people of Israel there is only one city: Jerusalem. It is both the national capital and the religious-spiritual center. All in one.

"The overwhelming majority of Jerusalem's inhabitants are Jewish: more than three-quarters of the city's 280,000 population. The Jews have been the majority for more than 100 years.

"In a political sense," the State of Israel is more concerned with Christian and Moslem sensitivities, than is an Arab administration. "There are 14 Arab states in the United Nations and only a single Israel—the latter looking eagerly for international recognition. Jews simply can less afford to alienate Christians and Moslems," Rabbi Spicehandler concluded.

FLEXIBILITY POSSIBLE

The Israeli vision for Jerusalem's future foresees flexible arrangements for preserving Moslem and Christian interests. Mayor Kollek said: "If needed, I personally, shall support Arab demands for having their own municipal boroughs in a united city."

Some Israeli leaders even see no objection to flying the Jordanian or other Arab flags on Moslem holy shrines. Talks of two Vaticanlike enclaves—one for Christian and the other for Moslem holy places—have been alive ever since Foreign Minister Abba Eban was received by Pope Paul VI last year.

"Without Jerusalem, we are like a body without a heart," the late Prime Minister Levi Eshkol used to say. "We know that Jerusalem has a special meaning for Moslems and Christians as well. We are therefore ready for a dialogue. . . ."

The dialogue is only at its beginning. In the meantime, those mostly concerned—the people of this disputed city—are constantly discussing the city's political future, their future.

Whatever the hopes, whatever the fears, most of them—Arabs and Jews—agree that their beloved Jerusalem must remain united, that the wall and the barbed wires separating a living city that nightmare of the past, should never come back again.

One day, Michael, the Arab, told Yaron, the Jew, that he had a dream. "I dreamt that again there was a wall between Arabs and Jews in Jerusalem," he said. "I felt most uncomfortable. I did not know how to talk to you. My only hope was that perhaps they forgot to cut the telephone line. I woke up drenched in sweat."

"My Arab friend's dream made me more aware than ever of the depth of the problem," Mr. Yaron explained to me. "I began building more 'telephone lines.' . . ."

ARAB VIEW OF EAST JERUSALEM: A REJECTION OF ISRAELI RULE

(By John K. Cooley)

BEIRUT, LEBANON.—At this Christmas season, as during the three proceding ones since the Arab-Israeli war of 1967, Jerusalem lies at the heart of all efforts to find peace in the Middle East.

No thoughtful or responsible Arab, either Muslim or Christian, wants a restoration of the walls and barriers that divided Jerusalem before Israel's conquest of the entire city in June, 1967. But virtually all Arabs and the world's vast nonArab Muslim communities reject Israeli rule over Arab East Jerusalem and the changes it has brought.

Prof. Walid Khalidi, professor of political studies and public administration at the American University of Bierut, is a Jerusalem Arab whose forebears have lived continuously in Jerusalem for the past 1,000 years.

Professor Khalidi recalls his last conversation with Teddy Kollek, now the Israeli Mayor of Jerusalem. It was in the salon of a Cairo hotel in 1946, two years before Israel came into being.

Mr. Kollek, who had been buying arms for the Zionist movement in the United States, was reading a classic work on Egyptian manners and mores.

Mr. Khalidi, browsing through a book on French impressionist painting, remarked conversationally to Mr. Kollek, "You believe in practical reading."

NO MORE MISTAKES

"Yes," Mr. Kollek replied, "there's nothing like knowing one's neighbors. . . . In any case, we don't plan to make the same mistake the Crusaders made in the Holy Land in the Middle Ages."

"Oh?" asked Mr. Khalidi. "What was that?"

"The Crusaders didn't bring in enough people to make their presence last. But we will!" answered Mr. Kollek.

Throughout 1970, Jerusalem' Arabs have been witnessing the fulfillment of Prime Minister Golda Meir's often repeated pledge to make "the whole City of Jerusalem Israel's capital."

Of all of Israel's 1967 territorial conquests, this is the hardest for Arabs to swallow. It is certain to be one of the toughest items on the agenda of any Arab-Israeli peace talks.

ARABS PUSHED OUT

Since the 1967 war, nearly 5,000 of the approximately 66,000 East Jerusalem Arabs living there when the war came have left their homes or been expelled from them. This year, somewhere in the neighborhood of 4,000 acres of Arab land within the new, greatly expanded city limit were expropriated. The amount seized since East Jerusalem was annexed to Israel in June, 1967, now is well over 5,000 acres.

Last May 17, Israeli Minister of State Shimon Peres announced a plan to double the present Jewish population of 200,000 within five years.

Arabs noted with dismay an Israeli city plan presented last August to extend still farther the city's boundaries, taking in another purely Arab area, Beit Jala, just north of Bethlehem. This coincides with the start of work to build new Jewish quarters and Jewish settlements in the West Jordan Arab city of Hebron, south of Bethlehem, where small settlements of Jews existed before the Arab-Jewish communal fighting of 1929.

APARTMENT BUILDINGS RISE

Big Israeli apartment projects are being rushed to provide housing for fresh Jewish immigrants from abroad to East Jerusalem. The most spectacular, and the most alarming to Arabs, is the new Ramat Eshkol quarter, including 2,500 housing units on 150 acres of seized Arab land.

Ramat Eshkol is placed in a crescent around the eastern border of West Jerusalem. According to Israeli Housing Minister Zeev Sharef, only 150 units of it are to be allotted to Arabs.

Jacob Talman, a Jewish professor of modern history at Jerusalem's Hebrew University, wrote in the Israeli newspaper Haaretz Aug. 20 that Jewish settlement "only confirms Arab fears that there is no intention of withdrawing from the occupied areas."

Not a single member of the world community has recognized Israel's annexation and changes in East Jerusalem as legal. Charles W. Yost, former United States Representative to the United Nations, told the UN Security Council on July 1, 1969:

"The expropriation or confiscation of land, the construction of housing on such land, the demolition of buildings, including those having historic or religious significance, and the application of Israeli law to occupied portions of the city are detrimental to our common interests in the city."

REPRISALS TAKEN

Yusuf Sayegh, a Palestinian economist, in detailed testimony to the UN group last April summed up the economic hardships of the Israeli occupation for the Arabs of Jerusalem and elsewhere.

These include destruction of houses and capital goods as reprisals for real or suspected anti-Israeli underground or guerrilla activity.

Several hundred prominent Jerusalem Arabs, active in civic affairs, professions or religion, have been expelled to East Jordan on Israeli administrative orders without a court case ever being brought against them.

Jerusalem's thousands of Arab shopkeepers, resisting as best they can the onerous Israeli tax and licensing laws, find they must buy from Israeli wholesalers or sell out. As soon as the Arab leaves, his shop is seized under Israel's absentee property law of 1950, the same law which enabled Israel to seize hundreds of thousands of acres of the best Arab-owned land inside pre-1967 Israel.

"The forced evacuation of homes," says Mr. Sayegh, "is often done not even under the pretext of security or for public-welfare projects but simply to make room for Jewish settlers.

"One illustrious example of this is a house that had to be vacated to make room for Gen. Yigal Allon [Israeli Deputy Prime Minister]" in the Old City.

Arab hotel keepers, tourist guides to the holy places, and taxi drivers in East Jerusalem are in dire straits because of the loss of tourism.

Last Easter, according to official Israeli reports, there were less than 400 Christian Arabs in the traditional Good Friday procession and only about 2,000 pilgrims, as against 30,000 last year, half of them Arabs.

EARLY HOPES DASHED

The tearing down in June, 1967, of the barriers along the 1949 Jordan-Israel armistice line raised some hopes that Jews and Arabs would freely mix. After some early curiosity by both sides, visits thinned out to a trickle. Most Arab residents, except menial laborers who go to jobs there, avoid the western city.

There have been many proposals to internationalize Jerusalem including the UN partition plan of 1947. Another, almost-forgotten proposal that may be raised in any eventual peace talks, was made by Sir William Fitzgerald, an official of Britain's pre-1948 mandatory government, in August, 1945, but never implemented.

MIXED COUNCIL PROPOSED

He proposed that a mixed Arab-Jewish council administer the municipality which would be divided into two municipal "boroughs as the County of London is divided." Each borough, the Jewish and the Arab one, would choose its own mayor and governing council and would run most of its own affairs. Four persons from each borough would serve on the central council.

King Hussein of Jordan has discussed with President Nixon and with Arab rulers proposals raised by Israel's and some West Bank Arabs for formation of a Palestinian Arab state on West Bank territory. King Hussein has found little support for the idea.

Both the Palestinian guerrillas and the Israeli Government totally reject it.

Israel would prefer such a state to include the present territory of East Jordan, with its capital at Amman. Both Palestinians and Israelis realize that any Arab state confined to the Palestinians of the West Bank could have only one natural capital: Arab Jerusalem.

EULOGY FOR MARGARET WALDMAN

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Mike Waldman is one of the most respected men in the Washington Press Corps. He is respected for his integrity and compassion, and for the thoroughness of his reporting. More than that, he is beloved in a city where that is not the customary emotion reserved for men of his profession.

It will sadden countless people whose lives have been brightened by contact with Mike Waldman and his wonderful wife, Jean, to learn that their daughter died suddenly and almost without warning at the age of 8. Margaret was a sparkling child, brilliant and warm, as beloved among her peers as are her parents among theirs. She loved life and made life more lovable for all who knew her. The heart breaks to think what the loss of such a child must do to her immediate family.

We are grateful that Margaret Waldman was with us for a few years, and desolate that the years were so few, that so much joy is now denied forever to all who survive her. We grieve for the Waldman family, one of those marvelous families whose members enjoy each other and share that enjoyment ungrudgingly with everyone else. Our prayers are with them, and we wish there were some way we could ease their burden. I am glad so many Members of the House have joined to pay tribute today to this rare spirit taken so suddenly from our midst. I am including in the RECORD some remarks about Margaret by her teacher at the Parkwood School, and a number of poems Margaret had written. Those who knew Margaret will cherish these tokens of her memory, and those who did not know her may share a hint of the radiance she added wherever she went.

EULOGY FOR MARGARET PAULINE WALDMAN

August 9, 1962—November 28, 1970

(By Audrie Allen)

In the course of most of our lives, there flashes across the horizon of one's consciousness a star—like a bright and shining jewel that illuminates the lives of every soul touched by its radiance.

Mararet Waldman was such a rare and beautiful person who for a little while we were privileged to have among us.

Margaret was in my first grade class at Parkwood School, and at the end of the school year the teacher was allowed to be promoted to the second grade with this fine group of children. So for two years, I had the good fortune to be Margaret's teacher: And what a joy it was to have this wonderful child in my room!

Margaret was a brilliant child, but the qualities which so greatly endeared her to me, the other teachers, and to the boys and girls, were a consumate sweetness and a selflessness which were manifested even at an early age. Even when it was occasionally necessary to admonish her with a word, she always responded with a smile and a willingness to do as she was asked.

Margaret possessed an unusual ability to assume leadership among her friends. She

loved to direct little plays, to lead in group singing to create her own stories and poems—in all of these areas she excelled. She was patient and always willing to help other children.

Margaret came from a happy home. She spoke lovingly of her two brothers, Norris and Danny. The influence of Jean and Myron Waldman was embodied in the development of this remarkable and lovable child. It is only with the nurturing of a precious soul by loving parents that brings to fruition a person like Margaret.

I HEART

I am a little heart on a shelf
And I am lonely
Along comes my love
And I am not lonely

COLORS

White is for the eggs, that we sometimes eat,
White is the clouds, that look so sweet.

Gold is the sun, shining so bright
Gold is so pretty, what a beautiful sight!

Red is a beautiful evening gown,
Red is the bricks all over the town.

Yellow is the lemon that is always sour
Yellow is almost all full of power!

Green is for St. Pateriks Day,
Green is like the month of May.

Blue is the beautiful morning sky,
Blue is the beautiful heavens so high.

SUMMER! SUMMER! SUMMER IS HERE!

Soon summer will be hear. And then
I hear you yell, in my ear, "Summer! Summer!
Summer is hear! All the butterflies are flying.
Babies in the park are crying! Let's have fun just like a hot bun!

Summer is almost hear! And then I hear you yell in my ear,
Summer! Summer! Summer is hear.
All the butterflies are flying, babies in the park are crying!
Let's have fun, Just like a hot bun.

THE WEATHER

All the colored leaves are blowing—Blowing swiftly. As the leaves go, Past me, I get cold.—Dust blows in My eyes. Someday it will snow.

FALL IS HERE

Fall is here. Summer is gone. No one wares bathing units any more. Now we go to school. No more bathing suits.

MARGARET

Planets. tickle,-touch tightly, causing little thrills, shivers, or wriggles. sod,-ground covered with grass. hammock-hanging bed—or couch.

NO TITLE

Hello jump rope. Hello swing. Good-by winter. Hello spring!

THE WALDMAN FAMILY

ME

See Me. My name is Margaret. I like to play with my farm set.

MOTHER

This is Mother. Her name is Jean. She is pretty.

FATHER

This is father. He is sweet. His name is Myron.

MY BROTHERS

I have two brothers. Their names are Morris and Daniel.

MY HOUSE

See my house. It is pretty.

ME

(By Margaret Waldman)

One day my mother
got married
to my father.
Soon my father took
my mother
to the hospital.

My mother
had a baby.
It was a girl.
Soon my mother went
home. She
called the little girl
Margaret.

Soon I was
1 years old.
I had a nice
Birthday
Party.

But in two
years—or 1
another
baby was born.

When I was
3 my mommy
gave me
reading lessons
like this.

When I was
3 I had friends
like this.

When I was 4
I had a Big
Birthday Party.

When I was 5
I moved in
To a House
Like this.

When I was 6
I went to
school
like this.

MARGARET

To Mommy
and
Daddy
Dear Mo–
mmy and
Daddy, I love you very m–
uch. There are
no other
Mommys or
Daddys in
the world like
you.
love,
Margaret

SANTA CLAUS

Do not cry,
Do not fight,
Santa's coming
Tonight!

JACK FROST

Today I woke up early.
Was it snow? No.
Was it silver spider webs?
No. It's Jack Frost!

MOTHER SUN

Old mother sun, she's warm and fun.
She gives us light, she's warm and bright.
"Will she ever die?" "I don't know why!"
"How many babies does she have?" "One, two, three,
four, five, six, seven, eight, nine! Now that's Fine'"

OLD, GOOD SUN

Old, good sun, she's warm, she's fun.
She gives us light, she's warm she's bright. Who gives us warmth? Who gives us light? She does! She does! She's all right.

IN SPRING

(By M. P. Waldman)

In Spring there are butterflies
and bees. There are baby birds.
But I think the most wonderful thing
about spring is that I can go
barefoot.

NO TITLE

I love you!
I Love you!
I Love
YOU!

DECREASE IN NATIVE-BORN POPULATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, judging from the figures released by the Census Bureau, the population control people are barking up the wrong tree with family planning.

According to statistics, immigration control and not abortion and limitation of children is the answer to the U.S. population explosion.

Mr. Speaker, I insert several related news clippings in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 30, 1970]

NONWHITE IMMIGRATION ROSE SHARPLY IN SIXTIES

DETROIT.—U.S. Census Bureau figures showed Tuesday that nonwhite immigration in the United States jumped sharply between 1960 and 1970, according for 13.6 per cent of all immigrants.

This compares to 4.4 per cent for the previous 10 years, reported Robert Warren, a Census Bureau official who announced the figures at the Allied Social Sciences Convention.

He said the increase stemmed from the Immigration Act of 1965, which for the first time allowed large-scale immigration from countries outside of northern Europe.

He said nonwhite immigration was 132,000 in the 1950s, compared to 524,000 in the last decade.

Warren said he could not provide figures on specific rates, but said that the immigration of Asians appear to be predominant.

He said the "nonwhites" category includes Negroes from Africa, Central and South America, and Chinese, Japanese and other Asians.

Warren said immigration from 1960–70 was about 3.9 million persons, which was a 900,000 increase over the previous decade.

He said immigation has become increasingly important, noting there were decreased rates of births in the United States.

Warren also said that immigration accounts for about 20 per cent of total population growth, while it was 11 per cent a decade ago.

He noted that about 250,000 persons left the United States in the 10-year period to go to other countries.

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 18, 1970]

34,175 ABORTIONS

ALBANY, N.Y.—The State Health Department says 34,175 induced abortions were reported in New York State during the first four months the liberalized abortion law was in effect.

OBSTRUCTIONISM WITHIN CONGRESS

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the Congress to act on important legislation during the session now drawing to a close is inexcusable. The Nixon administration has sent numerous proposals to the Congress on critical issues, and yet it is now evident that much of these legislative proposals will not have been enacted when the present Congress adjourns.

There are several reasons for this impasse but paramount is the obstructionism practiced by some members of the political opposition in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, these points are especially well made by Mr. David Lawrence in a recent column entitled "Obstructionism Within Congress" which appeared in the Washington Star on December 23, 1970. I insert Mr. Lawrence's column for reprinting in the RECORD at this point:

OBSTRUCTIONISM WITHIN CONGRESS

(By David Lawrence)

The American people are being given a dramatic example of the confusion in their governmental system brought about by the fact that the executive department is controlled by one party and the legislative branch is dominated by a majority from another party.

The country today is witnessing the interjection of numerous obstructive devices which are preventing necessary legislation from being passed by the lame-duck session of the 91st Congress. There is not much prospect that the new Congress, which begins in January, will be able to do any better toward a prompt disposition of the many pressing measures.

President Nixon is so disappointed by the failure of the Senate to act on increases in Social Security benefits that he has announced he will resubmit the measure to the next Congress and will propose that the rises be retroactive to Jan. 1, 1971. He expresses the hope that no Social Security recipient will be harmed by the Senate's failure to pass this bill.

Nixon has been urging Congress to deal not only with Social Security, but with other vital bills, such as welfare reforms, appropriation bills and the supersonic transport plane.

He feels that there should be plenty of time to do what's necessary before the current Congress expires on Jan. 3. If the Senate is unwilling to adopt these measures, however, he is going to resubmit them all when the new session of Congress starts.

The 92d Congress is due to convene on Jan. 21, but there has been talk that the President might call it into session on Jan. 3 in order to accelerate action.

The food-stamp program, for instance, was deadlocked for some time. It allows for food to be bought at discount prices by 8.8 million poor Americans. The program provides that recipients may purchase a specified amount of food stamps. These are then cashed in for groceries worth more than the stamps cost. Thus, a family of four with a monthly income of $200 can pay $60 for stamps worth $106 in groceries. The federal government makes up the difference.

Involved in the stalemate was a provision that requires all adults—except mothers of young children and students in a food-stamp family—to accept work or forfeit the family's entire stamp allotment. There is still a chance that the whole plan will be rejected.

Also, the President is complaining because Congress did not accept his plan to eliminate a special milk program costing $104 million, which provides cut-rate milk for schoolchildren regardless of family income.

He insists the government should support food programs that concentrate on helping the needy, instead of subsidizing rich and poor alike. While he considered vetoing the bill, he decided to sign it because there isn't time enough in the present session to pass a better measure.

Can it be expected, though, that the incoming Congress will do any better than its predecessor?

The primary trouble is in the conference committees. The general public knows very little about the negotiations between the Senate and the House conference groups.

Although measures may have passed both houses, there are often differences in them which have to be reconciled so as to prepare one bill that each house can accept. It is very easy, therefore, for individual senators who have axes to grind and who want to block legislation to demand certain changes and hold up compromises.

Plenty of influence is exerted by individuals who are chairman of committees or who are leaders of other committees which handle important legislation. So when the time comes for negotiating a settlement in a conference committee, it often takes a long while for an agreement to be worked out. Also, what may be acceptable to a majority in Congress isn't always satisfactory to the President.

The general public, of course, knows very little about the details of what goes on in congressional negotiations. At the moment, many vital pieces of legislation are being delayed.

Thus, it is possible that an early session of the next Congress will be called to secure passage of essential measures that the President feels should be acted upon at once. The whole situation hardly reflects an orderly process of government.

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, "MAX" MCCARTHY will be missed in the House of Representatives. He will be missed in the country. He stands as proof that one Member does make a difference—a big difference. While the issue of chemical and biological warfare may have been Congressman MCCARTHY's most dramatic triumph, it was not the only time that he made the difference.

Whether it was the war, or reform of the procedures of this House, or the great issues of mass transportation—time after time he gave conscience to the issues which ought to be before us and need the voice and vigor of a representatives who cares.

Mr. Speaker, MAX MCCARTHY was a Congressman who cared, and the people are the better for his having been here. We will miss him, and can be grateful that his vigor and enthusiasm will continue to be given to the cause of moving this country forward.

THE LATE HON. ROBERT W. LISHMAN

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of Robert W. Lishman, counsel for the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, was noted in a number of newspapers and periodicals. These articles provide a review of some of the details of Mr. Lishman's career with the committee and his achievements as subcommittee counsel. Many Members will remember personally some of the important investigations held by the subcommittee during the period of Mr. Lishman's service. In the interest of preserving an official record of these journalistic accounts that were published on the occasion of Mr. Lishman's death. I offer them for inclusion at this time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His career with the subcommittee led to investigations of considerable consequence and historical importance. In a democracy, there can be no more important function than insuring the integrity of the men and practices involved in Government and in the important industries, such as broadcasting, that are regulated by the Government. Mr. Lishman's work for the House of Representatives contributed to both areas.

The articles follow:

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

ROBERT LISHMAN, INVESTIGATOR, 67; COUNSEL WHO LED SHERMAN ADAMS INQUIRY IS DEAD

WASHINGTON, December 15.—Robert W. Lishman, chief counsel of the House Commerce Committee's subcommittee on investigations, died today of cancer at Sibley Hospital. He was 67 years old.

MAN OF VARIED TALENTS

Robert William Fishman, a fly-fisherman, a student of the history and philosophy of ancient Greece and a doubles tennis player, came to public attention as a soft-spoken but indefatigable Congressional investigator.

During the Eisenhower Administration, he directed the inquiry into the conduct of Sherman Adams, secretary to the President, and his relationship with Bernard Goldfine, the industrialist. He also investigated the rigging of television quiz shows.

When Mr. Lishman took the subcommittee post in 1958, he commented:

"I accept the appointment on the distinct understanding with the subcommittee that within the limits of their procedure I am to be independent and won't pull any punches. . . . It is my belief that the counsel is best seen and not heard unless the subcommittee tells him to be heard."

Mr. Lishman, who was born in Boston, was graduated from Harvard University and the Harvard Law School. In 1934 he was named Assistant Corporation Counsel of New York by Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia. He represented the city before the Interstate Commerce Commission and other Federal regulatory agencies.

He went to Washington at the beginning of World War II as an official of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, where he specialized in the conversion of manufacturing plants from peacetime use to the production of defense materials.

Mr. Lishman returned to Washington in 1954 and in 1958 became chief counsel of the then special subcommittee on legislative oversight of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

It was in this post that his investigation led to the resignation of Mr. Adams and the disclosure of the television and radio quiz contest and payola scandals.

Mr. Lishman engaged in private practice for five years but rejoined the special subcommittee early in 1966 at the request of its chairman, Representative Harley O. Staggers, Democrat of West Virginia.

He leaves his wife, Elinor; a daughter, Mrs. Ellen M. Robertson; two sons, Robert W. Jr. and a granddaughter.

A memorial service will be held on Friday at St. Alban's Episcopal Church in Washington.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 16, 1970]

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE COUNSEL ROBERT LISHMAN DIES AT 66

(By Ellen Hoffman)

Robert W. Lishman, 66, counsel to the House subcommittee that investigated rigged television quiz shows and the dealings of industrialist Bernard Goldfine, died Tuesday of Cancer at Sibley Hospital.

At the time of his death, Mr. Lishman was chief conusel of the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He had been in the post since 1966.

From 1958 to 1961, Mr. Lishman served as chief counsel to the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee, which preceded the Investigations Subcommittee.

At the hearings on the financial and political dealings of Goldfine in 1958, Mr. Lishman produced a list of the names of 37 congressional and White House employees to whom the New England industrialist had written checks as "Christmas gifts."

On the list was the name of secretary to presidential aide Sherman Adams. Adams later resigned after it was revealed that he had received a vicuma coat and other gifts from Goldfine.

Following the hearings Goldfine received a one-year suspended sentence and a $1,000 fine for contempt of Congress.

Mr. Lishman was also counsel to the Committee during the 1959 hearings on rigging of television quiz shows. The hearings included testimony from participants who revealed that they had received questions and answers in advance of their television appearances.

Mr. Lishman was born in Boston and was a graduate of Harvard University and Law School. In 1929 he joined the New York firm of Fletcher & Brown.

He became assistant corporation counsel in New York under Mayor LaGuardia in 1934. While in that job his assisted in the development of LaGuardia Airport and the city's rapid transit system.

He became a utility and franchise expert, representing the city before the Interstate Commerce Commission and other government regulatory agencies.

At the beginning of World War II, Mr. Lishman came to Washington to work for the Reconstruction Finance Corp., where he specialized in conversion of manufacturing plants from peacetime to wartime uses.

After the war he was a partner in the law firm of Knox, Matthews and Lishman, and later in the firm of Harter, Calhoun, Williams and Lishman.

He was a member of the Chevy Chase Club, the University Club, the Harvard Clubs of New York and Washington, the National Lawyers Club, the Barristers Lodge and the National Capital Democratic Club.

Mr. Lishman is survived by his wife, Elinor, of the home, 4853 Rockwood Pkwy. NW; a daughter, Ellen M. Robertson of Gaithersburg; two sons, Robert W., Jr. of Atherton, Calif. and John M. of La Jolla, Calif., and a grandchild.

[From Television Digest, Dec. 21, 1970]

ROBERT W. LISHMAN

Robert W. Lishman, 67, chief counsel of House Special Subcommittee on Investigations, died Dec. 15 in Sibley Hospital, Washington, of cancer. Native of Boston and graduate of Harvard Law School, he directed many headline-making investigations into broadcasting—ex parte contacts with FCC members, rigged quiz shows, payola, ratings, Pot Party, trafficking in licenses, Commission renewal policies. He first joined Subcommittee in 1958 at height of ex parte investigations, left in 1961, returned in 1966. His last act for Subcommittee was letter to Staggers criticizing FCC renewal policy (Vol. 10:49 p1) which accompanied critical staff report (see p. 2). Survivors include wife, daughter, 2 sons.

[From the Washington Daily News, Dec. 16, 1970]

ROBERT LISHMAN

Services will be held at noon Friday at St. Alban's Episcopal Church for Robert W. Lishman, 66, chief counsel of the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. Lishman, who died yesterday at Sibley Hosiptal, had worked with various Hill committees since 1958 and was counsel to the House group which probed rigged TV quiz shows in 1958. He also was counsel in the 1958 investigation against industrialist Bernard Goldfine, who was convicted of contempt of Congress and fined $1,000. Among recipients of "gifts" from the industrialist, according to the hearings, was White House aide Sherman Adams, who later resigned.

[From Traffic World, Dec. 21, 1970]

LISHMAN, COUNSEL TO HOUSE INVESTIGATIONS UNIT, DIES

Robert W. Lishman, chief counsel to the special subcommittee on investigations of the House interstate and foreign commerce committee, died of cancer December 15 at Sibley hospital in Washington, D.C. He was 67 years old.

Mr. Lishman was first named chief counsel in 1958 when the subcommittee was known as the special subcommittee on legislative oversight. He resigned to enter private practice for a period of five years and rejoined the subcommittee again in 1966 as chief counsel at the request of Representative Harley O. Staggers (D-W. Va.) chairman of the committee.

Mr. Lishman, though in failing health in recent years, was regarded as an indefatigable investigator. Scandals unearthed by the subcommittee during Mr. Lishman's years of service included the radio and television payola cases and alleged payoffs involving then White House aide Sherman Adams, resulting in Mr. Adams' resignation.

In recent months, Mr. Lishman had trained his guns on the Interstate Commerce Commission producing evidence of improper conduct of some ICC officials with members of the industries regulated by that agency.

In one of the more dramatic incidents of that investigation, ICC Secretary Neil Garson publicly resigned from the Commission (T.W., Aug. 3, p. 11).

Mr. Lishman is survived by his wife, Elinor; a daughter, Mrs. Ellen M. Robertson; two sons, Robert W., Jr., and John M., and a granddaughter.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Dec. 16, 1970]

ROBERT W. LISHMAN DIES; CONGRESSIONAL COUNSEL

Robert W. Lishman, 67, chief counsel of the Special Investigations subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, died of cancer yesterday in Sibley Memorial Hospital. He lived at 4853 Rockwood Parkway NW.

As the subcommittee's chief counsel, Mr. Lishman presided over hearings into alleged influence peddling involving Boston industrialist Bernard Goldfine and President Eisenhower's assistant, Sherman Adams, the television quiz show scandals and "payola" in radio and television.

Mr. Lishman was born in Boston and graduated magna cum laude from the Harvard University Law School in 1929. Later that year, he joined the New York law firm of Fletcher & Brown.

He became New York's assistant corporation counsel in 1934 under Mayor Fiorello La Guardia. Recognized as a utility and franchise expert, he assisted in the development of La Guardia airport and the city's rapid transit system.

Mr. Lishman began his federal service with the old Reconstruction Finance Corp. during Warld War II as a specialist in converting manufacturing plants from peacetime to wartime uses. He also participated in the Manhattan project.

He left the federal government in 1944 to become a partner in the District law firm of Knox, Matthews & Lishman. In 1954, he joined the firm of Harter, Calhoun, Williams & Lishman here.

In 1958, he accepted an appointment by then House Speaker Sam Rayburn to serve as chief counsel of the special subcommittee.

Mr. Lishman returned to private law in 1961 but rejoined the subcommittee in 1966 to serve again as chief counsel at the request of its chairman, Rep. Harley O. Staggers, D-W. Va.

He was a member of the state bars of New York and Massachusetts and of the District Bar. He also was a member of the American Bar Association, the Association of the Bar of New York City, the Federal Power Bar Association and the Interstate Commerce Bar Association.

Mr. Lishman was chairman of the board of trustees of Landon School for Boys and a member of the Chevy Chase Club, the University Club, the Harvard Club of New York and the District, the National Lawyers' Club, the Barristers' Lodge and the National Capital Democratic Club.

He leaves his wife, Elinor; a daughter, Mrs. George A. Robertson of Gaithersburg, Md.; two sons, Robert W. Jr., of Atherton, Calif., and John M., of the District, and a granddaughter.

A memorial service will be held at noon Friday at St. Alban's Episcopal Church, Massachusetts and Wisconsin Avenues nw. Burial will be in Philadelphia.

The family requests that expressions of sympathy be in the form of contribution to a favorite charity.

[From Broadcasting Magazine, Dec. 21, 1970]

ROBERT LISHMAN

Robert W. Lishman, 67, chief counsel of Special Subcommittee on Investigations, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, died Dec. 15 at Sibley Memorial hospital, Washington, of cancer. Mr. Lishman presided over proceedings concerning rigged

TV-quiz show scandals and payola. He is survived by his wife, Elinor, one daughter, and two sons.

[From Time Magazine, Dec. 28, 1970]

ROBERT LISHMAN DIED

Robert Lishman, 67, indefatigable congressional investigator; of cancer; in Washington, D.C. As chief counsel of a House subcommittee, Lishman directed the 1958 inquiry that led to the resignation of Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams for accepting gifts from Industrialist Bernard Goldfine; a year later, Lishman was instrumental in exposing rigged TV quiz shows.

HOLDING THE LINE ON FEDERAL SPENDING IN 1971

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the moment of moving into a new year and a new Congress is a particularly auspicious one for taking a hard look at the perennial problem of burgeoning Federal spending, now over $200 billion and still climbing.

That is almost exactly one thousand dollars apiece for every man, woman, and child in these United States.

No longer can we say that these astronomical totals are required by, or primarily due to, the needs of national defense. The Congress, just completing its work, substantially cut defense expenditures despite the fact that the budget as a whole continues to grow. More and more, the lion's share is going to nondefense spending—most of which is in reality the redistribution of wealth by government. We used to call that socialism.

The following survey of annual nondefense spending at 10-year intervals, prepared at my request by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, demonstrates better than any lengthy verbal explanation the enormity of our commitment to letting government do for us what we can do for ourselves:

Nondefense Federal outlays, 1890–1970

1890	$251,391,667
1900	330,133,001
1910	380,619,969
1920	3,999,706,226
1930	2,481,193,939
1940	7,256,624,257
1950	26,104,391,103
1960	48,254,505,857
1970	119,000,000,000

Contemplating figures like these, one is very much inclined to say, as Garet Garrett did in his famous essay on the first 5 years of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal, "The revolution was."

And still it continues, though it would be hard to find a man who could point to any major task in the economy which government performs better than free enterprise. One need only think of the Post Office.

On December 16 the House of Representatives debated this years' food stamp bill. It affords one of the best examples I have yet seen of how Federal programs grow to such monstrous proportions, and come to be used and abused in ways their original architects—or at least those who first voted for them—never dreamed of.

The original purpose of the food stamp program, viewed superficially, made some sense. The one indispensable need of man is food. Some people do not get enough to eat. By issuing food stamps we would "cut out the middleman" and provide the genuinely poor and needy with their "daily bread."

Yet the food stamp program was not enacted as a substitute for or improvement on any existing welfare program, but as an addition to them. Welfare recipients were given both money and stamps. And the food stamp program grew just as nondefense spending in general has grown. The ranking Republican on the House Agriculture Committee pointed out in the debate on the bill that in 1967 Congress appropriated $115 million for food stamps; in 1968, $187 million; in 1969, $251 million; in 1970, $610 million; and in 1972 the food stamp appropriation is expected to be $1.42 billion. Food stamp boosters are already calling for $2 billion a year.

Food stamps are now readily available to striking union members, which means that the taxpayers are subsidizing one side in labor disputes. One of the principal supporters of the food stamp bill admitted in the December 16 House debate that 18,461 out of 60,000 General Motors auto workers recently on strike in Detroit qualified for food stamps. An attempt to restrict strikers' eligibility for food stamps was approved by the House on a nonrecord teller vote, but then reversed on a record vote by a margin of 183 to 172. Yet if the public in general had been voting on this, I am certain they would have rejected food stamps for strikers by an overwhelming majority.

At the very least, let's stop the budget skyrocket for 1 year—this coming year of 1971—at $200 billion plus. It would be best if Congress refused to vote a single nondefense spending increase during the coming new year; and there can be no possible justification, in light of the record just reviewed, for increases in any program or benefits exceeding the annual inflation rate.

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it has been a particular pleasure for me to serve with my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN. He has served his people with distinction. He has been a most valuable member of my Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, and a leading participant on the side of the public in a number of conservation fights. He has been particularly effective in the effort for full funding of the Clean Water Restoration Act, which resulted in an appropriation of $800 million last year, and $1 billion this year.

He has been a distinguished and valuable Member of this body and will be sorely missed as a good friend by all of us who have had the privilege of serving with him.

THE KISSINGER VARIANT

HON. JOHN G SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the Armed Forces Journal of December 21, 1970, contained a most thoughtful and cogent letter written by Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, U.S. Army retired.

General Lane feels that if we continue to allow the North Vietnamese Communists to have secure rear areas in the form of sanctuaries the maintenance of a non-Communist Southeast Asia is highly unlikely.

General Lane also points out that "the horrendous error of both the Rostow and the Kissinger theses is the premise that the nuclear age rules out victory. The general, in my opinion, is entirely correct on this point. It is not the nuclear age which makes victory unobtainable. Victory is not achieved in Vietnam and elsewhere because it is never sought. Limited wars, of the no-win variety stem directly from the limited minds of the men who formulate our national strategy. Victory is achieved when the enemy powers of resistance, material, and morale, are sufficiently lowered so that he no longer has the capability to wage further organized resistance. This holds true whether it be the nuclear age or the stone age.

While General Lane feels that the fear of goading the Soviets into initiating a strike on the continental United States has been the motive behind limiting the operations of our forces to the point where they cannot defeat the enemy, Dr. Henry Kissinger has recently dispelled this notion as the basis of our no-win policy in Vietnam. In a news conference on the 26th of June this year Dr. Kissinger clearly stated:

Incidentally, I would have to say that if there is the danger of a general war in this Administration, I do not believe, and we do not believe that it will come from Southeast Asia. It is very hard to see what we could do in Southeast Asia that would produce a direct confrontation with the Soviet Union.

Although the United States continues to abjure victory, the one bit of logic behind this renunciation—unacceptable as it was both in theory and in fact—has vanished. It is time to take the war to the enemy in a serious and determined fashion. The fact that it is the twentieth century does not mean that it is time to start losing wars. We have the means on hand in Southeast Asia to bring the war to a quick and honorable end. Let us use them.

THE KISSINGER VARIANT

The commentary of Col. William E. Simons (Journal 16 Nov.) on the Naval War

College statement of Walt W. Rostow (Journal 27 June) gives an interesting insight into current war policy. Col Simons is of course stating the Kissinger variant of the Rostow thesis. As he noted, he can do no more.

But both the Rostow thesis and the Kissinger variant are clearly disastrous policy choices. The United States is accepting defeat at the hands of North Vietnam. If Americans cannot see the calamitous portent of that event, they are blind indeed. The historical reality is that American political leadership collapsed at a time when American military power was supreme.

Col. Simons endorses the Rostow statement of the "de Tocqueville oscillation," viz. that American purpose vacillates between wanting to ignore military problems and wanting to fight all-out war. Simons approves the Rostow statement that "there is no rational place for total war in a nuclear age." These are indeed vaporous remarks.

The myth of the impetuous American who must be restrained by more prudent insights derived from British experience was first propounded in my presence by a British diplomat speaking to the Air War College in 1947. It has been used since that time to restrain U.S. defense of its vital interests, especially in the Far East. It is used by Sir Robert Thompson in his book *No Exit from Vietnam* to sustain his argument for allowing sanctuary to the enemy in Cambodia and Laos. Under the spell of this myth, Americans accepted British guidance in China, in Korea and in Vietnam; and Col. Simons seems minded to continue to subservience.

The record of American performance is quite different from this British myth. Before Korea, Americans showed sound and discriminating judgment about war. In time of peace, they reduced armament to the level required for national security. But when they mobilized for war, they won the war quickly because they knew that was the way to restore peace.

What is "all-out" war? In World War II, the United States did not use poisonous gases even when it had overwhelming air superiority. That must have been a limited war. The important fact is that the object of the fighting was victory.

The horrendous error of both the Rostow and the Kissinger theses is the premise that the nuclear age rules out victory. This is sheer illusion. War continues on a subnuclear level just as it continued in World War II at a sub-poison gas level. The absolute certainty is that if you don't win, the enemy will. The world judges us—and the world knows that we have accepted military defeat in both Korea and Vietnam.

In both wars, the United States accommodated the enemy strategy of protracted war designed to frustrate our purposes, undermine our perseverance and dismay our people. The enemy strategy succeeded admirably—for him. But why did American leaders give such odds to the enemy? Why, in particular, did they give the enemy sanctuary from which to attack the ally we were bound to defend?

Col Simons renounces his once-held thesis that we could influence "enemy decisions compatible with our objectives by precise applications of minimum force." But the thesis is sound. It was just that our leaders did not have the wisdom nor the gumption to do what was necessary to influence those decisions. This is precisely what you do when you defeat the enemy. Only the illusion that you could defeat the enemy without defeating him was irrational.

Col Simons asserts that the country did not in 1965 (when U.S. combat troops were committed) consider Asia to be threatened by the domination of a hostile power. That is specious talk because he has no evidence to support his conclusion. We know that the U.S. did in 1954 consider Asia so threatened after France surrendered North Vietnam to Ho Chi Minh. It then created SEATO for just such action as the United States took in 1965. Col Simons mistakenly confuses the psychology of the nation now losing the war with the purposes of the minority which opposed our defense of South Vietnam. The anti-war protest has prevailed not from any merit in its cause but from the refusal of our leaders to win the victory which the people wanted. The popular will was illustrated in our national unity at the time of the Tonkin Gulf incident.

Col Simons rightly points to the conflict between Rostow concepts of regionalism and our almost solo support of South Vietnam. But he too misjudges the conflict. The breakdown of regionalism was compelled by U.S. strategy. However willing the United States may be to submit to a long war of attrition, our allies cannot join us in that posture. No political leader can send his soldiers off to fight a war which the United States refuses to win. Regionalism is possible only when the allies are agreed on a winning strategy. The United States outlawed such strategy in Vietnam.

The Simons surmise that fear of nuclear war did not influence U.S. strategy in 1965 disregards the basic issues. Fear of nuclear war is the cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy. It is the continuing determinant of U.S. actions. President Johnson committed U.S. troops in Vietnam in 1965 when the alternative was U.S. defeat and expulsion from the country. President Johnson is not a good loser, thank God. But that dire choice was the product of earlier refusal to allow South Vietnam to attack the North Vietnamese bases in Laos. And that decision was based on idle—really preposterous—fears of nuclear war. When President Kennedy compelled Laos to accept the tripartite government demanded by the Communists and then withdrew U.S. troops from Laos, Lord Home, then as now British Foreign Secretary, congratulated the President for his statesmanship in avoiding a Third World War!

Col Simons suggests that our domestic problems may be more serious threats to our national security than the prospect of nuclear war. Quite so. More nations are destroyed politically than militarily. But these are not the alternatives he implies. The domestic problems have been exacerbated not by the diversion of funds to war but the incapacity of our leaders to win the war. Domestic problems have received constantly rising allotments of federal funds, even as they worsened. They are derived not from any shortage of funds but from the inability of our political system to cope with internal conflict. The ineffectual quality of our leadership operates on both domestic and international affairs.

In suggesting that we can trade some war resources for domestic needs without inviting the disaster which Mr. Rostow feared, Col Simons of course speaks the Kissinger variant. Whether we can do so will depend on decisions unmentioned by Col Simons. If President Nixon persists in the fear that eliminating the enemy sanctuary in Laos would expand the war, South Vietnam will be unable to survive U.S. withdrawal. But if he reserves the Kennedy decision and allows South Vietnam to attack enemy forces in Laos, the enemy will be defeated and South Vietnam will be secure.

The whole course of this war has hinged on the simple fact that you cannot defend a country against an enemy who is allowed sanctuary across a border too long to be sealed against aggression. It is tragic that our military leaders did not forcefully point out to our political leaders in 1961 the predictable consequences of such military policy. All other disasters of this war have flowed from that error. Apparently we have still not learned the lesson. The enemy still enjoys sanctuary in Laos.

Maj. Gen. THOMAS A. LANE,
U.S. Army retired.

McLEAN, VA.

THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS: PARTNERSHIP FOR PROGRESS

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of my colleagues two items of interest to all of us who participate in the continuing dialog over economic and social problems that goes on in this Chamber. The first is a newspaper article by Erich Heinemann, which appeared in the December 27 New York Times, and the second is a speech by David Rockefeller, chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank, before the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce on December 7, 1970. Mr. Heinemann, at the end of a very interesting article, raises a question that has been all too often unasked; and Mr. Rockefeller goes a long way toward answering it in the course of his very perceptive and wide-ranging comments before the chamber in Pittsburgh.

Mr. Speaker, in the continuing dialog to which I have referred, much attention has been focussed on the supply of money and credit available—through both public and private sources—for the ongoing tasks of our society. The Federal Reserve Board, as we know, has been moving in recent months to ease controls over the public sources of the money supply, but we have also seen a corresponding movement in the private sector, with the Nation's large banks moving to lower interest rates and increase credit for housing starts, consumer loans, and other spending needs. Pointing out that the banks reflect as well as create the conditions which determine the supply and demand for money at any given time, Mr. Heinemann writes that it is erroneous to view the banking system as an arbitrary and independent force manipulating interest rates at will to squeeze the last shred of profit out of the money market. Then he asks:

> But if the banks don't control interest rates—and most economists would agree that they do not—a more serious question is whether their allocation of funds is adequate to the needs of society. Why, for example, has housing been starved for funds, while until recently loans to big corporations have been bounding upward?

Mr. Speaker, I think we are beginning to see a new awareness on the part of many large corporations of their responsibility to take social needs as well as profits into account. In the case of the banks, this concern ought to extend to the point of asking whether mortgage rates and home building loans—to cite but one pressing area where new funds

are greatly needed—should be more costly than capital expansion loans to corporations in certain sectors of the economy. This is an area of controversy into which we are just beginnnig to delve, and I for one would like to see more dialog between Government and the private sector as to how we can best use private resources, as well as public ones, to meet social goals. The strength of our American system, economically and politically, is in partnership, and it would be my hope that this precedent will again prove fruitful in meeting the unresolved challenges of the 1970's.

Mr. Rockefeller addresses himself precisely to this point in his very thoughtful speech of December 7. He has rejected both the extreme views of a Charles Reich—who sees business simply as a bogey, and a Milton Friedman—who still contends that businessmen trespass if they step for a moment outside the path of profit, pure and simple. He addresses himself to the key question Mr. Heinemann has raised, and in my view his answer, while not final, is one of the most suggestive ones yet proposed by a leading representative of the private sector. I was especially pleased to note his reference to the success of "turnkey" projects for low-income housing, because the first of these projects to be completed was in my own hometown of Rockford. Both businessmen and politicians may differ on several of the many points Mr. Rockefeller raised, but I commend his speech to all as a thoughtful and imaginative discussion of the role and responsibility of the private sector in the continuing partnership we all seek to serve. At this point I insert both Mr. Heinemann's article and Mr. Rockefeller's speech in the RECORD:

BANKS: DOING ALL RIGHT DESPITE THE RECESSION

(By H. Erich Heinemann)

Lenin, in planing the Soviet takeover of Russia, put nationalization of the banks at the top of his list of "principal measures" of revolution. "The banks," he said, "as we know, are the centers of modern economic life, the principal nerve centers of the whole capitalistic economic system."

The analysis was apt. In all societies, whether Western or Communist, the banks play a key role—not only in providing for the flow of money through the economic bloodstream, but more importantly, in portioning out a limited supply of capital among alternative uses. Lately, with the cost of money in this country skidding downward throughout the economy, the banks have been making headlines with one rate reduction after another.

Last week, the Chase Manhattan Bank in New York took the lead for the third time in a month and a half in initiating a cut in the "prime rate" (the minimum charge on loans to the biggest and most credit-worthy companies)—this time to 6¾ per cent from 7 per cent. It was the fifth such cut in 1970, toppling the rate from its historic high of 8½ per cent which it held from June, 1969, through last March.

But though the banks have repeatedly reduced the prime rate, their profitability has not really been affected; bank stocks were standout performers on the New York Stock Exchange last week. Chase Manhattan, for example, closed the week at $51.75 a share, up $2 from the previous Friday. The key to this seeming anomaly lies in the complex, little-understood role of interest rates in the banking system.

There are 13,678 banks in the United States, and they are far from homogeneous in character. The Canmer Deposit Bank in Canmer, Ky.—which is the smallest bank tabulated by the American Banker, the industry's daily newspaper—is as different from the Bank of America in San Francisco, the nation's largest bank, as a one-room schoolhouse is from Harvard University.

MANY FUNCTIONS

The major banks, which are heavily concentrated in New York, Chicago and San Francisco, perform a bewildering array of functions. Subject to the limits set down by the Federal Reserve System's credit policy, banks create money by making loans and investments; they act as middlemen (or, as the economists put it, "intermediaries") in bidding for funds from depositors and then lending them to others; they manage investments for pension funds and personal trust accounts; overseas, they are free to wheel and deal in the securities markets and invest in everything from steel mills to cemetery plots.

While the Canmer Deposit Bank is largely concerned with providing safekeeping for funds and making loans in its local community, the economics of a money-market giant such as the First National City Bank or the Chase Manhattan (each with well over $20-billion in assets, and ranking number two and three in size, respectively), depend on the interplay between interest rates.

All the large banks, and especially those in New York, purchase—or to be more precise, borrow—a major portion of the funds they lend. Chase, for example, paid out $409,-million in interest in the first nine months this year, which was by far its biggest expense item.

Thus, the profits of a bank are to a considerable degree the result of its skill in managing the differential between what it pays to borrow funds and what it gets from loans.

The banks have come through this recession-scarred year with their profits unscathed simply because the cost of their purchases of money has gone down even faster than the bank prime rate. Then, too, some lending rates haven't gone down at all. Chase Manhattan cut its consumer loan charges early this month, but other banks in the metropolitan area so far haven't been willing to go along.

THE BANKS' ROLE

Although without question the principal banks represent a tremendous concentration of economic power—the 50 largest banking organizations tabulated by Fortune magazine had $249-billion in assets at the end of last year, or almost half the assets of all banks in the country—it is hard to demonstrate that they control interest rates in any general sense.

By and large, banks react to economic developments rather than initiate them. Interest rates have gone down in 1970 because business has been slack, industrial production is down and the demand for short-term borrowing is weak. The Federal Reserve System, for its part, has become substantially more generous in providing funds for the economy.

But if the banks don't control interest rates—and most economists would agree that they do not—a more serious question is whether their allocation of funds is adequate to the needs of society. Why, for example, has housing been starved for funds, while until recently loans to big corporations have been bounding upward?

There is no consensus on this question—or even on what criteria might be used to set guidelines for allocation. But given the central role that banking plays in the society—which Lenin understood so clearly—it is obvious that more will be heard on the subject in the months to come.

PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITIES OF PRIVATE BUSINESS IN THE 1970'S

(By David Rockefeller)

I have looked forward to this occasion with particular pleasure because, frankly, I have long admired the forthright manner in which the Pittsburgh business community has dealt with urban and environmental problems.

As even the occasional visitor knows, you were among the first to recognize and respond to the many complex and interrelated issues of ecology and urban renewal. You did so with imaginative approaches that, in many cases, have since been adopted by other major cities.

During the 1950's and '60's, urbanologists and early environmentalists were still unable to get a serious hearing in many parts of the country. Yet here in Pittsburgh, you already had a functioning alliance of concerned business and civic leaders headed by Dick Mellon whose memory should be revered by all. Under this kind of capable leadership, you moved forward with a broad base of community support to reverse the tide of urban deterioration and environmental pollution.

In view of your record of accomplishment, you have better reasons than most to resent the current wave of attacks charging business with an utter lack of social concern. It is no exaggeration to say that American business today is facing its most severe public disfavor since the Depression era of the 1930's.

We are told in the most forceful terms by a wide range of critics that we are at once profligate and miserly, evangelistic and hypocritical. Indeed, there seems to be a fixed belief, in some quarters at least, that businessmen are constitutionally incapable of performing a selfless act. When one occurs, the critics are sure it must have been done for the wrong motives. And if no questionable motives can be assigned, then it is assumed to have been an accident!

We cannot escape evidence of this public disfavor even in the toy departments where we do our Christmas shopping. Where once the game of "monopoly" dominated the scene, we now find a proliferation of new ones with such topical names as "Smog: The Game of Environmental Awareness," and "Extinction: The Game of Ecology."

Ours is the dubious honor of having gone from "Monoply" to "Extinction" in one generation!

The net effect of this shifting public sentiment toward businessmen was summarized amusingly in a recent article in Finance Magazine. It ticked off the typical headaches of today's average executive in these words:

"Two citizens' groups have brought suit (against his company) . . . the press keeps making outrageous claims . . . consumers are trying to organize a boycott . . . a Federal agency is making a study . . . some fellow in Washington, acting independently with some law students, is about to slip a report to a Congressman . . . a nearby college has 150 scraggly potsmokers who are talking about bombing his office . . . and his children call him an imperialist pig!"

In such a climate of confrontation, it should come as no surprise that socially concerned businessmen are caught in a devastating cross-fire of criticism from both ends of the ideological spectrum.

At one pole, Professor Charles Reich has pronounced America's businessmen guilty of the social "crime" of creating an anti-human "Corporate State." In his current best-seller, "The Greening of America," Professor Reich views this supposed monolithic machine as a destroyer of individual dignity and holds it responsible for a catalogue of social ills ranging from depersonalization to pollution. In his view, business—as an oppressor of the human spirit—cannot make a positive social contribution.

Professor Reich's goals are admirable. Surely no one will contest a creed that places individual dignity and self-realization at the center of our social and economic efforts. But his analysis fails, I believe, when it attempts to make business the scapegoat for the inevitable dislocations produced by rapid progress. His view of business as a rigid, machine-like structure bears little resemblance to today's flexible, responsive, consumer-conscious corporation.

Material prosperity and automation have immeasurably improved the lives of millions and greatly shortened the work week, freeing people for the aesthetic, intellectual and recreational pursuits that Reich himself espouses. Business now is making substantial inroads against the by-products of technological advance through anti-pollution efforts, urban programs and a host of other activities. Further, business has moved away from arbitrary authority toward participative management and individual initiative in many of its operations.

In short, business concern for the individual and the community has moved us toward Professor Reich's most worthy goals. To use one of his own terms, his revolution has been "co-opted" by American business.

Attacking from an opposite point of view, Professor Milton Friedman contends that business has only one responsibility—to maximize profits for its shareholders. Beyond this, he insists, corporate social efforts are only "hypocritical window-dressing" and "unadulterated socialism." This is surely too narrow a perspective.

Even Professor Friedman recognizes that the donations made by businesses to various community service organizations on an annual appeal basis are appropriate under customary and conventional ethical standards of good citizenship. But what he fails to appreciate, in my view, are the many innovative social contributions of business which are perfectly consistent with the profit incentive. The construction of "turnkey" public housing, for example, in which private industry works with government to create much-needed housing for low-income families, has proven both profitable and socially beneficial.

Profits are, indeed, the lifeblood of business. But our own consciences as well as rising public expectations make it increasingly clear that modern managers must come up with more new and imaginative approaches like "turnkey" housing, to reconcile their expanding responsibility to society with the investment interest of their shareholders.

Responding to critics is tempting and I think businessmen should give in to the impulse more often—not to apologize but to set the record straight. I would hope, however, that we would not spend so much time and energy in answering critics that we have none left for reexamining our own performance to spot new areas for improvement.

This is a time of profound reassessment throughout our society, a time for reordering values and priorities at all levels.

Business must participate fully in this reassessment by redefining its own relationship to society.

The last time we went through such a national reappraisal—in the 1930's—business tended to stand aside and leave the initative to government. In retrospect, I think all of us would acknowledge that this was a mistake. The result was a serious erosion of our economic freedom. This time, unless business rolls up its sleeves and gets into the fray, there is likely to be not only a further erosion of economic freedom but of individual freedom as well.

The amount of freedom business retains will depend decisevly on the quality of management's response to changing public expectations and on the degree of its involvement in public responsibilities.

Certainly, I recognize the temptation to cut back on programs for social progress during a period of diminished profits, especially when we are being roundly criticized for these very commitments from certain enclaves of tradition. But I would argue that it is precisely at this time, when social expectations and needs are greatest, that we must weigh our options calmly and employ our most farsighted business judgment.

Far from cutting back, it seems to me highly desirable that we step up our social involvement, at this critical juncture, in at least three distinct areas.

The first, of course, is within our own companies. Many businessmen have been doing a good deal, individually, to make their corporations more socially responsive to the changing environment. But, for the most part, they have done this as a kind of "add-on" to their regular business—programming a response to each challenge as it appears. For example, they have stepped up financial contributions to deserving urban projects, developed more playgrounds in the ghettos, and provided more counseling services for the disadvantaged. In other words, they have responded with good intentions but usually with the self-limiting presumption that social improvement programs must be carried on the loss side of the company's ledger. They presumed that business and social responsibilities would not mix. I believe it is now time to question that presumption.

The immediate task, as I view it, is to learn how to discharge our social responsibilities as an integral part of our overall corporate planning and performance. We should think not so much in terms of how to hold down the cost of these programs, but rather how to make them more efficient and more effective so that they contribute to long-range profitability. Briefly stated, the essential job is to reconcile what happens in the marketplace with what has already happened in society. This may mean liberalizing our hiring practices to include more from the minorities or broadening our services to extend into disadvantaged neighborhoods.

This may also mean taking a longer range view of profits. It may mean lowering our profit sights in a particular year, in the interest of helping to shape an environment in which business can continue to prosper ten or twenty years into the future. In a sense, this is a kind of capital investment in community well-being which will produce future dividends in the form of a more viable business and living environment.

The latest surveys by the Opinion Research Corporation reveal that a solid majority of the American people now considers corporate responsibility for maintaining a pollution-free environment equal in importance with supplying customer needs at reasonable prices. So, besides being a matter of good conscience and good citizenship, it is also a matter of good business judgment to structure ourselves, within a sound application of free-market principles, to respond to the will of the majority of our potential customers. To narrow our individual corporate objectives solely to the pursuit of profits would place us almost at once in direct conflict with the many publics on whom those profits depend.

A second area in which businessmen can and should be involved in a socially responsive way is at the industry and even the multi-industry level.

The "pilot projects" of individual companies have been very much worthwhile, and have taught us valuable lessons about what can and can't be done with limited resources. But the need now, as I see it, is for more massive collaboration by groups of several corporations in diverse fields to tackle those truly major problems that surpass the resources of a single company.

One of the most promising avenues for expansion would be to select, from among the many trial-and-error experiences of separate companies, those ongoing projects which show the greatest potential for multi-industry application.

For instance, in my own industry, I think the "Key Cities Program" of the American Bankers Association, which is committing one billion dollars by 1975 in minority business financing across the country, is an important program. It will focus initially on 50 critical urban areas. In these, coordinating committees of local bank executives will see to it that this financing is responsive to unique local needs and problems. Supporting this funding program will be teams of visiting specialists who will bring their proven experience to bear through a series of Urban Development Seminars. The "Key Cities Program" is particularly attractive for multi-industry involvement because it offers wide-ranging opportunities for almost every kind of industry to supply its own particular technical, managerial and product support in local areas under local supervision.

The various manpower development programs of the National Alliance of Businessmen have proven themselves capable of far wider applicability, given the inter-industry base that has already been established. The lessons learned in these programs could be applied more extensively to the development of training capacities for moving workers up from entry-level competence toward managerial positions.

Although still in development stages, the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships and HUD's "Operation Breakthrough" are both promising prototypes for a total business-sector initiative. With its recent development grant from HUD, Westinghouse is already exploring the feasibility of modular and prefabricated housing on a broad scale.

In the underlying and, in many ways, most critical problem of educational deficiencies, the various "partnership projects" between corporations and schools have nationwide and industry-wide potential.

In the past several weeks, two major educational studies have been released—one by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the other by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Both studies concluded that the present educational system in this country is too rigidly degree-oriented and lacks the flexibility needed to guide young people with a wide range of talents and ambitions into suitable professions and occupations. They proposed that big cities create new models of secondary schools adapted to their own community needs rather than remain firmly anchored in the past and the present.

The validity of this proposal is supported by recent statistics revealing that almost one-quarter of all high school students drop out before graduation. And roughly half of those who enter college quit before taking the bachelor's degree.

Until now, the business sector has tackled this enormous problem largely on a company-by-company basis, setting up separate programs for the industrial and basic skills training of "drop-outs." These individual programs are often costly and inefficient, and the new educational techniques learned by one company are not transmitted quickly to others.

How much better it would be if we had a nationwide system of industry-supported vocational schools of sufficient scope to exert a real impact. Ideally, these institutions would not close off the possibility of subsequent academic training, but would provide a viable alternative route toward higher learning. Those who, for personal or family reasons, felt the need for early employment could have the opportunity and the flexibility to complete their high school education in these industry-sponsored vocational schools and then continue on to college if and when they desired.

By breaking down the rigid correlation between age and formal schooling, an approach such as this might go a long way toward making education a lifelong process with men and women entering college from the ranks of labor, commerce and industry—perhaps under employee or trade union scholarship programs. Nowhere is it written that education in America must be a hectic scramble by everyone, regardless of incentives and qualifications, to accumulate the maximum number of degrees in the minimum amount of time.

The major industries could establish a loosely-tied national chain—steel, transportation, utilities, communication and banking—building the buildings, defraying salaries and other operating costs and offering employment options to the graduates.

The schools that I propose would not be in competition with other public schools. They would be supplemental and would be fully certified and accredited by local educational authorities—differing not in educational standards but in educational emphasis and in the fact that they were financed in part by the private sector.

To work out the details of such a project in full cooperation with the present secondary school system and to ascertain what tax incentives might apply, this proposal would clearly require the concurrence of educators, leaders of business and labor and various governmental authorities. But I have outlined the proposal here in order to illustrate the dimensions of future commitment that I believe business must undertake at the multi-industry level.

The third major area in which this sense of commitment must be manifested is in the national debate over policies, programs and priorities.

Businessmen have been generally reluctant to enter into public debate on issues other than those of direct company concern. They will talk volubly about why they need higher tariffs or lower taxes. But they tend to become reticent when the discussion turns to the need for an improved welfare program, broad-gauged trade legislation, or more realistic safety standards. The supposed risks of alienating other businessmen or consumers are often regarded as unacceptably high. As a result, we too often end up with uninformed, catch-all legislation.

By restricting the range of topics to those directly related to their livelihood, businessmen have seldom achieved wide public recognition. It is precisely by avoiding social debate, that they have given currency to the notion that they are concerned solely with profits and have little of substance to contribute to the developing dialogue of democracy.

The great need here, as I see it, is to coordinate the business community's efforts, talents and influence in a way that will give it genuine impact not only at local and state levels, but at the national level as well.

Some coordination in the social realm already exists in activities of the National Alliance of Businessmen, the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships, the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Conference Board, the Committee for Economic Development and others.

But what is needed additionally, in my view, is an all-out determination to mobilize the opinions and resources of the business community behind workable large-scale approaches to urban problems. With a guiding consensus of our own, we would then be in a better position to enlist the support of the Administration and Congress to do the job that must be done. The influence and ideas of businessmen are needed now as never bfeore to speak out more forcefully and more frequently on social and urban legislation.

Because of this very urgency and because of your own enviable past record in setting examples for the large business community, I am taking the liberty now of urging upon you—the business leadership of Pittsburgh—this additional task. I know of no body of businessmen anywhere that is better equipped, by experience and achievement, to show us how the country's business sector can bring its influence to bear on forward-looking social legislation in city hall, state house and in Washington.

I do not mean to suggest that such a leadership role can or should be played in isolation. Its effective implementation will require the same kind of close cooperation with the academic and intellectual communities that you have achieved in the past. And it will require the same cordial working alliance with labor to impact effectively on Government at all levels.

But I believe that the first driving thrust could well come from the concerned and committed business sector of Pittsburgh. I would add only that the time is short and present problems across the nation are rapidly outrunning their solutions.

For those across the country who boggle at the immense urban tasks still before them, there would be great encouragement in the realization that "the spirit of Pittsburgh" was on the move once again.

In a larger sense, there is reassurance for the nation's businessmen, too, in recalling that since the days of Karl Marx, critics have been predicting the downfall of the American industrial system and the demise of the corporation. Yet through the years that system has proven remarkably durable and resilient. It has been highly resourceful in adapting to change involving employees, customers and society in general.

I personally am confident that it can and will demonstrate equal adaptability in the decade of the Seventies. I think it is more than capable of rising to the challenges posed by Professors Reich and Friedman by coming up with fresh solutions to many problems within the context of the free-market system.

Tradition holds that the first draft of the Declaration of Independence dedicated this new nation to "life, liberty and the pursuit of property." It was only at the urging of those who insisted on greater concern for the *quality of life* in America, that Thomas Jefferson struck out "property" and placed "the pursuit of happiness" in a position of high prominence.

Now, nearly two centuries later, we are witnessing a strong resurgence of this national goal. Those of us in business are being asked to contribute more to the quality of life than mere quantities of goods and services. I believe that "the spirit of Pittsburgh" could well supply us with the precedent and vision necessary to achieve this goal.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN of Ohio, a man who has served his country both long and well.

During his 28 years in Congress, MIKE FEIGHAN has performed devoted service to both his constituents and to the Nation. As second-ranking majority member of the Judiciary Committee, he had a long and well-deserved reputation as an expert in matters affecting the Federal bench and the judicial branch generally. And, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, he was in no small measure responsible for the United States having immigration and naturalization laws which are among the most enlightened in the world.

Personally, it has been a great pleasure and privilege to have served with MIKE FEIGHAN on the Ohio delegation for the past 16 years. I will not soon forget his many kindnesses and help.

In closing, I would just like to wish him and his devoted family all the best wishes for continued good health and happiness for many years to come.

LEGAL SERVICES TO THE POOR

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, too often attacks have been made on programs seeking to render legal services to the poor without any understanding of these programs or without any compassion for the poor who receive these services. Govenor Reagan, in his recent veto of CLRA funds, exemplifies that ignorance and lack of compassion in full measure. Had he read the enclosed article by Sheldon Greene, general counsel for CRLA, he might have acted differently:

LAWYERS FOR THE POOR: "SOMEBODY IS ALWAYS OFFENDED"

(By Sheldon L. Greene)

The poor, wrote John Adams in 1765, are too weak to organize in opposition to the powerful. The strong try to deprive the poor of "the knowledge of their rights and wrongs and the power to assert the former and redress the latter." That is why white panthers dressed as Indians polluted Boston Harbor with English tea. And it is why the Congress appropriates more than $50 million a year to pay the salaries of 2,000 lawyers to do nothing but represent the nation's poor.

Conservatives have sought to curb the powers of those poverty lawyers, and they seem to have won a round with the publication of regulations dismembering the national legal services program and with the dismissal of its national director, Terry F. Lenzner, by Donald Rumsfeld, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The Office of Legal Services is one of the smaller components of the OEO, accounting for less than 5 percent of the annual budget for the war against poverty. The money is apportioned among 265 local nonprofit corporations which have contracted, in free enterprise fashion, to provide legal representation for at least some of the 3 million Americans who live below the poverty line.

Legal services is an improved model of an old function, the public advocate. Public defenders and court-appointed counsel financed with taxpayers' funds have long represented indigent defendants. In large cities since the turn of the century, bar associations and private charities have passively supplied legal services to the poor, mostly through volunteers. Attorneys employed by

nonprofit foundations and special interest groups such as the NAACP and the American Civil Liberties Union maintain and provide legal services in public interest matters.

The new breed of public advocate is a full-time salaried specialist in poverty-related law, with a steady if not always sufficient source of funds. The Federal legal service program is national; its storefront law offices are now found in Nome, Alaska; Window Rock, Ariz.; or in the Hough district of Cleveland—wherever poverty is apparent. The program has its own national recruitment component, the Reginald Heber Smith Fellowship, which orients young lawyers and subsidizes their initial years in legal services. There is a national poverty law reporter, a periodical, a related memory bank, and back-up centers attached to universities, each specializing in a problem area such as housing, health and welfare.

Supplementing the attorneys is a corps of community workers and lay advocates drawn primarily from ethnic and minority groups in the client communities. These para-professionals handle tasks ranging from the simple service of papers to the representation of clients in welfare hearings. They often serve as a bridge between the low-income community, with which they share a common background and experience, and the professional staff.

Except for public interest firms like the Washington-based Center for Law and Social Policy, which rely on such private resources as the Ford Foundation, the lawyers are subject to federal regulation that ranges from rational to stultifying. For example, OEO-funded programs must raise 20 percent of their resources through voluntary in-kind contributions of expert services computed at 1932 hourly rates. Imagine the incredulity of Lockheed executives if defense contracts included a similar condition. Out of deference to the bar, poverty lawyers can handle no fee-bearing cases, no criminal defense, and cannot represent anyone who can afford to pay a fee. They are excluded from the government's higher salary scales and from its retirement programs. Possibly their greatest obstacle is the problem of redundant control. While only the National OEO can veto a program, everyone who approves the annual funding grant—conservative boards, bar associations, ambitious local Community Action Program directors, regional OEO directors and state poverty agencies—wants a say in running things.

Who are the new legal service lawyers? Aside from the common character traits of iconoclasm, intensity and dedication, generalities do not apply. They are Buckley conservatives, Lawyers Guild activists, disaffected corporation lawyers and wandering scholars. For the most part they share a disdain of working primarily for money, a belief in their own ability and in the capacity of the law as a limited vehicle for positive, nonviolent change.

Annual budgets for individual legal service programs run from a high of $4 million for the sprawling New York City program to a small-town two-attorney office operating on a grant of $50,000. But whatever the size of the project, the bulk of national legal service energy is invested in the endless daily problems of the poor—eviction, bankruptcy, consumer fraud and welfare entitlements. Legal service attorneys spend their time on delaying an eviction or preventing the repossession of a family car. Only the landlords and finance companies kick about these cases.

But a minority of problems and a minority of attorneys have aroused the indignation of numerous public officials, and precipitated multiple attacks on legal services and the judicial process. The first such explosion came when California Rural Legal Assistance, a statewide program aiding the rural poor, blocked attempts by California to cut $200 million in services from the state Medicaid program; and almost simultaneously obtained a restraining order against the Federal Department of Labor that temporarily stopped the importation of *bracero* farm workers. With a double stroke, poverty lawyers, acting not for one client but for a whole class of the poor, blocked the implementation of major state and federal administrative decisions. Both cases successfully alleged that the public agencies were in fact lawbreakers, since they were disregarding their legislative authority, and that the suits sought no more than to require public agencies to adhere to the same standards of compliance with the law as is demanded of motorists.

The reaction from conservative circles was in character. Sen. George Murphy, a supporter of agricultural interests, questioned the propriety of a federally funded lawyer suing a public agency. Legislation was introduced in Congress to restrict legal services to suits against private parties. Attorneys, it was felt, should not bite the hand that feeds them. But Congress disagreed, and the measure failed.

Similarly controversial litigation quickly developed in other parts of the country. In northern Mississippi, the legal services program ran into opposition when it sought to advance the desegregation of local schools. Agricultural interests in New Mexico screamed when the Navajo program attempted to press Indian claims for water. Action initiated on behalf of exploited Caribbean farm workers in south Florida provoked a whirlwind attempt, led by Congressmen and the Governor, to terminate the regional legal services program.

As in California, a persistent cause of such impact suits has been failure to comply with the law. Federal agencies have become Daddy Warbucks to state and local bureaucracy, establishing but not enforcing conditions on the use of money they supply for education, health, welfare and law enforcement.

The pressure on California agriculture resulting from multiple attacks on violations of minimum wage and field sanitation statutes, the widespread employment of illegal entrants, and a challenge to the use of pesticides harmful to consumers and farm workers, provoked a second legislative effort to muzzle legal services. Senator Murphy introduced a bill that would have given a governor the veto on all or part of all OEO-funded programs. Presented as a rider to the OEO authorization, it took liberals by surprise and cleared the Senate, but like its predecessor, was defeated in the House, thanks to the activities of the American Bar Association, the media, and a squad of legal service attorneys who canvassed Congressmen.

However, the battle to maintain autonomy did not end there, for Rumsfeld, who is a special adviser to the President as well as director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, still seemed eager to placate critics and insulate the Administration from abrasion. The object of the defeated Murphy amendment was to be achieved on a test basis under the Oklahoma plan, which provided governors with primary funding authority over OEO programs, with the possible, but not certain, exception of legal services. While initially the plan seemed to get no further than Oklahoma, a later proposal to decentralize legal services threatened to reverse the original promise of relative autonomy to the National Legal Services Office. Authority to fund programs and terminate grants would be transferred to OEO regional directors, who are the Oklahoma plan's chief opponents.

The need to insulate legal service from regional control is made evident by a recent decision of the Northwest regional director to cut off funding to an Idaho legal service program before he had investigated a subsequently discredited report that the attorneys had provoked a wildcat strike among harvest workers. Opposition to the latest regionalization plan came to a head in a critical Senate subcommittee hearing, where witnesses suggested that the change would contradict the will of Congress when it rejected the Murphy amendment.

While the embryonic plan died from exposure, regulations announced on November 18 accomplish the same object by indirection. The new system places ostensible authority to monitor and fund programs in regional legal service directors. However, a rococo system of checks and appeals (one OEO aide termed it "an administrative nightmare") delivers effective control to the regional OEO directors. When the regulations take effect, it is likely that programs faced with termination or emasculation or hung up in bureaucratic indecision, may be forced to use their lawyers' tools of litigation and public hearings simply to save their own necks.

Two days after announcing the new regulations, Rumsfeld on November 20 fired Office of Legal Services Director Lenzner and his deputy, Frank Jones. Since both men carry scars from numerous battles for the independence of legal service programs, the dismissals suggest a shift of policy away from controversial activities.

Neither Lenzner nor Jones meets Agnew's pejorative description of effete intellectuals. Lenzner is a burly former college football player who struck back by calling for the Director's own resignation, claiming that Rumsfeld was the proponent of "bargain basement justice." Jones, a husky black lawyer with a Dayan eye patch, stated that the legal services program "was now in the hands of Southern bigots and right-wing politicians across the country." As evidence, the deposed attorneys submitted that new appointments to the Office of Legal Services staff would require the backing of local or state Republican politicians. The effect of local political influence, they noted, is to be seen in Director Rumsfeld's willingness to suspend several large programs for violations, uncorroborated of OEO guidelines. For example, New Orleans Legal Services was censured for its representation of twelve defendants in a criminal case, although participation in the suit had been authorized. Approval of refunding for CRLA, the Navajo program, and the national senior citizens' project on November 30 came as a partial refutation of Lenzner's charges. The response of OEO to a possible veto of CRLA by ultraconservative state officials, willingness to modify the controversial decentralization plan, as well as the choice of a new legal services director will be further test.

The Administration's reaction to controversial litigation has not been limited to OEO-funded programs. Even the private nonprofit law firms, immune from a loss of federal funding, were recently threatened by the Internal Revenue Service with the loss of tax-exempt status for their role in ecology-oriented litigation.

Along with the attack from within the government, conservative lawyers, long eager to divide the $50 million legal services pie among private practitioners, are exerting increased pressure for a fee-for-services system employing private lawyers. But tests of private "judicare" have proved costly and deficient as a service mechanism.

When the dust settles it is easy to see that public advocacy is about as effective as a good pair of sun glasses on the desert—it relieves some of the discomfort but does not change things much. The opposition of some conservatives, while not justifiable, is understandable. Some of them are willing to acknowledge the public layers' usefulness as a safety valve against less palatable means of protest. Some, including Rumsfeld, consider the legal process to be a constructive outlet for the energies of the poor.

But others fear that federally funded legal

service programs will attract radical or simply immature lawyers who will, by the use of legal issues, manipulate impoverished communities into a position of violent confrontation with the community at large.

Other detractors, perhaps more honest, simply oppose any change, whether by litigation or by legislation. Yet they overestimate the potential of public advocates to effect change, for the American system contains built-in dampers to minimize the effect of any departure from the *status quo*, whether legislative, judicial, or executive.

The judiciary, for the most part, approaches matters which cross social or economic strata with some timidity. Attacks on the Supreme Court in the wake of decisions relating to civil rights and to the rights of the accused have encouraged judges to turn away from broad-based social or economic problems, out of fear that the judicial nostrum—in the context of contemporary racial conflict and the alleged rise of crime—might do more harm than good. Such matters, they say, should be left to the legislatures.

Similarly, legislatures, federal and state, are poor incubators for change. They tend today to place a higher value on intangible social services than they did in the past, but are still unwilling to authorize sufficient funds to make a substantial attack on any problem, whether underemployment, job retraining, housing or health. Change comes piecemeal from legislatures, because every problem is caught in a maze of economic interests.

By attacking public advocacy, law-and-order conservatives denigrate action that is consistent with their own ideology. Conservatives who used to complain of arrogant bureaucracy should be gleeful when a decision compels a public agency to be subservient to the will of the legislature. Yet that is seldom the reaction, for it is not the principle but the interest that is bruised and seeks retribution. No one can argue with decisions which increase wages to make low-income workers less dependent on public assistance. No one that is, but the people who must pay the higher wages. Who can disagree with the determination that an English literacy requirement which results in the disenfranchisement of a few hundred thousand Spanish-speaking Americans is unconstitutional? The answer is, candidates who fear that they might be unpopular with the Spanish-speaking.

"The trouble with this work," said CRLA's Marty Glick, of California's Rural Legal Assistance, "is that somebody is always offended by what we do. No one should complain about a decision preventing local school boards from classifying otherwise bright but Spanish-speaking children as mentally retarded because they flunked a middle-class English-language aptitudes test, but school psychologists fought like hell to defend their position." The decision barring arbitrary classification of minority schoolchildren as mentally retarded was implemented by only a few counties, and Glick had to pursue the change in the legislature. His innocuous bill to set minimum standards for mental retardation barely overcame vigorous opposition from the psychologists.

All but the mouthpieces of special interests should by now recognize the virtue of public advocacy in providing the mute and disenfranchised with both a voice and some small power against bureaucratic anarchy. Honest concern about the ill effects of excessive zeal or bad judgment on the part of public interest lawyers should be expressed by encouraging conditions which foster a responsible approach to litigation, rather than by intemperate criticism that creates hostility, insecurity and disaffection in the attorneys. Establishing conditions that encourage reasonable tenure for a nucleus of the most experienced and capable legal service attorneys is one step that could be taken. Insuring a steady influx of qualified recent graduates is another. Turning from annual refunding to a two-year grant would be a further means of providing greater stability and insulating the programs from demoralizing political attack.

Rather than push for regionalization, policy makers should establish an independent national legal foundation as a parent for all legal services. Such an agency could be structured to assume both proximity to the source of funding and insulation from recurent external coercion. Administrative policy may be moving in that direction: the proposed OEO budget excludes legal services and the American Bar Association has been asked to prepare a report on possible alternatives to the present room-and-board arrangement in OEO.

Finally, lawyers and non-lawyers concerned with the future of legal services should recognize that controversy is an incident of the legal process. Observers should be concerned only when there is none at all.

AN INTERVIEW WITH PEACE CORPS DIRECTOR BLATCHFORD

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, although the Peace Corps does not receive the same attention from the media today as it did in the early sixties when it was overworked as a symbol of New Frontier idealism and sacrifice, the fact remains that some exciting "new directions" have been charted for that agency to prepare it for the decade of the seventies. The man behind those "new directions" is 36-year-old Joe Blatchford, who took over the helm of the Peace Corps as President Nixon's appointed director in May of 1969. Blatchford brought to that appointment his vast experience as founder of a private volunteer agency, ACCION, which made a substantial contribution to the development process in several Latin American countries.

Over the last year and a half I have carefully followed the "new directions" being implemented at the Peace Corps by Joe Blatchford, and he has earned my great respect and admiration for his efforts and his accomplishments. Joe Blatchford has made his mark as one of the outstanding administrators of the Nixon administration, and I want to wish him continued success as we approach the new year.

Perhaps too much emphasis has been placed on Blatchford's attempts to recruit volunteers with special skills and experience. To listen to some critics, you would think the Peace Corps had become an R. & R. haven for blue collar workers or a carbon copy of AID. That is not the case. As Blatchford himself points out, the young single person, just out of college, is still the backbone of the Peace Corps and the main force behind it. It is true that the young volunteer is being better trained and more specially equipped than his predecessors. And it is true that the Peace Corps has made special efforts to recruit older volunteers with special skills and experience. This is one of the "new directions" at Peace Corps—a direction taken in direct response to the requests and needs of the countries which the Peace Corps serves.

If I were to choose two words to characterize the Peace Corps under Blatchford, I would choose "responsiveness and diversity." As I have already mentioned, the Peace Corps is especially responsive to the development needs and priorities of developing countries, as defined by those countries. In the past I think we have too often tried to force our ideas and nostrums for development down the throats of those countries. This has often backfired in two ways: first, it has generated resentment against the United States for being too pushy and paternalistic; and second, our prescriptions often proved to be wrong because we did not know enough about the nature of the problem or the people.

Joe Blatchford is changing all this by involving the host country nationals in every level of the decisionmaking process as it relates to that country. They are involved in planning, programing, recruitment administration, and evaluation. For the first time we are truly becoming what the Pearson Commission has called partners in development.

The Peace Corps has become more responsive in another way; it has become more responsive to the ideas and recommendations of its volunteers and staff in the field as well as its returned volunteers. This valuable input has had a lot to do with the new directions and helps to insure that the Peace Corps does not become the captive of the armchair development engineers in Washington who have been responsible for so many of our past mistakes.

The new diversity at Peace Corps is a result of special efforts to recruit volunteers from a wide range of backgrounds; to recruit more minority group volunteers, more skilled volunteers, and more volunteers of all ages. While diversity in, and of itself, may not be a positive value, in this instance it is because it enhances the possibilities for special contributions. This in turn provides a greater diversity in programing and volunteer assignments. The Peace Corps is no longer predominantly an overseas teacher corps. As a consequence, the Peace Corps today is in a much better position to make a special contribution to a wide range of development problems.

Mr. Speaker, while I have only touched the surface of the "new directions" being undertaken at the Peace Corps, I think I have given you some idea as to why I feel so strongly about what Joe Blatchford has been doing in his brief 1½ years as Director. As I mentioned at the outset of my remarks, some of this is not the stuff that headlines are made of, but I think it is the kind of thing that makes a difference in the third world, the kind of thing which does improve our badly tarnished image abroad, and the kind of thing of which we all can and should be proud. I for one have been proud to have supported the Peace Corps over these past 9 years because I think it has been one of our most successful foreign as-

sistance ventures. I commend all those volunteers, past and present, for the difference they have made. And I especially commend Director Joe Blatchford for the new life and enthusiasm he has brought to that agency.

Last summer, the Volunteer magazine carried an in-depth interview with Joe Blatchford which I think all my colleagues should read. I think they would be impressed both with his personal qualities of candor and courage, and with his administrative abilities and ideas. I insert in the RECORD the text of that interview in full:

VOLUNTEER INTERVIEW JOSEPH H. BLATCHFORD

(By John Osborn)

Joseph Blatchford, formerly of ACCION (Americans for Community Cooperation in Other Nations) and California politics, has directed the Peace Corps since May 5, 1969. Some say he is the most imaginative director the Peace Corps has had in its nine-year history. Others say he is trying to "Nixonize" the organization.

What is his background?

How does he stand on current issues facing the Peace Corps?

What are his plans for the agency as it moves into a new decade?

In January, the Volunteer asked its correspondents to submit questions they would like to ask the Director.

Over the next three months letters trickled in from Morocco, Ceylon, Bolivia, Fiji, Thailand, Tonga, Dahomey, Brazil, Uruguay, Columbia, Peru and Ghana, while the magazine went through a staff change and a major restyling.

In late April, I sat down with the questions in hand and put together an interview script, written to cover broad topics—like dissent, the draft and "New Directions"—and Joe's personal philosophy of development. More specific questions, such as those dealing with the readjustment allowance or vehicle policy, were set aside for future articles.

On May 5, I took the script and, accompanied by Editorial Assistant Paula Mayo and photographer Susan Biddle, dropped into Joe's office for an interview session.

We could not have picked a worse time: a week after President Nixon's Cambodia speech, and one day after the shootings at Kent State University.

We talked for an hour and fifteen minutes, at which point I ran out of recording tape and Joe ran out of wind.

The transcript of our session was 42 pages long.

It's been cut by about 20 percent, dropping redundant passages and retouching everybody's grammar. Had there been more time and space, we could have talked for another six hours.

Joe is well-versed in Middle Eastern and Oriental religion. He is an opera fan, a serious one. He has strong ideas about the Peace Corps stemming from his work with ACCION.

He is an atypical Nixon appointee. He lives in Georgetown among Democrats instead of at the Watergate with Administration Republicans. He rides a motorcycle, does impersonations of famous people and has a great nostalgia for San Francisco and its "beat" period.

The three most prominent hangings on his office walls are a photograph of his swearing-in by President Richard Nixon; a copy of the earth-rising-over-moon picture taken by the crew of Apollo 8 in 1968; and a psychedelic poster of Bob Dylan. A unique office, but one gets the impression he would rather be out in the field.

Joe will be 36 years old in June. He and his wife, Winnie, a former ACCION volunteer, are expecting their first child in mid-September.

Osborn: This is the anniversary of your appointment [as Director of the Peace Corps], I think.

Blatchford: Yes, as a matter of fact. About this hour, it was the same kind of day. We had a nice day.

Osborn: As soon as you were appointed, you made a quick trip abroad to see Volunteers and to talk to some of the governments we're helping. You conducted a pool of returned Volunteers, you held task force meetings, and met your country directors in September. After that, you proposed a series of "New Directions" for the Peace Corps in the '70's.

Blatchford: That's right.

Osborn: Now, I think one of the "New Directions" which created a lot of confusion is your call for Volunteers with more training and more experience in specialized jobs. Many people thought you were saying that you no longer wanted the young college graduate who had been a major part of the Peace Corps before, is that really true?

Blatchford: No; it's not true at all. As a matter of fact, all of our press releases and all of my testimony in public record before the Congress emphasize that we consider the young person, single, out of college, as the backbone of the Peace Corps. What we will try to do is give him better training, better programming, where he'll have a specified job, fit into that job, be supported in that job by the local government, so that he can accomplish more than he's been able to. But he'll still be the main force behind the Peace Corps.

Now, unfortunately, though incorporated in all our press releases, that message is not in the newspapers. What's news is that farmers are going to join the Peace Corps. That's different from the public image of the Peace Corps Volunteer as a young liberal arts grraduate right out of college.

When I went overseas, I constantly heard the cry from governments, people of all stripes—villagers, village leaders, school teachers and people who worked with the Peace Corps or were in charge of programming them—that, "We need a wide diversity of skills. We're more sophisticated in our development now than we were in the early '60's."

In the early '60's, newly independent African countries needed teachers en masse because they didn't have enough academically trained people to staff the civil service. So they put all their money into education and they asked for school teachers from all over the world to come.

As the decade ended a number of things happened. First, they found that they were training enough people for their civil service, in fact, training too many. Many countries said, "We're educating our revolution because we're training people academically without giving them skills which they can practice and use to earn a living." So now it's time to phase down some of that work and increase vocational training, agriculture, urban planning, and other things like this.

Second . . . nationalism. These new governments in Africa—I think the same applied to Latin America—were flushed with idealism. They were setting five and ten year plans in conjunction with the Alliance for Progress. They set almost visionary goals. And as those goals and hopes began to crumble, and as they saw that the process of social change, political turmoil . . . social change being too difficult, political turmoil not permitting them to even be in office long enough to project and accomplish these goals, they became disillusioned and they became more hardnosed and specified what they needed.

So the decade ended with, I think, overseas governments and institutions simply saying "We want Volunteers with more specialities, more experience"; and they told me this in no uncertain terms. The role of the generalist out of college—as teacher; as community development worker; as public health worker—is not up to their present needs. He is still needed, but not exclusively.

What I am saying is that everywhere, this is what the countries are saying, and too often our staff and our overseas people think that they've got the answers when their eyes aren't open and they're not watching the changing needs. They have to keep their ears to the ground and listen for change. And we have to be an agency which responds to that change.

Osborn: I think that's a point that's often missed. People think that the "New Directions" have just been generated here in Washington. But, in fact, it is a response.

Blatchford: It's a response to what I heard on my trips, what [Deputy Director Tom] Houser's heard, what our country directors have told us. We wrote a letter to everyone who worked for the Peace Corps and asked them for their ideas. We asked all our overseas staff and all Volunteers to write to me. We got hundreds and hundreds of letters in about a 60-day period which were all read. Out of that, plus the task force's work, came the New Directions. Not everyone participated—you can't have 11,000 people all participate—but I'd say over 1000 did.

What's interesting is that those who came into the Peace Corps with Shriver in the very early days thought this was the original idea of the Peace Corps. In the beginning they asked themselves, "How can we give an opportunity to B.A. Generalists when most of the requests will probably come for skilled workers, professional people, experienced teachers, agricultural degrees and so forth?"

But what happened was that they couldn't convince these skilled people to join the Peace Corps. They weren't interested. And that's why so many are saying today that we can't do these "New Directions" because people won't join. They're talking about their experience. They couldn't get them in the early '60's, but today's different. It's the opposite. Today Americans are more mobile. They don't stay in a job for 30 years. They move; they go; they want new horizons. They want the experience that the young guy gets. They're always saying to me, "It'd be great. I wish I were young enough; I could join the Peace Corps. I wish I didn't have responsibilities. I wish I didn't have a family. I wish I was just coming out of college; I could join the Peace Corps." You hear that all the time. So now we're simply saying, "Yes, you can. We'll twist and bend and make it so, because you're needed, and because you can make a contribution."

At the same time, the campus fellow who was there in the early '60's and available—his interest now has exploded into all kinds of other things. Some of them are still interested in the Peace Corps. Certainly enough to meet the demand. But so many others are withdrawing; searching for new things. They are concerned with urban problems; disenchanted with what government can accomplish or what they as individuals can do. The newness has worn off. Maybe they're waiting for some new call. Or maybe it will just be like the smoke drifting by and there'll be a renewed interest in this kind of thing. So that person is less "available." The rest of the country is opening up.

I guess the biggest criticism has been from some former staff people who have been quoted as saying, "This is really a disaster," or, "It's an idiotic scheme because you're taking the idealism out of the Peace Corps."

I think that's foolishness. I think that an American, at whatever age, who is willing

to leave home and do this, knowing he's going to have to live differently, knowing he's going to have to live on a minimum subsistence allowance, giving up a career and a job to do this, is as idealistic as a person coming out of school who may not have any plans or any burdens or responsibilities. The question of motivation, idealism is always hard to judge and should not be applied to just those coming out of college.

But the main point is that countries are asking for these individuals, and it's the job and the responsibility of the Peace Corps Director and the staff to supply them and not to tell those countries what kinds of people they ought to have.

OSBORN. Now, when you talk about skilled workers, what really do you have in mind?

BLATCHFORD. What's usually associated with the trade skills: people who work with their hands; carpenters, machinists, plumbers; mostly the construction trades are what are called for overseas.

OSBORN. What about graduates? Someone out of a business school or someone who has a Master's Degree in computer programming.

BLATCHFORD. Yes. In education there's a call for experienced teachers; people who have studied to be teachers or have the motivation and the practice in teaching.

Another category is professional skills. They would be your architects, lawyers, engineers, chemists, math and science experts, and so forth.

Then, we have agriculture, people with a strong agricultural background, or a degree, or those who actually were farmers, or are farmers.

OSBORN. How did the Peace Corps ever become saturated with generalists in the first place if, as you indicate, there is such a great demand overseas for skilled people?

BLATCHFORD. People tend to recruit people like themselves. Soon the Peace Corps becomes a homogeneous outfit internally. Those who are recruiting, processing applications, setting up application procedures, screening procedures, tend to set them up for the kind of person they imagine. In the past the Peace Corps has unintentionally discriminated and screened out members of minority groups, skilled workers, older people and so forth.

Take the language. The language test itself and the language course. Most older people probably couldn't get through that. They're not learning at the intensity level that a young college graduate is. And they're going to fall behind if placed in with 25 young liberal arts grads. They're going to fall behind and get discouraged, and they will bounce outside of the system.

OSBORN. Does this mean that the FSI (Foreign Service Institute) language requirement for an older person training will not be as high as that for a younger Volunteer?

BLATCHFORD. Well, I think we have to take a look at it. A person who is a teacher overseas has to have a degree of proficiency greater than a person who is working with his hands and is demonstrating. Some of the skilled workers who have gone overseas have testified to this. They have to be clued in to language, but they may not need the same degree of fluency to begin because of their ability to communicate with their hands.

We had some Indian officials here the other day, and some of our host country recruiters have been up here. They made this point very strongly; that we should be more flexible in our language requirements because many people, farmers and so forth, need less actual fluency in language—because of the nature of their work—than others who are teaching math or something like that, and that we have to examine that possibility. The ability to communicate ideas is the main thing, and not to pass a certain language test.

OSBORN. I've been looking at some of the matrix charts and as you say the requests for these kinds of people are quite high this year. How is the recruiting going? Are you getting these kinds of people in?

BLATCHFORD. I think we'll be successful enough to feel it's worth pursuing and that it can be done. The big question is, in this first attempt this spring, can this be done? Is it ridiculous and impossible, and should we just stay on the campus with the B.A. Generalists?

I say, no, we can't for two reasons. One, these are the requests that are coming in and we have to honor them the best we can. That's what we've said we'd do, and overseas our creditability depends on it. Secondly, there are lots of other Americans that would like to serve and we shouldn't exclude them. After all, the Peace Corps was to represent American society abroad, to give everyone an opportunity for this type of service. We should give it all we have to try to get this message across. And we can't do it in one recruiting season. It's May and we're just getting some of our television and radio recruiting advertising out. People with careers and professions—jobs—are less likely to just pull up roots overnight. They want to think about it. Many of the people we're reaching now will decide in a few months and maybe join next summer. So, it's going to take time to change or enlarge and widen the image that the Peace Corps has. We're doing well enough to give us hope that it can be done.

This summer we have some 300 or 400 more requests from overseas, firm requests, than we had last summer. And, they mainly represent agriculture, trade skills and things like this. They'll be hard to fill. I'm not saying we will fill them all. But I think we'll get 80 percent of them.

OSBORN. Last September you said that the Peace Corps is "lily white", and that you wanted to make it possible for blacks and Spanish-speaking people to join the Peace Corps. Has any progress been made on that?

BLATCHFORD. Some. But we haven't really made enough. We haven't gone all out, and that's the only way we can really make an indentation. Applications from black colleges are up 70 percent this year. That sounds good. But in absolute numbers, what is it . . . 1 percent to 1.7 percent. That's still not good enough.

So we've just set up a special office of minority recruitment. I've got a letter right here to presidents of all black colleges asking their advice and support. We have two inter programs now with Shaw and Atlanta, and last fall we did send the first all black group of Volunteers to Kenya. This is the way of the future. Only we've got to put more effort into it. If we do, I think we can recruit 1000 black Volunteers every year, I think we ought to.

OSBORN. Well, many Volunteers, and especially returned Volunteers wonder, will the older skilled individuals be able to develop the close ties with their communities and to learn the languages. You know, this is what seems to have characterized the Peace Corps in the past as different from A.I.D. or other organizations. What's your feeling about this?

BLATCHFORD. Well, too often the technical advisor of the past has been a very highly paid technician who doesn't live with the people, who lives like American businessmen and diplomats in the American section and doesn't learn the language and really deal with the people; who simply disseminates his expert knowledge in written or conference form to ministries who do with it what they want at the very top.

The Peace Corps hits a different level. It hits the lower middle class or the very poorest level of society. It deals directly with people. And, it will continue to do so. Communicating, learning a language, living modestly, getting to know people, is the sine qua non of development. You don't transfer knowledge and skills just on paper, you do it by this process of identification with the people you're working with. I think that should be the new direction of all American technical assistance in the 1970's.

OSBORN. Do you still think there will be a distinction made between A.I.D. and the Peace Corps overseas?

BLATCHFORD. There is a distinction, and there always will be. Now let's look at it in the eyes of the foreign national. When he thinks of the Peace Corps—he calls them kids or something—he thinks of young people working with the people. He doesn't think of them as part of the embassy or A.I.D. or our foreign aid program. That's good, and I think that will remain as long as whoever we bring learns the language, and works with the people. The countries ask for more skilled, more professional Volunteers, but they tell me they want to maintain this people-to-people approach.

OSBORN. In the 1968 Presidential campaign, I believe one of President Nixon's platforms called for closed coordination between various overseas missions such as A.I.D. and the Peace Corps. Is there any attempt being made to merge our efforts?

BLATCHFORD. No attempts are being made to merge the efforts. The Peterson Report and a number of other reports written on foreign aid, including those of a number of senators and congressmen, have recommended the complete dissolution or reformation of A.I.D. In this next year the future of that will be decided. I don't know what will happen to it. It may be stripped and broken down into parts. I recommended that technical assistance be taken away completely from political considerations; taken away from the economic considerations, the political support we give overseas. And certainly, by all means, it should be divorced from being in the same package with military assistance. Whatever military or shortrun aims the United States Government has should be separated entirely from our genuine interest in providing technical assistance overseas. That should be nonpolitical. It should not depend on boundaries nor should it follow our diplomatic relationships.

The President feels very strongly about that too. But he also feels that one of our primary responsibilities, my primary responsibility, ought to be to increase the contribution Volunteers make to the countries they live in, to make the Peace Corps less marginal to their development and more helpful to them on their terms. It's nice to have the experience that the American gets. This is one part of the Peace Corps. No one is negating that. But we shouldn't justify our existence overseas simply on the cross-cultural experience alone; on what the Volunteer learns when he comes home. That's educational exchange. And while I'm 100 percent for it, there is so much misery and poverty in the world that we can't justify the expenditure of this much money and this many people if we're not making a real contribution to a country. And that's where I stand; that's where I came from. I worked in Latin America for six or seven years and learned to look at the thing through the eyes of Brazilians and Venezuelans and Peruvians and I'm really interested, first and foremost, in whether anyone who comes into that country that I lived in comes to make a contribution. Otherwise, call it something else. Call it good will. And I hear this from Latins and others who say we've simply got to make the Peace Corps work better for them, not just for us.

OSBORN. Let's go back to that. You call yourself a returned Volunteer since you spent so many years in ACCION working in Latin American countries. How did you first get interested in the idea of sending Volunteers overseas?

BLATCHFORD. Well, I first got interested in it on a good will tour that I made through Latin America Playing tennis exhibitions, trying to use sports and music as a door opener, handles as they say, to get to know

students, politicians, labor leaders. We came back rather critical of American foreign policy and American ways of doing things in these countries. I saw the conditions and I saw the feeling of frustration that young people in Latin America had about not being able to forge their own futures. They saw many of their own elite in their own governments neglecting the social problems that existed. And they were frustrated, particularly when they saw a great power like the United States with very talented people and lots of money willing to align themselves with these governments, and not show any concern whatsoever for the really underprivileged and the poor barrios (city slums). It seemed that with just a little less neglect and a little bit of concern and very small amounts of money and people that were willing to spend their lives there, that we might identify with their problems and help them. I thought the U.S. should do something and I didn't know exactly what.

I went back to law school and during the second year, in 1959, did a lot of reading on America. I wrote a lot of things and talked about a new frontier, and the need for young Americans to get involved. What would we do now with our lives? We needed some vehicles . . . we needed some vessel to put our energy and talent into.

I was reading an essay by William James. He wrote about war and the crowd mind and his opposition to the Spanish-American War, which was very well known. He wrote that militarism will always dominate a society because it's the only way of gaining the national cohesion which every society needs. The military gains great credence in times of war and plays a dominant role in society and the country tends to depend upon it, almost turn to it in times of emotional need. He said the concept of peace was alien to the American or western culture. And therefore, if war became impossible or absurd like it has since the Second World War, there had to be some kind of alternative; "moral equivalent," he called it; something which would stress the marshall virtues and the strife, difficulty and national purpose. And so he talked about conscripting the "gilded youth," as he called them, off to far-flung parts of the world.

I was tremendously excited by that idea when I first read it. I said to myself, "This is the answer. There is just no question about it."

It was soon after that I typed up a proposal which I later developed into a plan for ACCION.

OSBORN. Back in the early days, when Sargent Shriver and the other people were first talking about voluntary action, you were one of those who said that voluntary service overseas should be run by a private organization of some kind. And now you are Director of the Peace Corps, a government organization. How do you feel about private action as opposed to government action now?

BLATCHFORD. Well, I have mixed feelings. I was on the platform at Notre Dame the other day with Harris Wofford. Harris is the man I came to see in Washington [in 1961]. We argued day and night. He wanted to make the Peace Corps a government operation. So did Shriver and Kennedy. They wanted a massive American presence overseas. It bordered on jingoism.

I thought a Peace Corps should start quietly. Eugene Burdick was working with me. And Burdick counseled me, when I first came up with the idea, "Don't go around making lots of speeches about it until you know what you're talking about." And I took his advice.

But Shriver said, "There's enough poverty to go around." It was all a very simplistic notion of how to fight poverty. We thought that it was probably a lot more difficult than that and we ought to quietly, in private, experimental ways, work the idea out for two or three years before announcing a massive program. We also felt that being part of the U.S. Government, we'd be suspect, that we'd be too bureaucratic, and that we would be hindered by American foreign policy and the embassies and all the other things that I had seen on my trip.

But Harris favored a government-sponsored Volunteer agency.

So we were on the platform together again [in 1970], and he was advocating that the Peace Corps be turned into a private corporation. I was standing up there as the head of the Peace Corps. We were on the opposite side of the thing again after nine years.

As I say, I have mixed emotions because I think it turned out so much better than I expected. The charge that we are government spies is still there. But I think the Peace Corps did a fantastic job and that Sargent Shriver did—in maintaining its independence. Volunteers were given a pretty free hand, and mainly because it was started by the President of the United States' brother-in-law. A very unique way to start any government agency. Not to be expected or anticipated. With that zest and push, it was really put on the map in big ways all over the country, all over the world, in ways it couldn't have been through starting small and starting privately.

But I still think it has problems, problems that have finally come home to roost. You can't have it both ways. We are part of the government and a part of the United States political system. That decision was made nine years ago. So, therefore, we do have to coordinate with other arms of the United States Government. There will certainly be suspicion on the campus or anywhere else that we are part of the government. That has to be overcome by all of us. The fact that we work for the government creates lack of trust. In the early days people believed in Kennedy and they believed in the mission of the United States Government. They believe less in this today.

So I have mixed emotions about it—being in this position.

OSBORN. Well, the Peace Corps represents such a cross-section of American society, now, that I think we find ourselves of many different opinions about American foreign policy overseas. I was sitting in on a host country recruiters conference a few weeks ago and they themselves started talking about the issue of dissent overseas. One of the things they said was that they didn't want Peace Corps Volunteers to practice politics in their country. But they felt very strongly that if a Volunteer had an opinion, if they asked him a question, he should be free to respond. What would you tell Volunteers who disagree with the government or with some of our actions overseas right now? How can they express their disagreement?

BLATCHFORD. Well, I think, if they disagree so strongly and heartily that it really limits them emotionally from making the commitment necessary to do the job, they ought to leave the Peace Corps, come home and go to work for the opposition to the present government or whatever; dedicate themselves to it. If they still believe that the best way that they can serve intellectually and emotionally is to do what they're doing in the Peace Corps, they ought to continue and simply say what they wish; say that they don't agree. If they want to officially somehow register their conscience with their associates back home or colleagues back home who feel this way, they ought to be allowed to, but keep a very quiet profile overseas within the host country.

Most foreign nationals expect people to speak their mind when asked. People in the village, the teachers, those they are working with—Volunteers can talk to them like they were talking to anyone else. They can have an open discussion with the people they live and work with. No problem. It's an open society at home and that's the kind of society we want to represent.

Now, if they want to take more formal means, I think they should be taken "in-house." We have internal disagreements in this country, and I think we have an obligation not to thrust our dirty laundry upon the people we are working with, whether they agree or not. They don't understand, and in most cases, don't appreciate our publicly raising our foreign policy issues in front of them. So we ask Volunteers to go and visit the ambassador. We ask them to write petitions to me and to the President. These will be read; they'll be listened to by officials in the United States Government. But to dedicate time and energy to public protests—they ought not to do it within the Peace Corps.

OSBORN. Has the prolonged war in Southeast Asia had any effect on the Peace Corps?

Blatchford: I think the war has had a pervasive influence on all American society, and all our institutions are affected by it, all of our attitudes. We're so caught up in it, so desirous it will end as soon as possible that this, I think, influences the Peace Corps. The emotional, negative context of our involvement in this war spills over into many of the things that our people, our universities, and our government agencies, such as the Peace Corps, are doing in a positive way.

In my travels I don't find that other countries are caught up in it to the same degree. They read the papers, they wonder about the war and our involvement, but certainly they look at it more as an American problem, an American war, and, it does not affect the life of the villager, the *barrio* dweller, the average government official who is so concerned and worried about his own problems of finding the money and help to develop his own people.

Those of us involved in idealistic work are more naturally sensitive and susceptible on the issue. However, it is terribly important that the Peace Corps not become another casualty of the Vietnam war, and that we maintain its survival in this era of cynicism, and doubt, and crisis of belief in government and in our institutions, and that we continually work quietly and strongly for peace through constructive change in the lives of the people we serve. And then prevent, hopefully, future Vietnams, and future causes of conflict.

We in the Peace Corps are interested in representing the idealistic and the positive, constructive emotions of the American people in their desire to help people overseas, to work in cooperation with people overseas, to give opportunities to Americans to share the experience and rewards that come from Volunteer service. And we must champion and maintain that institution which provides this opportunity and try hard not to let it fall victim to the overspill of the war effort which is being carried on.

We must work quietly here and overseas—progressively—for the kind of change we believe in, which would include a swift end to the war, so that we can divert that amount of money and energy towards constructive purposes which this war has left undone.

But for the Peace Corps publicly to be an agency identified with one political stance or another on which the President has the right or wrong policy for ending the war would not be helpful to our efforts at this time, nor would it be well understood or appreciated by many of the governments that we work with.

OSBORN. In your post as Director of the Peace Corps, do you consider yourself a member of President Nixon's Administration with an obligation to support his policies publicly? What degree of freedom do you see yourself as having within the Administration?

BLATCHFORD. I was appointed by the President, and serve at the pleasure of the President. But he has given me a free hand to develop the ideas for making the Peace Corps a vital and exciting means of carrying out its original mission in the 1970's. He has given me plenty of backing on this. He has met with all our country directors. He met the other day with members of our national advisory group, some of our staff. He's spent a good deal of time with us emphasizing the importance of the Peace Corps, and he's particularly emphasized the importance of having returned Volunteers go to work on the problems of American society. In much of the criticism we've received from members of Congress, he's backed me up. And in our efforts to broaden the Peace Corps and maintain the right of free speech overseas, we've had his consistent backing.

I do not feel the obligation to do other than speak out forcefully for Volunteer service, for the concept of the Peace Corps, and no need to one way or the other insert the Peace Corps publicly into issues beyond its original mission.

OSBORN. Do you feel any obligation to represent the views expressed in petitions from Volunteers overseas against the war to the President?

BLATCHFORD. Yes, I do. And the Secretary of State and the President are aware of this and the Vice President. They are aware of the feelings of Volunteers, as they are aware of the feelings of young people, and I think I have a special responsibility to constantly champion and be a spokesman within this Administration for the viewpoints of developing nations and America's young people, let us say, idealists of any age. We must maintain our hope for what can be done and what must be done in this world.

OSBORN. Have you forwarded the petitions you have received from Volunteers to the President?

BLATCHFORD. Yes, I have, and I will continue to do so.

OSBORN. Do you think it is wrong or unpatriotic for Volunteers to disagree openly with the official foreign policies of the United States Government?

BLATCHFORD. No, I do not. A Volunteer retains all of his rights as an American citizen while he is overseas. That means he may express himself within the U.S. on American issues.

But when he goes abroad, he agrees to remain apolitical while serving in his host country, and therefore not to engage in any political activity within that country.

All the rights he would have had if he remained in the U.S.—such as writing his congressman or senator, are retained and defended. I made that very clear in the letter I sent to all country directors in October last year.

OSBORN. Many people see your program to recruit older, skilled workers with families as an attempt to weed out Volunteers who might be opposed to the war in Vietnam. Is that true?

BLATCHFORD. No. Of course not. As I have said, our attempt to recruit greater numbers of skilled and mid-career Volunteers is a direct response to requests we are receiving from countries overseas, not to any domestic political pressure.

Besides, as I have also said, the recent college graduate remains—and will remain—the backbone of the Peace Corps.

OSBORN. In May, President Nixon abolished all draft deferments. But at the same time he sent a proposal to Congress for an all-volunteer army. You've always said that you thought Peace Corps service or VISTA service or Teacher Corps service were just as important as military service and should be made alternatives to service in the army. How is that proposal doing in the light of all of the changes that have taken place in the draft system over the past year. Do you think that Congress is more ready to accept the idea?

BLATCHFORD. Well, as you know, this debate went on for several weeks and I fought very hard to either maintain the Peace Corps deferment or to defer military service of drafted volunteers for the duration of their work in the Peace Corps. The Secretary of State backed me on this and the President allowed us our second proposal. But only after quite an exhaustive debate within the government. I think this will be only a temporary measure. I hope that the President will go to an all-volunteer army and there will be no draft.

But let's assume for the moment that even after this war is over there's a peace time army; that there's still some kind of draft call. I advocated before Senator Kennedy's subcommittee that three years of service at home and abroad, three years of your life helping people overeas as well as at home, should be an alternative to the draft, and that you should be able to elect that alternative age 18, 19, 20 or whenever you wanted to. I still think so, but I don't think its fair to go ahead with this until this Vietnam shooting is stopped. While others are getting killed, it's not fair to totally exempt people from the draft.

OSBORN. Let's talk about the Peace Corps as it moves into the '70's again. What would you like the agency to be doing over the next five to ten years? What would you like to see it become? Would you like to see it get back to its original size—say the size it was in '66 when we had 15,000 overseas—or do you think it should be smaller than that?

BLATCHFORD. Well, we're going to do something very, very important right now. We're going to ask every country director to write a four year country plan, to totally assess where that country is; where it's going; what it needs in manpower assistance through Volunteer service. We've nine years experience in many of these countries and four or five in others. And we ought to be able to take this kind of a look. We expect three or four months devoted effort, and then we'll be able to say, I think, the numbers that we'll have overseas.

I don't believe in just recruiting lots of people, putting them overseas and finding things for them to do. I just don't. That's just not the way I look at it. I look at it from the other country's point: "What is the need? How can Volunteers serve?"

But, also, I don't think we ought to just go to a government and say, "Where are your needs? We'll hand them to you." I think it takes tremendous imagination to search through all the private agencies, voluntary agencies, private enterprises, government, universities, school districts throughout a particular country—Peru, Venezuela, wherever—and find all the kinds of jobs Volunteers could be doing—institution building; innovating in new types of projects, possibly in the environment, in educational television, in low-cost housing and vocational training—things that maybe that government isn't working on but they'd like to, if they could have some expertise and some Volunteers to develop new projects.

At the same time, there are many jobs to be filled. And I don't know, I think that—I'm guessing—there probably is a limit of maybe 20,000 or so Volunteers that really could be effectively utilized overseas. And I say "effectively" utilized. We have to be very cautious. We don't want to replace the French and the British in Africa with a kind of volunteer imperialism. We don't want to give the image suddenly that the British and French left but that there's all these Americans swarming all over the place. New countries terribly need to gain their own sense of identity, culture, pride in their institutions. It is terribly important that we stay in the background and help quietly.

For the next two or three years, it's more important to improve the quality and the diversity of the people that go into the program, and the contribution that we can make. If the numbers go down temporarily, that doesn't bother me at all, because the Peace Corps should be measured on what it can do in the eyes of the host country nationals.

OSBORN. I thought of another question when you said you were going to ask the country directors to submit four or five year plans. One of the things that's always puzzled me is why there is so much tension between in-country staffs and Volunteers. When I was a Volunteer, I often had the feeling that my country director wasn't really interested in what I was doing. I never saw him except for the occasional trips he'd make out around the country. I think many Volunteers feel that decisions are made over their heads. That they should have greater say. While staff members feel that Volunteers aren't really informed about how the decisions should be made and what the variables are. Is anything being done to try to bring staff and Volunteers closer together?

BLATCHFORD. We're asking them to hold mid-service conferences, but I'm insisting that any policy decisions be communicated immediately to Volunteers. I think that there has to be a two-way flow. Volunteers have told us many things and I am insisting that those reports be read so that they go into the whole hopper of policy decisions when those policy decisions are made here. Washington offices have got to communicate with Volunteers. Oftentimes staff members are remiss in that they read these things and they study them and they're involved, but they don't go back and call the Volunteers together and explain it. We have an obligation to Volunteers to let them know what the Peace Corps is up to. We can't get mass participation in every decision. But we can weigh opinion from time to time and mainly communicate to them what we're trying to do and why. I think that's very important. Volunteers are very reasonable. They want to be a part of the Peace Corps.

I personally would like to eliminate—and maybe this is heresy—but I'd like to eliminate a lot of this giant gap between Volunteers and staff. The staff are always talking about a Volunteer like he's something in a gilded cage; some kind of a rare being filled with emotional sacrifice and dedication and with a completely different set of attitudes and background which we don't touch. Whereas staff are kind of hired hands, paid employees with responsibilities to help the Volunteer here and there. I think this is a certain mythology that shouldn't exist.

I think everyone in the Peace Corps, in a sense, is a Volunteer. How do you judge sacrifice or idealism or dedication to some cause? It's very hard to judge. To one staff member it may be sacrificing more than a Volunteer. I saw staff members work 24 hours a day practically, when I was in India. They were as dedicated and hard-working as I've seen anywhere. And I've seen the same with Volunteers.

Sure there's a hierarchy. Every organization this large has to have a hierarchy; it has to have a decision-making process; it has to delegate responsibilities. But I'd like to see distinctions eliminated. . . . Everyone is working very hard. They're all working for the Peace Corps; they're working for the government of India or Chile or Dahomey or Chad, and they're dedicated to that particular purpose. I think we're all really members of a team.

OSBORN. One criticism made in some of the letters I received was that the Peace Corps overseas staff is so large compared to other volunteer agencies such as the British VSO's or the Canadian volunteers.

BLATCHFORD. We're making a survey of this right now. We range greatly from one country to another in the size of our staff. And

this eludes me at the moment. We hope that by the end of the summer we'll have a survey of this and be able to know what the size ought to be. And this will be included also in each country plan.

We've cut back the staff 10 percent overseas, as you know, and the Washington staff 22 percent in the last 12 months. This is just something that has to be done to any big organization every so often.

OSBORN. One of the things I found out when I started doing research for the interview was that you never owned a car until you came to Washington, D.C., that you have always had a motorcycle. I was told the other day that you finally bought a family car for your wife [a Toyota].

BLATCHFORD. That's right . . . that's the first car I bought. No, I bought a car for $125, an old Buick once in Berkeley; but I never used it. It blew up, I think, after a bit, one trip.

OSBORN. Do you have any plans for after you finish with the Peace Corps? What does a retired Peace Corps Director do?

BLATCHFORD. I don't think I've ever thought ahead more than six months. I feel very sympathetic and very strongly about some of our young people on campuses. I had dinner a few months ago with Tommy Smothers and Paul Simon and we talked about how young people don't feel they have a future. Future is a meaningless word. During the late '50's when I was studying, that's all anybody talked about. It wasn't: "Are you happy now? Are you enjoying life? Are you doing something you think is worthwhile?" Everything had to be geared to your future, to your career, to wherever you were going to be 20 or 30 years from then. That was the cry and I rebelled very strongly against it. That's why I took off . . . it's heresy to take off a year of law school right in the middle and go to South America. I told my parents, "Well, I'm going to learn Spanish—that'll help me in the future." That was a kind of bone I tossed to them and their way of thinking. But at that time I never thought about it; and I still don't. I don't think it's worth it. I never dated a girl five days ahead of time because I didn't know if I'd really want to go out when I got there. So it's the same way. I serve at the pleasure of the President . . . times the way they are now, you never know how long you're going to be here.

RICHARD D. "MAX" McCARTHY

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pain that I rise to take note of the departure from our midst of my colleague and friend from New York, RICHARD D. "MAX" McCARTHY. I fervently hope that his departure will be merely temporary and that he will be back with us in the 93d, if not before.

MAX and I were both among the large number of Democrats who first served in the 89th. MAX was from the first one of the outstanding members of that distinguished group.

He deservedly made a national reputation in his courageous fight against chemical and biological warfare weapons, and he can properly take much of the credit for the steps the U.S. Government has reluctantly taken to forswear the use of biological warfare and to exercise greater care in the storage and transportation of chemical warfare weapons.

On many issues MAX has shown great courage. He has dared to challenge some of the most important lobbies that operate in Washington, including the military-industrial complex and the gun lobby. MAX McCARTHY has been one of the leaders in pressing for reasonable regulation of firearms and I have been privileged to work with him in that long and painful struggle.

To MAX McCARTHY and his delightful wife we say only "Au revoir." We expect to see you back here before long. In the meantime, we know you will contribute one way or another to making life brighter for a multitude of people.

MR. HOOVER AND THE FBI

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) for bringing this matter to the floor of the House. We are reminded again that he is one of those rare public figures whose integrity and courage help raise the quality of public debate. His presence here adds greatly to public esteem for the House. We are in his debt as Congressmen and as Americans, and I am glad to have this opportunity to salute him and to express my gratitude for his long and indomitable service to his country.

Congressman ANDERSON has discussed the odd and dangerous performance of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, in the Berrigan situation. I must also express my deep resentment—and the deep resentment of, I believe, a majority of the American people—over Mr. Hoover's utterly offensive and professionally incompetent remarks in impugning, among other things, the courage of Spanish-speaking Americans. Is it really proper for high Government officials to categorize groups of Americans in a way that imputes inaccurate and unattractive qualities to people of one or another ethnic background?

It is also time to review the implication and consequences of Mr. Hoover's predilection for announcing his views about leading citizens he does not like. The ordinary citizen wonders who is safe from personal attack by the Director of the FBI if men of the stature of Robert F. Kennedy, Ramsey Clark, and Martin Luther King, Jr., are not. As it happens, a great many Americans admire these men very much.

Two of them held the highest law enforcement position in the U.S. Government. Robert F. Kennedy was perhaps the most widely revered American of his generation. Ramsey Clark's father was a distinguished Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, and Robert Kennedy's brother was one of the greatest and most beloved Presidents of the United States. Martin King is regarded by most Americans and by much of the rest of the world as one of America's greatest sons. He was awarded the Nobel Prize for peace, and his birthday may soon be a national holiday. It is Mr. Hoover's right to disapprove of these men, but if he wishes to voice his disapproval publicly while heading a Federal agency, he should not be surprised if a vast company of Americans begin to voice their disapproval of him.

But that is not the central point. Dr. King, Senator Kennedy, and Mr. Clark need no defense from me. Mr. Hoover has not hurt them with his peculiar attacks on them, which simply served to disclose his own bias and to show a fundamental misapprehension about his job. He has, sadly enough, hurt himself. That may be his business, but he has also hurt the FBI, and that is our business here, and the business of every American.

The basic question posed by Mr. Hoover's behavior is whether someone publicly alined with a particular political viewpoint should be the head of the Government agency charged with protecting the Nation against crime and subversion, "The Bureau must be divorced from politics," Mr. Hoover said as one of his "terms" for accepting his appointment as head of the FBI. Can it be "divorced from politics" when its head engages in bitter running controversies about alleged ethnic traits and belittles political leaders who are heroes to millions of Americans? More than almost any other agency, the FBI must be above suspicion of political bias or personal malice. Mr. Hoover has made that very difficult to achieve, whatever the individual merits of thousands of dedicated FBI agents. Is this situation good for the FBI or for the Republic?

At a time when political fanatics and organized crime threaten our security and well-being, there should be no doubt among the American people that their chief law enforcement agencies are impartial and effective. There should be no division in our support of the effort to protect the public from terrorists and hoodlums. But if you are black or Spanish-speaking, or if you love Robert Kennedy or Martin King, how do you trust an agency headed by a man with the views continually proclaimed by J. Edgar Hoover.

The plain fact is that Mr. Hoover has managed to create the impression that the FBI suffers from political and racial prejudices. Even an impression of this kind is damaging, but as long as Mr. Hoover is head of the FBI, it is clear that the impression is correct, at least as far as the man who heads the agency is concerned. Not many people will easily believe that Mr. Hoover is a "jellyfish" or "softie" whose strongly held views do not affect the actions of his subordinates.

The health of a free society depends in substantial measure on citizens having confidence in the fairness of the law and in the fairness of the way the law is enforced. People of all backgrounds must feel certain that the law treats them equally. That is so basic to our system

that it has become one of our national mottos. In no field of government, therefore, are personal vendettas and racial, religious, or political prejudices less tolerable.

It is essential that public confidence in the FBI be restored—and deserved. Unfortunately that can no longer be achieved simply by Mr. Hoover's learning discretion. His intemperate outbursts have revealed a state of mind. and it is the state of mind, not the outbursts, that must go, if the FBI is to do its job properly—and, more than ever, we need an FBI that can do its job properly.

Mr. Hoover has done much over the years for the FBI and for the Nation. He can do no less now, for both the FBI and the Nation, than to retire. Many of his public statements sound, in fact, as if he thinks he has already retired. If he would retire now, there will be time to honor his achievements. But if he does not retire soon, he risks having those achievements buried in the storm of controversy and suspicion that he is making. More than that, he will have put the agency to which he has given so much of his life under a cloud from which it may take years to emerge.

That would be calamitous for the FBI. and tragic for the Nation.

CARE OF THE DIABETIC

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, constituents in the Third Congressional District of Michigan are very concerned about the controversy which is presently pending over the use of oral antidiabetes products, which controversy was initiated by the rumors of its content and release of a study conducted under the designation "University Group Diabetes Program," commonly referred to as the UGDP study. This study was endorsed by the Food and Drug Administration and aroused considerable controversy among the members of the medical profession. In turn, I am sure, constituents in my district who were using these oral antidiabetes products suffered, and continue to suffer, serious anxiety regarding the validity of this study which seriously questioned present methods of care of diabetes victims.

One such constituent wrote to me and her message bears repeating:

As I am one of the many hundreds of elderly people who has greatly benefited by the use of Orinase, it is only natural that I am much concerned by the widespread news coverage listing the "so-called" ill effects of this drug. These claims I believe to be very untrue, judging from my personal experience.

About five years ago, during one of my visits at my doctor's office, I stressed the fact that I was feeling rather badly. No ambition, not much interest in daily affairs, sleeping was a problem; in fact, I had to force myself to perform daily household tasks, all of which was entirely foreign to my nature. A complete physical examination revealed a diabetic condition—a mild borderline case. This was controlled for a time by strict dieting; however, when this failed, my doctor prescribed Orinase, with the result there was almost immediate improvement in my general condition. Only one Orinase tablet daily accomplished wondrous results.

Although I'm nearly 79 years young, and was nearly killed in an auto accident about a year ago (made a remarkable recovery), I take care of my housework and flowers, rake leaves and shovel snow on occasion—what more could one ask? Couldn't do it without Orinase!

* * * * *

Better give this matter much thought before banning its use if you don't want 800,000 senior citizens on your collective backs.

Although the claims and counterclaims have continued since late last spring, a recent meeting of specialists concerned in the field is deserving of note and I think it desirable that it be brought to the attention of my colleagues who no doubt have received the same type of inquires I have received regarding the FDA action.

An ad hoc committee of distinguished diabetologists, organized as the Committee on the Care of the Diabetic, met recently in Boston to consider the propriety and justification for endorsement by the FDA of a study conducted under the auspices of the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases which challenged current methods of diabetic therapy.

These diabetologists who met in Boston adopted a resolution challenging the UGDP study and its endorsement by the Food and Drug Administration. They have raised, by their action, serious questions with respect to the conduct and judgment of the FDA which should be of concern to everyone interested in insuring proper medical care.

The historical sequence of developments which gave rise to the adoption of this resolution warrants comment. They are disturbing in their indication of the role performed by nonscientific sources which reflect a questionable influence upon the FDA in the exercise of its authority. Furthermore, the medical and scientific controversy which characterizes the UGDP study appears to indicate that FDA endorsement was impulsive and premature; if so, this is an adverse reflection upon the proper exercise of its authority which should be of concern to us all.

The adverse reaction among members of the medical profession, particularly those specializing in the treatment of diabetes both here and abroad, to FDA endorsement of the UGDP study is premised in part, certainly, upon its failure to publish this study for peer review before it took such action. This culminated in the Boston meeting on November 30 of 40 diabetes experts. After a thorough review of available information, these research scientists and leading clinicians from 23 medical centers adopted their resolution. Since then, the study at last has been published. Subsequently, the FDA granted a 30-day delay in requiring label changes. This permits, finally, commencement of scientific debate.

One wonders, however, under the circumstances which characterize FDA treatment of this matter what damage has been done to the 1½ million people who use these oral agents. It may be difficult to measure the unjustified fear caused to these individuals as well as physician distrust generated and confusion created through FDA conduct.

The Committee on the Care of the Diabetic points this out in its resolution adopted on November 30, 1970, when it says:

The erroneous and insensitive manner in which purported information has been disseminated for the past six months has further burdened both physicians and the diabetic population at large with unwarranted anxiety over the treatment of the disease. The FDA action has been taken despite many contrary studies both here and abroad.

The recommendation restricts and all but prohibits the use of any and all oral agents in the treatment of diabetes, despite overwhelmingly favorable clinical experiences to the contrary. Furthermore, the therapeutic implications outlined are ambiguous and impossible to fulfill in accordance with established medical practice. The recent FDA recommendations for the treatment of diabetes seriously undermine the progress made on behalf of the diabetic through years of hard work and education, in the following respects:

(1) Diabetics and their families are confused, anxious, and uncertain of their physician's ability to guide their treatment. Progress in employment and insurance status will, in many instances, be pushed back a number of years by the enforced use of insulin treatment.

(2) The physician has had no basis for making his own decisions concerning the validity of the UGDP Study. Yet, he is now forced, at least indirectly, into the use of principles in diabetic treatment prescribed by the FDA. Potentially, he is exposed to an unprecedented series of malpractice suits based on any occurrence of cardiovascular problems. Though these occur with great frequency in all diabetic patients, they may now be blamed upon the taking of an oral hypoglycemic agent.

Inasmuch as I think it would be valuable to all of my colleagues to have the benefit of the full context of the resolution and because of the importance of this issue to all our unfortunate citizens afflicted with diabetes as well as the practice of medicine generally, the complete resolution follows:

STATEMENT ON THE TREATMENT OF DIABETES

Uncritical and premature recommendations of the Food and Drug Administration regarding the treatment of diabetes mellitus are to be deplored. This is the conclusion reached by forty diabetes specialists who met on November 30, 1970, at the Sheraton-Boston Hotel to discuss their mounting concern for more than one million diabetic patients who have become increasingly disturbed because of newspaper stories alleging adverse effects from long term use of oral anti-diabetes agents.

The current controversy arose following a scientific presentation on June 14, 1970, at the annual meeting of the American Diabetes Association in St. Louis. At that time a group of 12 university centers known as the University Group Diabetes Program (UGDP) presented the results of an 8-year study of more than 800 diabetic patients subjected to different forms of treatment. This prospective cooperative clinical study *appeared* to show that administration of a sulfonylurea drug (tolbutamide) to mild adult-onset diabetics led to a greater death rate from cardiovascular disease than was found in three other groups treated with diet alone, a fixed dosage of insulin or a variable dosage of

insulin. The report received widespread news coverage. Subsequently a letter sent by the FDA to its membership on October 27, 1970, supported the validity of this study, as did a report from the American Medical Association's Council on Drugs.

In late October, an official Food and Drug Administration "Current Drug Information" bulletin was sent to all physicians in the United States. Although based upon still unpublished findings, the letter contained far-reaching implications regarding the future treatment of diabetics. Portions of the FDA statement that may significantly affect diabetic management and greatly compromise the freedom of the physician to prescribe for his patients are as follows:

(1) "Oral hypoglycemic agents should be used only in diabetics with adult-onset, stable disease which cannot be controlled by diet alone and for whom insulin is unacceptable or impractical. A recently published study shows no evidence that, in diabetics with adult-onset, stable disease, therapy with a fixed dose of one such agent (tolbutamide) and diet is more effective in prolonging life than diet alone. The study also suggests that such a regimen may be less effective insofar as cardiovascular mortality is concerned than diet alone or than diet and insulin combined."

(2) In the words of Dr. Charles C. Edwards, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, "The initial and essential foundation for the management of adult-onset diabetes mellitus is diet and weight control. When the symptoms of the disease are adequately controlled by these measures, no other therapy is indicated. All oral hypoglycemic agents should be employed with caution and, if prescribed, then only when serious application of diet, or diet plus insulin has been proven ineffective in the judgment of the physician.

"A physician using hypoglycemic agents should familiarize himself with the cautionary material in the package inserts for these drugs and should adjust the dosage according to the individual patient's needs."

(3) Recommendations that extend the interpretation of the results of the UGDP study to the use of all currently available oral hypoglycemic agents are as follows: "The Food and Drug Administration recommends that the use of Orinase (tolbutamide) and other sulfonylurea type agents, Dymelor (acetohexamide), Diabinese (chlorpropamide), Tolinase (tolazomide), should be limited to those patients with symptomatic adult-onset nonketotic diabetes mellitus which cannot be adequately controlled by diet or weight loss alone and in whom the addition of insulin is impractical or unacceptable. The oral hypoglycemic agents are not recommended in the treatment of chemical or latent diabetes, in suspected diabetes, or in pre-diabetes, and are contraindicated in patients with keto-acidosis."

The actions of the FDA are based exclusively upon this solitary report by the UGDP. Yet, the absence of any similar observations during vast experience with large numbers of diabetic patients, both here and abroad, for periods up to 15 years in the use of tolbutamide and other oral hypoglycemic agents prompted this re-examination of the UGDP report.

The assembled group of diabetes specialists recognized numerous limitations of the UGDP study, including the following:

(1) There was no significant difference in overall mortality among the four treatment groups. Regarding the alleged excess of cardiovascular deaths in patients treated with tolbutamide, the lack of homogeneity of baseline risk factors in the 12 treatment centers invalidates statistical evaluation of the findings.

(2) Disagreement persists concerning the evaluation of the data by UGDP statisticians, since the application of different statistical methods has yielded contradictory results. For example, one independent analysis found no significant difference between tolubutamide and placebo groups with respect to cardiovascular deaths, either when tested separately within each of the 12 treatment centers or when the summed results of all 12 centers were analyzed.

(3) Spontaneous levelling of the claimed excessive mortality in tolbutamide-treated patients during the eighth and last year of the UGDP study suggests that the alleged increase in cardiovascular deaths is not due to the administration of the drug.

Other matters were criticized severely by the group. The application of an arbitrary, constant dosage of tolbutamide differs radically from the customary clinical usage of the drugs. The fact that therapy seemed to have little or no effect on maintaining normal blood sugar levels was attributed to the use of the fixed dosage of tolubtamide, which is also the shortest-acting of the sulfonylurea compounds. Furthermore, the well-known phenomenon of secondary failure known to occur in 30 percent or more of patients so treated was apparently ignored in this report as a possible cause for the elevated blood sugar levels observed.

Findings such as these made the group feel that the established treatment of diabetes was under significant pressure on the basis of experimental results of dubious validity.

The consensus of the meeting was that, before any further action is taken by regulatory agencies, the raw data should be made available to the scientific community at large.

The disastrous consequences of this report stem from the fact that it will tend to restrict treatment of patients with latent or asymptomatic hyperglycemia who do not respond to diet alone.

We categorically oppose the uncritical and premature recommendations of the FDA based on the single and still unpublished report of the UGDP, which is scientifically unacceptable to many specialists in diabetes. This unprecedented interference with the treatment of patients in a controversial area is not only outside the province of a governmental regulatory agency, but it has also damaged the welfare of more than a million diabetic patients.

The erroneous and insensitive manner in which purported information has been disseminated for the past six months has further burdened both physicians and the diabetic population at large with unwarranted anxiety over the treatment of the disease. The FDA action has been taken despite many contrary studies both here and abroad.

The recommendation restricts and all but prohibits the use of any and all oral agents in the treatment of diabetes, despite overwhelmingly favorable clinical experiences to the contrary. Furthermore, the therapeutic implications outlined are ambiguous and impossible to fulfull in accordance with established medical practice. The recent FDA recommendations for the treatment of diabetes seriously undermine the progress made on behalf of the diabetic through years of hard work and education, in the following respects:

(1) Diabetics and their families are confused, anxious, and uncertain of their physician's ability to guide their treatment. Progress in employment and insurance status will, in many instances, be pushed back a number of years by the enforced use of insulin treatment.

(2) The physician has had no basis for making his own decisions concerning the validity of the UGDP study. Yet, he is now forced, at least indirectly, into the use of principles in diabetic treatment prescribed by the FDA. Potentially, he is exposed to an unprecedented series of malpractice suits based on any occurrence of cardiovascular problems. Though these occur with great frequency in all diabetic patients, they may now be blamed upon the taking of an oral hypoglycemic agent.

The recommendations of the FDA tend to constitute the practice of medicine by specifying the order in which therapeutic programs are to be employed in the treatment of patients. This directive, if taken literally, will also prevent or seriously hamper future clinical research in this field. Furthermore, the FDA denies the value of chemical control of the disease, which emasculates any programs of diabetes detection as well as all public health measures in this area.

We request:

(1) Suitable modifications of the FDA Drug Information Letter. (2) Immediate reconsideration of currently proposed revisions of the package inserts demanded of the manufacturers of oral hypoglycemic agents, and (3) Further independent statistical and clinical analysis of the UGDP study based on raw data so far not available to the scientific community.

Signing the position statement are:

Robert F. Bradley, M.D., Medical Director, Joslin Clinic, Boston, Mass.

Peter H. Forsham, M.D., Director, Metabolic Research Unit, University of California Medical Center, San Francisco, California.

Henry Dolger, M.D., Clinical Prof. of Medicine Mount Sinai School of Medicine, City University of N.Y., New York, New York.

Holbrooke Seltzer, M.D., Chief of Endocrinology, Veterans Administration Hospital, Southwestern Medical School, Dallas, Texas.

James B. Ashmore, M.D., Professor of Pharmacology, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Samuel B. Beaser, M.D., Lecturer in Medicine, Tufts Medical School, Boston, Mass.

David R. Challoner, M.D., Associate Professor, Assistant Chairman, Department of Medicine, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Rafael A. Camerini-Davalos, M.D., Associate Professor in Medicine, Director, Diabetes, New York Medical College, New York, New York.

Dewitt E. DeLauter, M.D., Georgetown University School of Medicine, Washington, D.C.

Harold L. Dobson, M.D., Associate Professor of Medicine, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas.

Robert Feldman, M.D., Director of Metabolic Research, Kaiser Permanente Foundation, Oakland, California.

Philip W. Felts, M.D., Assistant Professor of Medicine. Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Nashville, Tennessee.

Gerald J. Friedman, M.D., Director of Diabetes, Beth-Israel Hospital, New York, New York.

Richard L. Fulton, M.D., President, Ohio Medical Association, Columbus, Ohio.

Edwin W. Gates, M.D., Niagra Falls, New York.

Robert R. Hare, M.D.. Past President, Oregon Diabetes Association, Portland, Oregon.

Edgar A. Haunz, M.D., Professor and Chairman, Dept. of Medicine, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota.

Wyman E. Jacobson, M.D., St. Louis Park Medical Center, President, Minneapolis Diabetes Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Gerald Kent, M.D., Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine, University Hospital, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

Leo P. Krall, M.D., Director of Education, Joslin Diabetes Foundation, Boston, Mass.

Arthur Krosnick, M.D., Coordinator, Diabetes, Endocrine, and Metabolic Disease Program, Div. of Chronic Illness Control, Dept. of Health, Trenton, New Jersey.

Alexander Marble, M.D., President, Joslin Diabetes Foundation, Boston, Mass.

Glen W. McDonald, M.D. (Ret.) Former Chief, Diabetes and Arthritis Control Program, U.S. Public Health Service, Norman, Oklahoma.

Leona Miller, M.D., Associate Professor of Medicine, University of Southern California School of Medicine, Chief, Diabetes Service, Los Angeles, California.

James M. Moss, M.D., Clinical Professor of Medicine, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Henry J. Oppenheimer, M.D., Associate Professor of Clinical Medicine, St. Louis University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Missouri.

John B. O'Sullivan, M.D., Chief, Diabetes and Arthritis, Field Research Unit, U.S. Public Health Service, Boston, Mass.

Marjorie Peebles-Meyers, M.D., President, Michigan Diabetes Association, Detroit, Michigan.

O. Peter Schumacher, M.D., Cleveland, Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio.

Charles Shuman, M.D., Professor of Medicine, Temple University Health Services Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Abraham A. Silver, M.D., Physician-in-Chief, North Charles Hospital, Baltimore, Maryland.

Charles W. Sisk, M.D. Regional Research Coordinator, Veterans Administration, Washington, D.C.

J. Stuart Soeldner, M.D., Associate Professor of Medicine, Harvard University School of Medicine, Boston, Mass.

John W. Stephens, M.D., Portland, Oregon.

George Welsh, M.D., President, New England Diabetes Association, University of Vermont Medical School, Burlington, Vermont.

GROUND-LEVEL "BOOM" AGAINST THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the loudest ground-level disturbances that has come to the attention of the Members of the 91st Congress has been from increasing numbers of American citizens exercising their opposition to the supersonic transport program. For the past 2 years, the voice of the public has created its own "sonic boom" about the proposed "flying boom doggle."

Part of the growing majority against the SST is represented by those interested in preserving our vanishing wildlife species now centered in and around the national parks, national forests, and national wilderness areas. These persons, perhaps unconvinced of the Government's promises regarding overland flights of the proposed SST, have petitioned me to introduce legislation which would prohibit sonic booms over such areas.

The petition reads:

We, the undersigned, oppose the use of any public-owned outdoor recreation and wilderness areas for the loosing of sonic booms.

Herewith, we submit our names in petition for and immediate enactment of legislation which will permanently prohibit sonic booms for occurring over, or within effective range of, all present and future national park and forest areas, without exception.

As you know, pending legislation would accomplish the ends sought by the petitioners and I am supporting such legislation. It is my hope that a law will be passed to prohibit sonic booms, irrespective of the outcome of the current battle over the funding of the prototype development of the airplane itself. Passage of such a law would mean that Congress recognizes the need for environmental parameters for the development of any aircraft program—government or private.

Although the total of names listed below is just over 1,000, I believe they would gladly join forces with the over 40 million individual members of the organizations who are represented in the coalition against the SST and who are supporting a total congressional rejection of the SST program. The list of petitioners follows:

LIST OF PETITIONERS

ARIZONA

Margarita Kay, Tucson; Sharon Urban, Tucson; Richard Vivian, Tucson; Wilma Kaemlein, Tucson.

Grace Heffelfinger, Tucson; James Ayres, Tucson; Mildred Ogg, Tucson; Robert Lovegren, Grand Canyon.

Maxwell Hancock, Grand Canyon; Richard Raynes, Grand Canyon; W. N. Mattesen, Grand Canyon; Warren Hill, Grand Canyon.

Darrow Dolan, Tucson; Curtis Wienker, Tucson; Harry Getty, Tucson; Roger Kelly, Tucson.

Harriett Martin, Tucson; Joyce Resnick, Tucson; Mark Harlan, Tucson; Alice Lehet, Tucson.

Martha Morrow, Tucson; Daniel Matson, Tucson; Clara Tanner, Tucson.

William Longacre, Tucson; Michael Real, Tucson; J. D. Brillhart, Tucson.

CALIFORNIA

Ken Harris, Mill Valley; Mabel Jin, San Francisco; Roberta Halpern, San Francisco; Betty Lederer, Concord.

M. R. Smith, Walnut Creek; Florence Klinger, Martinez; Jean Holden, Concord; Richard Holden, Concord.

Edith B. Draemel, Concord; Ann Cavanaugh, Concord; David Bortin, Walnut Crek naugh, Concord; David Bortin, Walnut Creek; A. P. Lindenmann, Concord.

Barbe Forster, Orinda; William H. Debe, Fairfield; Debbie Byrne, Orinda; Christine Payne, Orinda.

Marilyn Mitchell, Orinda; Alvin A. Burton, Walnut Creek; John Wright, Maraga; Mark Southland, Rohnert Park.

Hal Sears, Menlo Park; Caryle Hershberg, Palo Alto; Elenor Waxman, Palo Alto; Cory Kramer, Sunnyvale.

Margaret Lynn, Palo Alto; David Parker, Santa Cruz; Dennis Petrosian, Los Altos; Rhonda Levitt, Menlo Park.

Kevin Kilbridge, Palo Alto; David Glen, Los Gatos; Susan Barrett, Stanford; Denise Williams, San Jose.

Jonathan Williams, San Jose; Eric Lindquist, Los Altos; Larry Barnett, Santa Monica; Rick Clark, Sunnyvale.

John Graham, Millbrae; Merriam Graham, Milbrae; Dennis Nobrega, Oakland, Ira Marks, Oakland.

Peter B. Groves, Sausalito; Richard Simpson, Oakland; Steve Wilson, San Rafael; Sharon Lew, San Rafael.

Harold Franklin, San Francisco; Charlotte M. Harper, San Francisco; Michael Reed, San Francisco; Charles Leroy Christman, San Francisco.

Lou Ann Wiegert, Pacifica; Michael Dang, San Francisco; Pat Williams, San Francisco; David B. Sutton, Menlo Park.

Gerald W. George, San Francisco; Dena Korich, San Francisco; Ronald P. Addad, San Francisco; Timothy Reeves, Palo Alto.

Tom L. Adams, San Francisco; Corrine Hoh, San Francisco; William Henderson, San Francisco.

Linda M. Furtad, Orinda; Katie Burdick, San Francisco; Bob Leyland, Oakland; Earl Randall, Oakland.

Mary D. Sastos, Berkeley; Jullian H. Mayer, Berkeley; Craig Fisher, San Francisco; Rebecca A. Miller, San Francisco.

Eugene D. Hemppel, Jr., Santa Clara; Ronald L. Felzer, Berkeley; Stephen S. Allen, Berkeley; A. D. Armstrong, Bishop.

P. K. Noone, Oakland; Frances Osburn, Richmond; Chris Tarp, Orinda; Kari Tarp, Orinda.

Robert R. Aspinall, San Carlos; Dorothy E. Aspinall, San Carlos; Paul Teichel, Berkeley; Janice Bailey, Sacramento.

Steven D. Thompson, San Francisco; Joll Kroeker, Berkeley; Richard D. Strong, Berkeley; Doron Strong, Bolenas.

Alycia Gay, Davis; Carolyn Minor, Berkeley, Patrick McCarthy, San Francisco.

Margaret R. Hayes, Berkeley; Cassie Webb, Santa Clara; Howard B. Swank, Tracy; E. C. Lewis, San Jose.

T. V. Johnson, San Jose; Rachel B. Perry, Berkeley; Ann Dunlap, Berkeley; James E. Rush, Berkeley.

W. T. Schwartz, Berkeley; R. A. Hisselsboeck, Berkeley; Carlos Baron, Berkeley; Russell Barret Haney, Berkeley.

Bonney M. Ely, Berkeley; Steven Darrow, Berkeley; Kathy Thomsen, Berkeley; P. D. Trow, Berkeley.

Diane Schauer, Berkeley; Dana H. Morton, Berkeley; Fred C. McCollin, Albany; W. H. Carsen, Jr., Oakland.

W. Dublin, Los Angeles; Bemon Lee, Berkeley; Ruth Ann Larson, Oakland; Daniel O. Holmes, Orinda.

Randy Howard, Berkeley; Rick Adinolb, Berkeley; Phyllis A. Ford, Berkeley; Martin Kashwearoff, Berkeley.

Mark Commerford, Berkeley; Stephanie Wynshaw, Berkeley; Peggy Lutes, Berkeley; John S. Mayfield, Berkeley.

William James, San Diego; Winifred James, San Diego; Mrs. Kenneth Hayes, San Jose; Roberta Fries, Santa Clara.

Janie Bowman, San Jose; Wendell H. Kern, Cupertino; Mary A. Sanchez, San Jose; Dorothy J. Porter, San Jose.

Lindy Hayes, San Jose; Kenneth Hayes, M.D., San Jose; R. M. Nyman, San Jose; A. W. Dunlay, San Jose.

O. W. Dow, Sunnyvale; Shirley P Harris, San Jose; Kim C. Hayes, Berkeley; Eva S. Hayes, Berkeley; John Hayes, San Jose.

Mary Jorgensen, Berkeley; Janet Henley, Berkeley; Isabel Shanahan, Berkeley; Jon Robbin, Berkeley.

William Melland, Berkeley; Ellen Brasher, Berkeley; Ronald Wilcoxen, Oakland; G. E. McGinnis, Richmond.

Pamela Mitchell, Pasadena; Chris Robinson, Arcadia; Tom Hynes, Berkeley; Stanley Price, Berkeley.

Elizabeth Zorb, Berkeley; Eileen Henry, Oakland; Paul Williams, Oakland; Richard Goodman, Oakland.

Kay Cox, Vallejo; Ann Simpson, Berkeley; Linda Wilhelm, Berkeley.

Debbie Meyer, Orinda; Rebecca Oaks, Stockton; Robert McGowan, Alameda; Barbara Savage, Berkeley.

Jeff Hicks, Berkeley; Joe Holmes, Berkeley; Margaret Gironard, San Mateo.

Joanne Gonder, Oakland; L, Wortham, Berkeley; Steven Rudney, Oakland; Caryl White, Richmond.

Ira Bray, Davis; Ellen Roth, Berkeley; Michael Willingham, Berkeley.

Alonzo Reid, Berkeley; L. Ann Philipps, Oakland; George Fenell, Albany; Patricia Clark, Berkeley.

D. Pollan, Berkeley, D. Wold, Berkeley; Stan Peterson, Oakland; Elizabeth Gozzi, Danville.

Steven Bloom, Berkeley; Roger Spence, Berkeley; Kathy Griffa, Oakland; Paul Kleinman, Berkeley.

Tom Morrissey, Berkeley; Marion Alzofon, Berkeley; Diana Hughes, Berkeley; Anita Allen, Berkeley.

Retha Lobdell, Berkeley; Ron Eastwood, Berkeley; Jean K. Jenny, Berkeley; C. G. Powers, El Cerrito.

Ann Keim, Berkeley; Dan Sessler, Buena Vista; Ellen Watrons, Saratoga; Robert Dennis, Oakland.

Sandra Hager, Oakland; Randall Jones, Berkeley; T. Turner, Berkeley; B. J. Miller, Berkeley.

Janice Rasmussen, Berkeley; Edward Murphy, Oakland; Nina Ruymaker, Oakland; Richard Betts, El Cerrito; Paul Drablcin, Forestville.

Allan Daley, Berkeley; Jim Slate, Berkeley; Michael Pappone, Berkeley; Jeffrey Simkins, Berkeley.

B. A. Lee, Berkeley; Judith Berman, Berkeley; James Beibe, Berkeley; S. Taylor, Berkeley.

Daniel Kreshner, San Francisco; Eleanor Hodges, Berkeley; Howard Resnick, Berkeley; Jan Finch, Berkeley.

Adrienne Lowe, Berkeley; Maureen Moore, Berkeley; Bruce Klein, Berkeley; Ann Kane, Berkeley.

D. Elliott, Berkeley; Susan Muller, Berkeley; Susan Lydon, Berkeley; Mary Ivanetich, Berkeley.

Johanna Sluis, Albany; Priscilla Shenk, Oakland; Katherine Kallander, Berkeley; Dorothy Jones, Berkeley.

William Bakun, Berkeley; Charles Wood, Berkeley; William Wagg, Berkeley; Nathan Cohen, El Cerrito.

Madeline Sloane, Berkeley; Roy T. Reeves, Oakland; Sharron Sulinski, Albany; Robert Schwartz, Palo Alto.

William Brophy, Lafayette; Larry Harvey, Fresno; R. N. Schmidt, Berkeley; Tricia Beldock, Berkeley.

Kathleen Lignell, Oakland,; Sara Rosenthal, Berkeley; David Marshall, Berkeley; Eileen Keech, Berkeley.

Louise C. Brown, Berkeley; Hal Rosen, Berkeley; James Daley, Los Angeels; Alan Weinstein, Berkeley.

Thomas M. Powell, Berkeley; R. Sipol, Berkeley; Joseph W. Charg, Berkeley; Bruce D. Greenberg, Berkeley; Robert Landan, Oakland.

Thomas Mitchell, San Francisco; Stan Cates, San Francisco; Michael Klepetka, San Francisco; Keith Beattie, San Francisco.

Thomas Wills, San Francisco; Ken Daniels, San Francisco; Ken Smith, San Francisco; Pat McFarlane, San Francisco.

Mary O'Neill, San Francisco; Judy Spero, San Francisco; Rhonda Sharp, San Francisco; Dean Montgomery, San Francisco.

Margarate O'Neill, San Francisco; J. M. Highsmith, San Francisco; N. J. Chisholm, San Francisco; Mark O'Neill, San Francisco.

George O'Neill, San Francisco; Jim Battey, Los Altos; Eric Van Dyke, Los Altos Hills.

Cindy Rubin, Los Altos Hills; Patti Graham, Los Altos; Karen Henell, Los Altos Hills; Penny Poole, Los Altos.

Bruce Wheatley. Berkeley; Jacob Kambis, Berkeley; Paul Fogel, Berkeley; Michael Frumkin, Hayward.

Kathryn Walker, Berkeley; Donna Gerry, Berkeley; Alan Powell, Berkeley; James Brock, Berkeley.

Edward King, Berkeley; Paula Silver, Berkeley; Veronica Cassil, Berkeley; A. Perry Berkeley.

Paul Gifford, Berkeley; Mark Hancock, Oakland; Todd Main, Berkeley; Howard Sherman, Berkeley.

Douglas Stewart, Berkeley; Terrence Kaufman, Berkeley; Patrick Devine, San Francisco; J. S. Trimble, Berkeley.

Peter E. Glick, Berkeley; Barry Nichols, San Francisco; Donna Lowe, Berkeley; John Foster, Berkeley.

Mary P. Cooper, Berkeley; William Jones, Berkeley; Russell Hightower, Berkeley; William Lynch, San Francisco.

K. Fellon, San Francisco; Susan Raabe, Summerland; J. Trowbridge, Berkeley; Sandra Carter, Berkeley.

Mildred Brown, Oakland; T. A. Thompson, Berkeley; Margery Stern, Berkeley; R. Freeman, Berkeley.

Margaret Philp, Berkeley; Lorraine Crawford, Berkeley; Valerie Libby, Berkeley; Estralita Busk, San Leandro.

Howard Alta, Berkeley; Donna Russell, Hayward; Arnie Snyder, Hayward; Christopher Brown, Berkeley.

David Winet, Berkeley; R. R. Powell, Albany; Walter Moore, Berkeley; Ron Fishman, Berkeley.

Mark Woodworth, San Leandro; M. Evans, Berkeley; Jane Fields, Berkeley; Sally Majer, Berkeley; Randall Keller, Berkeley.

Tamara Rocklin, Berkeley; Catherine Williams, Berkeley; Bruce Estes, San Francisco; Donald Bolce, Oakland.

Paul Dalmas, Berkeley; Marsha Dalmas, Berkeley; L. Hinrichsen, Berkeley; Daniel Schmidt, Oakland.

Leslie Cooper, Oakland; Ruben Lugo, Oakland; Susan Pretti, Oakland; Bobra Goldsmith, Berkeley.

Alan Bond, Berkeley; Howard Ensler, Berkeley; Jeremy Kammerer, Oakland; A. C. White, Berkeley.

Ray Steigard, San Francisco; Patrick Gallagher, San Francisco; H. Mark Evans, Oakland; Robert Del Baker, Berkeley.

Terri Martin, Los Altos; William MacDougall, Los Altos; Wendy Levens, Mountain View; P. Hughes, Los Altos.

Sylvia Talarico, Sunnyvale; Christine Kirtley, Los Altos; Karen Jacobson, Los Altos; Marianne Ericsson, Mountain View.

Edith Lachenbruch, Los Altos Hills; Virginia Carlsen, Los Altos; Cheryl Crose, Los Altos; Carol Watham, Los Altos.

Denise Berg, Los Altos; Steve White, Los Altos; Matthew Ross, Berkeley; Marsha Knox, Berkeley.

David Christiano, Berkeley; Carl Applebaum, Oakland; Patricia Burt, Berkeley; David Dolberg, Oakland.

Ross Kersey, Berkeley; Deborah Spencer, Berkeley; Kathy Stimmel, Oakland; Norman R. Mancini, Emeryville.

Mrs. C. N. Ober, Berkeley; Allen McVoy, Berkeley; Amy Alexander, Berkeley; A. Weffer, Berkeley.

Alan Dressler, Berkeley; Jane Koplen, Berkeley; M. Tomas, Berkeley; A. M. Berler, Berkeley.

Richard Orlando, Berkeley; Larry Gross, Berkeley; Patricia Everall, San Francisco; Phyllis De Wall, Berkeley.

B. F. Ox, Berkeley; Ed Foust, Berkeley; Steve Albi, Berkeley; Phyllis Pansegrau, San Francisco.

Rosalyn Bindman, Berkeley; Bill Dix, Berkeley; Edmundo Angeles, Berkeley; Fred McCollum, Albany.

Frank Letton, Berkeley; David M. Hammon, Berkeley; Barabara Busch, Berkeley.

Jane Andrews, Berkeley; Allen Linn, Berkeley; Jeff Peters, Berkeley.

Zipporah Collins, Berkeley; Walter Caplan, Berkeley; Maureen Wyckoff, Berkeley; Thomas Stanley, Oakland.

Lawrence Owens, Oakland; Scott Herold, Richmond; Jon Bill, Berkeley; Neil Thomason, Berkeley.

Patricia Steinhour, Berkeley; Mrs. J. R. Jones, Berkeley; Cleo Cordell, Berkeley; John Hillenbrand, Berkeley.

Rev. James Carter, Berkeley; Nancy Dodge, Berkeley; Jeanne Matteson, Berkeley; Gregory Hodel, Berkeley.

Todd LaPorte, Lafayette; Lisa Phillips, Berkeley; Regina Blumenfeld, Berkeley; William Snyder, Oakland.

Virginia Aldrich, Berkeley; John W. Harbuck, Berkeley; Craig Harrison, Berkeley.

Junne Carlin, Berkeley; Eugene Kojar, Berkeley; Thomas B. Pringle, Oakland.

Robert Howe, Berkeley; Carol Carico, Berkely; Martin Mills, Berkeley; Jim Hughes, Berkeley.

Marla Mizraki, Berkeley; Anthony Ebert, Berkeley; Eric Beck, Berkeley; David Fischer, Berkeley.

Douglas Sevchak, Berkeley; Carl Fletcher, Berkeley; David Redell, Berkeley; Bruce Lindsey, Berkeley.

Blake Sutton, Berkeley; Diane Shaw, Berkeley; Dennis Smith, Berkeley; Janet Boyles, Berkeley.

Mary Wolstad, Berkeley; Abigail Montgomery, Berkeley; Richard Simon, Berkeley; Jeanne Ballentine, Berkeley.

John B. Schonk, M.D., San Francisco; C. Aeckles, M.D., Mill Valley; Barry Mendelson, M.D., San Francisco; Mari O. Fertig, San Francisco.

Jeff Shoriro, San Francisco; Sofi Kurtz, San Francisco; George Johnson, Daly City; Gail Freeman, Berkeley.

Mary B. Davis, San Francisco; Jonne Rondestredt, San Francisco; Golda Mopper, San Francisco; Joseph A. Henderson, San Francisco.

Nicholas N. Fintzelberg, La Mesa; Stefani B. Salkeld, Encinitas; Kenneth E. Hedges, Spring Valley; Judith Green, La Jolla.

Leanne Hinton, Leucadia; Ruth V. Evans, San Diego; Dorthy Mayer, Berkeley; Margaret Mason, Berkeley.

Jennifer Smith, Oakland; Avis Rappoport, Berkeley; Avril Weber, San Francisco; Angela Lett, Berkeley; Karl Wehrle, Oakland.

John Taylor, Big Sur; B. Tuck, Big Sur; Phyllis Calechinan, Berkeley; Alan W. Levy, Tustin.

Connie A. Parsons, San Francisco; Michelle Ryan, San Francisco; Marion Brennan, Sausalito; Robert Levine, Berkeley.

A. J. Madester, San Francisco; Carol Opstelter, San Francisco; Dale C. Rutherback, San Francisco; Jane L. Everson, San Francisco.

Barbara Levin, El Cerrito; E. M. Feigenbaum, San Francisco; Mary M. Ahern, San Francisco; Frank Schoenfeld, Berkeley.

Ana L. Overbeck, San Francisco; Margaret F. Forcade, San Francisco; Harriate Gell, El Cerrito; Joan Maesel, Sausalito.

Chrisula T. Asimos, San Francisco; Calvin L. Janzen, San Francisco; Ruth M. Ormsby, Sausalito; Mary M. Brusdte, San Francisco.

Charles M. Binger, San Rafael; Jacqueline Etemad, M.D., San Francisco; J. P. Adamson, M.D., Berkeley.

Fred M. Stephen, Berkeley; D. W. Meals, Oakland; Martha Dunne, Sonora; Benjamin Weaver, Big Sur.

Judyth Opowitz, Big Sur; Jane Kaskin, Alta; Tom H. Guis, Big Sur; Janet Lyon, Big Sur.

Sandra Koelner, Big Sur; E. Mason, Big Sur; Joe Caming, Big Sur; Bill Gay, Big Sur.

J. W. Larson, Big Sur; Linda Fishus, Big Sur; Deborah Carson, Big Sur; Barbara Schlucter, Big Sur.

S. Clark, Long Beach; Bob Stevers, Big Sur; Maxine Furland, Big Sur; Susan Martin, Big Sur.

Tania Abrams, Big Sur; Peter N. Welchin, Big Sur; Elna Widall, San Francisco; Irving Biers, Big Sur; Bingit Ball, Big Sur

Myles Gisson, San Francisco; Cynthia Kearney, Big Sur; Bettsie Fox, Big Sur; Elizabeth Fuller, Belvedere.

Mary Ellen Klee, Big Sur; Helen Hall Stephens, Big Sur; G. Ryan, Big Sur; Adrienne Poules, Big Sur.

Mary B. Melchior, Big Sur; Jeffrey A. Stewart, Big Sur; Jerome Mitchell, Big Sur; Samantha Cahill, Big Sur.

Virgin Harris, Big Sur; Ronald E. Spencer, Albany; J. Hamai, Berkeley; Bryan Frazer, Berkeley.

John M. Wenz, Albany; William H. Jordan, Jr., Berkeley; Candace Hogan, Berkeley; Cornell Dudley, Orinda.

Leibert R. Ellis, Albany; L. E. Ehler, Berkeley; Lloyd A. Andres, Berkeley.

Patricia A. Felch, Berkeley; Charles Laquer, Richmond; John A. L. Osborn, Berkeley.

Ethel Vergin, San Francisco; Rose Miller, San Francisco; Dorothy Richardson, Daly City; Richard S. Galin, San Francisco.

Willilam B. Goodheart, Mill Valley; Shirley A. Reece, San Francisco; Marsha Lewis, San Francisco; William J. Kellcher, San Francisco.

J. Martinez, San Francisco; Bingham

Young, Montera; C. A. Petilla, San Francisco; John Richardson, San Francisco; Michael Feiree, San Francisco.

Jeremiah C. Fitzgerald, Daly City; John F. McCloskey, Jr., Calma; Marjorie Souz, San Francisco; Carol Roberts, San Francisco.

Ronald J. Olina, San Francisco; Kathryn Gibbon, San Rafael; Pat Sax, San Francisco; Laurie Southgate, San Francisco.

Leonore Harrison, San Francisco; Dale D. Miller, Oakland; Mildred F. Oliva, San Francisco; Louis M. Teobr, San Francisco.

Berenice Palmer, Facifica; Mie Musake, San Francisco; S. Salasnik, Muir Beach; Pam Harcrow, San Francisco; Janet Larson, San Francisco.

Myrna Tussner, Anaheim; Marvin Sherrill, Fullerton; Joyce Arend, Orange; Pat Kidd, Santa Ana.

John S. Allan, Orange; C. W. Ball, Newport Beach; Emily Hector, Alhambra; Jim Lesh, Long Beach.

Judy Lockyer, Anaheim; Rod Sanderson, Garden Grove; Jim McCaskill, Pomona.

COLORADO

Michael Cashmore, Denver; Lyn Noland, Carbondale.

Clinton M. Kelley, Englewood; Jerry Robinson, Denver; Stanley F. Stot, Denver; Raoul E. Bates, Lakewood.

Josephine E. Carpenter, Denver; John H. Carpenter, Denver; Jacquelyn McCarty, Boulder; Wendy Gattanack, Denver.

James McIntosh, Denver; Helen J. Stiles, Boulder; Elna Lauko, Colorado Springs; Franz Mohling, Boulder.

Hugh E. Kugery, Denver; David A. Carter, Pueblo; Frances C. Carter, Pueblo; J. D. Sular, Littleton.

F. Richard Yeatts, Golden; Virginia A. Kelley, Englewood; Sally Richards, Denver.

Edward B. Wright III, Denver; M. K. Munn, Denver; Martin H. Stone, Denver; Ed Connors, Englewood.

V. Crane Wright, Denver; John A. C. Wright, Boulder; Estella B. Leopold, Denver; Rowon Dietz, Littleton.

Kay Collins, Englewood; Carolyn R. Johnson, Evergreen; Richard L. Hill, Colorado Springs; Gene Muratet, Arvada.

Lennig Sweet, Denver; Harry M. Swift, Golden; Roger A. Hudiburg, Boulder; Gail V. Young, Denver.

T. J. Davey, Denver; J. O. Rose, Denver; Charles L. Tuomey, Denver; Dona Murphy, Denver.

David E. Neidert, Denver; Phyllis E. Kendall, Denver; Robin Simmons, Lakewood; Peg Milroy, Littleton; Sally Richards, Denver.

E. F. Phillips, South Norwalk.
Gerald Rasmussen, Stamford.
James M. Arden, South Norwalk.
Donald F. Sisson, Milford.
Joll Friedenberg, Stamford.
Harriet Gayle, Stamford.
Stephan C. Thomson, Wethersfield.
Sandra Steinberg, New Haven.
Alan Shaw, New Haven.
Peter J. O'Connell, New Haven.
Lewis B. Heberly, New Haven.
Jim Gordeuk, New Haven.
Janet Becker, New Haven.
Frederick Rhoader, New Haven.
Eve Spangler, New Haven.
John R. Shultz, New Haven.
Elsa Townsend, Hamden.
George S. Andrews, Hamden.
Frederick Rhoades, New Haven.
Lorraine Carrejo, Waterbury.

DELAWARE

Cherie Smith, Wilmington.
Marc Tipping, Wilmington.
Carolyn Saler, Newark.
M. L. Dener, Hockessin.
Marge Allman, Newark.
Charles B. Nalle, Newark.

FLORIDA

Peggy Walden, Everglades National Park.
Jennette Clark, Homestead.
Flora Semingsen, Homestead.
Florence Schwartz, Miami.
Ida M. Smith, Homestead.
Mary B. Roberts, Homestead.
Stanley F. Robinson, Homestead.
Robert Peterson, Everglades National Park.
W. M. Alexander, Homestead.
Richard W. Klukar, Homestead.
John C. Ogden, Homestead.
William Robertson, Homestead.
Esther Pickersgill, Homestead.
F. Gratz, Homestead.
James Stewart, Homestead.
Roger Ronek, Florida City.
Maria E. Montes, Homestead.
Paul Heator, Homestead.

Mary W. Grane, Marathon; Mrs. L. Allen, Marathon; Frances I. Hauser, Key West; Keven B. Smith, Key West.

Bonnie H. Smith, Key West; Steven C. Smith, Key West; June H. Miller, Marathon; James C. Bragdon, Key West.

Mrs. Guy Carlton, Key West; Mrs. R. K. Bailey, Marathon; Coral M. Nelson, Marathon; Mrs. Effie Taylor, Marathon.

Mrs. Tom Lawler, Key Colony Beach; Howard P. Gilmore, Marathon; Mrs. Bruce Nelson, Apopka; Doris Mager, Apopka.

Georgina MacDonald, Winter Park; Pat Hopkins, Orlando; Patti Lawson, Winter Park.

Betsy McDonell, Winter Park; Betty Baker, Maitland; Jeanette Young, Longwood.

IDAHO

William Mager, Idaho Fall.

ILLINOIS

Daniel H. Janzen, Chicago.
Barbara Carroll, Chicago.
Louis Baslaw, Chicago.
C. Ronald Carroll, Chicago.
Larry L. Packwood, Chicago.
Katherine L. Wildman, Chicago.
Nancy Stanton, Chicago.
Ann W. Rain, Evanston.
Sara B. Kline, Chicago.
Joan Julien, Palos Heights.
Richard Geltman, Chicago.
Richard M. Roberts, Chicago.
Joan A. Gigueroa, Chicago.
Daniel Dykhuizen, Chicago.
Monte Lloyd, Chicago.
Robert K. Colwell, Chicago.
John W. Wilson III, Chicago.
J. G. Thompson, Chicago.
William C. Wimsatt, Chicago.
Evelyn S. Hlabse, Chicago.
Mary M. Colwell, Chicago.
F. Topping, Evanston.
Hazel S. Riegel, Dwight.
Harry L. Riegel, Dwight.
Charles Staples, Chicago.

INDIANA

Robert E. Hansen, Bloomington.

IOWA

Paul Stokstad, Des Moines.

KENTUCKY

Mary M. Porter, Richmond.

MARYLAND

Richard Rybeck, Kensington.
Frances Tolford, Potomac.
John Tolford, Potomac.
Josh Tolford, Potomac.
Matt Tolford, Potomac.
Lois Groner, Silver Spring.
Ann Spaner, Bethesda.
Kent Miller, Bethesda.
Sarah Gagne, Silver Spring.
Jean Meisel, Chevy Chase.
Steve Tobias, Baltimore.
David Tice, Baltimore.
Bill Schwarz, Baltimore.

MASSACHUSETTS

Robert Stevens, Andover; Arthur Costagno, Brookline; Stanley Stern, Cambridge; Clarence E. Purrington, Wakefield.

Burton C. Reed, Greenfield; Alice E. Reed, Greenfield; Lynn Overholt, Boston; Sandy Schaffer, Brighton.

Mary Cartier, Boston; Inez Miller, Pinehurst; Mrs. B. Moskow, Boston; Ellen R. Riggs, Winchester.

Judi Kent, Boston; Linda Deming, Boston; J. B. Hull, Jr., Great Barrington; Nanette M. Sexson, Cambridge.

Mrs. John S. Hull, Jr., Great Barrington; Mrs. C. E. Purrington, Wakefield.

MICHIGAN

Ann Kristal, Southfield; Douglas Scott, Ann Arbor; Sandra Marlatt, Battle Creek; Kenneth Gillett, Battle Creek; Warren Harris, Battle Creek; Donald Altemus, Bellevue.

MINNESOTA

James L. Tanner, Mankato; Linda Davison, Mankato; Steven Laufers, Minneapolis.

NEBRASKA

Connie Harden, Lincoln.

NEVADA

Thomas Ash, Reno; Bob Johnston, Reno.

NEW JERSEY

Jeff Spendelow, Marlton; Robert Valas, Pitman; Ray Brewser, Jersey City; Martino Joseph, Orange.

Paul Vallos, Manasquan; Josie Principato, Haddonfield; Wendy Mackrin, Springfield; Gayle Taylor, Harrington Park.

Michael Hlubik, Columbus; Thomas Smith, New Brunswick; Andrew Jasinski, Manville; J. Asher, W. Orange.

Susan Grossley, Great Notch; Judy Eisenberg, Bayonne; John Brovarone, Teaneck; Brett Howard, St. Orange.

Steve Wilson, Hackensack; Mike Ventura, Belleville; Bob Mellan, Belleville; Dominick Mellace, Belleville; Gary Clayton, Monmouth Junction.

NEW MEXICO

Watts Kittams, Carlsbad; Francis Schneider, Carlsbad; John DeWitt, Carlsbad; Hiram Parent, Carlsbad.

Robert Turner, Carlsbad; Claude Fernandez, Carlsbad; Robert DeVine, Carlsbad.

Neal Guse, Carlsbad; Roby Mabery, Carlsbad; Wayne Corbit, Carlsbad; Neal Bullington, Carlsbad.

Barney Burns, Carlsbad; Walter O'Neal, Carlsbad.

NEW YORK

Lynne Bierer, New York; Richard Horbert, New York.

Christiane Citron, New York; Robert Calvert, Brooklyn; Peter Rowley, New York; J. Sollami, Flushing.

Allen Geasberg, New York; Yvonne Semaire, Liverpool; The Niles, Cherry Valley; Peter Orlovsky, Cherry Valley.

Lee Crabtree, Cherry Valley; Julium Orlorsky, Cherry Valley; Denise Feliu, Cherry Valley; B. Brewser, Cherry Valley.

Ed T. Urich, Cherry Valley; Alice Gilbert, Jamaica; Elda Liusi, New York; Fai Coffin, Staten Island.

Wendy Schwartz, New York; Jerry D. Caffey, New York; Jeffrey Marker, New York; L. Reeves, New York.

William Kulock, New York; Steven Weiss, Brooklyn.

Thomas Humbert, Glen Cove; Stephen Morros, Buffalo; Kenneth Deardoff, New York; Beth Ann Hallman, Yonkers.

Brenda Winkel, Massapequa; Glenn Paulson, New York; Michael Steinberg, Brooklyn; Jackson Low, Bronx.

Cleo Gorman, New York, Andy Siegal, Jamaica; K. Kessler, Jamaica; Steven Vogel, Jamaica.

Susan Schayes, Brooklyn; S. Martin, New York; Irene George, New York; Anastasia Paul, New York.

Joanna Krotz, New York; Martha Friedberg, New York; Roger Mignon, Brooklyn; Ruth Ross, New York.

Barabara Hirsch, Brooklyn, Ruth Strauss, New York; Susan Block, New York; Lisa Price, New York.

NORTH CAROLINA

Debbie Kohl, Raleigh.

OHIO

William Hotchkiss, Columbus; Steve Johnston, Westerville; Ruth Wotz, Columbus; Terry Moore, Columbus.

Howard Knachel, Columbus; Carol Marteis, Columbus; John Landers, Columbus; Thomas Durkin, Columbus.

Ann B. Wildman, Westerville; Mary Virginia Carlburtson, Columbus; Hope B. Baker, Westerville; Clara H. Creager, Westerville.

Earl Murphy, Columbus; Slipus Kuntz, Columbus; Susan Williamson, Columbus; Juanita Williamson, Columbus.

Fred Van Dyke, Columbus; Susan Warns, Columbus; Jean Lunsted, Columbus; Mary Jane Brunt, Columbus.

M. J. Whitehouse, Columbus; Albert Lovejoy, Westville; George Bopp, Worthington; Michael Zunich, Columbus.

H. W. Sellers, Columbus; Dean Wilcox, Bexley; Stephen Koyder, Columbus; Richard Brommer, Columbus.

H. S. Wilson, Columbus; Donald R. Streilig, Columbus; M. A. Johnston, Gabanna.

Gary S. Alexander, Cleveland; Bruce McLoughlin, Columbus; Elizabeth Smith, Cuyahoga Falls; Linda Wildman, Westerville.

Annie Peters, Cuyahoga Falls; Rena Cappelli, Athens; Linda Williams, South Euclid; Debbie Graff, Millersburg.

Marsha Brindman, Dayton; Margaret Curran, Westerville; Christine Bailey, Eaton; Lisa Neff, Eaton.

Janis Davis, West Unity; Lynne Groenke, Parma Heights; Stephen Zemke, Huron; Joseph Politella, Kent.

Mrs. Glen Beal, Kent; Mrs. Ralph Boosinger, Kent; Bill Lockman, Columbus; Kenton Travis, Columbus.

S. G. Shore, Columbus; Douglas Denton, Columbus.

OREGON

Vern Cope, Williams; Jim Breaid, Eugene.

PENNSYLVANIA

Eileen Morgan, Pittsburgh; Earl Hempstead, Starlight.

TENNESSEE

Sandra Holmstrom, Oak Ridge; Gary Briggs, Oak Ridge; Ann Glatzer, Oak Ridge; Scott Bishop, Oak Ridge.

W. R. Garrett, Oak Ridge; Victor Jett, Oak Ridge; Ruth Young, Oak Ridge; L. B. Russell, Oak Ridge.

Eleanor C. DuBois, Kingston; C. M. DuBois, Kingston.

Boyd Hutchison, Oak Ridge; Margaret Clarke, Oak Ridge; James Ramsey, Oak Ridge; Jean Bangham, Oak Ridge.

Mrs. A. G. Bates, Oak Ridge; Betty Dreyer, Oak Ridge; Dawn Auerbach, Oak Ridge; Frances Loving, Oak Ridge.

Mary Loving, Oak Ridge; Anne Auerbach, Oak Ridge; Alison Auerbach, Oak Ridge; J. B. Auerbach, Oak Ridge.

William Mooney, Jr., Oak Ridge; J. T. Barish, Oak Ridge; T. H. Lee, Oak Ridge; Jean Cole, Oak Ridge.

Dot Hightower, Oak Ridge; Mrs. Sam Thompson, Oak Ridge; Jerry Wauggs, Oak Ridge; Mrs. Ray Johnson, Oak Ridge.

Robert Peelle, Oak Ridge; Marjorie Swenson, Oak Ridge; Elizabeth Peelle, Oak Ridge.

VIRGINIA

Ron Perlik, McLean; Fredd Loebe, Roanoke; Scott Robertson, McLean; B. Peterson, Fairfax.

Douglas Gillikin, Annandale; Jeffrey Wilber, Falls Church; Leanne Stallman, Arlington; E. Darmolray, Arlington.

Kenneth Schuppin, Arlington; G. H. Boron, Arlington; Carol Lee, Oakton; George Saulnier, Alexandria.

WASHINGTON

Laura Burnham, Davenport; Jim Coldwell, Seattle; Jeffrey Smith, Tacoma; James Miller, Omak.

Virginia Crow, Seattle; William Croso, Seattle.

WISCONSIN

Douglas Shidell, Schofeild; Ron Legro, Madison; Myra Weinberg, Madison; Frank Klein, Green Bay.

Warren Gilkey Jr., Madison; Michael Wagner, Valdeis; Leslie Gapp, Madison.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

L. Levitt, Washington; James Dwyer, Washington; Jay Korn, Washington; Lin Smith, Washington.

Raymond Angier, Washington; David Vlabor, Washington; Joel Semvels, Washington; Barbara Wallis, Washington.

Beverly Lyons, Washington; A. J. Bavoody, Washington; Paul Farras, Washington; Rev. Ralph Monteiro, Washington.

J. William Cooksy, Washington; Christopher Cooksy, Washington; Karl M. Kosee, Sr., Washington.

WE MUST FREE THE PRISONERS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the December 23, 1970, edition of the Review of the News magazine. The author of this piece is Mr. R. D. Patrick Mahoney, a man who has spent many years in Southeast Asia fighting against the totalitarian advance.

Mr. Mahoney comments on the sickening attempt, bravely resisted to this point, to utilize the wives of the men being held by the Communists as a pro-North Vietnamese lobby to agitate for our withdrawal. The people responsible for this effort are beneath contempt.

Mr. Mahoney feels that one of the reasons the recent attempt to rescue some of our men being held by the Communists failed was because the last administration had withdrawn our ground reconnaissance teams which had been surveying the scene in the enemy rear. Aerial reconnaissance is of limited efficacy—a fact we should keep in mind should an agreement be reached at the SALT talks. The question is why don't we put these reconnaissance teams back in? This is, of course, a variation of the real question, which is why don't we send the Marines or the 82d Airborne into the enemy rear?

A quote from an American flyer who was a prisoner of the North Vietnamese makes plain the ridiculous nature of our self-imposed restrictions as they apply to allowing the enemy complete freedom of action and organization in the material base from which he is launching attacks on three neighboring countries. This man was still in enemy hands when we curtailed our limited bombing efforts in North Vietnam. "The day we stopped bombing the North, I remember wondering what the hell happened—did we lose the war or what?" The article follows:

WE MUST FREE THE PRISONERS

(By R. D. Patrick Mahoney)

Seven members of the U.S. Special Forces team fighting in Vietnam had just been captured by the Vietcong. The *Boston Record American* quotes the typical reaction of a fellow Green Beret: "If we don't go grab those guys out of the bag, they're going to die, and their death will be on the hands of all Americans. Some of those people are my friends. I soldiered with them, and I'd gladly fly back out there right now to help get them." So would I. So would any other American aware of what the Enemy is doing to those men.

Yet what is being done to free them from captivity?

Damn little.

The *New York Times* of November 26, 1970, carried a description of a military operation called S.O.G., which it says "stands for Studies and Operations Group. Its assignment throughout the war has been to move into Laos, Cambodia and North Vietnam to gather military intelligence on such things as location of enemy troops, supply dumps and concentration of Air Defenses." The mission of some of those teams was the location by eyes and ears of the Enemy's P.O.W. camps. But the S.O.G. teams, providing ground reconnaissance, were withdrawn at the time of the bombing halt over two years ago. When President Johnson did this the effect was to assure the North Vietnamese that they could do what they pleased with the American prisoners in their hands; that no one would know; that they could continue to torture, harass, starve, and murder American P.O.W.'s with impunity; that the camps weren't even under surveillance. The nation that had committed those men to war had permitted their abandonment by a sick government hell-bent on going to Paris to "negotiate."

The fact is that President Nixon's recent Son Tay rescue attempt, for all the bravery of the Air Force pilots and Green Berets involved, failed because of the withdrawal of our S.O.G. intelligence teams from the North. That CH–53 helicopter assault from Thailand failed to return with freed American prisoners because a President of the United States had crippled the intelligence apparatus necessary to its success.

It is brutally clear what happened. Read between the lines when Air Force Brigadier General Leroy J. Manor tells the *New York Times* in one sentence, "I would say the intelligence on the camp was not good in that it had been identified *some time ago* as a POW facility," and then states, "Intelligence was excellent because we knew just how to *approach* the camp." That's a dead giveaway—we knew where the camp was from *two-year-old* intelligence. We did not know that the prisoners had been moved because a President of the United States had ordered our S.O.G. intelligence teams out of the North.

Everyone in Vietnam knows or suspects that contingency plans have long existed for hitting those camps simultaneously with a massive rescue operation. That would be routine. But any such plan would have required accurate, up-to-date intelligence to ensure the success of the mission. This could not be had at San Toy because the S.O.G. ground teams had two years before been pulled out of the areas around every enemy prison camp by order of the Commander-in-Chief.

And so the debasement, terror, and inhumanity to America's P.O..W.s continues. It continues because of a failure of grit on the part of three successive Administrations. It continues because they have been more interested in political grandstanding than freeing those prisoners. Cut it any way you like, it adds up to that.

Lieutenant Bob Frishman and Petty Officer Douglas Hegdahl, both of whom have been prisoners of the North Vietnamese, testified in December before the House Committee on Internal Security. Frishman said that en route to prison from his downed aircraft he was "pelted with rocks, beaten with sticks, and poked with knives," despite the fact that he was suffering from a severe wound in his arm with an exposed bone and profuse bleed-

ing. He said that from conversation with other prisoners he knew that his experience was typical. For contradicting his captors' charge that he was not a Prisoner of War but a political criminal, for instance, Doug Hedgdahl was put into solitary confinement for seven months and ten days.

The House Committee summarized the testimony it heard from released prisoners, noting that Americans in the hands of the Enemy are regularly suffering "grossly deficient medical care; binding and hanging men from the ceilings; beatings; inadequate food and water, sometimes deliberately withheld; isolation in dark rooms; confinement in cages; and, the rebreaking of broken bones during interrogation sessions."

Lieutenant Bob Frishman knows all about it. As a result of Enemy tortures he left one elbow in North Vietnam. Colonel Norris Overly is another who knows what he is talking about. He says the North Vietnamese prison camps are "worse than the Nazi stalag or the North Korean compound." He speaks of "being placed in an 8 by 11 cell and left to rot, month after month, and year after year." This after the Enemy had paraded him through its villages—where he was beaten, spat and urinated upon, and made to suffer every conceivable brutality and indignity at the hands of North Vietnamese mobs.

At the time Colonel Overly was captured, we were still bombing North Vietnam. They "wired him to a fifty-gallon drum full of gasoline and put him on a truck for transport to a P.O.W.–M.I.A. camp." The idea was that if our fighter-bombers hit the convoy, prisoner Overly could be certain of a horrible death.

Petty Officer Hegdahl tells of thirty letters he wrote to send home. After his release he found that only five were received. When the Enemy allowed Christmas packages to be sent by wives and families, every item that might help to ease the loneliness of their hours was confiscated from the boxes. Both Frishman and Hegdahl talked of the treatment of other prisoners. They spoke for instance of Admiral John S. McCain's son, Lt Commander J. S. McCain, who has suffered at least five broken bones and been kept by the Enemy in solitary isolation since April of 1968. Men are kept in cages too small to permit them to stand, forced to sit in their own excrement, for months on end; they are chained in caves and sealed in rooms without windows; they are caged and hung from trees; they are starved, and refused water, and beaten.

But, brutal as such treatment is, something far worse can happen to an American serviceman in the hands of the Enemy. On April 29, 1970, Congressman Mendel Rivers, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, testified about this before a House Subcommittee investigating the plight of American Prisoners of War in Southeast Asia:

Mr. RIVERS. Oh, yes. I had one young man come to our committee, he rolled off the names of five members of the other body [the U.S. Senate] so fast that it would make your head swim, and he said: "Every day, every day, every day, their speeches were played over" to them, just poured out of these loudspeakers, speeches of members of the other body. . . . This boy said he had nothing else to do but go crazy. He said his buddy died.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the members of the subcommittee fully are aware of who the members of the other body might very likely be—the five members.

The "young man" referred to by Chairman Rivers was Major James N. Rowe. Human Events of December 13, 1969, quotes Major Rowe as follows: "In the latter part of 1967 they ceased quoting any of their sources, dropped them completely, and began drawing from American sources, our own news media in the U.S. They started drawing from statements made by prominent individuals within our government (Senators Mansfield, Morse, McGovern, Fulbright)." American publications cited by Major Rowe is used by the Enemy to help break the morale of American prisoners included Time, Life, Look, the Washington Post, and the New York Times. So effective was Communist torture when the will of our soldiers was broken by the Communist propaganda from these media and those Senators, said Major Rowe, that his buddy died of it. Died of the shame of it! He could take the beatings but not the betrayal.

"The day we stopped bombing the North," says Lieutenant Frishman, "I remember wondering what the hell happened—did we lose the war or what?" For twenty-two months he had been permitted to read only "special articles" from the *New York Times*, or speeches by Benjamin Spock, or quotations from the Vietnik speeches of Senator George McGovern. One day, he remembers, a new prisoner "told me about what 'super hawk' Mendel Rivers was doing—trying to win the war. Hell, I never felt so good in my life. It was almost worth another chapter of Benjamin Spock."

The government of North Vietnam currently acknowledges holding as prisoners some 324 Americans; our government says it has solid evidence of 457 in captivity. But as many as 1,500 Americans are missing in Southeast Asia. How many of those are yet alive in Communist prison camps is a matter known only to the Enemy. The Communists aren't saying. But, for the wives and families of those listed as P.O.W.'s, and those in that limbo status of M.I.A., the waiting is the same. The anguish, the tears, the hollow look, the terrible lonely hours leave an indelible mark. It's in their faces. You meet one of them and you know.

Those listed as prisoners by the North Vietnamese are now permitted an occasional six-line letter home. Packages from home are sometimes allowed, but the contents rarely get through intact. There is heavy censorship both ways, and the only thing that the wives of those men "declared" to be P.O.W.s can be assured of is that on the date of the last six-line letter their husbands were alive. That sounds like so little. Yet the wives of our men listed as Missing In Action would give the world for just such a meager assurance. It is a heartbreaking world those wives live in. I know their plight personally. I know many of them, and I know their husbands, fathers, mothers, brothers, and sisters. I am proud to know them. They understand what the Green Berets mean when they say: "You have never lived 'til you've almost died. For those who fight for it, life has a flavor the protected will never know."

For years these families listened as faceless men in our government double-talked and lied to them. They were boldly told to keep their mouths shut or face reprisals. It was over a year and a half ago that Mrs. James Bond Stockdale, accompanied by relatives of ten other prisoners, moved into Defense Secretary Melvin Laird's office to urge a major campaign to free the prisoners. According to the *New York Times* of July 29, 1969, they were there "seeking aid and comfort." But, says the *Times*, they received "little comfort and even less aid."

That did it! They would fight. And they would fight even their own government if necessary. Within weeks some three thousand women had banded together to form "The National League Of Families Of American Prisoners And Missing In Southeast Asia." They immediately began, as Mrs. Stockdale put it, "to try to educate the public."

The Congress of the United States soon got a taste of what they meant by education. In the spring of 1970, Hearings were held before the House Subcommittee On National Security Policy And Scientific Developments. The wives would be heard. Mrs. Jane Denton of Virginia Beach, Virginia, was the first of these courageous ladies to testify. She spoke proudly:

"In May of 1966 my husband appeared in a television interview released by a Japanese news agency and shown around the world. I saw him, gaunt and haggard, subjected to an inquisition the obvious object of which was to force him to repudiate his country. Instead he expressed his loyalty.

"We saw that night a shell of the man who had left here the year before. It was not easy to see one's husband or father in that condition and not be able to reach out and help him. It is still painful to visualize him that way, but that is the mental picture I carry of him to this day.

"That was 4 years ago. What must his condition be now? How long will he have to wait? And have I waited too long to speak out? These are questions which torture me."

Why was this gallant lady speaking out now? She explained that the Communists had promised the P.O.W. issue would be discussed following the bombing halt of eighteen months before. "How," she asked, "could I be patient any longer?"

Mrs. Lorraine Ramsey of Jacksonville, North Carolina, was just as angry. She is the wife of a Marine Corps major, missing since January of 1968. She said she was disgusted with "piecemeal" tactics. "If pressure is the solution," she said, "then I urge you to put our military leaders on notice to end this war, giving them the support needed to accomplish the task. If this war is allowed to continue, as a war of death and mutilation in Vietnam, and a war of polemics here in the safety of our shores, then all of the sacrifices of these loyal and brave men have been for naught."

Mrs. F. Harold Kushner of Danville, Virginia, told of those who had journeyed around the world on behalf of their men, "not knowing their own status—were they wives or were they widows." Chairman Rivers told her to "keep the faith." She replied: "I have never lost faith in my husband, but at times I wonder if my country has lost faith in him . . . I come before you today to tell you that I am tired, I am tired of traveling and I am tired of publicly baring my private anguish. And I am most tired of Presidential platitudes and Congressional convocations. They no longer reassure me, and they have never brought any relief to the men involved." Only one word could be added to that. Amen.

And what of those Presidential platitudes? In October of this year the National League Of Families Of American Prisoners And Missing In Southeast Asia held a convention in Washington. Once again the wives were rebuffed by the Administration. And the Defense Department began to apply pressure to their leaders to quiet down or else. The new president of the League, Mrs. Carole North of Wellfleet, Massachusetts, addressed a group of wives and families on the steps of the Capitol. She declared that the Nixon Administration was doing all it could. The wives who had elected her were horrified! According to the *Boston Globe* of October 6, 1970, "she was drowned out by a chorus of *No* from the men and women on the steps behind her." These people will not be fooled and they will not be sold out.

The *Richmond News Leader* interviewed Mrs. Paul E. Galanti, Mrs. H. E. Richeson, Mrs. T. S. Clifford, and Mrs. Wilmer N. Grubb—all wives of prisoners—in its issue of November 11, 1970. I remember an account about Mrs. Grubb in *Air Force And Space Digest* for October 1969. Author Louis R. Stockstill had written of her: "The day Mrs. Grubb heard of his capture, it was snowing, two of her three sons were ill, and she was three months pregnant."

The courage of Evelyn Grubb has been tested almost beyond endurance, but she is a valiant lady who will not break. It was she who told the *Richmond News Leader* that "in all the history of warfare, this is the first time that the wives and families have had to work to free their men. Never before has this kind of thing happened. And I am not too sure that it is something that our country can be proud of. To hear nothing from a country that can produce a list of the names of the My Lai massacre civilians in five days and cannot produce a list of prisoners in five years is beyond belief."

The plight of these women is a national disgrace. Little indignities are repeated and repeated. The *News Leader* tells of Mrs. Galanti being over-charged for repairs on her car; of Mrs. Grubb not being able to get a credit card because her husband can't sign the application. These brave ladies can't even buy or sell a home because their powers of attorney have expired. They talk of seeking legislation—not for handouts, but to extend their powers of attorney, permitting them to act in the financial interests of their families. Yet they know that such a bill will kick around the hoppers of Congress for two years while that same Congress is speedily passing legislation to send strategic goods to Russia and the satellite nations supplying arms to our Enemy in the field. Mrs. Galanti put it very well. She said: "I would cut off any trade . . . *with any* . . . *countries* that are supplying our enemy." And she added, "Congress *can* do it. And this *is* the most obvious solution." Few in Congress will even listen.

Mrs. Galanti speaks of the day when the prisoners can come home. But she speaks not of the joy of reunion. Not of families reunited. She is a military wife and she looks at it this way: "It is going to be very hard for them to see that very few people have really cared that they have been over there and it hasn't achieved anything . . ." And she speaks not of herself, but of others: "Take for instance Mrs. Grubb's situation. Although her husband knew she was pregnant before he was shot down, he doesn't even know that he has another little boy."

People like this are an honor to America. And the voices of these families are beginning to capture the attention of the American people. *They* will not give up. *They* will fight on and on and on. And they *will* be heard.

The Communists know it. They fear that the prisoner issue might stiffen the backbone of America. To counter the efforts of the wives and families of American Prisoners of War, Vietnik radicals have been organized into a hate group called the Committee Of Liaison With Families Of Servicemen *Detained* In North Vietnam. It was founded by self-confessed Communist David Dellinger and Cora Weiss, a radical fugitive from a broomstick.

You will remember Cora from the insurrection in Chicago during the Democrat National Convention. She is cited as one of the organizers of that ugly business in the Hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities published as *Subversive Involvement In Disruption Of 1968 Democratic Party National Convention*. Mrs. Weiss has also been active in such subversive operations as The New Mobilization To End The War In Vietnam and the scabrous Women Strike For Peace.

No one was surprised when the Liberation News Service reported on March 14, 1970, that the North Vietnamese government "chose to work with the anti-war Liaison Committee because it believes that the families of the pilots should join the anti-war movement." The Liaison Committee is now busy mailing Communist propaganda to the families of America's imprisoned servicemen from Cora's headquarters above a nudie peep show at 365 West 42nd Street in New York City.

Cora's husband Peter is meanwhile working with the National Lawyers' Guild—officially cited as "the foremost legal bulwark of the Community Party"—on behalf of the Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam. Their announced intention is to subject American prisoners to Nuremberg-type trials. Reporting on a radical meeting in Toronto with representatives from North Vietnam, John H. Vincent described the strategy in *Twin Circle* for May 17, 1970, noting that the group was seeking to "prepare the groundwork for 'trying hundreds of American servicemen,' now prisoners of war in North Vietnam, *also* as 'war criminals.'"

While Peter Weiss works to gather "evidence," Cora is pressing wives of American Prisoners of War to trade leniency on their husbands for work against the best interests of their country. It is a pincers movement of shame—and perfidy—for which both Cora and Peter Weiss should be tried and executed for treason.

Radical Cora Weiss now travels at will to Hanoi, bringing back six-line letters to P.O.W. dependents who are the target of Red propaganda. The theme is plain. If you want your husbands, sons, and brothers to survive—join the Communist team. Asked about the matter, an Assistant Secretary of Defense recently told a House Subcommittee: "I would say this: that we, of course, are very pleased to see the information, any information on our prisoners, come out through any source." The ugly game goes on and on, and our government is "pleased" to see it develop as a means of acquiring "information on our prisoners."

Returning from North Vietnam, Cora Weiss also brings out lists of the dead—prisoners murdered or tortured to death—on behalf of the North Vietnam Committee For Solidarity With American People. Its complement in the United States is called the American Committee For Solidarity With Vietnamese People, and counts among its sponsors such identified Communists as Holland Roberts and Herbert J. Phillips.

In late November, Cora Weiss carried six letters from Hanoi to six families in the United States. Mrs. Wilmer N. Grubb, the outspoken anti-Communist, was one of the six who received a short note from Cora and her Communist friends. After five years of being separated from her husband, Evelyn Grubb would no longer worry about him. "Newk" Grubb's youngest son, Roy, born while he was in captivity, would never look into the face of his father. Jeffrey, Roland, and Stephen Grubb would never see their Dad again. Cora Weiss had delivered a Christmas message from the Reds. Her husband, it said, was dead—probably tortured to death in North Vietnam.

Sitting in front of me as I write is a picture of Wilmer "Newk" Grubb, Major, United States Air Force. He was shot down while piloting an unarmed reconnaissance plane over the North during a truce. Released by Communist sources through U.P.I. on February 22, 1966, it is a photograph showing "Newk" shortly after capture and in excellent health. But Evelyn Grubb had refused to cooperate with the Communists; "Newk" Grubb had remained loyal to his oath and had refused to betray his country. The message Cora Weiss sent was clear: Merry Christmass, Mrs. Grubb and Jeff and Roland and Stephen and Roy—we have killed your husband and father. Merry Christmas from Hanoi.

On Page 114 of its annual report for 1969, the House Committee on Internal Security revealed that the group led by Cora Weiss has been permitted by our government to engage "in activities which exploit suffering American Prisoners Of War for Communist propaganda purposes and thereby render aid and comfort to a nation with which the United States is engaged in armed conflict." Our Constitution defines that as treason. By that definition Cora and Peter Weiss are traitors.

My friend Frank Cortese puts it well when asked why he stays in the fight, year after year, to expose such Communist activity. "I'll tell you why," he says angrily, "I'm waiting for the treason trials!" So are the nearly 3,000 members of the National League Of Families Of American Prisoners And Missing In Southeast Asia. When they are asked to believe that all is being done for men like "Newk" Grubb that can be done, they look at the activities of Cora and Peter Weiss and they know it is a damned lie.

As our government has proved ever more cowardly, the Enemy has become steadily more brazen, to the point that it is now using Prisoners of War to blackmail American families into supporting the Communists in America's streets. It is an act of such infamy as to enrage the nation—if it but knew the story. If it but knew! But Americans *don't* know. They don't know because *Time* and *Look* and the others don't want it known, lest Americans also discover the role that they have played in this betrayal. There is a conspiracy of silence.

Just before I left the battlefields of Southeast Asia in late August, two gallant men of our Air Force presented me with a plaque. One was Captain Frank Kricker, still a Forward Air Controller somewhere in Southeast Asia. The other was Major Ron Marzano, an extraordinary pilot who had often been the difference between a man being picked up behind Enemy lines or taken prisoner. The plaque they gave me was engraved with a message, and it reads like this:

"War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things; the decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks that nothing is worth war is much worse. A man who has nothing for which he is willing to fight; nothing he cares about more than his own personal safety; is a miserable creature who has no chance of being free, unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself."

Men like the late "Newk" Grubb. In my opinion, one "Newk" Grubb—one tortured American in the nands of a brutal Enemy, one man tortured to death because he and his wife would not betray America—is worth whatever it takes to get this war over. Whatever it takes, dammit!

The Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee evidently agrees. In his testimony before the Subcommittee looking into the P.O.W. atrocities, Congressman Mendel Rivers made that clear:

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The proposal of issuing an ultimatum to Hanoi has been made in some circles. Would you venture a timetable?

Mr. RIVERS. Absolutely. Absolutely.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. In your opinion, what would be the ultimate date?

Mr. RIVERS. I would have made it yesterday. Yesterday was too late. I would say, "After such and such a date, we are putting you on notice, we will not be responsible for our actions, because of your treatment of the POW's." I would dress it up in some of this high falutin' language that these State Department people can dress up stuff, but I would figure it so they could understand it.

Chairman Rivers' proposal can be easily backed. And it won't even require any of that "highfalutin'" language from the State Department. The solution is at this minute bottled up in the House Foreign Affairs Committee as I write. It is House Joint Resolution 1378, introduced by President Nixon's Congressman, the Honorable John G. Schmitz of California's 35th District. This Joint House-Senate Resolution is written in language the Enemy can understand. It reads in part as follows:

". . . unless within thirty days following passage of this joint resolution the govern-

ment of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Vietnam indicates a genuine desire for peace in Southeast Asia by (1) the release of all United States prisoners of war and also (2) the large scale withdrawal of its fighting forces back within its own territorial limits indicating to the satisfaction of the President of the United States that their aggression is ended, the state of war between the United States and the Communist government of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Vietnam which has been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared.

By passing it, Congress would be telling the Enemy to return our prisoners and get out of South Vietnam or face total destruction. Call it, if you will, the "Newk" Grubb Resolution.

I write, in the days just before Christmas, with the hope that as President Nixon sits down to Christmas dinner with his family and his conscience he can spare a thought for another family whose father and husband died in captivity in North Vietnam. She and her four sons, Mr. Nixon, live at 307 Norwood Drive in Colonial Heights, Virginia. Cora Weiss sent them a Christmas card this year. Merry Christmas, it said, we have killed your husband. Unlike you, Mr. Nixon, she would not back off. She would not surrender. God bless her. God bless them every one.

FISHERMAN MUST BE PROTECTED

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, lately, the effects of pollution on our society have received wide attention. There has been an emphasis on the effects of pollution on our health, yet, we rarely hear about the economics of the issue. I, too, feel that our prime consideration should be protecting our environment so that our health is not impaired, however, pollution is also hurting our economy and ruining some of our vital industries.

A case in point is the fishing industry. Recently, tuna fish have been found with amounts of mercury which have been termed excessive by the Food and Drug Administration. In other recent action, the Food and Drug Administration seized 8,000 pounds of kingfish because of excessive DDT content. This is the first such action involving saltwater fish and DDT.

Mr. Speaker, today, the Clean Air Act Amendments became law. Congress decided that all of us would be better off if the air were breatheable. Why should we all suffer because of automobile exhaust emissions? In the same vein, Congress should not allow the fisherman to suffer because of mercury pollution and DDT contamination over which they have no control.

I am not suggesting that we abolish our statutes and regulations which protect consumers from unhealthy foods. As a matter of fact, I feel they should be more stringent in some cases. I am suggesting that we get to the root of the problem by enacting strict penalties for the discharge of mercury into our atmosphere and I am suggesting that we prohibit the use of DDT except in special situations.

But, until the day comes when mercury and DDT no longer contaminate our fish, I suggest that we enact an interim measure—a measure such as H.R. 18274 which I cosponsored which would provide partial reimbursement for losses incurred by commercial fishermen as a result of restrictions imposed on domestic commercial fishing by a State or the Federal Government because of deterioration in the quality of the aquatic environment.

Mr. Speaker, through no fault of their own, fishermen have had to suffer. I feel that we must take immediate remedial action and enact interim measures to correct this potentially disastrous situation.

THE 91ST CONGRESS

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as each Congress comes to an end, we all feel a little wistful about it and also a litle weary of it. We take pride in certain accomplishments and are disappointed that we have not done more. So it has been, I suppose, since the 1st Congress; so it is, surely, with the 91st.

The 91st Congress has been neither the best nor the worst of the 11 Congresses in which I have had the honor of serving; it has been neither a do-nothing Congress nor a can-do Congress; it has not justified the wildest fears nor the headiest hopes which were current when we first convened 2 years ago. In purely partisan terms it is difficult to say of the 91st Congress, as it was of the recent election, exactly who won and who lost.

One reason the record of the 91st Congress is hard to capsulize is the vast difference in the performance of its two bodies. Standing alone, the labors of the House of Representatives have been considerable and generally constructive, responsive to public needs and reasonably free of excessive partisanship. In this season of goodwill I shall not dwell on the Senate's record since it speaks—unendingly—for itself.

For living Americans the past 2 years have been unique in the operation of their Federal Government. The Presidency and the executive branch have been in the hands of Republicans, returned to power in 1969, while the 91st Congress continued under Democratic majority control. So this Congress cannot fairly be compared with its predecessor or, indeed, with any Congress of modern times.

Not since 1849 has a new Administration entered the White House with the opposition party commanding Capitol Hill. The burning issue before the country 120 years ago was slavery and secession. President Zachary Taylor and the 31st Congress are mainly remembered for the Compromise of 1850 which brought California into the Union as a free State.

President Taylor was a nonpolitical career soldier from Louisiana who owned slaves but opposed secession. He died after 16 months in office and Vice President Millard Fillmore of New York, an upstate lawyer, became the last Whig President.

The 31st Congress, while Democratic, was as divided as the Nation itself. The House took 63 ballots to elect a Speaker. The first session set a new record of 302 days but Congress recovered enough sense to wind up its second session on March 3 and adjourn sine die.

The spotlight during the 31st Congress was all on the Senate. There the Great Debate on the slavery question pitted the rising political stars of Stephen A. Douglas, Jefferson Davis and William H. Seward against the giants of an earlier era—Clay, Webster and Calhoun, whose hopes for the Presidency had faded. There are interesting parallels here but I shall not belabor them. Suffice it to say neither brilliant debate nor ingenious compromise was able to resolve the grave crisis that threatened the Nation.

To return to the 91st Congress, chosen at the same time the American people gave their mandate for change to a Republican President. There were many misgivings at the time of President Nixon's Inauguration as to how his program of reform and redirection would fare at the hands of a Democratic Congress.

It is fair to say the worst such fears proved unfounded. Thanks in large measure to the steadying influence of our Speaker and responsible House leadership on both sides, the 91st Congress cannot be branded narrowly obstructionist and a substantial portion of the Nixon program has become law.

Bipartisan majorities have enacted landmark legislation in the war against crime, drug abuse and obscenity; long needed and fundamental reforms of the Postal Service, Federal taxation and Selective Service; voting rights including the 18-year-old vote; major overhaul and expansion of our merchant marine, airport and airways programs; important environmental control and related antipollution statutes; improvements in occupational safety laws, unemployment insurance and veterans benefits.

But the 91st Congress also failed to finish its work in many urgent areas. It failed to come to grips—even with a long lame duck session to do so—with President Nixon's bold and comprehensive proposals for basic changes in our outrageously ineffective welfare system, for fundamental restructuring of Federal and State revenues, for protection of the public interest in national strike emergencies, for permanent improvements in social security.

These are pressing problems which must be solved by hard legislative labor. They will not go away. The duty of Congress is not solely to criticize but to create practical solutions for real conflicts in our society. In the 91st Congress the House showed more consciousness of this obligation than the other body, but not enough.

The finest hours of the 91st Congress, in my judgment, came when this House

by decisive nonpartisan votes upheld President Nixon's efforts to win a just peace in Vietnam, serving clear notice to friends and enemies abroad of the essential unity of the American people behind his endeavor to bring about a full generation of peace.

Looking ahead to next year and the 92d Congress, I hope this spirit will continue to prevail in foreign and defense affairs, and on the domestic side, that much more of President Nixon's program can seriously be considered and at least brought to a vote. If rejected, superior substitutes for the President's recommendations should be sought by the Congress, for the problems he addresses are real and urgent. I am mindful that 1972 is a Presidential election year and that this campaign already has begun. But the American people will continue to reward with their confidence those elected Representatives who put the country's good above partisan advantage or personal publicity.

Under the new Legislative Reorganization Act the House has begun a much needed modernization of its internal machinery which I hope will materially improve and expedite our conduct of public business. The 92d Congress can help halt the erosion of confidence in the legislative process by prompt consideration of a realistic and comprehensive clean elections law and re-enactment of the electoral reform amendment.

When the 92d Congress meets there will be many old friends' familiar faces missing, most notably the beloved gentleman from Massachusetts who has so long guided this body from the Speaker's chair. I shall greatly miss him, and with him all of our colleagues who will not be returning next year. I wish for each of them the best the future can bring and thank them all for their help and friendship.

As this Congress closes I would also express my appreciation and that of all minority Members for the fine service and assistance we have received from the officers and employees of the House who labor in anonymity but with great loyalty to this body and its traditions.

To the distinguished majority leader, my good friend from Oklahoma; to my strong right arm, LES ARENDS, the distinguished minority whip; to all those associated in the leadership on both sides, my deep gratitude for your consideration and cooperation throughout this Congress; and to all my colleagues in the 91st Congress, my best wishes for a happy new year.

THE 1970 ANNUAL REPORT OF SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this, my 22d annual report to the people of New York State, reviews the work of the second session of the 91st Congress (1970) as well as my own activites. I see many struggles not yet won, but at the same time hopeful signs for the year and decade ahead.

The year 1970 saw our Nation struggling for a new direction and a new sense of purpose—only half succeeding at best, but still demonstrating its basic strength, resourcefulness and resiliency.

There were hopeful signs at the end of the first year of this decade.

The most hopeful of all the signs, I feel, is that for the first time since 1965, we have begun to wind down the war in Vietnam and end our military involvement in Southeast Asia. Nevertheless, the casualties in Vietnam still go on, and the list of killed and maimed serve as an ever present reminder that we must fix our own definite and early timetable for an end to our combat involvement in Vietnam.

Rampant inflation finally showed signs of being stemmed, a fragile peace was holding up in the Middle East, violent protest appeared to be on the wane, the first major steps toward redeeming our environment were taken, and election year, 1970, demonstrated that the American people still have a firm grip on the political center despite some attempts to polarize them on the volatile issue of law and order.

However, there were some deeply disturbing signs in 1970. Our Nation's economic productivity declined for the first time since 1958; the American people had to bear up to the agony of following the trials of fellow-Americans accused of committing atrocities in an unpopular war; the shooting down of four students at Kent State University by frightened National Guardsmen and the shootings at Jackson State, staggered the Nation, but also seemed to compel soul searching on both sides and a better dialog between the generations; and Americans were deeply troubled by crime and violence and by increasing drug abuse among our children.

For the first time since the myriad "New Frontier" and "Great Society" programs began, we concentrated more on efficiency in Government programs than on development of new programs; but, this resulted generally only in diminished funding for critically important programs so far, and the result has yet to prove itself a net plus.

I have found it most gratifying to be engaged in seeking solutions to our great domestic and international problems in my new role as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee; as ranking Republican member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs and the Select Committee on Small Business; and as second-ranking Republican member of the Government Operations Committee and of the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity.

In the 91st Congress some 61 measures that I sponsored and 39 that I cosponsored were enacted into law, in addition to 35 measures that I either sponsored or cosponsored which passed the Senate.

In the hope that basic new directions have been found on many of the critical issues facing our Nation today, next year holds the potential for being a time to move much more vigorously to succor our cities, withdraw from Vietnam, secure peace in the Middle East and elsewhere in the world, limit armaments, sharply reduce unemployment and the consequences of inflation and generally to move forward with renewed vigor for freedom, peace, and social justice.

VIETNAM AND WAR POWERS

As a members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I continued to lead and join in efforts to bring the war in Indochina to an end and to prevent future Vietnams. My position was to press for an accelerated rate of U.S. troop withdrawal from Vietnam according to a fixed timetable, not subject to veto by Hanoi or Saigon. I sought a reassertion of the long-unused war-making powers of Congress provided in the Constitution as a check and balance on Presidential power as Commander in Chief in undeclared wars like Vietnam.

I cosponsored the Cooper-Church amendment to restrict U.S. military involvement in Cambolia. This amendment was adopted by the Senate on June 30 by a vote of 58–37.

I sponsored a resolution to repeal the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, adopted by the Senate on July 10 by a vote of 57–5 and now effectuated in law.

On June 15, I introduced a bill (S. 3964) to define by law the respective war powers of the Congress and the President in situations of undeclared war. This bill would provide safeguards aimed at preventing contemporary Vietnam-style undeclared wars—safeguards similar to those in the Constitution which give Congress and the President an equal voice in dealing with traditional situations of declared wars. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee plans to hold hearings on my bill early in the next session of Congress.

I cosponsored and helped redraft the final version of the McGovern-Hatfield-Goodell "Amendment to End the War." Although this amendment was defeated in the Senate on September 1 by a vote of 39–55, the vote still showed an impressively large group of Senators seeking a speedy end to the war by a phased, unilateral U.S. withdrawal from the combat responsibility by mid-1972.

I cosponsored an amendment to the Foreign Aid Supplemental Authorization Bill prohibiting the introduction of U.S. ground combat troops into Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand and establishing by statute that economic and arms aid to Cambodia does not constitute a U.S. commitment to the defense of Cambodia. The legislation containing this amendment was passed by the Senate by a vote of 72 to 22 on December 16 and became law.

I supported various resolutions concerning humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war in Vietnam.

I supported efforts to achieve a peace breakthrough at the Paris talks and twice visited our negotiators in Paris to discuss the issues firsthand. In addition, I made a factfinding visit to Vietnam early in 1970 as part of a mission in 7 Asian and European nations and in Israel under Foreign Relations Committee auspices.

MIDDLE EAST

My primary concern in the Mideast is for the United States to help achieve a just and lasting peace that will secure Israel's integrity and security and permit a new era of progress and prosperity in that ancient and benighted region.

In January, I visited Israel for the third time since the 1967 Six Day War to discuss the overall situation with Israel's leaders; and I hosted a major meeting in the Senate for Prime Minister Golda Meir during her visit to Washington on September 18.

I strongly supported the President's policy of providing Israel with the arms it needs so desperately for self-defense and to deter another war. While supporting the administration's efforts to secure a ceasefire and to promote peace negotiations, I protested strongly the Egyption and Soviet movement of missiles along the Suez Canal in violation of the ceasefire-standstill agreement.

I took the lead in the Senate in organizing a letter signed by 73 Senators to Secretary Rogers on May 26 urging the sale of additional jet aircraft to Israel. I lent my strong support to legislation (on the initiative of Senator JACKSON of Washington) in the Congress providing Israel with $500 million in credits to enable it to purchase the arms it needs from the United States. I also organized (with Senators SYMINGTON and RIBICOFF) a letter to President Nixon on July 30, signed by 71 Senators, supporting his strong stand in the Mideast against Soviet efforts to support Arab attempts to undermine Israel.

I actively protested and am continuing to work to correct the mistreatment of Jews in the Soviet Union and the Kremlin's denial of their basic human right to emigrate. I spoke out strongly against the barbaric sentences, including the death penalty (later commuted), imposed on Soviet Jews found guilty of allegedly planning an airplane hijacking after their request for permission to emigrate to Israel to rejoin families was denied. I also worked closely with the State Department in its successful efforts to secure the release of the 225 U.S. citizens held hostage last July 6 by the Palestinian guerrilla hijackers.

WORLD COMMITMENTS, ARMS CONTROL

The year 1970 was crucial for U.S.-European relations, as questions of the future course of NATO, the impact of the Mideast crisis, and European negotiations to expand the Common Market and to achieve a detente with the Soviet bloc all reached critical stages. As chairman of the Political Committee of the North Atlantic Assembly—the parliamentary arm of NATO—I chaired the committee's semiannual meetings in Brussels in July and in The Hague in November dealing with these problems.

I was honored to serve this year as U.S. delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, where I handled such key issues as the question of Chinese representation in the U.N., the Second Development Decade and reform of the World Court.

In my role on the Foreign Relations Committee, I was successful in the efforts to have reported to the Senate—after a delay of nearly 20 years—the Genocide Convention. It now awaits Senate ratification—I will work hard to effect it.

Major attention in the Senate was again directed to the interrelated questions of expansion of the Safeguard ABM system, the SALT negotiations with the Soviet Union and limitation of the nuclear arms race. For the third consecutive year, I cosponsored the Cooper-Hart amendment to restrict ABM deployment, which was defeated by a close vote in the Senate.

The Nation's economy, underwent a year of profound and painful adjustment in 1970. Economic growth came to a standstill at the start of the year and regressed slightly by the year's end; inflationary pressures showed only a little sign of abating; interest rates soared to historical highs, subsiding slightly in the last quarter, and since the writing of my last annual report, more than one and one-half million Americans were added to the employment rolls.

One serious side-effect of this troubled economy was a surprising weakness in corporate and municipal liquidity. Available cash supplies were severely squeezed, bringing bankruptcy in some cases. The Penn Central bankruptcy was the best known example of the problem.

Notwithstanding the obvious problems of inflation, I contended that the primary challenge facing our economy was to avert a serious recession with unacceptable unemployment and to get productivity moving again with a 4-percent real annual growth rate. I expressed this view last March in the annual report of the Joint Economic Committee, on which I sit as the ranking Republican member.

In March, I proposed a program of economic recovery: channel more funds into housing, strengthen the Administration's manpower bill to provide for public sector jobs and more manpower training funds, ease monetary policy, adopt an "income policy" to restrain the unrestrained upward climb of wages and prices, and modernize business equipment depreciation schedules in order to improve productivity.

The national housing market was improved by passage of a HUD and Independent Offices appropriation which provided an additional $200 million for urban renewal; by passage of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970 which provided additional mortgage money for home construction including a special section for the middle income homebuyer; and by pasage of the Housing Act of 1970, which contained a new authorization for all the major Federal housing programs and some important new ones. I detail my roles in these housing programs elsewhere in this report.

I view as extremely unfortunate the President's decision to veto the Manpower and Training Act of 1970, as approved by both Houses of the Congress. The act would have authorized expanded manpower training and employment programs administered through a new system of State and local prime sponsors. It included a number of provisions which I authorized: a triggering of additional funds for training and employment programs in severe economic conditions such as we faced in 1970 and for public-service employment training programs linked to employment in the prisons.

I note with some optimism that the Federal Reserve Board, under the able leadership of Dr. Arthur Burns, increased the money supply in 1970 at a faster rate than it did in 1969, when tight money became a major factor in the economic slowdown. It remains to be seen whether this actions came soon enough and with sufficient force to head off a major recession—or inflation.

In another area, incomes policy, I introduced, in May, a Senate Joint Resolution calling upon the administration to pinpoint unusually inflationary wage settlements and price increases. My proposal was adopted in principle by the President in June, when he announced regular publication of an "Inflation Alert." But I was disappointed by the two mildly worded Inflation Alerts of 1970. I believe the President will have to take a stronger stand on inflationary wages and prices if his program of economic recovery is to avoid setting off another inflationary spiral.

Revised depreciation schedules, or some other investment incentive, remains a priority piece of economic policy. Since repeal of the investment tax credit in 1969, I have been concerned by the absence of adequate investment incentives for the business community to insure the Nation's technological leadership, its economic growth and prosperity, and its ability ot compete in foreign markets. Last July the Treasury Department completed for me a comprehensive study on the subject of depreciation liberalization. It is my understanding that the White House now has under priority consideration a plan to revise our badly outdated depreciation schedules.

To meet the liquidity crisis triggered by the Penn Central bankruptcy, I urged extraordinary Government action through a bill I introduced in August to provide Federal guarantees-of-last-resort for corporate loans where the national interest was at stake; such relief for the Penn Central has now become law. Although the liquidity crisis eased by the end of 1970, I believe that this country should be prepared wiht such a Federal emergency loan guarantee authority.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY

The traditionally liberal trade policies of the United States, which have contributed so much to the overall economic health and well-being of our Nation since the end of World War II, faced a severe test of the 91st Congress. The conservative minded Senate Finance Committee reported out legislation which was widely regarded as the most protectionist trade legislation proposed since the passage of the extremely regressive Smoot-Hawley tariffs in the 1930's. For this reason, I led the fight in the Senate (with Senator MONDALE) which succeeded in preventing passage of the ill-conceived trade bill.

By seeking to limit the supply of basic commodities at a time when inflationary pressures already were excessive, the

trade bill would have fueled further the fires of inflation. In addition, passage of this trade legislation would have insured retaliation from the major trading nations of the world—retaliation which would have had adverse effects on the extensive export interests of New York State.

At the same time as I vigorously opposed the trade bill, I strove throughout the year to persuade the Japanese Government to limit voluntarily their exports of certain categories of manmade apparel and textiles that are alleged to be seriously disruptive of the American textile industry. I met on this subject with Japanese Prime Minister Sato and members of his cabinet in Tokyo.

The oil import quota system again contributed to the scarce and overpriced fuel oil supplies available to New York State residents. I carefully reviewed the supply situation with key officials in major New York cities, and then conveyed their assessment to the White House, which responded with a loosening of oil import requirements.

I am pleased to report that the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), a legislative initiative of mine for many years which won enactment in 1969, finally came into being with the appointment of its officers and directors late in 1970.

The United Nations, at its 25th anniversary meeting which I attended as a U.S. delegate to the General Assembly, renewed its commitment to bridge the increasingly dangerous gap between the less developed, "have-not" nations and the nations of the industrialized world in the 1970's—the second development decade.

The initial phase of the work of the Greek-Turkish economic cooperation project, which I fathered in 1965 as then chairman of the Economic Committee of the NATO North Atlantic Assembly, has come to a successful conclusion. Economic ties between the governments and the business communities of Greece and Turkey have been strengthened, and the viable economic development projects developed by the Eastern Mediterranean Development Institute (EMDI) are now bing reviewed by international financial institutions.

CRIME AND DRUGS

The related growth of crime and drug addiction continued to plague the Nation and grew into an issue of awesome proportions in New York State—especially in the major cities. Fear has become a way of life in our cities, and fear has begun to move into the suburbs along with the social decay that gives rise to it.

Crime and drug addiction are but the outward manifestations of a sense of hopelessness that increasingly permeates our inner cities—hopelessness bred of bad housing, inferior schools, inadequate transportation, unequal job opportunities, insufficient health services and a degrading welfare system. As in the fight against any epidemic, the disease—in this case, crime and violence—must be rooted out at the same time we deal with the underlying causes. Thus, I offered and supported tough anticrime, antidrug and gun control measures, at the same time that I worked for legislation aimed at prevention, rehabilitation, and improving the quality of life in the cities.

The Organized Crime Control Act became law. I supported this measure because, while I had some reservations on civil liberties grounds—the new law gives the Federal Government some important tools that should be used to rid our society of the menace of organized crime.

I supported the amendment to the Safe Streets Act, which was enacted to give increased authority to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to fund State and local crime prevention programs. Under this authority, New York is eligible to receive $7 million in fiscal 1971 for crime prevention and will be eligible for additional aid in the next fiscal year.

I opposed the District of Columbia crime bill which sought to reorganize the criminal court system of the District of Columbia; while I supported the court reorganization provisions of the bill, I vigorously opposed the preventive detention, no-knock, wire-tap and mandatory maximum-sentence provisions as a serious abridgement of civil liberties without any corresponding guarantee of achieving more effective crime control.

I continued to cosponsor several bills which would achieve a national registry of all guns and licensing of all owners. I successfully opposed a attempt to delete .22-caliber rimfire ammunition from the Gun Control Act of 1968 because such ammunition is used not only in sportsmen's rifles, but in pistols which are commonly used in crime; only criminals—not sportsmen—continue to have anything to fear from Federal gun control laws.

In order to find solutions to the crime problems of our cities it is necessary that the police, the courts and the corrections institutions direct their efforts at the serious crimes and not be diverted by the alcoholics and drug addicts or abusers who have not committed any other crime. The problems of alcohol and drug abuse should be treated as the medical and social problems they are and taken out of the criminal jurisdiction to the extent possible, so that law-enforcement agencies can devote their full energies to combating illegal drug traffic and other serious crimes.

As the ranking Republican on the Alcoholism and Narcotics subcommittee, I authored the desperately needed provisions, enacted into law (Public Law 91–211), to provide narcotic-addiction treatment and rehabilitation programs through Community Mental Health Centers.

To seek to overcome the drug abuse epidemic afflicting our youth, drug abuse education legislation which I supported was enacted into law (Public Law 91–527). I played an active role in developing the rehabilitation-program provisions enacted into law (Public Law 91–513). Effective treatment services and successful rehabilitation offer the best possibility to prevent drug-related crime.

Also, a major law to rehabilitate an estimated 6,000,000 alcoholics in the United States is now law.

POVERTY, HUNGER

Despite truly historic initiatives on the part of the administration and the Congress, the session ended without effecting the needed reform of our welfare and manpower training programs, with mixed results in efforts to combat hunger and with only the beginnings of efforts to expand and improve poverty and child-care programs.

The President's highly commendable Family Assistance Act—the most important piece of domestic legislation—was not acted upon by the Senate before Congress adjourned. While I generally supported welfare reforms contained in the Act—and was one of its original cosponsors—I also submitted amendments to increase the basic benefit level above the proposed $1,600 standard for a family of four, to expand fiscal relief, to provide supplemental payments to the working poor, to relieve mothers of school-age children from the work requirements, and to insure quality child care. I shall pursue these and other changes in 1971 in a major family assistance bill.

The Congress passed a food stamp reform bill which marked an improvement over the old program, but which fell far short of the reforms passed originally by the Senate which were introduced by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN and me, as the chairman and ranking Republican respectively of the so-called Senate Hunger Committee. Notwithstanding the merits of the final bill, I was compelled by conscience to cast the lone vote in the Senate against it because I felt its mandatory work provision punishing the children for the sins of their parents, had no place in a food bill. I am hopeful that a better food stamp reform can be passed in 1971.

I also offered an amendment to the school lunch bill, the key provisions of which were enacted into law to establish national eligibility standards allowing all children below certain poverty-income levels to receive free lunches.

On December 10, 1970, I introduced the Comprehensive Community Child Development Act of 1971, which is designed to provide substantial funding for the coordinated evolution of child development programs. The bill, to be considered in 1971, would maintain the priority on programs benefiting children of low-income families, and—building on that foundation—make such programs universally available throughout the Nation.

During the year, I led successful efforts to obtain greater funding for the programs under the Economic Opportunity Act. In response to amendments which I submitted, the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program—which provides jobs for disadvantaged youths—was funded at a higher level last summer than the year before. I also am pleased to note that efforts which I instituted with other Senators in August, 1970, resulted in an increase in funding for the 1971 Head Start program by approximately $35 million over 1970.

I opposed regionalization of the Legal

Services program and any other changes that would have diminished its effectiveness or the independence of those who work within it. Accordingly, I was pleased when the administration decided to abandon any plans to change the manner in which the program is conducted.

I shall introduce early next session legislation to extend the poverty program for an additional 5 years beyond next June, with special emphasis on programs that involve the poor themselves and with increased freedom on the part of the Agency to act as advocate for the poor.

EDUCATION, HEALTH

Congress enacted comprehensive legislation strengthening Federal elementary, secondary and other education assistance programs. In the new law—Public Law 91–230—were a member of provisions I authored, including the focusing of Federal resources on the improvement of educational opportunities for gifted and talented children; a new Adult Education Act to provide an opportunity to catch up for the 56 million adult Americans who have not had a high school education; strengthening local education agencies with the principal emphasis on innovation; inclusion of nutritional, food-use, and food-purchase education in homemaking programs; inclusion of Puerto Rico as eligible for assistance for neglected and delinquent children, and strengthening the enforcement of title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

Also enacted into law was my amendment to the approriations bill providing $75 million in assistance to school districts needing help in effectuating desegregation programs.

Congress also enacted the Environmental Education Act to establish programs to encourage and support educational activities designed to preserve and enhance environmental quality and ecological balance; also, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act to help utilize more effectively the Nation's library and information resources. I actively supported both of these measures.

I voted to override the President's veto of the Education Appropriation Bill, because while there are clearly important needs to curtail Federal expenditures in the fight against inflation, I believed that the needs for education funds were of even higher priority.

Congress enacted legislation which I cosponsored extending and strengthening the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

The Senate passed legislation I authored to extend to the severely handicapped the special priority now reserved for the blind in the selling of certain products to the Federal Government.

I introduced the National Health Insurance and Health Improvements Act of 1970. To implement such a national health insurance system, it is vital to proceed immediately with the rationalization of medical care services and facilities, and I introduced as a companion measure the Local Comprehensive Health Service Systems Act of 1970 designed to accomplish that end.

Legislation I authored to help modernize outmoded and obsolete hospital facilities and to give priority to development of innovative health facilities was enacted into law (Public Law 91–296).

I authored legislation, which passed the House and Senate, to stimulate health-profession courses in problems relating to malnutrition; it was vetoed because part of another bill, but I will try again.

To provide our medical and dental schools—which face a grave fiscal crisis—the financial ability to continue functioning I introduced legislation to provide them $100,000,000 in "disaster relief." This bill passed the Senate, and as later modified in conference with the House, was enacted into law (Public Law 91–519).

To improve the quality of care for heart disease, cancer, and stroke—and establish an equivalent Federal commitment to combat kidney disease—I authored legislation, enacted into law (Public Law 91–515), to extend and improve the education, research, training, and demonstration programs in these fields.

I have been active for years—and offered the first bill with Senator Moss, in the fight against alcoholism—our Nation's fourth most serious health problem afflicting over 6 million Americans—and played a leadership role in having enacted into law a comprehensive alcoholism prevention, treatment and rehabilitation bill which I cosponsored.

I introduced, on behalf of the administration, legislation to assure Federal support for the mentally retarded, and I cosponsored a bill to provide services to the mentally retarded and others with related developmental disabilities, which was enacted into law (Public Law 91–517).

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING

To help combat the dilapidated condition of urban mass transit in New York State and elsewhere in the Nation, I worked for the passage of the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1969 which authorized $3.1 billion in Federal funds for the improvement of mass transit facilities over a 5-year period. Further, I sponsored an amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 aimed at transferring money from the urban highway portion of the highway trust fund to the development of mass transportation facilities. This amendment failed to reach a vote, but I was assured that hearings on it would be held during the next Congress.

In June, when the Nation was rocked by the bankruptcy petition of the Penn Central Railroad, I introduced a bill similar to that of the administration to guarantee Penn Central loans, but with more safeguards regarding the use of taxpayer money. In the closing days of the 91st Congress, legislation was passed authorizing Federal loan guarantees, to railroads in bankruptcy for up to $125 million for limited railroading purposes.

To combat the increasing number of airline hijackings, I worked closely with the Federal Government to develop security standards and procedures to protect air passengers. In addition, I cosponsored a bill which sought to stop aircraft hijacking by authorizing a commercial air traffic quarantine against countries aiding or abetting acts of aircraft piracy.

To help meet the congestion problems and safety needs which our airports and airways are facing, I worked for passage of the Airport and Airway Development Act, modeled in large part after a bill I had authored.

For reasons of national priorities, I voted against the continued Federal financing of the development of the supersonic transport (SST) at the $290 million level. Slower development of the plane would allow time enough to perfect the plane's design to enable us to leapfrog early over less economically desirable aircraft, to establish fairer priority in expenditure, to prevent environmental hazards and to pass any necessary laws to prevent the plane from causing damage to the environment.

To help alleviate the high incidence of cargo theft at the airports in the New York City area, I sponsored a resolution for a New York-New Jersey compact, which would create an Airport Commission authorized to exercise powers at the airports in the New York City area.

I was the principal cosponsor of the HUD-Independent Offices appropriation bill, which resulted in the appropriation of an additional $200 million to help fund the tremendous backlog of applications for urban renewal projects. I also supported enactment of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970, which provided additional mortgage money for home construction and contained a special new section which will make more money available to middle income home buyers. An amendment of mine will permit more mortgage money for housing to become available in high cost areas throughout New York State.

The Housing Act of 1970 contained an amendment I authored to insure that the prototype model unit used to determine the unit cost of public housing will be of good architectural design and will contain all the amenities of a regular apartment. I also authored an amendment which allowed such State housing corporations as the New York Urban Development Corporation, to receive increased subsidies from the Federal Government. I also cosponsored an amendment by Senator GOODELL for a $25 million demonstration-grant program to combat the acute problem of abandoned housing in many of the cities of our State.

LABOR; PENSIONS

Each year some 14,000 American workers die and more than 2 million suffer disabling injuries on the job. Congress responded in 1970 by enacting the Federal Occupational Health and Safety Act, which will ensure minimum standards of workplace health and safety for virtually all American workers. As the ranking Republican on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee and on the Labor Subcommittee, I was privileged to introduce the Administration's bill and play an active role in shaping the provisions which were enacted into law. This law is unquestionably one of the most important pieces of legislation affecting the

welfare of American workers to have been enacted in many years.

For many years I have called attention to the need for permanent legislation to enable us to protect the health and safety of the Nation when it is threatened by paralyzing strikes or lockouts. In 1970, Congress was faced with potential paralysis from threatened national railroad strikes. In April, the dispute involved the four shopcraft unions. I managed on the Senate floor the President's proposal to deal with the dispute, which ultimately was enacted into law. In December, I introduced the President's proposal to delay for 45 a days a strike threatened by four of the operating railroad unions for midnight, December 10. The law finally enacted delayed a strike until March 1, 1971, and contained an amendment which I cosponsored requiring the President to report back a recommended solution of the dispute by February 13, 1971, if the parties have been unable to reach an agreement by that time. I believe that our crisis-prone experience in 1970 convinced a substantial majority of Congress of the need to enact permanent emergency labor dispute legislation—for which I have contended for years.

During the past several years I have been seriously concerned with a number of weaknesses in the private pension plans which provide the lifeblood of retirement security for 27 million American workers.

Legislation which I introduced would protect the pension expectations of employees by making sure that eligibility requirements are reasonable and by establishing a federal reinsurance program that would protect against premature plan termination—just as the Federal Depoist Insurance Corporation now protects bank accounts against bank failure. To provide the necessary perspective in which to evaluate this legislation, Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, chairman of the Labor Subcommittee, and I, as the ranking Republican member, also initiated a full-scale study of pension and welfare funds.

I backed the bill to increase social security benefits, and supported an amendment to permit greater earnings without loss of benefits. I offered an amendment, which passed the Senate, to prohibit private pension plans from lowering benefits as social security benefits go up. I also supported the provision of the bill to enact a "cost of living excalator" in social security. All these measures will be considered by Congress early in 1971.

ENVIRONMENT, CONSUMER PROTECTION

I was pleased to be a principal Senate sponsor of the reorganization plan creating the new Environmental Protection Agency, which started operation at the end of the year. I was also a principal sponsor of the reorganization plan creating the new national Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration in the Commerce Department.

Earlier this year, I was pleased to support new amendments of the Federal Water Quality Act which were enacted to combat oil spills.

I authored an amendment which will make more money available to New York State to reimburse State and local funds already spent on sewage treatment facilities throughout the State.

I also authored an amendment to the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Act, which would start a clean-up program for New York harbor and another amendment which provides for increased Federal funding for hurricane protection and beach erosion projects—now law.

Finally, I introduced a bill to provide a bounty on junked cars to help eliminate the litter created in many areas of the State by abandoned automobiles. I will pursue this effort.

A major and most important step in the area of consumer protection was taken in 1970 when the Senate overwhelmingly passed the consumer organization bill, which I helped author. Most regrettably, a small number of Congressmen prevented the House of Representatives from considering this bill. It will be reconsidered in 1971. This bill would authorize the creation of a Federal Consumer Protection Agency in the executive branch of Government to advocate before all other Federal departments and agencies on behalf of the interests of consumers.

I will make every effort to see that an effective consumer protection bill is enacted.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES

In an effort to redirect priorities toward our most pressing domestic problems, I authored an amendment which passed the Senate as part of the full employment opportunity bill to establish an office of goals and priorities analysis in the Congress. The new office would provide the Congress with an annual national priorities report and continuing information necessary for enlightened priority decisions. The bill also would create a council of social advisors and provide for an annual social report by the President to the Congress. I will work to get the Congress to act on this legislation in 1971.

In a further effort to redirect priorities, I cosponsored an amendment to the space appropriation bill which would have eliminated funds for design of a NASA space shuttle station.

I also supported the efforts made in the Congress to cut the Defense budget by approximately $2.5 billion. I believe that it is necessary to continue to take a critical look at future military budgets with a view to trimming them to the greatest extent possible, consistent with our national security.

DRAFT REFORM

During this past Congress, several improvements were made in the Selective Service System, reform of which has been long overdue. In particular, I supported legislation, which was enacted into law, authorizing use of a lottery system as well as the President's order eliminating virtually all occupational deferments in the future. In past years such deferments have represented one of the most discriminatory features of the draft.

While these changes represent some improvement, I remain convinced that a much more comprehensive and profound reform of our whole Selective Service System is necessary, including elimination of student deferments in time of armed conflict as inherently discriminatory. I authored a bill (S. 992), to achieve these goals. Since the present Selective Service law is due to expire on June 30, 1971, Congress will be considering draft reform early in the next Congress.

CIVIL RIGHTS, SUPREME COURT

The major civil rights legislation of the year was the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. This law, so effective in adding hundreds of thousands of black voters to the rolls in the South, was extended in August for another 5 years. In addition, this same law broadened the franchise by abolishing literacy tests and residency requirements in presidential elections nationwide. Another long overdue reform was the lowering of the voting age to 18 which I supported and strongly favor—a change ratified by the Supreme Court only insofar as Federal elections are concerned.

Convinced that we must seek to achieve equal educational opportunity for all and that we must define our objectives in desegregating our school systems, I cosponsored the resolution which resulted in establishment of the select committee on equal educational opportunity. Since its first hearings in April, the select committee has studied the difficulties faced in desegregating schools, the existence of racial isolation, and the problems of ghetto and poverty impacted communities in New York City and elsewhere in the Nation in achieving quality education.

One vacancy existed on the Supreme Court when Congress convened and the President nominated G. Harrold Carswell of Florida to this position. Once again the Senate exercised its prerogative carefully to scrutinize the qualifications of a high court nominee in light of his past performance. I voted with a majority of the Senate against confirmation of Judge Carswell, and I was pleased that the President's next nominee, Judge Harry A. Blackmun of Minnesota, was unanimously confirmed within a month.

GOVERNMENT AND CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM

This year, the Congress took some long needed steps toward modernizing the legislative machinery by passing the first amendments of the Legislative Reorganization Act in many years. I supported these reforms, and offered one amendment which Congress adopted, requiring all committees to adopt and publish written committee rules, so that all parties to congressional proceedings—Senators, witnesses, and the public generally—can know where they stand and what the ground rules are.

But much more needs to be done, including revision of the filibuster rule—a controversial practice that aften causes legislative logjams that last for weeks and on occasion kill good legislation. I also favor a review of the seniority system and of the vast powers held by committee chairmen.

I supported efforts to amend the Constitution to provide for direct election of the President and to guarantee equal rights for women. Unfortunately, filibusters blocked these amendments from

coming to a Senate vote, and a substitute on equal rights which I offered with Senator BAYH failed to come to a vote. They will be pursued in 1971.

SMALL BUSINESS, MINORITY ENTERPRISE

As ranking Republican member of the Select Committee on Small Business, I continued my efforts to expand the Small Business Administration's effectiveness in bringing minority businessmen into the economic mainstream. The Senate this year passed my proposals to increase the SBA appropriation for technical and managerial assistance to low-income, disadvantaged persons and to raise the maximum allowable economic opportunity loan from $25,000 to $50,000.

A committee of New York City bankers, at my suggestion, explored the problem of economic development in the disadvantaged areas of New York City and made specific recommendations for increasing the SBA's service to small businesses and minority entrepreneurs. Some major recommendations, including accelerated loan guarantee approval, have already been implemented.

VETERANS, POSTAL REFORM

I introduced an amendment to the Higher Education Act to provide special services for veterans to help them obtain a higher education. With my support, the Senate passed several significant veterans bills to authorize advance educational assistance allowance payments to eligible veterans; to establish a veterans work-study program; to permit a veteran to use his GI entitlement to pay off prior Federal education loans; to restore unused home loan entitlements for World War II and Korean war veterans and to remove the future expiration dates for all eligible war veterans; and to provide GI bill benefits for families of servicemen who are missing in action or are prisoners of war.

One of the most laudable achievements of this Congress was the enactment of the President's proposal for reform of our postal system—an objective toward which I have worked for a long time. Under the proposal enacted by Congress, a quasi-public corporation will be responsible for administering our postal system.

As a father, I can well understand the concern of my constituents over pornography and have supported legislation I consider to be constitutional restricting the use of the mails for this purpose.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL LIFE

I supported the $55,000 ceiling on subsidy payments which was included in the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1970. This limitation is a major step forward in revising our agricultural policies—a major priority if we are to provide an equitable and sound farm program to consumers and to growers, while taking care to maintain high agricultural productivity.

In view of the importance of the dairy industry to New York State, I have strongly continued my efforts to reduce inflation, thereby insuring that support prices for milk come as close to 90 percent of parity as possible. In addition, I supported the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1970, provisions of which were generally favorable to the milk industry.

NEW YORK STATE

Although New York State ranked second in fiscal 1969 in terms of Federal funds received among the 50 States—in keeping with its second-ranking position in population and number of poor—the fact remained that for every Federal tax dollar paid out by New Yorkers, only 11 cents was returned to the State in the form of Federal aid.

To meet this apparent inequity to New Yorkers, I long have been an advocate of Federal revenue sharing with the States, having a proposal of my own and supporting similar proposals offered by President Nixon and Governor Rockefeller. I also fought hard to win New York larger grants under existing aid formulas, and, most important, also to rewrite formulas that now discriminate against New York and other populous States.

I am pleased to report that I was able to help win substantial funds for New York State public works programs including several navigational, flood- and erosion-control projects in upstate and metropolitan New York areas.

My offices in Washington, New York City, and Buffalo continued their excellent efforts to attend to constituents problems at home. I also sought to assist in efforts to improve local housing, child-care, narcotics, minority enterprise, and community action programs.

CONCLUSION

There is much to do in 1971 and thereafter and I appreciate the thousands of letters and visits of the people of New York and their support in the year just ended.

GILMER MIRROR BACKS CONSIDERATION OF WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Gilmer Mirror of Gilmer, Tex., one of the most respected papers in my congressional district, recently endorsed a move toward some form of wage and price controls.

This is a stand that more and more papers across the country have been taking in recent weeks and follows a call by many industry and labor groups for action to combat the inflation in our country.

On December 17, President Nixon signed Public Law 91-558 that in part extends through March 1971 standby wage and price controls. President Nixon has made it clear on several occasions that he has neither asked for nor sought such legislation and that he has no intention of using this tool in the fight against inflation.

Wage and price controls are, indeed, stringent methods for curbing inflation, but the time has long since passed when our present inflation could have been solved in a painless manner. In short, the situation has gotten out of hand and it is clear that the only way to solve the problem in a relatively short period of time is through some form of wage and price controls.

It is true that in recent weeks we have seen a slight decrease in the prime rate, but we have not seen corresponding decreases in prices or the cost of living. The inflationary battle will not be won by periodic statements from administration officials telling the country that things are getting better. This does not satisfy the housewife when she must come up with extra money for groceries each week, nor does it satisfy a husband when he sits down to pay his family's bills. They know that their money does not go as far as it did only a few short years ago.

It is time for the President to give serious consideration to a wage and price control program. People across the country who at one time shuddered at the thought of wage and price controls now openly endorse them as the only hope to a rapid economic recovery. It is time that the President got in step with the economic thoughts of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks a copy of the Gilmer Mirror editorial since it so adequately describes the feeling of many who now lean toward wage and price controls:

WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

Although no public statement will be issued by President Nixon on this, he and his advisers must see, as much of the nation does, that present battle against inflation is going badly. Latest figures snow a steady, unabated, and rapid rise in the cost of living.

And with skyrocketing prices, the other spectre is continued and rising joblessness, with major industrial layoffs or plant shutdowns.

It is significant that the 1970-71 college debate topic is "resolved; that the federal government adopt programs of compulsory wage and price controls."

President Nixon has said he would not use such controls, even though Congress has approved standby powers to do so. Congress also approved Presidential "rollback" of prime interest rates through the Federal Reserve Board.

Settlements of major labor contracts, auto, steel and rail, will result in higher 1971 consumer prices. Higher prices for everything means more inflation. Forty percent of Texas families have incomes of $5,000 or less. Few can get higher wages in 1971. They are being pushed into poverty by galloping inflation.

Interest rates, which took a series of jumps within a few months after Nixon came into office, have gone to historic highs. Congressman Wright Patman says that present home mortgage rates and bank loans on many items are usury. Everything a person buys today carried a higher price, caused largely because of high interest—which feeds the fires of inflation, rather than cooling them, in Mr. Patman's opinion.

He is not alone. Major groups are moving toward a wage and price control measure. These include both labor and business groups. We join again in asking for action on this most critical aspect of our nation today.

TRIBUTE TO HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join in paying tribute to my colleague MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN. After 28 years of devoted and energetic service to

the people of Ohio and to this country, he is retiring from this body.

It is with a deep sense of respect and gratitude for his friendship over these past years, but also with profound regret that I bid him farewell.

I extend my sincerest wishes for his continued happiness in the years ahead.

A PLUG FOR DIVISIVENESS

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following column by John P. Roche appeared in the Washington Post of January 2. It is a good way to start the new year—with a sense of reality. I insert the following article in the RECORD:

A PLUG FOR DIVISIVENESS

(By John P. Roche)

As one year ends and another begins, it might be worthwhile to look back at one of the dominant themes of 1970—that the President, the Vice President, and other officials of the United States government have an obligation to stop "dividing the people." You may recall that at the time of Cambodia and Kent State a significant group of college and university presidents actually told Mr. Nixon that the war had to stop—the young people didn't like it!

The Scranton Commission avoided this absurd proposition, but did include a section arguing that presidential leadership was needed to heal the wounds in our national psyche. It was reasonably phrased, but triggered off a lot of criticism from those who—I suspect—had not read the text.

It was not so much an indictment as an exhortation, in the great tradition of government textbooks, to use the presidency (in Theodore Roosevelt's phrase) as a "bully pulpit." Mr. Nixon, in turn, has written a polite note to former Gov. Scranton thanking him for his labors and somewhat curtly indicating that the President can never make everybody happy. Presumably that closes the file.

But actually a great deal more needs to be said. Our society, although it has a singular unity at bedrock level, has many basic problems that have to be confronted. I have one set of answers to these problems, other Americans have other answers, and we often differ vehemently. Our task is to fight it out within the democratic framework and this implies—indeed, it demands—"divisiveness."

The other day an old press clipping turned up from a Cincinnati paper, dated Dec. 2, 1958. The headline said "U.S. Must Integrate, Says Roche," and it quoted me as saying "The problem of desegregation must be met head-on. We have had ten years of compromises and moderation and it's been futile . . . the desegregation issue is the litmus paper test of American democracy."

Now as a historian I must admit that desegregation was a far more "divisive" issue than the war in Vietnam. In effect, three centuries of folkways and legal institutions were being challenged, the whole way of life of millions of Americans was up for change, yet we of the liberal and civil rights movements demanded the legal destruction of this huge edifice. Could anything have been more "divisive?"

Once John Kennedy became President, we began to work him over on the subject. In March, 1963, as national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, I led a delegation to urge the President to get moving. He gave us two beautiful 20-minute lectures: The first, on President and Congress, outlining his problems with Southern Democratic barons on the Hill; the second, on federalism, exploring the limits of national power, and indicating his pessimism. The gist of the whole meeting was simple: President Kennedy asked the ADA not to be "divisive." We thanked him politely and went right back to our fight for a strong civil rights bill.

If at that point 25 leading Southern college and university presidents had appeared to say that segregation must not be ended—it would upset their campuses—we would have hooted them out of town. But, for some reason, when this idiotic logic surfaced in May, 1970, it was taken quite seriously.

Democracy and divisiveness go hand in hand. Within the obvious limits of decency and the criminal code, it is the duty of those who think differently to put their cause to the people. Of course, every political leader will call for "consensus"—meaning agreement with him—but that's part of the game. As we say at poker, "the winners talk cheerfully and the losers say, grimly, 'deal the cards!' " So, Mr. President: "Deal the cards!"

COSTS AND FUNDING OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the recent White House Conference on Children brought to our attention many of the needs of American children—in nutrition, in education, and in early childhood development.

At a recent conference on industry and day care, sponsored by the Urban Research Corp., of Chicago, Jule M. Sugarman, formerly the acting director of the Office of Child Development in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and presently head of the human resources administration in New York City, spoke about the experience of recent years in the development of day care and other child development programs and his expectations for the future.

Because of Dr. Sugarman's great experience and knowledge of this field and of its importance, I take this opportunity to insert the text of his remarks in the RECORD:

COSTS AND FUNDING OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

I might say one thing to begin with: Thus far the federal government's effort with respect to day care and preschool programs have not had as their motivation anything to do with helping business. The government's motivations have really been of two orders: First, to do something for young children whose circumstances, in the absence of a program, might predict trouble later on in life—essentially the children of poverty, with a few digressions into other fields as well. What we have been trying to do in Head Start and under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and in a few other programs is to give children the kinds of experience early in life that would make it possible for them to function well later in life—in the school system certainly—but, much broader than that, in life as a whole.

The second major motivation for the government's involvement thus far has been reduction of the welfare rolls. We have been trying to create a situation in which a number of people on the welfare rolls, primarily women, could, by being exposed to appropriate training programs and by being given help in finding and holding jobs, get off welfare rolls, and as an adjunct to that it has been necessary and desirable to provide child care.

Once the decision was made that child care is important, the government has taken (from my point of view) a very broad and liberal interpretation of the kind of child care that is desirable and necessary, and has consistently said that if in fact we are going to create a situtation in which parents and children need to be separated, then let's do the best possible kind of program that we can with federal resources.

But I emphasize that neither one of these things came about in any effort to help the business world. That just hasn't been a part of the picture.

NEW DIMENSIONS IN DAY CARE

It seems to me there are now a number of changes taking place which may introduce a somewhat new dimension. Back in 1967, an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act was passed that focused not on poor children, not on welfare children, but on children of middle- or low-middle-income families. It was the consensus of a number of Congressmen and Senators—I think particularly Senator Javits of New York—that we needed to do something about the many working women who were finding it increasingly difficult to provide child care arrangements for their children even though they weren't poor in the traditional sense of the word.

Senator Javits introduced an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act, Title V–B, which provided that the government could subsidize day care for non-low-income people if industry and labor either separately or together were willing to put up at least 50 per cent of the cost. That piece of legislation has been on the books since 1967. It has never been used. It is the kind of legislation where, by a simple decision on the part of the Director of OEO, money could be placed in support of that kind of program; but the section has never received any appropriations.

I think part of the reason there have been no appropriations is that to do so meant shutting down other programs. There has been no growth in the OEO budget over the years, and there simply has not been enough concrete expression of industrial interest or labor union interest to create the kind of pressure which you need to get federal funds for programs.

PRESSURE FROM MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILIES

Among the things that are beginning, in my judgment, to make those pressures stronger, is the fact that between 1965 and 1970 the number of women working who have preschool children has probably jumped about 60 per cent. Figures vary somewhat, but I am estimating a jump from around three-and-one-half to five million. Every figure we can get from our colleagues in the Women's Bureau and from other parts of the Labor Department would indicate that the pattern is going to continue.

At the same time, the number of women who are available to provide child care, as governesses or homemakers or even good maids, has diminished; and I think every working middle-class wife has had very serious problems trying to locate people who could take care of her children in her own home.

I think we have a very significant pressure building up from the middle-income woman who by choice or necessity works and who is very concerned about the kinds of

arrangements that are available to her child. There are at the moment probably 10 significant bills pending before Congress which have at least as part of their objective to do something about that, and to begin—probably on a small scale—to make funds available for lower middle-income and maybe middle-income day care support. The conviction in Washington is that one of those bills, or some combination of those bills, is very likely to pass this year.

Let me emphasize another point: The passage of legislation and availability of appropriations are two different things, as we found in Title V-B, where we have the legislation, but no money to do something about it.

If some of these trends do result in legislation and in more money being available, then the government's authority to work with business to help solve some of these problems will be significantly increased. Again, I think the prime motivation is still not that of helping business *per se*. The prime motivation is not helping you to deal with some of the very acute manpower shortages that you find in a number of industrial firms — the high-intensity womanpower firms—but rather the intention is to help people, both low-income and middle-income people.

That does not mean that the help can't be provided in a way that is compatible with the interests of industry too. I think, frankly, our best interests would be served if it is provided in a way that is compatible with industrial objectives.

I think the country needs to be concerned with the fact that the telephone company has a lot of problems finding telephone operators, or that IBM can't find enough keypunch operators, or that the textile industry is having real difficulties recruiting enough women and holding them in productive employment. This country is based on economic production of goods; when we don't have the manpower that it takes to do that, when costs become extraordinarily high because there is no possibility of holding personnel, when you have rapid turnover of personnel that destroys efficient production, everybody suffers in America. It is not peculiar to any particular group; it just makes for a higher cost of doing business, and that is not good for our economy. It is not good for our competitive position with other nations either.

COST-BENEFITS

I know that one of the pressing questions that industry raises is: What is the cost-benefit of child care? I might as well say quite candidly to you that nobody knows. To my knowledge, there is no definitive information which can tell you whether you will make or lose money by investing in child care. The only way we are going to find out is to get some real experience under our belt.

We made a small foray in that direction with the KLH project in Massachusetts. That is not a definitive project. We learned a fair amount from it and probably will learn more before it comes to a conclusion; but it is not going to give you enough of the kind of information that you need to make a hard business decision.

On the other hand, my suspicion (from a fair amount of dealing with business) is that not all business decisions are made on hard data—that a really dynamic business has to take a lot of calculated risks and has to make some judgments on the best information it can get, and be prepared to change if it doesn't work out.

So I think those of you who are on the verge of deciding to do or not to do something are going to have to make your decision without complete information and without knowing whether it is going to work or not. I think it would be a mistake for you or for any company, at this point in time, to go into day care on a very large scale. I think you can get yourselves in trouble with your labor force, and you could get yourselves in trouble with your stockholders.

Another thing that makes the decision difficult for you as businessmen is the very great paucity of data on what it costs to provide child care. There are several reasons for this: First, whatever figures do exist are based largely on federal experience to date, primarily with Head Start. This program was designed with some rather specific objectives, many of which are compatible with the objectives that I would think you would want to have in industrial day care, but many of which are special to the needs of the children served. The whole question of the number and ratios of personnel in the Head Start program is geared to children whom we expect to have some very special problems; therefore we provide special staffing. You start from a population base that may be different from that served by Head Start.

Second, all the figures we publish are synthetic figures. They are averages of what happens in South Carolina, Texas, California and Massachusetts. None of those figures is necessarily right for your particular plant location or for your particular business establishment.

Because child care is a very intensive labor input operation, the whole structure of cost is dramatically affected by labor costs and how much is paid to a teacher in a center. Our experience, for example, would tell us that in Charleston, South Carolina, we can probably do a Head Start program for $1,100 per child which in Boston would cost us $2,800 for exactly the same kind of program. That is an enormous range of difference, and it makes it very difficult for you to take any set of figures and figure out what is right for your situation.

PRESSURE ON WAGES IN DAY CARE

Moreover, when the government sponsors a program on a large scale, the question of the appropriate level of wages undergoes some changes. Day care used to be provided primarily by private, nonprofit organizations, such as United Fund and other groups. It used to be provided by people who were willing to work at quite minimal wages. The wage scale for day care employees in most communities was well below that for school teachers with the same qualifications. I've never really understood exactly why it is, but people working in a day care environment are generally willing to work for less.

It is one of the facts of life that when government financing becomes available for a program, the cost of wages tends to go up to a level which corresponds to what other public employees are paid, so that a day care worker who worked in the XYZ settlement house at $3,500 a year now says to herself, "A public school teacher in my community gets $5,000. Why shouldn't I?" It is hard to argue that she shouldn't. Thus, there is an inevitable pressure on wages under public financing.

The fact is that a great many people working in day care are really being paid at less than minimum wage rates. If they were working a 40-hour week, pay might equal minimum wage rates, but in fact many of them work much more than 40 hours per week and get paid in actual dollars which, if priced out on an hourly basis, are below minimum wage.

The government does not choose to support people at that level of income. We think they ought to be paid minimum wage, and we insist on it in programs we fund. I would argue not just from my government position but from my philosophy generally, that it is important that people be paid an adequate wage, and the minimum certainly should be the floor. I would argue, too, that people who work in a day care center should be just as well qualified and should be paid just as much as they would be paid in a public education program. They are dealing in just as vital a way with the children involved, and they should have the rewards. All of those factors tend to increase costs.

One of the questions that you as businessmen are going to face is: Given the above facts, if you get into the day care business, at what level of compensation are you going to be operating? Are you going to be paying the wages and rates that are comparable to what public employment pays, or are you going to be paying the rates that private nonprofit organizations pay, or are you going to be somewhere in between? You are really the only ones who can answer that question, and again, you probably will have to answer it in terms of what the situation is in the particular community where your plant is.

What I am saying here is that the government does *not* believe we should tell business how to run its day care. We have a point of view. We think it is important to pay people better than minimum wage. We think it is important to pay enough to attract the kind of people needed. But most of these decisions are essentially business decisions when *you* finance day care.

When and if the government becomes involved with you in financing day care, you may well be told to pay people minimum wages or to pay a wage that approaches comparability with public employees' wages. That is the kind of thing you should have at the back of your economic thinking as you look at this problem and attempt to decide whether it is a good idea to be partners with the government or not. It is entirely conceivable that it might not be.

RELATIONSHIP TO LABOR UNIONS

One final point I would like to touch on, and one that is very puzzling to me, is just exactly what the interests of the labor movement are in this field. Certainly, in the case of unions like the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and International Ladies Garment Workers Union, you find union leadership that seems very concerned about and responsive to the need for day care. They were the moving force behind the legislation enacted last year which permits the utilization of joint management-labor trust funds for the provision of day care, and some of them have actually put significant money from union treasuries into the program. Certainly at the national level of the AFL-CIO, we've found a pretty strong commitment to good day care and a desire to have labor unions and industry heavily involved in financing it with the federal government.

However, I think it is also correct to say that there are a good many union leaders and members of unions who have some grave skepticism about day care, based perhaps on not wanting women to compete with men for jobs, or on the belief that the entrance of women into the labor market tends to lower wages for men, or to lower wages generally.

I make no comment as to whether there are truths or not. I say only that among people we have talked to there are certainly a number of labor union leaders who really are not convinced that the government, business or labor should have anything to do with the provision of day care. I suppose again this is going to be an industry-by-industry and business firm-by-business firm kind of decision.

I would be interested in your judgment on this, but I don't really anticipate that there will be any massive movement within labor to make day care a fringe benefit part of the collective bargaining process. It may happen in a few places, but I don't think it is going to be very massive.

Those unions and businesses that have gotten into the day care business—and you know there are really relatively few when

you think of how big a country this is, and how many working women there are—have found it not easy, that the simple availability of day care doesn't necessarily mean that people use it or that people are happy with it. It creates its own set of problems which management has to deal with, but it may also have some very beneficial effects on industry. The operation at Staunton, Virginia, had a great deal of difficulty at the beginning. They found it very, very hard to fill up that center and to get the people really believing that this was the thing to do.

Most people have a hypothesis, which I think is correct but which I can't prove, that as day care becomes better known, and as it becomes clearly evident to mothers that it is not harmful to the child but that it is a good arrangement, mothers will tend to want to change from some sort of in-home care to day care in a group setting. In-home care with grandma or an aunt or neighbor breaks down too often because somebody is sick or goes off on a vacation.

On the other hand, a lot of mothers, very understandably, are worried about putting their children into day care centers which, in their mind, have the image of an impersonal mass mechanism. This is particularly true for very young children. My hypothesis is that as mothers see what can happen in a good day care center, they will shift voluntarily into organized day care.

DEFINITIONS OF QUALITY

I had almost decided not to mention the word *"quality"* at all because it is a red herring in a way. It means all sorts of things to all sorts of people, and it is very hard to put in terms that everybody hears in the same way. But it is not possible to avoid, so let me talk about quality in terms that I think are appropriate.

AN ATTRACTIVE ENVIRONMENT

When I talk about quality I mean that the child is in a physical *environment* which is comfortable, safe, and which does not create any health problems for the child. I also mean an environment which is attractive and which, because it is attractive, permits a child to learn and to grow.

I think you can do that in a store front. I think you can do that in an old red barn. I think you can do that in the finest buildings that Butler or Kaiser Aluminum or Alcoa or anybody else turns out. I am not of the conviction that one needs to have an elaborate, highly expensive building to have good child care.

FLEXIBILITY IN STAFF

The second thing I would mention as an element of quality is that in the total mix of *staff*—in the total numbers of staff—you have to have enough people to provide attention to the children in that particular program. You will find a range of judgment as to what the appropriate number of staff is. Where you have children who has come from disadvantaged homes, I think your need for manpower is much greater. Where you have children who come from advantaged homes I think you can operate effectively with a smaller number of people.

Lest anyone misunderstand me, I am not saying that this is open season on the numbers game and that numbers are not important. I am saying that numbers are important, but they can be differentiated, based on the particular group of children you are serving.

I feel that the kind of people who can be effectively used as staff in child care centers can be drawn from a much broader range than many people believed in the past—that people with relatively small amounts of formal education, with the right kind of supervision and training, can provide a very heavy proportion of the services in a child care center.

I am very much opposed to day care centers or progams that try to operate with nobody knowing what they are doing; and that happens—it happens all the time. Somebody goes into the business of providing child care without any real concept at all, and without any access to help in how to get things done. That is bad. But I am also opposed to the program that requires a person with a master's degree in early childhood education in every classroom. There are situations in which you need persons with that level of competence to work with children but, in my judgment, it is not a universal need.

I have seen, in visiting day care and Head Start and other programs around the country, a very substantial change in staffing in the last five years. It used to be that I could go into a classroom and with no trouble at all tell who the teacher was, and who the teacher's aide was. Today I can't do that, at least not in the more progessive programs.

I say this simply to emphasize the point that I think there are a great many more people who can be used to provide child care—who can do an effective job—than the statisticians would indicate in terms of people with appropriate degrees. But it takes management; it takes skill in organization; and it takes a real and consistent dedication to training to make this work.

So, in my concept of a quality program, there is flexibility in numbers of staff and in the kinds of staff, depending on the children served.

It is fairly easy to say that as a theoretical concept. I am very well aware that it is hard to apply. If you have a group of 45 children, how do you know what they need? Our tools for assessing the needs of children are very rudimentary at this time, and the best answer I can give you is to get some people who are knowledgeable in working with young children, and let them work with you in deciding what children need.

PROGRAM DESIGN

Another element of quality that I feel is a critical ingredient is the *scope of the program* which you are prepared to offer. I am absolutely convinced that nobody yet has a program that is appropriate for all children.

You have to find out what the children are like in your particular center, and then design your curriculum accordingly. The program can't be viewed as simply the hour or two a day that you work on cognitive development. It has to be viewed as the total mix of things that go on throughout the whole day—the total variety of interactions that take place between the children and the staff.

PARENT PARTICIPATION

I think it is vitally important that child care programs in industry be a cooperative venture between the center and the parents. The criteria of *parent involvement* may be the item that we need most carefully to examine in comparing industry-operated child care with existing programs receiving federal funds. In fact, a number of Washington officials concerned with the legislation for the President's Family Assistance Program have the belief that industry cannot be required to work with parents in the development of day care programs. They tell me that industry makes its decisions on business lines and just won't do anything in this field if parent involvement is a requirement.

My view is that industry is not the monolithic in its decision process—that in good personnel management industry found out a long time ago that it had better give some real consideration to how employees feel about things, that the soundest business decision from a management and organization point of view may fall completely apart when it has to stand the test of being carried out by employees.

And so I don't find the extension of parent participation to day care in industry any different from what you now do when you make a decision about such matters as what kind of machinery you are going to install, what kind of coffee breaks you are going to have or what kind of fringe benefits you are going to make available to employees.

The whole labor-management decision-making process that has gone on over the years is based on the fact that there is a sharing of decisions. Maybe I overstate the case, but I don't think so. I think decision-making about day care has got to have the same elements of participation by the people who are going to benefit by it as you apply to any other business decision. It may even be that the degree of parent participation in this area is going to be higher because you are touching on something that is very personal to the families.

Ironically, making the opportunity for parent participation available does not necessarily make it happen. We have had PTA's for years that nobody goes to, and we have Head Start policy advisory committees that parents ignore, because they don't really believe they work. They don't believe that anybody is actually going to make decisions based on what they think. As you think about parent participation in your programs, I hope you will recognize that it takes effort to convince parents they have some say.

There is another aspect of parent participation which may not be important to you in business terms but which is important in program terms. We find that where parents are actively involved in the programs, and where opportunities are created to help them become better parents, the impact on the child is tremendously increased. This holds true no matter how fine a classroom program is offered. The program must be completed and reinforced by the things that go on in the home.

I would make a special plea to do what you can in day care programs to provide opportunities for parents to participate, and to give them the kind of supplementary and complementary help that will make them better or more confident parents.

POLISH RIOTS RIP IRON CURTAIN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most knowledgeable journalists in foreign affairs is Mr. Walter Trohan, Washington bureau chief emeritus of the Chicago Tribune whose background and experience permits him to unfailingly reach the heart of problems in complex foreign developments.

His article of Wednesday, December 30, discussing the riots which erupted in Poland and forced a change in government functionaries is a typical Trohan masterpiece. The article follows:

POLISH RIOTS RIP IRON CURTAIN

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON.—The recent riots in Poland opened a window on Communism in the captive nations, and the sight was not pretty.

Yet, the lessons that it taught probably will escape those who want revolution in this country.

What happened in Poland could happen anywhere behind the Iron Curtain. This was no explosion of a powder keg as were the riots in Poznan in 1956 and in Hungary the

same year. Nor were they slow fuses that burst into demands for change as were those later squelched by Russian guns and tanks in Czechoslovakia.

It was an expression of dissatisfaction with the promises of Communism and the reality of the meagerness of life under the system. This was no revolt of the downtrodden, as was the uprising of the dregs of Parisian life in the French revolution. Rather, it was an awakening of workers and the growing middle class to the low quality of life under Socialism.

In Poland, the average monthly wage is about 2,000 zlotys ($50) a month. This is less than some hippies are able to panhandle in the capital's Du Pont Circle in a day. It probably is less than they can borrow from parents or friends.

These wages aren't sufficient for existence, so workers turn to moon-lighting, which is frequently more profitable. It is not surprising that workers rest up at their regular jobs for whatever side jobs they may have.

The low wages also mean that wives have to work. It is estimated that two-thirds of the married women in Poland have jobs. The proportion is even higher in other countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Naturally the birth rate has dropped. In Poland, it has fallen from 30.7 to 16.3 per 1,000 since 1950. Abortions are legal behind the Iron Curtain, altho Romania has halted them because of concern for the nosediving birth rate. Hungary is offering women two years at home on full pay as an inducement to rear a family.

Food is hard to come by, and the prices are high. Consumer goods are in short supply; prices often are out of reach. This means that shoppers face long lines and endless waiting. It also means that bribes are exacted by butchers and grocers.

Washing machines and dishwashers are almost unknown. Refrigerators are more common but small. Automobiles are largely the stuff dreams are made of. Altho Poland manufactures about 150,000 cars a year, most are exported.

Apartments are hard to come by unless one offers money on the side. The demand is generally for hard money—marks, pound., Swiss francs, or dollars.

There are almost no personal checking accounts and no charge accounts. Cash is the medium of exchange.

The system of distribution is creaky. The one thing that is in surplus is bureaucratic red tape. Forms and regulations surround every phase of life.

In the everybody world of shortages and unreality, prices were allowed to remain at an impossible level. When efforts were made to bring prices to realistic levels without any corresponding adjustment in wages, the workers of Gdansk, Gynia, Sopot and Szcecin protested.

Russia moved up troops, and the government was reorganized, but the problem remains. Mismanagement and mushrooming technocracy forced a crisis. The crisis will grow as the middle class grows and begins demanding the comforts of middle class life. The vicious circle of technology and appetite is a sure bet to breed dissatisfaction quicker than the Socialist millennium.

THE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it is most regrettable that our good friend and able colleague, MIKE FEIGHAN, is retiring from the Congress. He came here when I did, 28 years ago, and throughout that period he has been a tireless worker in representing his district. A dedicated public servant, MIKE has been an extremely useful legislator.

MIKE'S valuable seniority, his expertise in the field of immigration problems, his broad knowledge of the major issues, and his courageous approach to all of these things are recognized by all. He has indeed given an excellent account of his stewardship, and his record here speaks for itself.

I wish for MIKE and his family all the good things in life. The scores of friends in the Congress will be wishing him the best in his future endeavors.

THE SNOOPERS

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, recent revelations concerning the strangely widened role of military intelligence has brought the sort of editorial response one expects in a free society.

One of the sharpest comments to appear in my own district is from the Chula Vista, Calif., Star-News for Sunday, December 27. The editorial follows:

THE SNOOPERS

A year or so ago, a dark-suited, crew-cut gentleman dropped unannounced into our office, flashed a badge and handed us a card identifying himself as being from Naval intelligence—and said he was investigating someone who had written a letter to The Star-News complaining about military practices.

The Navy sleuth said he wanted to know what we knew about the letter-writer (which was nothing).

We were astonished. We told him we would expect such a call in the Soviet Union or in a South American military dictatorship, not in a supposedly free society. We demanded to know who sent him. If the military had begun to spy on letter-writers, we informed him, it would be of interest to our readers.

He begged off, saying his call was all his own idea, and hastily retreated out the door. Oh, well, we thought at the time, every organization has people who try to make a record by exceeding their authority.

We thought again of that call the other day when we read a former Army intelligence agent's testimony that his activities had even included spying on an Illinois senator, a congressman and a former governor.

The Secretary of the Army subsequently denied that these individuals' political activities have ever been investigated by military intelligence.

But he did not deny the former agent's other statements. These were that military intelligence also had been spying on well-known reporters, civil rights activists, lawyers, war protesters and even priests and ministers—among a host of people or organizations deemed by Army intelligence brass hats to be "subversive or radical in nature."

Nor were there denials of newspaper and wire service revelations that the Navy and Air Force had similar organizations to spy on civilians—and that the spying extended to such non-militarily related activities as student protest movements or a rally over the shooting of a black man by a Los Angeles policeman.

The Army agent, in fact, wrote that his particular spy group "was collecting information on every individual and organization in Illinois who espoused discontent with the military intervention in Southeast Asia or who openly opposed the Nixon administration's controversial domestic policies."

Presumably, these names were fed into a computer at Fort Holabird, Md., headquarters of U.S. Army intelligence, where yet another agent reported such material is sequestered.

The Army, following protests, now claims that this data bank has been "discontinued and destroyed," but the Los Angeles Times reported that at least some of the computer's data is in the hands of other federal agencies.

After reading this cheerful information during the holiday season, we wondered if that slippery gentleman from Naval intelligence who was investigating a letter-writer actually had been exceeding his authority.

For, while the White House says it does "not condone" such activities, and that President Nixon finds such things "inconceivable," there seems to be substantial evidence that, 14 years in advance of 1984, Big Brother is already watching. And, beneath his business suit, he's wearing a uniform.

Spying on civilians by the military—and even by any but the most rigidly controlled civilian investigative agencies—is repugnant to a nation supposedly founded on the principles of free discussion and uninhibited expression. It is an offense to the freedoms guaranteed all Americans in our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

At the least, it intimidates the timid and creates an atmosphere of fear.

At the worst, combined with such door-openers as wire tapping and no-knock laws, it can be the prelude to a military take-over and a police state.

It has happened elsewhere in once-free nations—nations less technologically equipped than ours to bring to heel those who foolishly thought they lived in a free land.

With guns it took Nazi Germany six years to solidify its hold on a gutless population yearning for "order" over freedom. The Knock on the Door came gradually there, a few people at a time, first the "subversives," then the "extreme radicals," then the "radicals," then the Jews, then the "dissidents," then the "complainers," until the prisons were so full they had to build concentration camps, and when these overflowed the only space left was in the gas chambers.

This was how the Nazis put into practice: "Germany, love it or leave it."

With computers, the roundup today can be done overnight. Those who seize power needn't wait for your neighbor to rat on you or your relatives. They merely can press a button at Fort Holabird, Md.

Happily, the revelations of military snooping upon American civilians have provoked the outspoken wrath of many prominent Americans. Moreover, the Secretary of Defense just four days ago ordered stronger civilian control of military intelligence agencies to "make certain the constitutional rights of all Americans are protected."

These are nice words, and the vaguely spelled out promise of more civilian control is a step forward.

But it is not enough.

If we are to retain our freedoms, if what happened in Germany and many other nations is not to happen here, the public must demand, and the President and Congress must order, far more rigid controls over the military establishment.

In the 25 years since the end of World War II, the armed forces have grown far too powerful.

Sixty cents out of every federal tax dollar now goes to their support. Their tentacles now reach deep into determining foreign policy, into our economy through military links with key industries, and now, we learn,

into the public thoughts and private lives of our citizens.

The military establishment's wings must be clipped. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty—and the place to begin exercising it is over our own military.

A CHRISTMAS MESSAGE FOR ALL YEAR

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I noted an editorial which appeared in the December 19 issue of the Worthington Globe entitled "Peace on Earth, Goodwill Toward Men." This is one of those editorials which should have wide distribution, especially in these troubled times when all men speak of peace in a period of war and conflict.

Peace, after all, must be found in the minds of men, and there can be no peace on earth if there is no good will.

I include the Worthington Globe editorial at this point in my remarks in the RECORD:

PEACE ON EARTH, GOODWILL TOWARD MEN

St. Luke, as he is translated in the somewhat disfavored but majestic King James version of the Holy Bible, has the multitude of heavenly hosts at the birth of Jesus Christ proclaiming "peace on earth, goodwill toward men."

Through centuries mankind has been somewhat preoccupied with the first three words to the neglect of the last three. Peace on earth. It is a mockery; there is no peace, there has been no peace, there will be no peace. That is one familiar reflection. Many persons who share this view are inclined to place faith in a prophecy that there will ever be war or rumors of war and, with that, to accept the angels' proclamation of peace as nothing but a happy thought, the original Christmas greeting. "Peace on earth . . . Merry Christmas." An expression of a fond but vain wish. For what it is worth it is passed along.

Among other considerations of the angels' words, it is familiarly suggested that the allusion is not to peace among men—not an end of warring—but peace within men. God and man are reconciled. There is, or can be, spiritual peace.

And, of course, in a host of more contemporary translations the words and phrasing are changed completely. (Peace on earth among men of goodwill is one of the popular renderings.)

Whether the translation be accurate or not, there is a message of great worth in the language of the King James version. And this message has value in an exclusively secular context, spiritual considerations wholly aside. (The spiritual meaning is properly the province of the Second Estate—the clergy—rather than the Fourth Estate, the press.)

Peace on earth, goodwill toward men. The key word is the neglected word: goodwill.

There is a tendency not peculiar to this time and society to reform. One man finds a way of life and an ethic which he values. He is not content to keep it to himself. To the contrary, he makes his life a mission of pressing upon others what is good and right to him.

So it is that in America of our time we have—one place to start—young men and women who reject the values and life style of their elders. Some among them are not content simply to hold as a personal treasure what has become to them the way and the truth. They set out to rehabilitate, to reform, even to foment revolution all toward the end of pressing upon others what is desirable to them. And there is no peace.

At the opposite pole are elders who cherish the life style in the established pattern which has served them well. They are not content to hold what they value and to permit others to deviate. They seek to press (or suppress) all who follow in the same mold. And there is no peace.

There are societies of men who have found a satisfactory order for themselves in one or another economic structure. They are not content to keep their preferred system to themselves. They press their truths upon the "unenlightened," which is to say all who do not accept them. And there is no peace.

The seemingly irresistible tendency to "share with the blind"—to require others to do as we do—extends through the entire range of human concerns from philosophies of government to modes of dress. And there is no peace.

We quarrel. We protest. We wrangle. We shout. We harangue. We harrass. We war. The hope for peace is mocked through every hour.

What is forgotten? In many instances, it is not love which is lacking. Men are motivated by love for others to press upon them what they see as a thing good for them.

The thing lacking is goodwill. Peace on earth, goodwill toward men. The six words are an indivisible concept which far transcends what they might at a glance appear to be, a companion pair of good wishes. They are brought together necessarily, deliberately.

Goodwill. The resolve not to offend, to be tolerant, benevolent, charitable. To be kind. With that comes peace. Goodwill toward men brings peace on earth; peace on earth, goodwill toward men.

He may offer a suggestion in goodwill. We may urge or explain or discuss. But we can not push, insist, demand, demean or decory. (We cannot know that what is best for us is even good for another.)

The precious message of Christmas is brought close upon us once again to remind, to haunt, to guide, to reassure. Goodwill is the requisite for peace, peace is the inevitable end product of goodwill.

Peace on earth, goodwill toward men. It is a divine wisdom.

HON. SAMUEL FRIEDEL

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to know and serve with SAM FRIEDEL during his 18 years in Congress. SAM has earned the deep respect and warm friendship of his colleagues by his diligence and devotion to the duties of his office. He is a gentleman of integrity and high principle who has dedicated his efforts to the betterment of our country, his State, and his constituency. He was ready to lend his time and interest in the solution of personal problems of his constituents and his sympathic interest in their welfare, improvement of living conditions of those in the substandard levels was well known among his colleagues. It was a hallmark of his service. In retrospect, SAM will have good reason to be proud of his record in the Congress, as well as his work in his committee. Those of us who knew SAM well were keenly aware of his dedication to his duties and had often observed the studious application of his abilities and efforts to serve his Nation and constituents to the fullest extent. SAM was unswerving in his determination to do what he considered right and just to all his fellowmen. The high caliber of his service in the Congress has been recognized by his colleagues who have often praised him for his unstinting consideration of their problems, which came before him as chairman of the Committee on House Administration. His colleagues who have had occasion to appear before his committee have frequently expressed their respect and admiration for the manner in which they were received and in which their requests and perplexing problems were resolved.

It is no happenstance that SAM's departure from this body brings a goodly measure of sadness to his colleagues.

To SAM and his lovely wife, I extend my best wishes for continued good health and happiness.

U.S. PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker, the recent holiday season has again mirrored the fact that loved ones were not able to be together to celebrate the occasion with their families. I refer to the U.S. prisoners of war being held captive in North Vietnam and their brave and courageous relatives. But the year 1970 did not pass without giving them hope that the U.S. Government is doing everything in its power to reunite these lost families. The unsuccessful raid by the U.S. Army and Air Force troops deep into North Vietnam in an attempt to rescue some of those prisoners is an example of daring and determined courage that should not go unrecognized.

The Pittsburgh Chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars passed a resolution commending the leaders and the men of this team. I should like to call this resolution to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, a task force of Army and Air Force Volunteers of the United States conducted a commando-style raid on a Prisoner of War camp deep into North Vietnam on Friday, November 20, 1970; and

Whereas, the volunteer force was led by Brig. General LeRoy J. Manor of the United States Air Force and Col. Arthur D. Simons of the United States Army; and

Whereas, the Pittsburgh Chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars was favored in 1966 to have General Manor, then a Colonel, as its distinguished speaker, at a luncheon commemorating the anniversary of the United States Air Force.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the

Pittsburgh Chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars hereby extends its congratulations to the volunteer force on its hazardous mission and, particularly, commends General Manor on his strategic planning of the operation, skillful execution of the raid, and for his outstanding courage and daring above and beyond the call of duty to the glory of our country.

Submitted by:

JOHN G. BROSKY,
Past State President.

CENSORSHIP OVER POLICE IN VIRGINIA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people will be shocked to learn that police in Virginia have been forbidden to use training films on communism entitled "Revolution Underway," "Communists on Campus," and "The Truth About Communism."

Apparently the so-called civil rights groups which claim the credit for such suppression have no fear of crime, violence, revolution, or communism, they only fear the truth and would burn all educational aids essential to train our police to fulfill their mission in protecting the people.

Ironically, this censorship move to deprive police from education on communism and subversion came on the same day this House passed House Resolution 1366 expressing grave concern for the cruel and unusual punishment imposed upon Jews by the Communist regime in the Soviet Union. Yet the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith, and group research along with the NAACP, ACLU, and Urban League are reported to boast of their role in preventing police training in communism by the use of such Communist-coined trigger words as "racist" and "McCarthyite" propaganda.

Rather a double standard of behavior unless we are to conclude that our Jewish friends are only concerned with Communist tyranny in Russia. If not, it behooves Jewish leaders to get their activists back into the mainstream of the American society.

Likewise the suppression of the police training films follows by 1 day a lead editorial in the Richmond, Va., News Leader complaining of crime so rampant in that State's capital that busdrivers would no longer make change for fares. The editorial concluded:

> It would be far better, it seems, to hire more policemen to catch more crooks than to set 250,000 Richmonders to counting their nickels, dimes and pennies after sundown.

And the year's first issue of U.S. News & World Report issues a violence report for 1970; At least 88 policemen killed, 200 civil disturbances of which 18 classed as "major riots" with 25 dead, 1,000 bombings through November of 1970, and nearly 1,800 student demonstrations with eight killed and 462 injured.

It appears past time to let our police as well as our people know the truth and be prepared for the pattern of violence anticiated in 1971. Book burning and name calling just would not erase the statistics—the truth will out and beware to those who would hide and distort that which cannot be hidden.

I insert several newsclippings and an article in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Dec. 30, 1970]

VIRGINIA POLICE STOP USING CONTROVERSIAL MOVIES

(By Helen Dewar)

The Virginia Department of State Police, apparently under pressure from the Holton administration, said yesterday it will no longer use three training films that have been criticized as containing "racist and McCarthyite propaganda."

The announcement came after consultations Tuesday between T. Edward Temple, commissioner of administration under Gov. Linwood Holton, and Col. Harold W. Burgess, superintendent of state police.

Temple said last week he would seek a re-evaluation of the films' use after several civil rights and civil liberties leaders called on Holton to order the police to stop showing them.

STATEMENT ISSUED

Yesterday Capt. Meredith S. Urick, personnel and training officer for the 920-member force, issued this statement:

"We periodically re-evaluate our training program. Since the films in question have been used to train and retrain all our members, they can serve no further purpose. Therefore, they will be replaced with other training aids."

Urick said he didn't know whether the action was taken at Temple's request. Neither Burgess nor Temple were available to comment. However, it was understood that the matter was handled with a view toward proper bureaucratic protocol.

ARKANSAS PRODUCER

The films, "Revolution Underway," "Communists on Campus" and "The Truth About Communism," were produced by the National Education Program in Searcy, Ark.

The NEP, which has been active in anti-communist crusades since its founding by George S. Benson in 1936, has been described as "right-wing" and "radical right" by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Group Research, Inc., and other groups that keep an eye on ultraconservative organizations.

The Virginia protests were brought by spokesmen for the NAACP, the state branch of the American Civil Liberties Union, the Richmond Urban League and the Virginia Council on Human Relations, a private group.

In a letter to Holton Dec. 22, they charged that the three films were inflammatory, designed to link minority groups and dissenters with international communism and were useless as police training devices.

DIFFERING PORTRAYAL

They said one of the films showed a picture of Negroes looting and rioting, followed by a plea for citizens to combine to put down internal threats, which was pictured along with a group of white people.

They also said the film showed a crowd scene from the 1967 march on the Pentagon with the communist hammer and sickle superimposed.

Glenn A. Green, vice president of NEP, denied that its films are extremist or inflammatory. He said some of the group's roughly 50 film productions are used by police forces but added that they are not designed specifically for police training purposes.

Burgess originally rejected the critics' demands that the films be withdrawn. At first Temple said he could see no objection to use of the films for training purposes, but he apparently had second thoughts. Holton reportedly took no direct role in the controversy.

[From the Richmond News Leader, Dec. 29, 1970]

EXACT CHANGE OR NO SALE

In proposing a resolution to ask all local businesses to adopt exact-change policies for night-time transactions, Mayor Thomas Bliley clearly intends to reduce opportunities for theft. Nonetheless, his proposed remedy for a pressing crime problem seems far too radical for the disease.

Virginia Transit Company buses already require exact change fares; to some customers, this has meant considerable inconvenience, even though bus hold-ups no longer occur. Because of the increasing number of service station robberies, many local stations now require exact change at night, but, because many customers use credit cards to pay for their gas, their inconvenience has been minimal. In some cities, cab companies have instituted exact-change policies to reduce the number of cab hold-ups; it may not be long before local cab companies also adopt exact-change policies.

Even so, these exact-change policies have affected a limited number of persons. Consider, however, the widespread inconvenience that could result if all local businesses were to adopt exact-change policies for transactions made after dark. Almost everyone would be affected, from the shopper seeking fresh lamb chops for dinner to the father needing a prescription filled for a sick child. No exact change, no sale.

There is, after all, a great deal of difference between paying a known exact-change busfare and paying in exact change for hundreds of items whose exact price may not be known in advance. Not many persons wear change carriers at their waists, so pity the poor shopper who would lack 79 cents in change for a $3.79 purchase.

There was a time when no amount of temptation was sufficient justification for theft, which, after all, is a crime. Nowadays, the horde of criminals preying upon law-abiding citizens has grown so dauntless that the law-abiding citizen, at considerable inconvenience, must beware of tempting a criminal. He must make his house a fortress and buy all kinds of fancy burglar alarms for his car—and he must never, never, leave his car unlocked for fear of making a car thief out of a teen-ager. It would be the car owner's fault, you see, not the teen-ager's. Subtly, the burden of guilt has shifted from the criminal to his victim.

This kind of reasoning underlies Mayor Bliley's resolution. Although the resolution, if adopted, would express only the will of City Council, no doubt many businesses would find it a reasonable excuse for demanding exact change from their customers, to be deposited in safes on the spot. No doubt, also thieves merely would look elsewhere for their marks.

Instead of robbing stores and gas stations, they would turn to street muggings, shoplifting, residential break-ins, car thefts, and other more personal crimes. Thwarting criminals at one turn sends them to another, for they steal as a way of life. It would be far better, it seems, to hire more policemen to catch more crooks than to set 250,000 Richmonders to counting their nickels, dimes, and pennies after sundown.

NEW PATTERN OF VIOLENCE

It's terrorism, not riots, that experts on violence fear most in 1971. New dangers are seen: Sabotage, political kidnapings and assassinations.

The changing pattern of violence in the U.S. points to this for 1971:

Terrorism is to be a growing menace. Bombings are likely to continue. So are arson and attacks on police. Sabotage of industrial plants and utilities may rise as a big, new danger. There is alarm over possible political kidnapings and assassinations.

College-campus violence appears to be waning.

High schools, however, are scenes of expanding racial strife and violence—a trend to which most observers see no early end.

Street riots probably will be smaller—and may be fewer—than in years of the recent past.

The era of mass rioting and massive destruction in black neighborhoods of major cities appears to be ending.

It is terroristic violence that is most to be feared in the era ahead.

These are the views of Government officials and other experts consulted by members of the staff of "U.S. News & World Report."

What is happening, these experts say, is a shift in the type of violence most commonly committed in this country. The move they see is away from mass demonstrations of anger to more specific acts of destruction committed by individuals or small groups.

This new pattern of violence is becoming more and more like tactics of the guerrilla warfare that some radicals have been predicting for years.

To defend against such tactics, both government and private industry have built up elaborate security systems. Entrances to many federal buildings are closed or guarded. The same is true of many courthouses or other buildings of State and local governments. Armed guards ride airlines to prevent hijacking. Bodyguards have been assigned to a few key officials and special protection has been provided for diplomats to guard against kidnapings or assassinations.

On December 23, New York City police revealed threats to "blow up" Governor Nelson Rockefeller, who had signed papers to extradite Angela Davis, a black militant, to California for trial on murder and conspiracy charges.

U.S. Attorney General John Mitchell, urging increased funds for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, said recently:

"The FBI has information that black extremists and New Left dissidents may resort to aircraft hijackings as part of their strategy to get our Government to meet their demands."

In private industry, company after company is reported taking strong measures to protect its plants, equipment and employes.

A GROWING FEAR

It is not only bombing that is dreaded. Industrial managers as well as government officials are reluctant to talk about this, but apprehension is growing that other kinds of sabotage may soon be tried to cripple factories, headquarters and utilities.

One private expert on violence who asked not to be identified told "U.S. News & World Report":

"Sabotage is the likely next development in terroristic violence. It is the traditional next step after bombing."

Some companies admit privately that they have not only increased their guard forces but also have started developing "blue-collar spies" to detect possible saboteurs. The head of security for one firm with nationwide operations says:

"If we tell anyone our plans to combat sabotage, those plans would become useless. But industrial security has changed from the old night-watchman approach to a system of preventive security which relies heavily on intelligence gathering."

CHANGE FOR BETTER?

Despite all the new fears, some experts predict that 1971 may be less violent—in some ways—than 1970.

From James T. Devine, chief of operations of the civil-disturbances unit of the U.S. Department of Justice, comes this hopeful forecast:

"I think there will be less violence generally in 1971."

Why? Mr. Devine explains.

"The police have become more skillful, more sensitive to some problems. The blacks in the ghettos are not reacting as the militants would program them to react. College students are not following militants as readily."

Yet Mr. Devine and most other experts temper this optimism with caution. The potential for serious trouble, they warn, remains high.

Racial relations are feared to be worsening, rather than improving. Ben Holman, director of the Justice Department's community-relations service, says:

"The races are not getting closer together. There is a growing amount of separatism. It is going to be very difficult for those who are leaders—black or white. Over the next few years, I see things getting more up tight."

"CAUTIOUSLY OPTIMISTIC"

John P. Spiegel, director of the Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence, located at Brandeis University, agrees that racial hostility is rising but he sees some hopeful signs. He says:

"It might mean things are coming out now because Negroes think the white community might listen. We, as a nation, are in the business of opening up society for blacks. This means that long-buried antagonisms must come out into the open. I think there is going to be more trouble, but we shouldn't get panicky about it. Over the long pull, I am cautiously optimistic."

Negro outbreaks, once occurring mostly in big cities, now are spreading into many smaller towns and erupting in the public schools. Junior-high and elementary schools, as well as high schools, are being disrupted.

In the 1969–70 school year, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover recently told Congress, there were 530 racial incidents in public schools—68 per cent more than in the previous year. And some officials predict that the total for the current school year will prove to be even higher.

Militancy also is reported growing among Spanish-speaking Americans, those of Mexican or Puerto Rican backgrounds. Rioting rocked the so-called "Chicano," or Mexican-American, community of East Los Angeles late last summer, resulting in two deaths. Some Chicano leaders have warned that this might prove to be only the beginning of serious trouble among the Mexican Americans.

THE NEW TREND

As the Spanish-American community heats up, violence in black ghettos is taking new forms. Instead of the mass rioting, looting and burning that shattered scores of cities in the late 1960s, the trend in 1970 was toward smaller flare-ups, involving fewer people, of shorter duration, and causing less property damage.

Such flare-ups are frequent. By some counts, their numbers are larger than in previous years. But they don't attract as much national attention.

The switch in style of black protest is attributed by experts partly to changing attitudes in the Negro communities and partly to more expertise on the part of police.

Mr. Spiegel of the Lemberg Center told "U.S. News & World Report":

"There is as much grievance among the blacks as ever. But there is a growing reluctance to engage in any violent confrontation. After all, it is usually the blacks who get hurt."

Mr. Devine, whose civil-disturbances unit deals with race troubles, made this comment:

"Most of the participants in disturbances now are kids. Few are over 20. When a large group is broken up, they split off into small groups, throwing rocks, looting when they can. They are hard to stop. But it isn't a serious confrontation.

"These kids may have some support from the black community, but the people are not out in the streets with them."

Mr. Holman of the federal community-relations service credits improved police work for holding down the size of black riots. He says there is more communication now between Negroes and police and Negroes understand the problem better: "They realize there is not necessarily going to be a riot every time the police cordon off two blocks."

The new police methods result in fewer shootings and angry confrontations, says Mr. Devine. He adds:

"Small towns now are more likely to have this sort of overreaction. Big-city police are more likely to back off and mediate than to go in shooting."

ROLE OF PANTHERS

Black Panthers, a militant organization of Negroes, are accused by federal officials of being a major factor in black violence.

FBI Chief Hoover recently told a congressional committee:

"Since 1967, more than 200 separate incidents of serious violence on the part of Black Panther Party members have been reported. . . . Panther publications consistently advocate violence against police, public officials, and the entire system and have encouraged the use of any form of terrorism, including assassinations and kidnapings, to achieve overthrow of the establishment."

Mr. Hoover also warned: "Increasing ties between Arab terrorists and Panthers raise the ominous possibility that militants may seek to ape Arab tactics, including airplane hijackings, to gain release of jailed Panther members. . . ."

California officials say arms bound for Vietnam are being stolen in large numbers and later show up in the hands of people involved in bombing and shooting incidents. For example, they say, a stolen machine gun was captured from Black Panthers after a shoot-out in Oakland last April.

Panthers are believed to be few in number. But when police move against them there often is a loud outcry of protest from blacks. Mr. Spiegel explains that in this way:

"The black community does not buy the Panthers' revolutionary program, but it is in sympathy with some of the symbolic gestures of the Panther Party, particularly their attitude of not wanting to be pushed around.

Bombings continue to increase rapidly. In 1969, a total of 541 incidents of explosive or incendiary bombing was reported. This year, about 1,000 bombings were reported in the first 11 months.

NEW YORK'S EXPERIENCE

Records of the bomb squad of the New York City police force show the problem terrorism creates for big-city officials. In 1969, the bomb squad reported 3,192 cases. By early November of this year, it had handled 8,745 cases.

Eventually, Mr. Spiegel predicts, this type of violence will die down because "the use of direct terrorism really turns off so many people that it is destructive to any radical movement." He says the extremist groups are badly organized and will not attract any broad support.

The radical groups advocating terrorism seem to be getting less and less support on college campuses.

Campus violence set a record in the 1969–

70 school year when, the FBI reports, there were nearly 1,800 student demonstrations with 7,500 arrests, 462 injuries, 8 deaths, 247 cases of arson and 313 sit-ins or building seizures. Up to November of this school year, FBI reports showed only 130 demonstrations, with 150 arrests, 23 injuries, 6 sit-ins, 8 bombings and 10 cases of arson.

"We can't tell yet what might happen after the Christmas vacation," says Mr. Spiegel. "But the students appear to be emotionally exhausted from last spring's violence. They can't keep agitating all the time and still keep up with their studies. They are aware that colleges are in financial trouble and they don't really want to make it worse—except for the far-out radicals."

That, as the experts see it, is pretty much the picture for the entire country. Large masses of people who have rioted and made trouble in the past appear now ready to "cool it."

Not the "far-out radicals," however, it is their type of violence–terrorism—that Americans fear most in 1971.

THE 1970 TOLL OF VIOLENCE

Street riots: More than 200 civil disturbances, including 18 classed as "major riots" by the U.S. Department of Justice. Death toll—25.

Bombings: About 1,000 through November, nearly double the total reported for all of 1969. Businesses, government buildings, private homes were the main targets.

Campus violence: Nearly 1,800 student demonstrations, sit-ins, arsons, building seizures—a record—in the 1969–70 college year, ended last June. Casualties—8 killed, 462 injured. About 7,500 persons were arrested. Violence is down so far in the school year starting last September.

School disturbances: Unrest spread in grade and high schools during 1969–70. A total of 530 racial incidents—68 per cent more than the previous year—made up the bulk of disturbances. Officials expect the current school year to prove even more violent.

Attacks on police: At least 88 policemen were killed, a new high. Included were 17 slain in unprovoked attacks.

Source: U.S. Dept. of Justice; Internal Revenue Service, International Association of Chiefs of Police.

DEALING WITH BOMBS ON CAMPUS

Bombings—and threats of bombings—appear to worry campus security officers more than anything else as they prepare for the second half of the 1970–71 school year.

Preventive measures include more campus policemen and identification cards for students and faculty. At Stanford University and other schools, professors are volunteering as building guards.

Since the school year began in September, there have been few mass demonstrations or riots. Still, not a month has passed without a bombing at some American college or university.

There was an explosion on the Madison campus of the University of Wisconsin even before school opened. On August 24, a tremendous blast rocked the Army Mathematics Research Center there, killing a young scientist and causing damage estimated at 6 million dollars.

Subsequently, bombs went off at the Universities of Colorado and Oregon, Kent State University in Ohio, Florida State University and at a branch of the Bank of America which serves the University of California at Santa Barbara. No one was injured in these incidents.

When a bomb exploded at the University of Kansas on the night of December 11, however, three students were hurt slightly. The blast blew out two walls in the university's computer center.

Authorities blame the bombings on radical extremists, possibly nonstudents, who have gone underground to make a last-ditch stand against the university "establishment." Press reports of all such incidents do not record a single arrest so far.

FALSE ALARMS

Almost as bad as the bombings, in their disruptive effects, are the false alarms.

There were more than 175 bomb threats this autumn at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, leading Dr. Mason Gross, the university president, to declare:

"We must soon, I believe, arrive at a policy of keeping our buildings open in spite of bomb threats, or they may bring the university to a standstill."

No bombs had been found at Rutgers through December 24, but every telephoned threat has led to a disruption of up to two hours as buildings were evacuated and searched.

At Boston University in recent months, students have been routed out of classrooms and dormitories more than 80 times because of bomb scares.

"We can't sleep, we can't eat, we can't study," one student complained.

Students at Boston U. now have the option of staying put during a bomb alert. Buildings are not evacuated unless a search turns up something suspicious.

College authorities are fearful that the false-alarm type of harassment—costing only a 10-cent phone call—will continue and spread into the new year.

They say there is one hopeful development, however. Surveys indicate that campus bombings, and threats of bombings, are alienating large numbers of students and hurting radical causes far more than they are helping them.

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM T. MURPHY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 28, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my distinguished colleague in recognizing the distinctive service WILLIAM T. MURPHY has given this country as a Congressman.

I have been associated with him for many years, as a colleague and as a friend. Our common interests also include an interest in baseball and we have many mutual friends participating in that great sport.

In 1966, WILLIAM MURPHY represented the Speaker at the dedication of the Israeli Knesset in Jerusalem. I accompanied that delegation and was impressed by the dignity and knowledge of foreign affairs he displayed on that occasion. He has also shown great knowledge and leadership in the very important area of U.S.-Canadian relations. We worked together on problems of mutual interest to the United States and Canada, an area of vital importance to the people of my district.

He has served with great distinction on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. In the last decade, much of our foreign policy attention has been directed toward Asia, and his role as chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs was carried out impressively. The "Winds of Change" which announced European decolonization in the Third World also received the attention warranted, for WILLIAM MURPHY also served on the Subcommittee on Africa and the Near East and contributed his extensive knowledge to their deliberations.

My association with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has been of great value to me and I regret that our professional association will soon be coming to an end. His guidance and his example will continue to inspire his colleagues for many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MR. CLAYBORNE GEORGE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to one of Cleveland's outstanding citizens, Mr. Clayborne George.

Mr. George was one of the first Negro attorneys to open offices in Cleveland, having been admitted to the Ohio Bar in 1920. I have always considered him to have been one of the pioneers in the fields of law and politics for black men and shall greatly miss the leadership he provided. Yet the inspiration he gave to many young black lawyers will stand as a living monument to him.

With the permission of the House, I insert in the RECORD the following articles from the Cleveland Plain Dealer and the Cleveland Press which noted his outstanding achievements:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer]

CIVIC LEADER GEORGE DIES AT AGE OF 82

Clayborne George, one of the first Negro lawyers in Cleveland and prominent in civic affairs here for 50 years, is dead at 82.

Mr. George, husband of Dr. Zelma George, executive director of the Cleveland Job Corps for Women and former United States delegate to the United Nations, died Christmas Eve in his home, 2178 E. 81st Street.

Rising from a one-room country school in his native Virginia, Mr. George was graduated from Howard University, Washington, D.C., in 1911.

In 1917, he obtained his law degree from Howard and three years later received a master's degree in law from Boston University.

Between degrees, Mr. George was graduated from the first Negro Officers Training Camp in Ft. Des Moines, Iowa, as a first lieutenant and served in combat in France during World War I.

In 1927, Mr. George was elected to Cleveland City Council from Ward 18 and served three terms.

He is past president of the Cleveland branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. His law offices served as the first headquarters here for the NAACP.

Mr. George was instrumental in furthering the cause of blacks in politics and helped elect the late Charles W. White as the first Negro Cuyahoga County Common Pleas judge.

A life-long Republican, Mr. George was appointed to the Cleveland Civil Service Commission in 1934 by Mayor Harry L. Davis.

He retired Dec. 31, 1969, having served on a civil service commission longer than any U.S. citizen.

Mayor Carl B. Stokes presided at a testimonial dinner for Mr. George last January which was attended by 2,000 persons.

Mr. George was first married to Enola McDaniel. She died in 1941. In 1944, he married Zelma Watson.

Mr. George was admitted to the Ohio bar in 1920, joining in partnership with Judge Chester K. Gillespie.

At the time of death, he was associated with lawyers John H. Bustamante and John G. Pegg.

In the 1920s, Mr. George was one of the first Negro professionals to obtain office space in downtown Cleveland.

Mr. George was awarded the distinguished service certificate of the Community Chest of Greater Cleveland in 1950.

Mr. George was an active member of the Antioch Baptist Church where he taught a men's Bible class for more than 40 years.

Funeral services will be conducted at the church, 8869 Cedar Avenue S.E., at 11 a.m. Tuesday.

Visiting hours will be from 7 to 9 p.m. tomorrow at The House of Wills, 2491 E. 55th Street.

Survivors include his wife; a nephew, Dr. Theodore George, Washington, D.C.; a foster daughter, Flossie Gilchrist; cousins, Mrs. William P. Young, Youngstown, and Dr. William Hale.

The family asks contributions be made to the NAACP through John Bustamate, 1107 Public Square Building.

[From the Cleveland Press]

CLAYBORNE GEORGE

At a testimonial dinner last January, many kind words were spoken about Clayborne George, all of them true. Through hard work and determination he carved out a long and useful career here.

Mr. George worked his way through Howard University and earned a law degree at Boston University. He served several terms as a Cleveland councilman and for a quarter of a century was a member of the Civil Service Commission.

As an energetic member of the Cleveland chapter of the NAACP Mr. George helped Negroes win employment in areas that previously were closed to them. With the death of Mr. George at the age of 82 Cleveland has lost an outstanding citizen.

NOTRE DAME IS NO. 1

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, while I do not expect any argument from the usually vocal Texans or from the usually proud Ohio delegation, I am convinced that as a result of yesterday's games Notre Dame is the No. 1 college even despite Nebraskan views to the contrary.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that our Texas colleagues are surprisingly quiet this morning and for a good reason. They appreciate the fact that Notre Dame in its Christian charity held the final score below what they could have run up.

While I appreciate that fact that Nebraska will now claim to be the Nation's No. 1 college football team, I must point out that LSU was softened up by Notre Dame during the regular season and this fact saved Nebraska from defeat yesterday.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that any objective football fan, even a Boston Irishman such as yourself, will agree that Notre Dame is No. 1.

KENTUCKY CREDIT UNION TYPIFIES CREDIT UNION MOTTO

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, virtually every day I learn of credit unions across the country that are performing outstanding services for their members.

In fact, stories of uncommon work on the part of credit unions have become commonplace throughout the credit union world. Typical of the uncommon but yet commonplace service performed by credit unions is the case of the Richmond Federal Credit Union in Richmond, Ky.

The credit union was founded by a Catholic priest and a Methodist minister in 1966, and it was designed to help the poor in the Richmond area, which is on the fringe of Appalachia. Since its small beginning with 10 members and $50 in assets, the credit union has increased its assets to $34,478. One of the principal benefits of the credit union is that it has put out of business many of the free-lance loan sharks in the area who lent money at an interest rate of 25 percent a week and more. Even more outstanding is the fact that the credit union is providing all of its services without any outside help or subsidy.

Mr. Speaker, a recent Associated Press article concerning this credit union describes why the Richmond Federal Credit Union typifies the credit union motto of "Not for profit, not for charity, but for service." The article follows:

TO HELP POOR: CREDIT UNION ALL-COUNTY

(By Bob Cooper)

RICHMOND, KY.—Race and religion don't mean much around the Richmond Federal Credit Union. Just ask the bank examiner who visited here a few months ago.

"I'm here in a black minister's Baptist church," he told his home office on the phone. "I'm talking with a Catholic priest and there's a Methodist minister across the table.

"And, so help me, they've got a Jewish boy keeping the books."

The credit union was founded by the priest and the Methodist minister—then chaplains at Eastern Kentucky University here—in 1966 to help the poor in this county on the fringe of Appalachia.

Its officials now believe it is the only federal credit union operating on a county-wide basis in the nation. Others usually serve employes of an individual company.

The priest and the Methodist minister have gone—transferred to other areas by their respective churches—but the Baptist minister is still around. He serves as the credit union's bad-debt collector.

The Rev. A. C. Goodlow "is good at it, too," said Mrs. William Manz, treasurer of the credit union. But before he takes over, the bad debts have been "on the wall" for a time.

"We have a list of names we put on the wall here in the office," Mrs. Manz explained. "The word usually gets around and people who are behind in their payments usually come in and pay up right away."

At the time she was speaking, there were 33 names on the wall, "but one of those came in and paid this morning, so his name will come down."

"The credit union not only offers loans to the poor, but it's an education for some of them, too," she continued. "Some of these people aren't used to paying their bills and this is an education for them.

"Not only that, it's even more of an education for me," Mrs. Manz said. "I've really learned a lot about people since we got this thing started."

The credit union was begun by the Rev. John J. McGuire, Catholic Newman Club chaplain at the university, and the Rev. James E. Wilson, Eastern's campus minister for Methodist students.

In the beginning, it had 10 members and assets of about $50. By the first of 1967, assets totaled $1,924; a year later, $3,295; at the start of last year, $17,000 and now, $34,478.

"We made two big jumps in assets," Mrs. Manz said. "One was when we got some organizations here interested in being depositors and the other was last November when we started payroll deductions."

Like all credit unions, the one here is limited by law to loans to any individual of 10 per cent of its total assets. That means you can borrow only $3,447 right now.

The credit union office is located in Richmond's poverty-ridden east end, where some people live in shacks with dirt floors, no plumbing and paperthin walls.

Its loans, however, are not limited to those living in the poverty area.

"A professor at the university can be in as great a need of a loan as somebody living right around here," Mrs. Manz said. "We have to consider each loan application individually."

The credit union's loan committee also has to use compassion as well as business judgment when it reviews the applications.

"Last Christmas, we had an application from a woman who lives out in the county. She has four children; one of them had been burned badly by falling against a stove and another is retarded.

"The mother has a heart murmur and just now is getting over an operation. The father is illiterate and doesn't work much.

"But it was Christmas. We loaned them the money. We haven't gotten a payment for a while, but we'll get it. I'm sure of that," Mrs. Manz said.

The credit union hopes to crimp the business of free-lance loan sharks who roam Richmond's east side, lending money at interest of 25 per cent per week and more.

Although it is just trying to help the poor, the credit union runs into a great deal of suspicion.

"You've got to understand that these people have been surveyed to death. They've been promised things, shown pictures and so on, but they are still living in absolute poverty.

"That makes these people suspicious of us, too. But we're not subsidized in any way, shape or form and all we're in business for is to help these people," she added.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE RICHARD D. McCARTHY

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

I rise to join my colleagues in paying a well-deserved tribute to the Hon. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, an outstanding young legislator from Buffalo, N.Y.

In his 6 years in Congress, MAX MCCARTHY fought valiently to preserve the integrity of our environment. As a fellow Great Lakes Congressman, I can attest to his vigorous efforts to clean up and restore vitality to our diminishing supply of fresh water. In addition, MAX MCCARTHY almost singlehandedly reversed the policies of our Nation on chemical and biological warfare.

The people of Buffalo and the Nation are better off for the efforts of MAX MCCARTHY and I am sure we will be hearing a great deal more of MAX in the years to come, both in and out of Congress.

SOVIETS MEDDLE IN U.S. POLITICS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 1, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

CONTROL OF CONGRESS—SOVIETS MEDDLE IN U.S. POLITICS

(By Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—The battle for control of congressional committees in the 92nd Congress is taking on international ramifications.

This is clearly indicated by the recent full page denunciation of Sen. James Eastland, D-Miss., and the Mississippi congressional delegation by the Red Star, the main organ of the Soviet Army.

Both the content and the timing of the Red Star blast against Sen. Eastland and other members of the Mississippi delegation are considered highly significant by American intelligence authorities who have carefully studied the unprecedented attack by the Russian military.

The Red Star attack preceded by a day the publication in the Washington Post of two editorials attacking the right of members of the Mississippi delegation to head major congressional committees.

Supporters of the campaign to oust the Mississippi delegation from their chairmanships privately say that the Post articles kicked off their drive. Their objective is to rid Congress of "Southern influence" by attacking the seniority system and forcing the election of committee chairmen.

In addition to Sen. Eastland, chairman of the powerful Senate Judiciary Committee and Internal Security subcommittee, the immediate targets of this campaign are: Sen. John Stennis, D-Miss., chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee; Rep. William M. Colmer, D-Miss., chairman of House Rules Committee, and Rep. John McMillan, D-S.C., chairman of the House District Committee.

If any one of these Southern members can be barred from his congressional committee chairmanship, it will be the beginning of the end of the seniority system in Congress and the tremendous influence exerted by lawmakers from the South.

The Soviet army's decision to jump into the fight is viewed by American intelligence officials as an attempt to turn Congress into a major psychological warfare battleground.

The Russians are pictured as seeing the seniority battle as a golden opportunity to help rid the Congress of its strong anti-Communist influence.

All veteran committee chairmen under attack are known for their strong anti-Communist views and support for strong internal security measures.

The retirement of Speaker John McCormack, D-Mass., and the death of Rep. Mendel Rivers, D-S.C., is expected to have a strong influence on the outcome of the battle.

With these two powerful leaders gone from the congressional scene, the leadership umbrella that in the past protected and encouraged other members to support strong anti-Communist measure may be missing. Whether House Majority Leader Carl Albert, D-Okla., will follow McCormack's umbrella policy when he becomes Speaker is conjectural.

The test for Albert will come when a coalition of liberal congressmen headed by Rep. Donald Fraser, D-Minn., attempts to bar Reps. Colmer and McMillan from their committee chairmanships. His efforts to influence the outcome of this vote will indicate his position.

Under the present system backed by long tradition, the senior majority party members of a committee automatically are recommended as chairmen by the House Ways and Means Committee, chaired by Rep. Wilbur Mills, D-Ark.

The Fraser group plans to ask the Democratic caucus to reject the Mills' committee's recommendations of chairmanships for Colmer and McMillan.

A powerful new lobby known as Common Cause and headed by John Gardner, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, is now working backstage here to support the Fraser group.

Should this move succeed in the House, efforts will then be made in the Senate to strip Sens. Eastland and Stennis of their chairmanships.

The outcome of these battles could greatly influence U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union in the '70s and the Kremlin knows it. That is why they want a piece of the action.

ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that no freshman Member of the House since Henry Clay—and not excluding Abraham Lincoln or John F. Kennedy—has made more of an impression on this body than has ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN.

I have found it a rare privilege to get to know AL LOWENSTEIN and to work with him here. His has been an eloquent voice for peace, for a better life for Americans, and for improvement in the cobwebbed rules and customs of this House.

Before January 1969 I knew AL mainly by reputation—as a young idealist who had courageously led a civil rights crusade in Mississippi and who had set in motion another crusade which had enormous impact on our national leadership and on the war in Vietnam.

Since January 1969 I have come to know this young man as one of the most generous, thoughtful, and kindly human beings I have ever known. It was a measure of these qualities that won AL the affection and respect of so many in this House, including many who were opposed to him on virtually every issue.

I hope very much that AL LOWENSTEIN will return to these Halls in the 93d Congress, if not before. But I know that, whatever he chooses to do, this country—and indeed the world—will be the better for it.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES: THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION GROWS UP

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the United States has now become the acknowledged world center of painting, music, the dance, and many facets of theater, architecture, and film.

While America has become a world cultural center, we have also in recent years been taking steps to make our culture achievements more available to our own people—through the mechanism of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities.

The magazine Science, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, recently contained an excellent two-part article on the Foundation, by Constance Holden.

Because this year marks 5 years of productive and energetic life of the Foundation, and because the Science articles so competently report on those years, I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to insert them in the body of the RECORD:

1. ARTS AND HUMANITIES: CULTURE AGENCY IS EMERGING FROM INFANCY

(I must study politics and war that my sons have liberty to study mathematics and philosophy. My sons ought to study mathematics and philosophy, geography, natural history and naval architecture, navigation, commerce, and agriculture, in order to give their children a right to study painting, poetry, music, architecture. . . . President John Adams.)

The legislation

With the passage of the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, the United States government undertook for the first time to become a continuing patron of the nation's cultural activities. In the years since the act was passed, a total of some $50.5 million have been expended under the Act. The effects of these expenditures are difficult to evaluate as a whole: in many instances the individual sums are small and the impact of many of the activities cannot be measured in physical terms. But the organization that implements the Act, the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities (NFAH), appears destined for an increasingly large role in the economics of American culture; therefore, at this half-decade mark, it may be useful to examine the structure of the NFAH and its pursuits.

The legislation created two separate but adjacent organizations, or endowments, one for the arts and one for the humanities. It provided for a staff for each and a 26-member council, composed of well-known figures from a variety of disciplines, to preside over each. The chairman of each council, who is also chairman of the endowment, was to receive the same salary, $28,500, as the director of the National Science Foundation (the salary has since been raised to $40,000 for council chairmen and $42,500 for the NSF director). To coordinate the endowments and provide liaison with other government departments a Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities, made up of selected government administrators, was appointed. The endowments were each allotted $5 million for the first year of operation, with as much as $5 million more apiece promised to match private gifts.

The arts endowment was directed to supply fellowships and matching grants to individuals and groups engaged in study or performance in all fields of the performing and creative arts, including film-making, architecture, and fashion design. The mandate to the humanists was to assist the study, teaching, and public dissemination of knowledge in history, philosophy, law, languages, literature, religion, and archeology.

The law governing NFAH is designed to keep federal participation minimal, both spiritually and financially. It contains the usual language forbidding interference with the policies of grantees. Most grants to institutions or groups made through the arts endowment require that at least 50 percent of the necessary money be put up by the recipient; no such stricture pertains in the humanities endowment. But both operate under the assumption that federal funds are to act as "seed" money, not as primary support of any project.

Like NSF, NFAH underwent many changes and reversals between conception and birth; but unlike NSF, whose budget has blossomed from a few million to almost a half billion dollars, funding levels have remained small by federal standards.

This year has seen the Foundation's first big jump in appropriations—the fiscal year 1971 allocation is $31,310,000, an amount exceeding that allotted for fiscal 1970 by more than 50 percent. Of this, $11,060,000 is earmarked for humanities programs, and $12,590,000 will go to the arts, of which $4,125,000 is designated for the use of state arts councils. $2.5 million in matching funds is available for each endowment. The rest is for administration.

History

No one now seems to question the Foundation's right to exist, but many regard its acceptance by Congress as little short of miraculous. Attempts to create a federal arts agency go far back in the nation's history, but success can finally be attributed to the 89th Congress, which, rich with the liberal harvest of the 1964 Democratic landslide, supplied a friendly environment to arts legislation. In addition, President Johnson, whose cultural philistinism was generally exaggerated, gratified enthusiasts by his strong endorsement of an administration bill that combined the arts and humanities in a single agency. The mood of the nation—activist and optimistic—was ripe for the idea. "Arts have a way of moving ahead when people feel this way," observes a National Gallery official, "and this was a time when in the unconscious sense this was a great society."

The bill was not without its critics, some of who feared the enstatement of a "culture czar," the propagation of "committee taste," and the danger that the arts would be dragged into a slough of mediocrity. However, the Foundation has not only failed to justify these expectations but has, despite its modest appropriations, apparently surpassed the hopes of its fondest adherents.

The arts and its problems

The arts endowment, which got a year's head start in planning, has perhaps scored the most significant advances. In 1966, its first full year of operation, it faced what the arts council likened to a cultural desert in America. While great metropolitan centers such as New York, Chicago, and San Francisco were teeming with creative activity, the rest of the country was relatively barren of professional artists. Museums, symphony orchestras, and theater companies, which traditionally operate on the verge of bankruptcy, were teetering on the brink of extinction. Ironically, the country's culture boom is counterproductive for arts institutions, for whom a heavy customer load increases the already existing financial drain. As a result of skyrocketing attendance, for example, many museum officials have been confronted with the choice of either limiting visiting hours or setting high admission fees. Dance, the newest and smallest of America's performing arts, is also in financial trouble. Average yearly salaries for dancers in major companies range downward from $9000 to less than $4000. New York is the acknowledged "dance capital of the world," but companies dare not stray outside the half-dozen large cities where they can be assured of an established audience.

According to a landmark study called *The Economic Dilemma of the Performing Arts*, by William Baumol and William Bowers, which was published in 1966, the situation can only deteriorate because the performing arts are not suited to the rules of America's mass production economy. Annual net deficits of all performing groups were estimated at $26 million, with a projected rise of up to $60 million by 1975.

Except for tax exemptions to nonprofit groups, the government, prior to the establishment of the endowment, did next to nothing to alleviate the situation. Hardly anyone wants the federal government to become the No. 1 patron of the arts, as is the case in Europe—least of all the artists themselves, who cherish a visceral antipathy toward bureaucracy. Nonetheless, statistics tell of a striking disparity: the Austrian government annually spends about $3.78 per capita on the arts, and Great Britain puts out $1.23, in contrast to 10 cents a head in the United States.

While Europeans regard art as a necessity, Americans see it as a luxury. Sculptress Jimilu Mason, a member of the arts council, is appalled at the contrast. After a recent trip to Europe she said, "Returning to America makes you wonder what in the world has happened to art. In Europe, there's art in public buildings, in post offices—art is everywhere." Miss Mason contends that the American notion of the exclusivity of art has prevented us from incorporating it into everyday life. Endowment staff members, too, remark that Europe looks to this country for the most exciting new developments in the arts, but Americans themselves are hardly aware of the riches they harbor. "The vitality, diversity, and creativity in American dance has been one of the world's best kept secrets," says June Arey, director of dance programs. "For years some companies have been kept alive by foreign tours sponsored by the State Department."

Aims

The arts endowment has set itself a twofold task: to stimulate and support creativity and to democratize the arts through wide public exposure and the creation of new channels of dissemination. To the latter end, approximately one-third of the money directly allocated to the endowment is distributed among state arts councils. About half the states had arts councils at the time that the legislation passed. With stimulation from the endowment, the councils have expanded and others have been created. Now one exists in every state and territory, including the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

As autonomous bodies, the state councils operate as mini-endowments, designing programs tailored to the needs and fancies of their areas and collecting funds, either appropriated by state legislatures or contributed by private donors, to match the federal funds. (Federal moneys plays a very small role for some councils: in New York the legislature allocated an unprecedented $20 million for the coming year to bail out her foundering performing arts groups.)

One significance of the state program is that it stimulates small-scale amateur projects of the sort private foundations rarely touch. In Michigan, for instance, the railroad association donated cars for an "Artrain" which was stuffed with art exhibitions, craft shows, and traveling lecturers and sent around the state. In West Virginia, a little money and talent transformed the State Music Association from a listless assortment of nonmusicians, who met to discuss high school band outfits, into a vital group that broke the pageant-like tradition of outdoor theater in Appalachia by staging an original production of *The Hatfields and McCoys*.

The state program bears much responsibility for the endowment's popularity. There is evidence that enthusiastic mail from home has spurred a number of congressmen to jump on the art bandwagon. The program's vitality also argues against the occasional criticism that the endowment is limiting its beneficence to entrenched big-city cultural establishments.

The national program money has gone to a variety of individuals and groups in nine categories: dance, literature, music, education, public media, theater, visual arts, architecture, and interdisciplinary programs. Nonmatching grants to individual creative artists account for about 4 percent of outgoing funds. Other grants are designed, as a staff member put it, to "kill all kinds of birds with one stone."

An example of this multiplier effect is found in a grant which enabled the Vermont Marble Company to arrange an outdoor sculpture symposium. Ten outstanding sculptors were invited to spend the summer chipping away at blocks of marble, and the results were left to start a sculpture park. For a modest outlay of $10,000, the endowment linked up with private industry, which promises to be a vast source of future support for the arts, engaged a wide audience (some 100,000 people came by to watch the artists at work), set an unusual and imaginative precedent, and left a legacy which will draw further contributions.

Another unorthodox venture is the Affiliate Artists program, made possible by a donation from the Sears Roebuck Foundation. A performing artist, usually a musician, becomes an affiliate of a college or community organization, and—freed from the usual academic obligations of the artist-in-residence—he gives concerts and acts as an adviser to the community.

The endowment's largest commitment to date has been $2.6 million, over a 3-year period, matched by donations from the Ford Foundation and the Motion Picture Association of America, for the creation and support of the American Film Institute. The AFI is a nonprofit organization set up to further education, research, and publication on film-making and to build an archive of old American movies which have been transferred from crumbling nitrate to durable acetate stock. The AFI also runs a theater in Washington, D.C., whose overwhelming popularity testifies to a heretofore untapped audience of old-film addicts.

Projects

The endowment faces a danger common among all foundations: that of sinking money into projects that die the minute their grants are used up. The idea that a program, once launched, will be carried by momentum "is plainly a complete illusion," says Michael Straight, deputy to chairman Nancy Hanks. Grant applicants are therefore required to submit long-range plans and to furnish information on potential private sources of cash. Miss Hanks, who came to the endowment after 10 years as chairman of the American Association of Arts Councils, is also credited with uncanny knowledge of the habits of private foundations and the business world, which enables the endowment to make realistic assessments of a program's survival capability.

Nonetheless, miscalculations have been made. A few years ago the endowment put $350,000 into the creation of a touring arm

of the Metropolitan Opera Company. After 2 years of struggle the company sank. Sarah Caldwell's American Opera Company was then given a touring grant, but this venture has been plagued with financial difficulty.

Also in deep trouble is a resident theater company which was set up in New Orleans—one of several pilot theater projects across the country. The endowment played the major role in establishing the theater in a community where little organized interest existed, and efforts are still being made to create a reliable base of community support.

Nevertheless, popularity is not enough to ensure a program's success, since the worth of an artistic institution cannot be judged by standards of cost-effectiveness. While salaries and expenses rise, there can be no balancing rise in efficiency when the product is labor. As one report notes, "it takes as many manhours to perform a Schubert string quartet today as it did 150 years ago."

With their new 1971 appropriations, Miss Hanks and her council have decided to address this problem with the endowment's first grants to symphony orchestras. Although Straight hails the move as "going to the core of the arts," to the "carriers of our cultural heritage," others question its merits. "Every orchestra in this country operates on a deficit—they're bottomless pits," says a congressional staff lawyer. Endowment policy forbids the funding of deficits, "but that's where the money's bound to go."

A music critic points out that only 5 percent of the population goes to one or more performances a year by any of the performing arts. A stafl member calls symphony orchestras "gargantuan" monsters, a creation of another era, whose march to extinction will not be slowed by a few million dollars. Critics also mention the $82 million invested by the Ford Foundation into 61 major orchestras over the past 5 years. Services have been expanded and salaries have been raised as a result, they say, but the orchestras' escalated economy has created further needs which leaves them back where they started.

Nevertheless, the endowment believes aid to symphonies will spur their managements to uncover new sources of financial support and, more importantly, will encourage them to break past their hoary role as museums for the classics—to play more contemporary music, to break into small ensemble groups, and to venture out of concert halls and into parks and suburbs.

As the endownment grows, so will controversy within and around it, and the staff is aware that the real battles are yet to come. At present, though, harmony predominates. Nancy Hanks, who was appointed by the President last year to take over from Democrat Roger Stevens, enjoys unusual respect and admiration from her colleagues. Combined with her soft-spoken charm is an awesome political prowess which the Oxford-educated Miss Hanks used to good effect in the course of buttonholing some 200 congressmen to urge this year's hike in appropriations. Nixon offered concrete evidence of his faith in the Hanks leadership when he asked Congress last December to double the Foundation's allocations. The confidence seems to be mutual—"the arts picture under Nixon is the brightest it's ever been," says she.

2. ARTS AND HUMANITIES: FEDERAL MONEY IS BENEFITING CULTURE

The humanities—aims

The National Endowment for the Humanities has the twofold mission of upgrading the quality of humanistic endeavor and laying open its riches to the general public.

Former president of Brown University Barnaby Keeney, chairman of the endowment until President Nixon's refusal to reappoint him last July, remains its most outspoken representative. Keeney feels that humanists have lost sight of what he considers their proper role, namely, that of interpreting the past so that man may live more wisely and happily in the present. He thinks that the humanities have been in danger of becoming an intellectual retreat rather than a living force, and that humanists have been delinquent in helping people formulate new values to deal with the consequences of advances in science and technology.

In a 1969 speech, for example, Keeney declared: "Strenuous and occasionally successful efforts are being made to apply the social sciences, but almost never are the humanities well applied. We do not use philosophy in defining our conduct. We do not use literature as a source of real and vicarious experience to save us the trouble of living every life again in our own."

The most visible signs of the disparity between government support for science and the humanities are found in aid to higher education. In 1965, of all federal money for research, less than one-half percent went to humanities, with the result that the proportion of humanities scholars to science scholars declined drastically in postgraduate education programs (*Science*, 1 October 1965). The effect of this bias is seen on campuses throughout the country, where humanities classes are often housed in shabby edifices abandoned by science departments when they moved to shiny new government-funded facilities.

Four categories

The endowment directs its beneficence into four categories—fellowships and stipends for individual scholars; research and publication; the upgrading of humanities education; and a public program, whose broad mandate is to get the grass roots excited about the joys of knowledge.

While individual research and scholarship grants are awarded for many kinds of activities, from underwater archeological excavation to a study of the philosophy of law, the humanities council has tried to favor studies that will stimulate thought on civilization's current afflictions. The stress on "relevancy" has produced some dismay in scholarly quarters where there was fear that pure research was being downgraded. But the objections have apparently been dispelled. When asked recently what the endowment's greatest accomplishment had been, Keeney replied: It's gotten the humanists to think of something besides pure research." The endowment started out by handing over 80 percent of its budget for individual study and research. Now, with priorities shifting to education and public programs, the proportion is down to 35 percent.

Program for public consumption

The most adventurous and least clearly defined of the programs is the one for public consumption. It has two basic thrusts: one deals through the media, primarily in the form of educational television programs; the other involves direct confrontations between the humanities and The People. In the latter category, the centerpiece is the National Humanities Series. Organized with grants to the Woodrow Wilson Scholarship Foundation, the series sends teams of actors and teachers to interested communities whose cultural facilities are limited. Under the general heading of "Time Out for Man: The Humanities in Action," the teams stage lively public productions, which feature the writings of history's great thinkers, around themes of current public concern. After the performance, discussions are held between the audieuce and those on stage. The performers have reportedly been enthusiastically received, and some communities have become excited enough to form groups to foster more such activities.

The aim of the public programs is to build on the resources of all the local institutions it can get its hands on—museums, libraries, schools, adult education centers, historical societies, radio and TV stations, and newspapers. A pilot program in Utah, for example, provides for a humanities agent (modeled on the liens of an agriculture extension agent) to aid statewide agencies in designing programs related to local history and culture, and to engender cooperation between public schools and local historical societies.

Educational programs

The endowment's education program is largely concerned with aiding in the development of humanities curricula. Colleges and universities have received the most attention, but the most novel program may be the National Humanities Faculty, which is applied to elementary and high schools. Under this program, small groups of scholars and teachers deliver talks to students and aid faculties in designing courses that have special relevance within a particular school—such as a program on human attitudes and values to aid in a school's transition to desegregated classes. A broader aim of the program is to get high schools and neighboring colleges—which for the most part inhabit separate intellectual communities—into a pattern of productive exchanges.

Considerable money has gone into programs with direct application to the country's social problems—such as ethnic studies of minority groups, a grant for the Watts Writers Workshop in Los Angeles, and faculty development grants for small Negro colleges—but the endowment has yet to discover a comprehensive way of harnessing the cultural energies of poor and underprivileged youth. One such opportunity arose in the formation of the Eastern High School Freedom Annex in Washington, D.C., a center for supplementary courses in black history and culture, which was formed by a group of young blacks who were fed up with their high school. The program, which has received two endowment grants, has drawn a number of dropouts back into the school system and has propelled others on to college. Endowment staff members say they would like to back more programs that perform a beneficial, social as well as cultural function. But a paramount concern for quality forces them to be highly selective: "after all, we're not a social action agency."

Standard setter—Research and publications

The endowment tries to be a standard-setter for excellence and a perpetuator of the best in American culture. In this capacity, one of the largest appropriations has been made to the Modern Language Association. Under yearly grants ($189,000 for 1970) teams of scholars have labored over production of complete, accurate, annotated editions of the works of major 19th century American authors. The project is widely praised for supplying an authoritative collection of works, many of which are unpublished, out of print, or abroad in inaccurate texts. Some critics have complained that the grants put a lot of money into some pretty precious scholarship. "Does it really matter whether Melville's ocean was 'rolling' or 'boiling.'" wondered one.

As part of its effort to break down rigid barriers between disciplines, the endowment is putting money into a number of programs to stimulate across-breeding with the sciences. Among these is a grant to the Princeton engineering faculty to perimt widening of the curriculum to include the political esthetic, and human ramifications of an engineering project. Another grant enables research fellows at the Salk Institute to study the humanistic implications of advances in such fields as genetics.

In the scholarly realm, the endowment intends to place future emphasis on the development of basic research tools such as bibliographies and dictionaries, and on technological research aids like computers, micro-

film libraries, and improved methods of copying documents.

Creation of State Programs

In the public arena, inspired in part by the success of the state arts councils, the endowment is looking into the creation of a new state-based program. The form it will take is yet undecided. State programs might become attached to local arts councils or historical societies, or they might be administered by state humanities consortia made up of representatives from cultural agencies, publications, and educational TV stations. Keeney, whose views incline to acerbity, doubts whether local autonomous agencies can conduct programs of high quality, but feels that a state-based program would be "very helpful politically."

The National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities (NFAH), because of its high artistic and intellectual standards and the fact it has had so little money, has operated remarkably free of serious criticism. Experience has proved unfounded the fears that money would be poured only into existing channels rather than used to create new ones, that government intervention would mean the pollution of art, or that federal infusions would dry up private contributions. The uneven cultural landscape of the country—with its vast expanses of TV land unaffected by artistically thriving urban centers, the two-way snobbery between the enlightened and the intellectually unwashed, dancers in the "dance capital of the world" waiting on tables to stay alive, towns whose only building that is not air conditioned is the library—is partly a result of the government's laissez-faire attitude toward what is not a commercial enterprise. The Ford Foundation's vice president McNeil Lowry has noted that artistic standards have become "generalized and popularized" when subjected to the laws of the marketplace.

The argument that art and the state don't mix has become nearly obsolete in face of the fact that private sources are inadequate to supply the financial support needed by the arts to experiment and flourish. Far from preempting the fields in which it operates, NFAH grants serve as magnets to attract other funds, and, for every federal dollar spent, well over $3 in outside money has been generated. As Keeney says, "There's nothing like money to attract money." The respectability conferred by government endorsement of a program is also attractive. One witness at congressional hearings claimed that corporation boards whose philanthropic contributions had been limited to the "kids and dogs" category were becoming emboldened to dip into cultural activities.

Careful selection

The NFAH procedure for selecting projects for funding was meticulously designed to avoid any suggestion of government manipulation. Once a program is designated by an endowment's council, project applications are invited. The staff forwards feasible-looking applications to selected specialists and to appropriate members of large, multidisciplinary "peer panels" (whose names are kept confidential to spare them harassment) for critcism and recommendations. The applications then undergo exhaustive screening by the council, which meets privately four times a year. The chairman must approve the final selections. The responsibility for grant selection is diffused by the requirement that the entire council must vote on every sum over $10,000.

Congress has found little cause for complaint in the Foundation's mode of operation. One exception was an uproar in the House occasioned by certain colorful-sounding projects, most notably a study of 19th century comic strips. Several members chose the occasion to call for a termination of "handouts" to individuals under the arts program, an alarming prospect since grants to individual artists go to the core of creative activity. Some observers think that the problem was simply one of public relations—if the comic strips had been called "visual satire," for instance, the project would have met with no objections.

On the whole, staffs and councils feel that Congress leans over backward to avoid imposing its preferences. Still, they look forward to being granted a permanent lease on life (they were granted a 3-year extension this year). "We're so small that if Congress makes any cuts they could kill us," said one arts council member. "I would like us to get bigger and feel we were a permanent part of the scene." The size of the budget leaves little leeway for mistakes, and staff members feel strongly that they must have enough freedom to take risks. "Congress jumped down our throats for including one example of concrete poetry—poetry which relies on visual effect—in a literary anthology [a one-word poem: *Lighght*]," said one. "If a scientist does 100 experiments and succeeds the 101st time he's called a success—but if an artist goofs after 100 successes he's judged by the failure." The comparison, while overdrawn, reflects the defensive stance humanists have assumed in recent decades in response to uncritical public support of science and technology.

Pilot stage

The NFAH, for all its hundreds of programs, remains in the pilot stage. Next year will be the first in which its beneficence outstrips that of the Ford Foundation's contributions to arts and humanities, which, this year, amounts to about $20 million. Witnesses at this spring's hearings estimated that some $150 million a year per endowment would be required to make a real dent in the country's cultural scene.

But the ball is rolling, The Foundation has always had a solid base of bipartisan support in Congress, and insiders believe the agency has successfully kept its nose above governmental politics. Congressional opposition, almost entirely limited to the House, has dwindled to some ritualistic carping—and Senator Strom Thurmond (D-S.C.), who 5 years ago labeled the whole idea unconstitutional, was recently to be found introducing one of the witnesses at the 1970 hearings. Press coverage is favorage, particularly for the more visible activities of the arts endowment.

Some observers, Keeney among them, think that ultimately the interests of both humanists and scientists would be best served if NFAH and NSF were merged into a single National Foundation for the advancement of research, education, and the arts. (Representative Emilio Daddario's subcommittee recommended a similar body in the form of a National Institute of Research and Advanced Studies.) Such a body would be a public symbol of the interrelationship of all branches of knowledge and could more effectively support programs in which the respective purposes of scientists and humanists merge. Most arts people, however, would strongly resist such a combination since they feel their identity and objectives would be drowned in a large, multi-purpose organization. A more fruitful alliance, they suggest, might be with the cultural exchange programs of the State Department.

The marriage of convenience, as many regard it, between the arts and humanities may one day be dissolved in a government reshuffle. But right now the Foundation is young and happy, and many would agree with a staff member who calls it "the most exciting thing in government." As a federal agency devoted to spreading truth and beauty rather than combating misery and evil, the Foundation is rare indeed. And it will have further claim to distinction if its spirited and individualistic approach to its job can survive bureaucratic maturity.

Where the Arts Money Goes

In addition to grants to individual artists and performing groups, the National Endowment for the Arts has made contributions to projects like these:

$100,000 to a Theater Development Fund which purchases tickets of new plays with artistic merit but shaky financial footings, and resells them at reduced prices.

A grant of $91,291 enabling ten young musicians to spend a year in Hungary studying the Kodaly concept of music education.

$12,500 to aid a National Educational Television production of two films on fashion design.

$30,000 each for environmental design projects: an urban, open space design study concentrating on the design potentials of a city street; an investigation of less destructive methods of strip mining.

Grants totaling $1 million to aid in the establishment of Westbeth, a nonprofit artists' housing project created out of the old Bell Telepone Laboratories on New York's Lower West Side.

$203,767 for the University of Wisconsin to conduct experiments on how to increase rural community receptivity to and participation in cultural programs.

Poetry in the schools: the endowment pledged $148,000 to state arts councils and universities across the nation for a program in which poets visit public schools to read and discuss their work.

$3,500 for research into a lost technique of violin finishing ("the shellac that made a Strad a Strad").

Yearly anthologies of poetry and prose culled from hundreds of small American literary magazines and edited by writer George Plimpton. Most of the endowment's total contribution of $179,950 went into cash prizes for authors and editors. (Support of the project was terminated when the council decided priority should be given to creation of new works rather than recognition of work done.)—C.H.

HUMANITIES: SOME TYPICAL PROJECTS

The following undertakings give an idea of the range of ways in which the National Endowment for the Humanities has tried to pump fresh blood into humanistic pursuits:

A grant of $87,730 to Education Systems Corporation for the production of elementary school readers on Mexican-American history and culture.

$900 for a college professor who undertook, with his students, the excavation of a 400-year-old Indian village in Pennsylvania.

Development of a 7th-grade course on the civilizations of Athens and Sparta which places emphasis on social change and the role of warfare in changing values.

A Younger Humanist Fellowship to allow a professor to develop his concept of an "eco-community," a new life style which minimizes waste and pollution.

A study of the federal arts projects of the Depression.

A whirlwind 3-month program of community enlightenment sponsored by the Tulsa, Oklahoma, library system, in which a $24,250 grant was used to pay for speakers, films, and public discussions about civilization's current concerns.

Fellowships enabling authors to complete books such as *The Mind and Mood of Black America; International History of City Development;* and *Jefferson the President.*

An $80,000 contribution to "Trail of Tears," an educational television series documenting the government's maltreatment of the Cherokees.

A grant to a musicologist to record and publish the reminiscences of old New Orleans jazz musicians.

$161,000 in grants to faculty members of junior colleges so that they can take a year off to improve themselves as teachers.

$30,170 for a Folklore Institute, in Ari-

zona, which experiments in the classroom use of folklore in the state's ethnically mixed junior high schools.

$46,330 to George Washington University for exploration of the humanistic dimensions of its relations with the City of Washington, D.C. —C.H.

ACHESON ON U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTH-WEST AFRICA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker: a just released paper by Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State, points out most succintly the continuing errors of U.S. involvement in South-West Africa.

Not only has the United States voted in the U.N. against continuing civilization in South-West Africa, but we have filed a brief with the International Court of Justice supposedly supporting the expulsion of South Africa from South-West Africa. The contents of the legal brief are so secret and confidential that the American people, including we in Congress, are uninformed as to what is being urged in our name as in the best interests of our country.

Mr. Acheson in his paper points out the utter folly of our supposed position which can be expected to favor turning South-West Africa into another no-man's land like so many other African states.

At most our involvement can be politely considered as simply another exercise in politics to curry bloc votes—this time international politics to trade for bloc votes in the U.N.

I am inserting Mr. Acheson's paper in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 2, 1971]

ACHESON ON U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTH WEST AFRICA

(By Dean Acheson)

Thanks to a recent report from Senator Henry Jackson's Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations, I have learned of Francesco Guicciardini's excellent admonition: "Take heed how you involve yourself in new enterprises or engagements; for once in, you are forced to go on. Whence it results that men are often found laboring through tasks which being embarked in they cannot withdraw from, though had they foreseen a tenth part of their difficulty they would have gone a thousand miles to avoid them. This rule holds most of all in feuds, factions, and wars, before taking part in which, or anything of a like nature, no amount of careful and cautious consideration will be excessive."

No wiser precept could guide the conduct of foreign policy, particularly respecting southern Africa. Forces active in world affairs are trying to hustle up conflict there and, along with some assistance in the United States, aim to inveigle this government into hostilities. Unless the nation takes leave of its senses, it will stay clear of that booby-trap. Surely this administration has no intention of being drawn into such folly. The danger is that the administration, like the two preceding ones, will permit itself to be pressed, especially at the United Nations, into forensic positions that tend toward that baleful consequence. Some day, unless it mends its ways, the government will get to the crux of put up or shut up.

If there is no intention ultimately to play cat's paw in a southern African war, then the government should avoid gestures that can only lead to eventual embarrassment. Someone high in the administration's councils should keep a wary eye on initiatives from certain parts of the State Department—particularly the Untied Nations Bureau, African Affairs, and the Legal Adviser's Office—where zeal all too often exceeds judgment. It would be presumptuous to make a nomination.

The foregoing is prelude to some specific observations about the United States' relation to issues over South West Africa. The pertinent background is complex. A few details will indicate the basis of concern.

South West Africa is a sparse land twice the size of California. It lies on the Atlantic southward of Angola and Zambia, west of Botswana, and north and west of South Africa. About a sixth of its population of 650,000 consists of whites. Small fractions are Bushmen, Hottentots, and mixed breeds. The main aggregate engrosses diverse tribes of blacks.

In the latter ninetheenth-century, while restrained by Gladstone's stringent policies, Great Britain forewent annexing South West to South Africa, except for a small coastal enclave embracing the sole deep-water harbor, Germany, rising to the opportunity presented by Britain's forbearance, then organized the region as a colony. German authority held on until overturned in 1915 by South African forces invading at Great Britain's behest.

Germany formally ceded the territory to the principal victor powers in the Versailles Treaty in 1919. These powers at the same time ratified South Africa's occupation by assigning the territory to South Africa subject to a mandate to be issued by the League of Nations Council. The mandate, issued in 1920, authorized South Africa to govern the territory as if an extension of its own domain. The terms included standards of conduct to which South African authority was obligated in regard to the welfare of indigenous peoples. Periodic reports to the League's Permanent Mandates Commission were required. The arrangements were operative during the League's tenure.

Eventually the League subsided into history, and the United Nations came on stage. The charter mentioned principles pertinent to the intsitutionalizing of trusteeships over subordinate territories but was silent as to the status of League mandates. Thereby an enduring quarrel was kindled. It has sputtered along ever since.

In an early phase of the U.N. General Assembly's aim was to make South Africa submit its administration in South West Africa to supervision by the Trusteeship Council. South Africa persistently refused. The attendant issues were referred to the International Court of Justice. Here I sum up the court's views given in a series of advisory opinions. The mandate was viewed as having survived the League and as susceptible of dissolution only by concurrence of South Africa and the pertinent international authority. The U.N. was viewed as the League's sucessor and surrogate with respect to the mandate. The General Assembly was viewed as an appropriate body for the pertinent role. The General Assembly's ordinary rules of procedure, in place of the League's requirement of unanimity, were viewed as appropriate for pertinent deliberations. The General Assembly's pertinent functions were viewed as limited to those specified in the charter. For the General Assembly to receive petitions and complaints from indigenous peoples of South West Africa was viewed as permissible. A trusteeship for South West Africa was viewed as appropriate, but South Africa was viewed as not obligated to submit to me.

The advisory opinions explored but did not resolve the issues. Subsequently, following the proliferation of African independencies in the late 1950s and early 1960s, South Africa's adversaries have shifted aim—striving to get the mandate dissolved rather than perpetuated and South Africa's authority in South West Africa displaced rather than merely made subservient to a trusteeship arrangement. A high point in this phase was marked by litigation before the International Court of Justice launched by Liberia and Ethopia acting on behalf of the Organization of African Unity. The court assumed jurisdiction in a close vote. The petitioners at first importuned the court to set aside the mandate on grounds of South Africa's malperformance on specifics pertinent to the welfare of indigenous peoples. After South Africa successfully countered the allegations, petitioners changed their approach and asked the court to invalidate the mandate by finding that it had been rendered obsolete by new international law alleged to be inferrable from General Assembly resolutions and other expressions by the so-called international community. In the upshot, the court, faced with a choice either to take a reckless leap from the established premises of international law or to find for South Africa on the merits, prudently vacated jurisdiction, again by a close vote, in the summer of 1966.

This government's folly in relation to the problem became pronounced from that time on. Our official spokesmen, from the then Secretary of State on down, criticized the court's ruling without showing even slight familiarity with the sound reasoning on which it was based. Thenceforward, despite occasional spells of prudent reluctance, this government has repeatedly colluded with the advocates of trouble both in getting the General Assembly to attempt actions manifestly beyond its powers under the charter and in aligning the Security Council as a seconder and presumable enforcer of the General Assembly's actions.

In the autumn of 1966 the General Assembly—notwithstanding that the charter restricts it to nondeterminative deliberations such as discussing, considering, recommending, and calling attention—undertook to cancel the mandate, to abolish South Africa's authority there, and to put the place under U.N. control. The United States delegation joined the charade. I take at face value reports in the press to the effect that the delegation decided to do so on its own without clearing with higher authority. I can only assure you that no such thing would have occurred when I was head of the foreign office.

Subsequently the General Assembly has elaborated the fantasy—periodically reaffirming its declaratory actions, renaming the place "Namibia," designating a commission to supervise and a bureaucrat to govern it, and performing other officious gestures without concrete effect. Two years ago this month the General Assembly importuned the Security Council to press the projected expulsion. On March 20, 1969, the Council—by a 13-to-0 vote with only France and the United Kingdom showing the good sense to abstain—passed a resolution taking note of the General Assembly's previous actions and summoning South Africa to withdraw its administration immediately. I can only comment that this government and any government of good will would have been utterly horrified if South Africa, likewise abandoning practical reason, had undertaken to comply, for the U.N. lacked resources, in material or talent, for taking over South Africa's responsibilities. This year there were other pro forma actions by the Security Council calling for irritative commercial

restrictions, setting a specific deadline, and so on.

A particular action in the Security Council deserves more elaborate notice. In July of this year that body resolved to elicit from the international Court of Justice an advisory opinion as to the legal consequences for states of the continued presence of South Africa in "Namibia," notwithstanding a previous action by the Security Council setting a deadline for South Africa to withdraw its authority and operations.

If the court has not been demoralized by the unfounded criticism leveled against it for the 1966 dismissal of the Liberian-Ethiopian petition, it might conceivably return the question with an admonition for the Security Council to confine such requests to answerable propositions. Such an exercise in good sense is probably more than one is entitled to expect in the realm of international organization in these times.

Two circumstances attending debate over the question in the Security Council are interesting. The representatives of third-world states participating articulated an ultimatum of sorts to the court: this occasion would constitute a last opportunity for the court to atone for its offense in having overruled the Liberian-Ethiopian petition. The same representatives stressed the importance of phrasing the question so as to circumvent the court's considering the United Nation's authority to rescind the mandate—hence the awkward phraseology.

The United States, which concurred on this resolution (unlike Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and Poland, which had abstained), has filed a brief. It is held by the court in confidence; hence I do not know its contents. I hope our advocates have dissociated themselves from other states' attempts to intimidate the court and that the U.S. brief does not uphold the effort to foreclose the court from examining the United Nation's authority in the premises. One can only speculate about the line of reasoning necessary to support the United States' pertinent votes.

For the life of me, I cannot see how it is possible to make any case at all without resorting to some equivalent, pertinent to international law, of the doctrine of implied powers familiar in our domestic constitutional tradition. I say this because how else can one try to uphold the purported recision of the mandate; firstly, to infer a provision for termination in the mandate even though none is expressed, secondly to infer pertinent determinative power in the Assembly even though the charter does not grant it, and thirdly, to perceive an authorization for the Security Council to give such a corroboratory order even though no language of the charter warrants it.

This approach is essential to any justification of the United States' recent attitude on the South West Africa problem. The rub is that the approach is quite at odds with our long-run and general interests. If such a line of reasoning should prevail in the court, I, for one, believe the United States would perforce eventually have to cancel its adherence to the court's statute and dissociate itself entirely from the court's work. It is difficult enough to get sovereign states to submit disputes with respect to express provisions of treaties. If the court is going to embark on the practice of inferring, interpreting, and applying language beyond the plain meaning of the texts of treaties—with all the hazards in such a practice—then states in their senses will simply have to desist from recourse to the institution.

As you see, my objections to the government's present course settle down to three points. If the United States does intend eventually to try to coerce South Africa out of South West Africa, it is following a path to huge and gratuitous folly. If the United States has no such intention, it is helping make mischief of a most reprehensible sort both by deliberately encouraging other states to mistake our intentions and by making frivolous use of international institutions. In any event, the United States has put itself in a position where, to justify its course, it must employ legal argument that are dubious in basis and dangerous in implication. So I return to Guicciardini's precept with which I began.

THE ROAD AHEAD FOR INDIANAPOLIS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 1, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE EDITOR'S CORNER—THE ROAD AHEAD FOR OUR CITY

(By Stan Evans)

Indianapolis enters 1971, the year of its sesquicentennial, with much to its credit and prospects of further success in the future.

Like all American communities, we have our assets and our liabilities, but a glance at the record of the past decade indicates we are in several respects more favored than other cities. That record suggests that, given appropriate policies, we can continue to grow and prosper in the months ahead. Or, alternatively, we can repeat the mistakes that others have made and inherit some of their troubles. The choice is up to us.

And review of community assets would have to include our favorable geographic location—open to expansion on every side, located near important transportation links, and centered in a state economy balanced between agriculture and business.

More important than these technical benefits, however, is the spirit which Indianapolis has displayed across the years.

Hoosier emphasis on private enterprise and self-help, plus avoidance of various Federal programs which create social disruption and hardship, have been essential factors in the growth of our community. On every major index of economic health, our town has stood well ahead of other cities where enterprise and initiative have been discouraged, and grandiose Federal schemes have been enacted as supposed solutions for urban distress.

Thus in the years 1965–69, Indianapolis had an unemployment rate which ranged from a low of 2.2 per cent to a high of 2.6 per cent—compared to what is considered to be a "full employment" rate of 3 per cent. Effective incomes were higher here than in Columbus, Ohio, Cincinnati, Louisville, and St. Louis. A smaller percentage of Indianapolis families were poor than in any of the above-mentioned communities, as well as Detroit—where every conceivable anti-poverty program has been enacted.

In matters of housing, the private housing market has produced new units at a rate double that of population growth. More housing units were authorized per capita in Indianapolis than in all the cities previously named, plus Chicago, Milwaukee, and Pittsburgh. The number of "dilapidated" housing units in Indianapolis fell from 6.9 per cent of the supply in 1950 to 4 per cent in 1960. As of 1967, some 55.4 per cent of dwellings in our city were owner-occupied, as compared to percentages in the 40s and 30s in other Midwest communities.

Equally to the point, we have averted the devastation and disorder which Federal knock-down buildup programs of "urban renewal" and public housing have visited on cities like Detroit and St. Louis. We have not evicted thousands of our citizens from their homes in the name of some abstract "progress" which looks impressive on a Federal planner's chart but brings misery to the people directly affected by it.

Our self-help and private enterprise themes have also produced the finest array of voluntary action programs anywhere in the nation, and a building boom which has visibly altered the skyline of our city.

The New Indiana National Bank Building thrusting high above the Hoosier plain is but one of many such improvements which have occurred in recent years—the work of private capital in a city stressing private enterprise.

As we enter our sesquicentennial year, we need to recall the elements which brought our city's growth, stress the factors which are linked to its success, and avoid the errors which have plagued so many other towns. If we pursue that course, the next 149 years can be even more successful than the last.

HON. MICHAEL FEIGHAN

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 28, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my distinguished colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from Ohio. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN has given this House 28 years of distinguished service and his leadership and guidance have been of great value to the country.

He has made available his impressive talents in his capacity as chairman of the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and also as a key member of the Committee on Merchant Marines and Fisheries.

He has, thus, been a sympathetic and helpful source of assistance in an area of great importance to all of us; namely, immigration and naturalization. As we all know, Mr. Speaker, the responsibilities of a Congressman often include assisting foreign-born Americans, or their alien relatives, or—in some cases—foreign strangers to our land. I have always found my assistance in this area to be one of the most rewarding aspects of my public service. Assisting the foreigner who will someday be proud to achieve American citizenship, assisting those aliens who are dear to our countrymen, reuniting families—these are the kinds of fundamental, decent efforts that make public service worthwhile.

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN showed great sympathy and understanding on the many occasions when I have contacted him for advice or assistance on a problem of immigration or naturalization. As chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, he showed not only great leadership but also great compassion.

The people of my district have cause to be very grateful to MICHAEL FEIGHAN, for his interest, involvement, and understanding frequently made possible happy family reunions and that solemn, but proud, oath of allegiance to America and all it stands for.

I regret that our professional association is coming to an end, for that association has been as educative and inspiring, as our friendship has been pleasant and rewarding. I am sure that the admiration and respect I feel toward MIKE FEIGHAN is shared by us all.

A CHRISTMAS LETTER PRAISING GOD AND COUNTRY

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on December 24 last, on Christmas Eve, there appeared a message in the San Antonio Express and News a very inspiring message.

The message was from a successful and distinguished San Antonion, Mr. Alton S. Newell, who is contributing to the wealth and progress of our city, State, and Nation.

I spread upon the RECORD the message from Mr. Newell.

A CHRISTMAS LETTER PRAISING GOD AND COUNTRY

Since you have been the object of much criticism lately, both from within and without your borders, I would like to write you a few words of praise to brighten your holiday season.

I returned just last month from my second trip around the world this year. In most all the countries I visited I saw irrefutable evidence of your deep concern for the welfare of all the people of the globe. Your men in uniform are scattered throughout the world. Not a one of them is there to conquer any space or subdue a human being. They are at their assigned places to insure that free men will remain free. Many white crosses there give evidence to the sacrifice made by those who never returned to their homeland. Twice in my lifetime you have joined other free nations to put down those who would enslave their fellow man. You beat your enemies to the ground only to pick them up again and dust them off, bind up their wounds and tenderly nurse them back to health again. In many cases you provided them with more modern and sophisticated equipment than we have at home. Your scientists, engineers and technicians are busy all over the world today to help people obtain a more abundant life. Your doctors, nurses and many helpers are fighting the effects of disease and poverty in underdeveloped and, in some cases, overpopulated countries of the world. Most of the people of the free world appreciate this and praise you for it and pray that you will not become discouraged enough to cease your endeavor. I pray for you and thank God for you too dear Uncle because you have done so much for me.

I was born in a tent in Oklahoma and grew up in poverty. My parents were sharecroppers and moved from farm to farm. In the fall of 1922 they took their six children and headed west and became migrant workers. Seven or eight months later we reached California in time for the fruit harvest and became known, along with others, as "fruit tramps." The next year my parents separated when I was ten years of age. All the children, ranging in age from two to fourteen, went with my father and for several years went back and forth from Texas to California working our way along. We went to school when we were in one place long enough for the truant officers to find us. Getting an education under these conditions was difficult, but with the help of many others we all made it to high school . . . Our father's health was not good and he also developed a serious drinking problem. The two youngest children had to be sent to their grandparents for a while, but we soon got back together again. We finally settled down out west and began our slow climb out of poverty. Many people helped us along the way. Thank you dear Uncle for allowing God to bless us through you.

I sit today at the top of eight companies one of which is doing business all over the world. I do not claim even a small amount of genius for myself, but would like to tell the world that our system of government gives a better chance to the individual to have a good life than any system known to man. I do not belittle those who have been unable to reach their goal but offer my experience for their encouragement and also to encourage those who have it made to help those who don't. I could never go back and find and thank all those whose lives touched and enriched mine so, to make up for it, I will try to help and encourage others. I count it a privilege to support my church and other worthwhile causes. I don't mind paying income taxes because they are an indication of material blessings. So dear Uncle Sam don't let anyone tamper with your system unless they first show you a better one. Thanks for listening and Merry Christmas.

FOOD STAMP DEBACLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now that Congress has refunded the food stamp program, we learn that the Agriculture Department has devised new rules to bypass the intent of Congress. The ruling that food stamp customers can be given change up to 49 cents in cash instead of "credit slips" removes all supervision over the mandatory use for which food stamp buying power was to be used and belies the emotional arguments that foods stamps would insure a more nutritious diet.

It only takes grade school arithmetic to figure out that just under one-half the value of food stamps can now be converted to cash to be used as the food stamp user pleases including purchases of beer, wine, whiskey, and cigarettes.

Perhaps the Department's ruling, coming after passage of the new food stamp bill, is intended as an educational reform to conform to the arguments of some of the proponents who urged: "Why give them food stamps, give them money."

Who in the bureaucracy is concerned over inflation?

I include a UPI story in the RECORD as follows:

UNITED STATES EASES RULES ON FOOD STAMPS

The Agriculture Department has changed two rules governing the nation's 8.8 million food stamp users.

One permits grocers to give food stamp customers change up to 49 cents in cash instead of "credit slips." The other permits use of stamps to pay deposits on milk and soft drink bottles.

Officials conceded the shift to cash for change would make it possible for food stamp users to use the money for items which cannot legally be bought with stamps or credit slips, such as beer and soap. The new rules take effect today.

LEGISLATION PASSED DURING POST-ELECTION SESSION

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in one of my final acts of service in this distinguished body which I have loved so well and will miss so dearly, I should like to pause for a moment to acquaint the Members of the House with those items of major legislation which obtained final congressional approval during the session following the 1970 elections. I would advise my colleagues that I have offered herein only brief summaries and only for measures which passed both Houses.

This report shows that we have had a highly successful and constructive session during the past month and a half, from November 16, 1970, to January 2, 1971.

And, since I can do this without appearing too unseemly, I want to congratulate the Members for their hard work during the period of festive holidays. I know it has been difficult for you to have to sit here, but we can take satisfaction from the record, a record of performance in the service of our people.

Final approval was given to two bills affecting American agriculture. First, to the very important Agriculture Act which authorizes the subsidy programs for wheat, feed grains, and cotton, and for milk marketing quotas as well. Among the more innovative provisions of this act—H.R. 18546, Public Law 91–524—is that section which places a $55,000 ceiling per crop, per year, per producer on subsidies for wheat, feed grains, and cotton.

In addition, we enacted H.R. 11547, the Farm Loan Limitations Act, which increases the maximum ceiling for certain farm loans from $60,000 to $100,000 in recognition of the trying economic times in which we find ourselves and which have caused such tribulation for the American farmer.

We passed two authorization measures, one of which was H.R. 19911, a foreign assistance supplemental, to authorize an additional $550 million in assistance to foreign countries. Included in this authorization were funds to provide additional U.S. relief help to Pakistan, which is still recovering from the natural devastation which was recently visited upon its people. Moreover, the bill contained a prohibition on the sending of U.S. troops or advisers to Cambodia; a policy statement that aid furnished Cambodia shall not be construed as a commitment to defend that country; and a requirement that the President give Congress prior notice before giving Cam-

bodia additional aid through use of the emergency authority granted him in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. The second authorization, S. 4557, was for $25.5 million to the Atomic Energy Commission for fire safety modifications in AEC facilities to prevent any similar occurrence of the 1969 fire which broke out in one of their facilities.

Eight appropriations were granted final approval during the postelection session. They were: First, H.R. 17923, appropriating more than $8 billion to fund the operations of the Department of Agriculture and related agencies; second, H.R. 17970, appropriating more than $2 billion for construction of military facilities; third, H.R. 19590, appropriating almost $66.6 billion for the Department of Defense; fourth, H.R. 19830, appropriating more than $17.7 billion for certain independent offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development; fifth, H.R. 18515, appropriating almost $19 billion for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, including more than $1.3 billion to the Office of Economic Opportunity; sixth, H.R. 17876, appropriating more than $4.5 billion for foreign assistance and the Peace Corps; seventh, a continuing resolution to fund the Department of Transportation and related agencies through March 30, 1971, at the more than $2.65 billion level contained in the 1971 fiscal DOT Appropriations Act, H.R. 17755, which did not receive clearance because of opposition in the Senate concerning funding of the SST; and, eighth, H.R. 19928, the first supplemental for 1971 at more than $1.8 billion. Cumulatively, these appropriations exceed $120 billion.

During the November–December session we passed two additional bills to protect the American consumer: First, S. 2162, the Hazardous Substances, Child Protection Act, to provide for child-resistant packaging to protect children from serious personal injury or illness from handling hazardous household substances; and, second, H.R. 19172, the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Act, to grant $30 million during fiscal 1971 and 1972 to local governments to combat lead poisoning of children who eat paint from walls.

We passed H.R. 19885, the District of Columbia Revenue Act, to authorize a Federal payment of $126 million annually rather than the existing $105 million, and to provide authorization for $6.2 million to medical and dental schools at Georgetown and George Washington Universities, which are in dire financial straits.

In the field of education, in which we have been so productively active during the past decade, we gave final approval to two bills: First, H.R. 14252, Public Law 91–527, a Drug Abuse Education Act, to provide means for teaching our children of the dangers of drug abuse, an alarming problem of our times; and, second, S. 3318, the Library Services and Construction Amendments of 1970, to increase funds for library construction and renovations and to authorize programs for the disadvantaged.

America is rightly concerned these days about our environment and the need for ecological balance. Six bills related to these concerns obtained final action during our month and a half, postelection session. One was the very important Clean Air Act amendments, H.R. 17225, which authorized $1.1 billion for research and aid to establish programs to prevent air pollution in compliance with national air pollution standards and which contained a requirement that automobile manufacturers produce a car with minimal pollution consequences no later than 1975 with a permissible 1-year extension of that deadline. We also passed a National Mining and Minerals Policy Act, S. 719, to encourage economical and environmentally protective use of our mineral resources. The Water Bank Act, H.R. 15770, will provide needed protection to nesting and breeding wetlands used by migratory birds and subject to increasing drainage.

In addition, in this area, we passed an Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Act, H.R. 19877, authorizing 11 navigational projects; 20 flood control projects; and expansion of a comprehensive river basin plan; and the cleaning up the Cuyahoga River, one of the four filthiest rivers in our Nation. Finally, we passed the Atomic Energy Act Amendments of 1970—H.R. 18679, Public Law 91–560—to facilitate licensing by AEC of commercial-industrial nuclear facilities.

Two items were approved in the area of foreign policy: H.R. 15628—S. 3429—the Foreign Military Sales Act, authorizing funds for sale of military equipment to foreign nations and establishing credit ceilings for the same purpose, and H.R. 19567, extending the President's authority to carry out and enforce agreements reached under the International Coffee Agreement Act, which is so important to our Latin neighbors.

In the field of general government, seven measures were given our final approval in the postelection session.

We passed S. 11, the Intergovernmental Personnel Act, to provide for the training of State and local government employees. Another approved measure was the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Land Acquisition Policies Act, S. 1, to establish uniform relocation assistance for all persons displaced by Federal or federally funded urban renewal, highway construction, or other governmental land acquisition programs.

We passed two important wage bills affecting Federal civil servants: H.R. 17809 affording a 4-percent salary increase for Federal blue-collar workers, which the President vetoed on January 2, 1971, and H.R. 13000, the Federal Pay Comparability Act, which establishes a nearly automatic wage increase system for white-collar civil servants and insures that their pay will be comparable with that given equivalent workers in the private sector of the economy. H.R. 13000 is a landmark piece of legislation for, except under certain conditions, it eliminates the Congress from legislating future Government pay raises. Also S. 2108, the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act.

We approved H.R. 17901, to create a Federal circuit executive officer for each U.S. court of appeals, thereby relieving the chief judge of much paperwork duty. Finally, we approved S. 437, a Survivor Annuities Act, which permits widows who remarry and subsequently divorce to become eligible again for Federal pension benefits.

Health care is becoming a frightening problem for the average American. Health costs are literally out of sight with no indication of anything but a continuing upward curve. I would expect Congress to continue to address itself in the future to this problem. We did pass with no indication of anything but a congress, including some after our return from election day recess.

Although both the House and Senate passed a Social Security Amendments Act, insufficient time remained to iron out differences in conference. Accordingly, lost for the time being was a provision of that bill, H.R. 17550, to correct abuses in the medicare and medicaid programs which provide, respectively, health care to the elderly and the indigent. I mention this because of its importance to America and because it indicates congressional concern with such abuses.

We did pass the Family Practice of Medicine Act, S. 3418, to subsidize medical schools to provide for training of more general practitioners, who are desperately needed in many areas of the Nation. Regrettably, the President vetoed this much needed legislation. We passed S. 4106, the Emergency Health Personnel Act, to authorize Public Health Service officers to be allocated, upon request, to locales critically in need of health services. This should help to alleviate critical deficiencies.

Finally, in this area, we passed, also during the postelection session, H.R. 18874, the Comprehensive Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act, which commits the Federal Government to fund programs to combat one of our more serious social problems.

Among noteworthy bills receiving final clearance was H.R. 19436, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, which expands and improves existing housing programs and authorizes a "new community development" program.

Of human and religious interest was postelection clearance of H.R. 471, Public Law 91–550, which restored ownership of lands to the Taos Pueblo Indians formerly held in trust and containing grounds holy to the tribe.

In the labor area, Congress was, unfortunately, forced to pass House Joint Resolution 1413, Public Law 91–541 ordering an 81-day moratorium on a proposed strike by railway workers against rail managers. Among other things this resolution also provided a 13½-percent increase in pay for the railway workers.

Of a more positive note is our clearance of S. 2193, the Occupational Safety and Health Act, which authorizes strict Federal safety standards for all industrial employees. Together with the Mine Safety and Rail Safety Acts passed during the 91st Congress, S. 2193 insures comprehensive Federal health and safety

standards for the American laboring man.

Final approval was granted to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act Amendments of 1970, H.R. 17825. Among the more notable aspects of this comprehensive crime bill are: First, funding authorization for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration at $650 million for fiscal 1971, $1.5 billion for fiscal 1972, and $1.75 billion for fiscal 1973; second, stricter penalties for carrying a firearm while committing or planning to commit a Federal felony; third, making it a Federal offense to kill, kidnap, or assault any Member of Congress; fourth, establishment of Federal penalties for unauthorized entry into any building or the grounds thereof where the President may be temporarily residing; and, fifth, reinstatement of the Wiretap Commission created in 1968 but abolished by the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970.

Two measures concerning job training received final action during the postelection session. H.R. 19401, an extension of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, authorizes $1.01 billion during fiscal 1972 to continue those programs which have rehabilitated many handicapped individuals and permitted them to earn a livelihood. It is worth noting that during fiscal 1970, for the first time, more than 250,000 persons received training under these programs.

Congress also passed S. 3867, a $9.5 billion manpower training measure which, most regrettably, the President vetoed. S. 3867 would have extended, and reorganized, those manpower training programs which enable the unemployed and the unskilled to learn skills and find good paying jobs. A total of $5 billion was authorized for those programs.

In addition, the bill authorized $4.5 billion for a new program of public service jobs for the hard-core unemployed. The President took exception to this aspect of the bill and it was a primary reason for his veto, although he was also dissatisfied with the degree of reorganization of manpower programs, being of the opinion that further reorganization was in order regarding State and local control over these programs.

The President's veto was ill advised in a time of rising unemployment. The public jobs provision would have insured work for individuals who otherwise are forced onto relief. There is meaningful environmental work to be done in the public sector and there is nothing disgraceful or demeaning in hiring persons unable to find jobs in the private sector to do this work.

In mid-December Congress passed the Bank Holding Company Act, H.R. 6778, to extend the coverage of the 1956 act to all one-bank holding companies. By this action Congress closed a loophole in the 1956 act which has permitted banks to escape regulation by the Federal Reserve Board. During the 1960's, banks moved increasingly into that form of economic concentration called conglomerating; that is, buying up businesses bearing no relationship to one another and financing their operations under a holding company. In so doing banks have erased a traditional economic separation of power between the suppliers of of money—banks—and the users of money—businesses. H.R. 6778, henceforth, permits the Federal Reserve Board to keep tabs on bank holding companies to determine if they are complying with such regulations as are made under authority of the 1956 act and amendments thereto. The FRB can now make determinations concerning the legitimacy of bank holding company activities.

Final approval of additional legislation affecting monetary and tax policy was passed by the Congress. H.R. 10634 was passed to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, to exempt the pay of certain interstate transportation employees from tax withholding under the laws of States or subdivisions other than the State or subdivision of an employee's residence.

We approved S. 2224, Public Law 91-547, amending the Investment Company Act to limit mutual fund sales charges and establish broader authority for the regulation of mutual funds. S. 2224 embodies the first substantial change in the regulation of mutual funds in 30 years.

We enacted S. 3431, amending the Securities Exchange Act, to provide additional protection for investors. S. 3431 requires disclosure to shareholders of any acquisition or offer of acquisition for 5 percent or more of a company's stock. Prior to enactment of S. 3431 such disclosure was required only of transactions or tenders of 10 percent or more. Congress felt that shareholders had a right to know of any proposition involving 5 percent or more of a company's stock. In addition, the measure gives the Securities and Exchange Commission additional rulemaking power to cope with fraud, deception, and other manipulative practices.

The stock market plunge in the early months of 1970 heightened the need for legislation to protect investors whose brokerage firms fold. Accordingly, we enacted the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970—H.R. 19333, S. 2348. This act will protect investors against a total loss of cash and securities held by their broker-dealers who bankrupt. The act creates a Securities Investor Protection Corporation which will have a fund of $150 million, obtained through assessment of members of the Corporation, to guarantee investors against losses up to $50,000—$20,000 in cash and the rest in securities. If these resources become insufficient to meet claims, the Corporation is empowered to borrow up to $1 billion from the U.S. Treasury. Passage of this measure will alleviate the agony which has visited many investors whose brokerage firms have bankrupted, leaving their investors financially stripped.

Finally, we approved H.R. 16199, which, among other things, accelerated the collection of estate and gift taxes and continued excise taxes on passenger automobiles and communication services through calendar year 1972. The latter extension will realize a revenue of $630 million for the Federal Government in fiscal 1971 and more than $1.8 billion for fiscal 1972. The House passed this measure under bill number H.R. 19868. In the Senate the provisions of H.R. 19868 were attached to H.R. 16199, a capital fund Treasury measure.

Though it failed of final passage because of insufficient time for a conference, mention is in order of the Social Security Amendments Act which passed the House and Senate in differing forms. H.R. 17550 would have authorized a much needed increase in social security benefits for the elderly people in our country who depend upon these benefits for existence. Among other things H.R. 17550, as passed by the House, provided for a 5-percent increase effective January 1971. In the Senate that figure was set at 10 percent. The distinguished chairman and distinguished ranking Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee have promised prompt action on a social security benefits increase in the 92d Congress, which is good news indeed because those on fixed incomes—particularly those on social security—are affected terribly by the inflation which continues to haunt our economy.

Our Nation is bound together by its transportation system and through the years of our great Republic Congress has passed many measures to provide for an ever better network of roads to insure that traffic will move as smoothly as possible. We find the need for more roads and for road improvement a continuing one. We passed several bills related to this during the 91st Congress, and during the postelection session final approval was given to H.R. 19504, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970.

This legislation extends construction authority for the Interstate Highway System through 1976, and increases the total authorization for this very vital program by $9,775,000,000. Another $1.1 billion is authorized for primary, secondary, and urban road programs. A new feature in our roadbuilding programs is authorized in H.R. 19504, a Federal-aid urban system to provide grants for high-speed express lanes which will link fringe parking areas around metropolitan centers with downtown, thus enabling those who avail themselves of parking in these areas to enjoy rapid access by public transportation to our center cities.

On the eve of adjournment, Congress cleared H.R. 19953, the Emergency Rail Service Act of 1970, which will subsidize vital rail transport provided by the Penn Central, the Central of New Jersey, the Boston & Maine, and the Lehigh Valley Railroads, all of which are either bankrupt or on the verge of bankruptcy. It is most regrettable that we had to take such remedial action but not to do so would have jeopardized delivery of essential goods to many eastern cities during the winter. No direct appropriation of Federal moneys is involved in the subsidization process at this point. Instead the U.S. Government will guarantee payment for those emergency services provided by these railroads. It is greatly to be hoped that order will soon be restored to the economic chaos which is threatening to paralyze our national rail transport system.

The welfare of our veterans has been—

and ought to be—of great concern to the Congress. These brave men and women serve this country on the frontiers of democracy and they deserve extra care upon their return to civilian life. During the 91st Congress we continued the policy of passing legislation which will realize our fundamental commitment of assistance to returning veterans or their families. One bill of importance in this area was passed during the postelection session: H.R. 15911, Public Law 91–588, to increase the rates of pension payable for non-service-connected disabilities to veterans, or to their survivors in case of death, of World War I, or later conflicts, and to veterans of Mexican border service in 1916–17. The pension benefits under this act are justified. In some cases individuals receiving these pensions depend upon them as their sole means of income.

Finally, we approved amendments to the Food Stamp Act of 1964. H.R. 18582, which cleared Congress in the waning days of the second session, continues the food stamp program which has helped to feed many hungry Americans. Fiscal authorization in the bill is $1.75 billion for fiscal 1971, 1972, and 1973. The extensions of this program was of vital importance, otherwise it would have expired, adversely affecting the millions who benefit from this excellent program.

None of those bills I have mentioned would have been enacted into law if the Congress had not met after the 1970 elections.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House can see by this résumé that we were highly productive during the days in session following the 1970 elections. The actions we took during the postelection session, together with our legislative product during the rest of the second and the first sessions of the 91st Congress, give us cause to take great satisfaction in our record. As I leave now, I am humbly grateful to all Members for helping to achieve this outstanding record of accomplishment in this, for me, my final Congress.

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, for 20 years BYRON ROGERS stood by my side. In his unique, unassuming way, he helped shepherd through Congress the kind of legislation which brought hope and light to millions of our citizens, and while doing so, he did not stand on the top of a roof braying through a horn. He never sought attention—only work. Whether it be a civil rights bill or a bankruptcy bill, he worked.

It is very difficult for me to think of a Congress without BYRON ROGERS, of a committee meeting without BYRON ROGERS, of an emergency without BYRON ROGERS standing by.

I never knew a kinder man or a more modest one. I never knew a man of a greater patience, and I never knew a man whose good humor never failed him.

There are few who realize how rare a man he is, least of all himself.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE 91ST CONGRESS—A RECORD OF CONGRESSIONAL INITIATIVE

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the last time to report to you on the accomplishments of a Congress. In so doing I wish again to express my affection for you and gratitude for your many kindnesses during the years we have served together in this House which we both love. You have served with impressive distinction as Speaker, an office which you have held consecutively longer than any other Speaker. Your total years of service, almost 9 to the day, rank you second in this category among all Speakers in the history of the House. Only the late Sam Rayburn served longer. I have enjoyed these many years working with you, first as Democratic whip and, during the past 9 years, as majority leader. They have been exceedingly rewarding.

I want also to express thanks to the Democratic whip, HALE BOGGS, for his valuable contribution in moving the legislative program forward with a minimum of friction. Gratitude is due also to the distinguished minority leader, GERALD FORD. His spirit of cooperation and general affability have made my job easier in this time of divided control of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, in this report I have attempted to provide for the benefit of the Members succinct, informative summaries of all major bills passed by the Housing during the second session of the 91st Congress. In addition, a brief discussion has been included summarizing the most important legislation enacted during the first session. For a more complete summary on the first session, I refer Members to my report printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 5, 1970.

During this second session of the 91st Congress we have been most productive. We have enacted twice as many public laws, and private laws, as we did during the first session. In the first session 190 measures became public law, while 75 were enacted into private law. By the time the President completes action on the measures passed during this second session, I anticipate that an additional 400 or so measures will become public law and around 140 private law.

The 91st Congress convened January 3, 1969, and adjourned sine die on January 2, 1971, making it one of the longest Congresses in our history. One has to go back to the days of the Korean war, in the early 1950's, to find a Congress which has sat for a longer period of time. Only the several recesses we took during both sessions preclude the 91st Congress from ranking near the top in length of time.

It does not strike me as unusual, or as a sign of dawdling or dereliction of duty, that the Congress has been in session so many days during 1969 and 1970. It is, after all, a time during which the Presidency is controlled by one party and the Congress by another. Unavoidably this complicates to some extent, the legislative process. Moreover, there were issues debated during the past 2 years which deserved the time spent on them. It is a major misconception to assume, as some have, that because Congress was so late in adjourning sine die it deserves to be criticized.

On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, as we look at the record of the 2 years of the 91st Congress we find a great deal to applaud. I think particularly of the scrutiny given to the President's budgets, with an especial eye on reordering of national priorities. We have provided for a strong national defense while at the same time scrutinizing all expenditures, including those of the military, to eliminate unnecessary items. We have enacted several laws during this second session which indicate that this has been a Congress exceedingly mindful of the need to protect our environment from further desolation and destruction.

Of course, one would expect the hand of Congress to be more visible in legislation passed during a period of divided control of the Government. During periods of united control the Congress is more likely to have more of an input at an earlier stage of the legislative process; that is, before Executive recommendations reach the Hill. But even during those times, Congress makes its input.

The 91st Congress, in my estimation, deserves special marks for initiative, persistence, and innovation; as for example, in refusing to capitulate on certain education and health funding measures. Congress passed—with few exceptions—the President's anticrime proposals. In the field of foreign policy we have seen a continued effort by the Congress to assert its proper role in the determination of that policy, particularly with respect to military engagements abroad. We have done this without tying the hands of the President as the Chief Executive Officer of our Nation or as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. The Voting Rights Act Amendments bear a heavy congressional stamp, including a lowering of the voting age to 18 for all Federal elections—in line with the Supreme Court's recent sustaining of that part of the law. I think the Drug Abuse Education Act a notable achievement, particularly because it emphasizes a more positive approach to drug abuse.

As regards environmental protection, Congress passed several important measures including the Clean Air Act Amendments, a Water Quality Improvement Act establishing legal requirements for cleaning up our polluted waterways, a Resource Recovery Act to authorize recycling and recovery programs for solid waste, a Geothermal Steam Act to explore nonpollutive ways for supplying energy, a Mines and Minerals Policy Act to provide for more economical use of these valuable resources, and a Water Bank Act to protect wetlands used by migratory birds. These are by no means

all the measures enacted with an eye to preserving and protecting our environment.

We can no longer afford to suppose that overpopulation is not a serious problem, even for the United States at some future time unless efforts to achieve population balance are effected. As a step toward effectuating such a balance we passed the Family Planning Services Act.

On its own initiative Congress passed a Political Broadcasting Act which included monetary limitations on television-radio advertising by all Federal and some State candidates for office. Regretably the President saw fit to veto this bill. Its passage, however, suggests that additional legislation may be forthcoming in an attempt to cope with the problem of increasing campaign costs.

The Comprehensive Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act is a congressional product. We also passed the Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act, which strengthens the warning message on cigarette packs and bans cigarette advertising on radio and TV after January 1, 1971.

Over the President's veto we passed the Medical Facilities Construction Amendments Act to provide urgently needed authorization of funds for building hospitals and other health facilities. The President also vetoed a Family Practice of Medicine Act even though the need for general practitioners in some areas of the Nation is critical.

During the first session we passed an important Mine Health and Safety Act. During this session we passed a Railroad Health and Safety Act and an Occupational Safety and Health Act, thereby blanketing American industry under Federal health and safety standards, certainly an innovative and needed step on our part.

For the first time in almost a quarter of a century we passed a bill to reorganize the Congress, thus improving its operations.

Mr. Speaker, we can take pride in our record during the 91st Congress and I do believe that this report, and the one which I delivered on first session achievements, give ample evidence that we have performed our legislative tasks well.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker, during the second session the House has passed five bills of major importance affecting the American farmer.

AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1970—H.R. 18546, PUBLIC LAW 91-525

President Nixon signed the Agricultural Act of 1970 into law on November 30, 1970. Public Law 91-524 continues price support and loan programs for 3 years through 1973 for wheat, feed grains, and cotton. In addition, it continues the Government dairy program for establishing marketing quotas for milk production.

The law also extends Public Law 480, the "food for peace" program which provides surplus food to underdeveloped nations.

Our farm subsidy programs have been integral to the continued economic soundness of the American farmer for many years. With the growth through the years of larger and larger farms, fewer and fewer farmers, and in particular the development of the corporate farm, there has developed in the Congress concern over the amount and extent of subsidy payments. Accordingly, Public Law 91-524 contains a new feature in the subsidy program. Henceforth, no farmer can receive more than $55,000, per crop—wheat, feed grains, and cotton—for keeping land out of production.

FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENTS—S. 3592, PUBLIC LAW 91-342

The Wholesale Meat Act had exempted from inspection already inspected meat processed for retail sale and farm-raised livestock slaughtered and processed for the farmer himself. Public Law 91-342 which was approved in July of this year amends this act to authorize the Department of Agriculture to prescribe regulations and inspections of establishments conducting such custom operations to assure that they are maintained and operated in a sanitary manner. This is another effort by the 91st Congress to protect the consumer interest of our citizens to assure them that the meat they buy and consume is healthful and safe.

RESEARCH ON PRODUCTION OF COMMODITIES—H.R. 14810, PUBLIC LAW 91-292

Public Law 91-292 provides for preharvest research to be financed by levying assessments directly on the commodities concerned. Many benefits will be reaped by this research. It will permit growers and handlers to study and improve their harvesting methods and techniques in order to provide the commodities most desired by the consumer. In the past growers had to reply upon research done by the Department of Agriculture or in some cases by private individuals. Public Law 91-292 will enable growers to solve their own problems at their own pace and not be dependent upon the Department of Agriculture for funds and research.

LOAN LIMITATIONS—H.R. 11547, PUBLIC LAW 91-620

H.R. 11547, to increase the limitation on certain farm loans from $60,000 to $100,000, cleared the Congress December 19, 1970. The aim of this legislation is to increase the indebtedness limitation set in 1961 for farm ownership to a more realistic level. Our farmers, along with all our citizens, have been plagued by the serious inflation the Nation is experiencing.

WHEAT PROGRAM—H.R. 13543, PUBLIC LAW 91-430

On September 26, 1970, the President signed into law H.R. 13543, to establish a program of wheat research and promotion. Public Law 91-430 authorizes the Secretary of the Agriculture to enter into agreements with organizations of wheat growers, farm organizations, and other organizations to expand the domestic and foreign markets for U.S. wheat. This legislation stems from the successful operation of wheat commissions in 10 of the commercial wheat States which were established by State legislation and financed by producer assessment.

AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Speaker, one of the major items on Congress' agenda each year is the passage of annual authorization and appropriation bills which supply the funds to finance the many activities of the Government.

For the benefit of Members, this report summarizes in tabular form those authorizations and appropriations passed and signed into law during the first session of the 91st Congress.

Following these tables are summaries of authorizations and appropriations passed in the second session, including some fiscal 1970 appropriations acts.

Throughout our actions on these measures, Mr. Speaker, is a thread of discernible concern for funding at adequate levels social and national defense programs. At the same time we have striven to cut expenditures where at all possible in an attempt to curtail the inflation which plagues our economy.

There can be no question that the Congress has acted responsibly in this area.

AUTHORIZATIONS, FISCAL 1970

Agency	Amount	Date approved	Public Law No.
Atomic Energy Commission	$2,448,052,000	July 11, 1969	91-44
Coast Guard	142,800,000	July 22, 1969	91-49
Foreign aid	1,972,525,000	Dec. 30, 1969	91-75
Maritime Administration	384,600,000	Oct. 10, 1969	91-85
Military construction	1,650,597,000	Dec. 5, 1969	91-142
Military procurement	20,723,202,000	Nov. 19, 1969	91-121
NASA	3,715,527,000	Nov. 18, 1969	91-119
National Science Foundation	477,605,000	do	91-120
Peace Corps	98,450,000	Oct. 29, 1969	91-99
REGULAR ANNUAL			
Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office	2,276,232,000	Sept. 29, 1969	91-74
Department of Agriculture and related agencies	7,488,903,150	Nov. 26, 1969	91-127
Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development	$15,111,870,500	do	91-126
Department of the Interior and related agencies	1,380,375,300	Oct. 29, 1969	91-98
Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies	2,354,432,700	Dec. 24, 1969	91-153
Legislative branch	344,326,817	Dec. 12, 1969	91-145
Public works and AEC	4,756,007,500	Dec. 11, 1969	91-144
Military construction	1,560,456,000	Dec. 29, 1969	91-170
Department of Transportation and related agencies	2,143,738,630	Dec. 26, 1969	91-168
District of Columbia funds	650,249,600	Dec. 24, 1969	91-155
Department of Defense	69,640,568,000	Dec. 29, 1969	91-171
Supplemental, 1970: Small Business Administration	278,281,318	Dec. 26, 1969	91-166

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATION ACT OF 1970—H.R. 15149, PUBLIC LAW 91–194

The foreign aid bill, H.R. 15149, was one of two fiscal 1970 regular appropriations bills on which Congress was unable to complete action in 1969. The contested funds were the $54.4 million allotted for fighter aircraft to the Republic of China. In view of the fact that the Senate and House could not come to an agreement on this issue, both Houses adopted a continuing resolution as an amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill (H.R. 15209) which maintained at fiscal 1969 levels foreign aid expenditures into the second session of the 91st Congress.

The second conference report, filed at the beginning of the second session, did not contain the $54.4 million for the Republic of China. Although regret was expressed over the deleted funds, the House gave its final approval to H.R. 15149, Public Law 91–194. The bill appropriated $1.46 billion for economic aid, as opposed to the administration request of $2.28 billion, and allocated $350 million for military assistance, as compared to the budget figure of $425 million. Other funds went to the Peace Corps, Inter-American Development Bank, International Development Association, HEW-Cuban refugee plan, and the Asian Development Bank, among others.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1970—H.R. 15931, PUBLIC LAW 91–204

When President Nixon signed into law the fiscal 1970 Labor-HEW appropriations bill—H.R. 15931, Public Law 91–204—on March 5, he ended one of the longest disputes in history over an appropriations bill. The other body declined to pass the 1970 appropriations bill in the first session. A continuing resolution was added to the supplemental appropriations bill which maintained at fiscal 1969 levels Labor-HEW expenditures into the second session of the 91st Congress. A fiscal 1970 Labor-HEW appropriations bill, H.R. 13111, was cleared by Congress but vetoed by President Nixon. The House failed to override the veto, and Congress began to work on a new bill, H.R. 15931.

The final bill allotted $19,381,920,200 in appropriations; in addition, $1,010,-814,300 in advance funds were available for expenditure during fiscal 1970 from the fiscal 1969 Labor-HEW appropriations act. Public Law 91–204 included a provision limiting expenditures to 98 percent of appropriations, with the stipulation that no single allotment be cut by more than 15 percent. The following were exempted from this expenditure limitation: Social Security Administration, the Railroad Retirement Board, the U.S. Soldiers Home and payments into the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Trust Funds. The Department of Labor was allotted $980,446,000, as compared to the administration's request of $1,003,035,000; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was granted $16,359,572,200, an increase of $329,519,500 over the budget request; and the Office of Economic Opportunity was allocated $1,948,000,000 or $100,000 less than the administration figure.

H.R. 15931 also contained amendments which provide that except as required by the Constitution, funds in the bill may not be used to force school districts to bus students, abolish schools, or make pupil assignments against the choice of the students' parents as a prerequisite to receiving Federal aid. In addition, the act prohibited the use of funds for students, teachers, or college employees who have participated in campus disorders since August 1, 1969, which involved force, threat of force, or the seizure of property.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1970—H.R. 17399, PUBLIC LAW 91–305

Five days before the end of fiscal 1970 the House adopted the conference report on the 1970 Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, H.R. 17399, Public Law 91–305. Appropriations amounted to $6,021,535,005 for various departments and agencies. This sum was $558,636,897 less than the President had requested, $680,840,078 less than the Senate had originally approved, and $257,419,214 more than the House had previously voted. Approximately $4.3 billion of the funds included in the appropriations were to finance two Federal pay raises: One a comparability pay raise which went into effect on July 1, 1969, a result of the 1967 Government employees pay raise bill—Public Law 90–206; and the second, a raise approved by Congress April 15, 1970—Public Law 91–231. H.R. 17399 also set ceilings on Government expenditures: For fiscal 1970 at about $197.9 billion with the stipulation that the President could raise the ceiling, after notifying Congress, up to $2 billion for certain uncontrollable items; and for fiscal 1971 at about $200.8 billion, with flexibility of ceiling granted to the President, after notifying Congress, up to $4.5 billion.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS ACT AND THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION—H.R. 17575, PUBLIC LAW 91–472, AND H.R. 15945, PUBLIC LAW 91–247

Since the second session of the 90th Congress, the Maritime Administration has been obliged to seek an annual authorization of funds. This authority was granted for fiscal year 1971 in H.R. 15945, Public Law 91–247, which authorized a total of $429,420,000 for the construction and operation of American ships. An additional $2.3 million was added by the House over the administration request in order to maintain the operation of the nuclear ship *Savannah*. The House also approved a Senate addition of $120,000 for financial assistance to a State marine school. Among the provisions of H.R. 15945 are $199,500,000 for the construction of 19 ships and the reconditioning of others, $193,000,000 for ship operation subsidies, $20,700,000 for research and development, $4,675,000 for reserve fleet expenses, $6,800,000 for maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., and $2,445,000 for financial assistance to State marine schools.

The 1971 Appropriations Act for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary—H.R. 17575, Public Law 91–472—included appropriations for the Maritime Administration as well as 13 related agencies. These funds totaled $3,302,422,500 which amounted to an increase of $453,230,600 above the total appropriations for fiscal 1970 and yet provided $143,125,500 less than the total new budget authority requested by the administration.

The State Department was voted $445,431,800; $9,002,200 less than the budget request, $1,947,800 less than the House sum, and $100,000 less than the Senate version. The conference retained the higher Senate amount for salaries and expenses and the lower Senate figure for contributions to international organizations. Funds also went to international commissions and for educational educational exchange. In addition, H.R. 17575 contained a provision that no funds appropriated in the bill could be used to provide financial aid to any student, teacher or employee of a college or university who took part in a campus disorder after August 1, 1969.

The Department of Justice had its first billion-dollar budget in the fiscal 1971 appropriations with an increase of $269,-076,000 above its appropriations for fiscal 1970. The total appropriation to the Department of Justice amounted to $1,-120,323,000, including $116,413,000 for legal activities and general administration; $260,235,000 to the Federal Bureau of Investigation; $111,480,000 to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, $117,750,000 to the Federal Prison System, $480,000,000 to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and $34,445,000 to the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

Most of the fiscal 1971 increase within the Department of Commerce allocation went to the Maritime Administration. Moneys granted to the Commerce Department for 1971 operations totaled $943,955,000, an increase of $125,530,-000 over the 1970 allotment, but less than the administration's request of $1,007,645,000. In addition to the $236,-727,000 for the Maritime Administration, other agencies financed in the Commerce appropriation include: The Bureau of Census, $65,299,000; the Environmental Science Services Administration, $197,-578,000; the Minority Business Enterprise, $1,850,000; the U.S. Travel Service, $4,500,000; the Patent Office, $50,000,000; and the National Bureau of Standards, $43,515,000. A sum of $251,895,000 was allocated for economic development assistance during 1971 and a figure of $27.6 million for international activities by the Department of Commerce.

The Judiciary branch received $135,-870,000 for 1971 operations. The administration had submitted a request for $138,561,600. The funded operations encompass the Customs Court, Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, Supreme Court of the United States, and the Federal courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services.

Thirteen other agencies or commissions of the Government were appropriated for in H.R. 17575: American Battle Monuments Commission, $2,739,000; Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, $8,250,000; Commission on Civil Rights, $3,200,000; Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, $19,000,000; Equal Opportunity Commission, $15,485,000; Federal Maritime Commission, $4,479,000; Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, $710,000; National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws, $100,000; Small Business Administration, $220,290,000; Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, $597,000; Subversive Activities Control Board, $401,400; Tariff Commission, $3,845,000; and the U.S. Information Agency, $183,398,000.

The House-Senate conferees had remained in disagreement on the funds for the National Industrial Pollution Control Council because the House had not considered that item. House conferees agreed to offer a motion in the House, which was passed, to concur in the Senate amount of $300,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT—H.R. 17868, PUBLIC LAW 91–337

Appropriations for 1971 were granted the District in H.R. 17868. The total funding was $189,039,800 less than the budget request, $34,374,800 less than the Senate version, and $6,787,800 less than the House approved figure. Moneys for most new programs, many of the new building projects, and further construction of the city's planned subway were all eliminated. The $34.2 million budget request for subway construction had been allowed by the Senate, but the House refused to grant funds because the city was not proceeding with the construction of several controversial freeway projects. The conferees followed the House position on this matter.

A Federal payment of $108,938,000 was allocated to the city—$105 million from the general fund and $3,938,000 in sewer and water payments. The bill reflected fiscal 1970 authorization levels since Congress had not yet passed a new District revenue bill. The revenue bill grants the city authority to collect new taxes and also sets the maximum level for Federal payments to the city. Instead of issuing bonds the District had traditionally borrowed funds from the Treasury, however the authority for these loans expired at the end of fiscal 1970. Congress had not yet enacted new legislation to either extend the District's authority to borrow from the Treasury or to issue bonds, thus the District was without financing for most of its construction projects. The final appropriation sum was $636,118,200, which included $143,991,000 for public safety, $146,353,000 for education, and $157,164,900 for human resources.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATIONS ACT—H.R. 17604, PUBLIC LAW 91–511 AND H.R. 17970, PUBLIC LAW 91–544

Public Law 91–511 (H.R. 17604) authorized $1,667,154,000 for construction of military and related facilities during 1971. This amount was $401,940,000 below that requested by the administration. The administration figure of $2,069,094,000 included $334 million in construction funds for the Safeguard antiballistic missile—ABM—system but authorization of the ABM was made in the defense procurement authorization bill (H.R. 17123, Public Law 91–441). In Public Law 91–511, $264,914,000 was authorized for the Army, $268,898,000 for the Navy, and $256,189,000 for the Air Force. Military family housing received an authorization of $795,353,000. In addition, H.R. 17604 authorized the Secretary of Defense to aid communities affected by the construction and operations of ABM facilities in Montana and North Dakota. In view of House opposition to a Senate provision halting further use by the Navy of the Puerto Rican island of Culebra for naval target practice, the bill directed the Secretary to study and report by April 1, 1971, on alternatives to the Navy's use of the island and ordered the Navy to avoid increasing its operations there pending the report.

Actual 1971 appropriations for military construction were granted in H.R. 17970. The final figure amounted to $2,037,814,000, which was $96,986,000 below the Nixon budget request, but $475,206,411 more than appropriated for fiscal 1970. The appropriation funding was greater than the military construction authorization because of permanent authorizations and inclusion of ABM funds authorized in the defense procurement authorization act. One of the largest items allocated in the bill was $357 million for the construction of additional Safeguard antiballistic missile—ABM—sites. The $12 million which had originally been designated for survey work at additional ABM sites was set aside for economic aid to those communities affected by the construction. Military family housing was allotted $715,926,000. Army military construction grants amounted to $546,958,000, while Navy construction disbursements were $302,483,000, and the Air Force construction allotments totaled $284,147,000.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT—H.R. 16915, PUBLIC LAW 91–382

H.R. 16915, Public Law 91–382 allocated $413,104,220 for fiscal 1971 for the legislative branch. Since traditionally each House provides its own funds, the House allotted itself $110,526,455. This was $5,712,820 more than fiscal 1970. The increase was due to growing pay costs, additional retirement contributions, and other expenses the House authorized for itself in 1969. The Senate assigned itself $60,929,464. Joint expenses for the Congress amounted to $14,558,775 which is composed of such costs as the education of the House and Senate pages, joint committees, Capitol Police, and mail.

Other appropriations in H.R. 16915 went to the Botanic Garden, $672,800; the Government Printing Office, one of whose many services include the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, $65,382,000; the General Accounting Office, which assists Congress in providing legislative control over the receipt, allocation, and application of public funds, $74,020,000; and the Library of Congress, which not only serves as the research agency for Congress through the Legislative Reference Service, but also includes the Nation's Copyright Office, $50,396,600. Funds for the Architect of the Capitol—$36,568,126—included $15.6 million to begin construction of the James Madison Memorial Library building.

AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT—H.R. 17923, PUBLIC LAW 91–566

The administration requested $7,748,354,500 to fund the operations of the Department of Agriculture and related agencies. The congressional bill—H.R. 17923—added $342,502,000 to this request, an amount $7,260,400 more than appropriated in fiscal 1970. Two items accounted for the funding of a larger sum than requested in the President's budget: First, $195.5 million for the continuation of the agricultural conservation program under which the Government shares with farmers the cost of carrying out soil-and-water conservation practices; and second, $104 million for the special milk program. The administration had attempted to eliminate both of these programs.

The conference committee to resolve differences between the House and Senate versions was delayed until the enactment of the Agriculture Act of 1970—H.R. 18546, Public Law 91–524—an omnibus farm bill which set a ceiling on subsidy payments of $55,000 per crop per producer. In view of this provision, the conferees deleted the Senate-approved $20,000 subsidy limitation in H.R. 17923.

A number of important programs are financed in the general activities covered by this appropriation: the Agricultural Research Service was allocated $151,633,000 for general research, a compromise between the House proposed $146 million and the Senate approved $160 million. The increase over the House amounts included $1 million for research on nonchemical means of pest control and an additional $3 million for staffing and equipping newly completed research laboratories. The total appropriation for ARS came to $255,252,750.

The Extension Service was granted $160,768,600, an increase of $29,284,000 over fiscal 1970 appropriations. The Soil Conservation Service was allotted a total of $270,784,000 which encompasses such activities as river basin surveys and investigations, watershed planning, flood prevention, and resource conservation; $149,247,000 was granted to the Consumer and Marketing Service for consumer protection, marketing and regulatory programs. An additional $1,675,000 is allocated within this service for payments to States and possessions. The appropriation of $1,825,974,000 for the Food and Nutrition Service provided $301,974,000 for child nutrition programs, and a transfer of section 32 funds of $238,358,000, as well as $1,420,000 for the food stamp program.

Credit agencies funded by H.R. 17923 are the Rural Electrification Administration—REA—and the Farmers Home Administration—FHA. The REA allocation of $480,413,000 was comprised of $337 million for electrification loans, $128.8 million for telephone loans, and

$14,613,000 for salaries and expenses. The $190 million funding for the FHA amounted to an increase of $76.2 million over the budget request and $35 million greater than the fiscal 1970 appropriation. In addition, the FHA direct loan account was set at $386,700,000. Grants to corporations were composed of $12,000,000 for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, $3,363,155,000 to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and $702,500,000 for Public Law 83-480 food-for-peace funds.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS ACT—H.R. 16916, PUBLIC LAW 91-380

The fiscal 1971 appropriations for the Office of Education was separated for the first time from regular appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Since, in recent years, the Labor-HEW appropriations bills have not cleared Congress until late in the fall, education funds were proposed in a separate version in order to clear school funds before the beginning of the school year in September. The House July 16, and the Senate July 28, adopted H.R. 16916 appropriating $4,420,145,000 for fiscal 1971 for programs administered by the Office of Education. On August 11, President Nixon vetoed this appropriation measure which exceeded the budget request by more than $450 million. He stated that veto meant "saying no to bigger spending and no to higher prices in the interest of all the American people."

The House August 13, and the Senate August 18, overrode the President's veto and enacted H.R. 16916 as Public Law 91-380. The final appropriations figure was $293 million more than the House proposal; $327 million less than the Senate version; and about $606 million over fiscal 1970 spending. Elementary and secondary education programs were allocated $1,846,968,000 for fiscal 1971. Much of the funding in this category was for title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—ESEA—the program of aid to schools with concentration of poor students. This sum amounted to $232,275,000 more than the President had requested. It included $50 million for equipment and minor remodeling, for which the President had not requested funding. The increase of title I disbursements over fiscal 1970 was due in part to the normal annual increment in per pupil costs.

A total of $551,068,000 was allotted as assistance to those school districts affected adversely by the exemption of federally owned property from local taxes, $105 million was made available in fiscal 1971 for programs aimed at developing the education professions. The teacher corps, which hires talented instructors to teach in areas with low education standards, received a $30.8 million allocation.

Funds for the expansion and improvement of vocational education amounted to $494,196,000. Moneys for the improvement of community library services were provided in the amount of $85,040,000. A total of $105 million was granted for special education programs for the handicapped. More than $90 million was made available for research and training programs in education. Grants under the higher education acts were appropriated $967,880,000, with another $2,952,000 supplied for the higher education facilities loan fund.

In addition, $75 million was included to begin funding the President's proposed program to aid schools in the process of desegregating. A provision of the bill stipulated that no funds appropriated in the bill could be used to force schools or school districts already desegregated under the 1964 Civil Rights Act to bus students, abolish schools or set attendance zones either against the choice of students' parents or as a prerequisite for obtaining Federal funds. The bill also prohibited the use of funds for loans, loan guarantees, or salaries or other pay for students, employees, teachers or researchers at institutions of higher education who had engaged in conduct since August 1, 1969, involving the use or threat of force or seizure of property to require curriculum changes or to interfere with the activities of the institution.

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, AND CERTAIN INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT—H.R. 16900, PUBLIC LAW 91-422

The President requested $3,046,693,000 to finance 1971 operations of the Departments of Treasury and the Post Office, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies. In H.R. 16900—Public Law 91-422—Congress cut $41,982,000 from the request leaving an appropriation of $3,004,711,000. This sum constituted an increase of $211,174,000 over 1970 appropriations. The bill granted $33 million more than the House provided and $13.4 million less than the Senate version.

The $1,239,858,000 allocated to the Treasury Department was $12,693,000 less than the administration figure; $17,736,000 more than the House-approved figure; and $8,220,000 less than the Senate proposal. Within the allotment to the Treasury Department $9,660,000 was approved for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Secretary; $1,080,000 for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center; $66,792,000 for the Bureau of the Public Debt; and $46,650,000 for the Bureau of Accounts.

A $137 million disbursement to the Bureau of Customs represented an increase of almost $11.9 million. This augmentation of funds is due in part to the Bureau's larger role in policing illicit drug smuggling activities.

The Internal Revenue Service received $26,096,000 for salaries and expenses, $221,500,000 for revenue accounting and processing, and $655,000,000 for compliance activities—totaling almost $902.6 million for the Service.

The allotment to the Secret Service of $42.3 million was nearly $7.4 million over the fiscal 1970 appropriation. The increased expenditure was necessary to implement the extension of the Secret Service duties to protection of Washington embassies and candidates for the Presidency.

The Post Office was directly apportioned $1,728,160,000 which constituted the difference between the offsetting postal revenues of $6,521,000,000 and the total authorization ceiling of $8,249,160,000. The postal appropriation was $13,335,000 more than the House version; $5,148,000 less than the Senate proposal; and $29,099,000 less than the budget request. The largest share of the funds, $6,508,000,000, was for postal operations. The full budget request of $269,825,000 for postal public buildings was approved. This sum constituted an increase of $99,825,000 over fiscal 1971 and was the largest annual appropriation ever for new postal buildings. In accounting for expanded expenditures, it was noted that the volume of mail would advance by nearly 2 billion pieces to 86.3 billion pieces in fiscal 1971. In addition, $162.3 million was granted for administration and regional operation; $62 million for research, development, and engineering; $657 million for transportation; $118 million for supplies and services; and $217 million for plant and equipment.

Both the Senate and House approved $30,765,000 for the Executive Office of the President. This appropriation amounted to an increase of almost $6.5 million over fiscal 1970 expenditures. This budget increase reflected the inclusion of the office of the Vice President for the first time in the appropriation, which received new staff positions within the allocation as "Special Assistance to the President"; $250,000 was disbursed directly for the President; $1,100,000 for the Executive residence; $9,750,000 for the White House Office—$8,550,000 for White House staff and $700,000 for "Special Assistance to the President"—$13,100,000 for the Office of Budget and Management; $1,233,000 for the Council of Economic Advisers; and $2,182,000 for the National Security Council.

H.R. 16900 also provided $4,278,000 to three independent agencies—the Administrative Conference, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and the U.S. Tax Court. A separate allotment of $1,650,000 was appropriated to the President for the protection of foreign dignitaries visiting the United States during the 25th anniversary observation of the United Nations.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS ACT—H.R. 17619, PUBLIC LAW 91-361

Appropriations to support 1971 operations by the Department of the Interior and related agencies were provided in H.R. 17619—Public Law 91-361. A total of $2,028,524,700 was allocated: $1,835,474,700 in new budget authority and $193,050,000 to liquidate contract authorizations. The Department of the Interior was granted $1,343,753,600 for the activities of its various agencies and offices, including the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Office of Territories, Geological Survey Agency, the Bureau of Mines, the Office of Coal Research, the Office of Oil and Gas, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the National Park Service, the

Office of Saline Water, and the Office of Water Resources Research.

The $322,426,000 allocated to the Bureau of Indian Affairs represented a compromise between the House figure of $323,547,000 and the Senate amount of $321,094,500. The Bureau of the Mines received $102,616,000 which was $1.3 million more than the House version; $1.15 million more than the Senate proposal; and $23,306,000 more than fiscal 1970 funding.

Major appropriations for related agencies encompass: the Forest Service, in the Department of Agriculture, $286,394,700; Indian health services and facilities, administered by the Public Health Service, $136,701,000; the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, $31,310,000; and the Smithsonian Institution, $42,818,000. Substantial growth in activities covered by H.R. 17619 over last year's level include: education, welfare, services, and other aid to American Indians; land and water conservation fund; conservation and development of natural resources; mineral resources—including the health and safety provisions of the 1969 Coal Mine Safety Act—national parks; and geologic surveys.

PUBLIC WORKS AND THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATIONS ACT—H.R. 17405, S. 3818, PUBLIC LAW 91–273 AND H.R. 18127, PUBLIC LAW 91–439

Authorization acts are required for both public works projects and the Atomic Energy Commission. Subsequently, funds for the activities authorized are appropriated in the Public Works-Atomic Energy Appropriations Act.

Authorizations for the Atomic Energy Commission—AEC—were passed in H.R. 17405—S. 3818, Public Law 91–273. This bill authorized $2,290,907,000 for AEC operating, capital, and equipment expenditures during 1971—an amount more than $7.7 million over the administration request.

H.R. 18127—Public Law 91–439—allocated those sums to be spent in 1971 by AEC and for public works projects. The Atomic Energy Commission received $2,282,760,000 for its 1971 activities: $1,929,160,000 for operating expenses and $353,600,000 for plant and capital equipment. The original budget request came to $2,363,000,000. Environmental activities of the AEC are increased under the bill, including provision for further research in biological effects of radiation, radioactive waste management, and the effects of thermal alteration of the environment.

Funds for the Department of Defense amounted to $1,359,746,000. Of this sum, $1,295,933,000 was allotted to the Army Corps of Engineers for flood control and rivers and harbors improvements during 1971. The allocation to the Panama Canal of $45,629,000 amounted to an increase of $1,966,000 over fiscal 1971 appropriations. These moneys finance the operation of the Canal Zone Government and constitute an advance of funds which is repaid to the U.S. Treasury through revenues of the Panama Canal. The increase above the 1970 appropriation level was for salary increments and additional workload in the operation of schools, hospitals, and clinics. Cemetery expenses were met by $18,184,000.

H.R. 18127 allocated $1,532,603,000 for Interior Department agencies funded through public works, an increase of $252,677,500 over the 1970 disbursement, and an increase of $18,788,000 over the President's request. The largest single item within this allocation was $1 billion for direct construction grants for waste treatment works for the Federal Water Quality Administration. In addition, $98,618,000 were approved for pollution control operations and research through the Federal Water Quality Administration. These pollution control grants and the Federal water resources construction and research and development funding were in response to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969—Public Law 91–765—aimed at improving both water quality and quantity and are further evidence of congressional concern for the environment.

The Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation, the other major public works agency of the Federal Government besides the Corps of Engineers, received a 1971 appropriation of $310,185,000. Within this allocation were funds for the Upper Colorado River project and the Colorado River Basin project. In addition to the Bureau of Reclamation and Federal Water Pollution Control Administrations: Alaska, $1,C00,000; Bonneville, $115,200,000; Southeastern, $800,000; and Southwestern, $6,050,000.

Congress approved the following appropriations for independent offices: Delaware River Basin Commission, $233,000; Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, $5,000; National Water Commission, $1,840,000; Tennessee Valley Authority, $56,180,000; and the Water Resources Council, $5,150,000.

The total new spending granted by H.R. 18127 was $5,238,517,000 with an additional $5,748,000 to liquidate previously approved contract authority. This figure amounted to $469,749,500 more than fiscal 1970 appropriations but $24,916,000 less than requested by the administration.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AND NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATIONS; DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS ACT—H.R. 16516, PUBLIC LAW 91–303; H.R. 16595, PUBLIC LAW 91–356; H.R. 19830, PUBLIC LAW 91–556

Law requires that both the Space Administration and the National Science Foundation obtain annual authorization of funds. Congress provided for the NASA authorization in H.R. 16516—Public Law 91–303—for fiscal 1971. The final authorization of $3,410,878,000 was $304,649,000 less than the fiscal 1970 NASA authorization but $77,878,000 more than the administration request. For the first time since the establishment of NASA under the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, total authorizations in the bill were more than the budget request. Increases over the administration's figures included $50 million for the space flight operations program, which encompasses the Skylab and space shuttle and station projects, and an increase of $38 million in the Apollo program, for the production of long leadtime items for scientific payloads for Apollo lunar exploration flights after 1973. A $9 million reduction from the budget request was made within the research and management section of the bill, which constituted a reduction in authorized personnel costs. The act also required the disclosure of the names and job descriptions for former NASA employees who are hired by companies under contract with the agency for more than $10 million in business annually, and for employees currently working for NASA who formerly worked for aerospace contractors. In addition, H.R. 16516 barred funds to universities which prohibit campus recruiting of Armed Forces personnel unless the Administrator makes an exception.

Authorizations for the National Science Foundation were made in H.R. 16595—Public Law 91–356. The total authorized amount of $537,730,000 was $37,730,000 more than the budget request; $12.1 million more than the House approved figure, but $10,270,000 less than the Senate passed sum. The act provided for a 2-year cutoff of funds by institutions of higher learning to persons convicted of a crime connected with disruption of such an institution.

Funds for NASA and the National Science Foundation are provided in the Department of Housing and Urban Development—HUD—Independent Offices Appropriation Act. In H.R. 17548, the first HUD Appropriations Act Congress passed, the total appropriation amounted to $18,009,525,000, which was $541,301,800 more than the President's request. The three major increases over the administration's figure were $105 million for veterans' medical care, $350 million for water and sewer grants, and $350 million for urban renewal. However, President Nixon stated that he was determined "to hold the line against a dangerous budget deficit," and consequently vetoed the HUD appropriations bill on August 11. His veto of H.R. 17548 was sustained by the House on August 13.

A new appropriations bill was reported—H.R. 19830—granting $17,709,525,300 for fiscal 1971 for HUD and such independent agencies as the Veterans' Administration and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The final allocation was $300 million less than the vetoed amount in H.R. 17548. The reductions were $150 million each in urban renewal, and water and sewer grants. There were no other changes in the new appropriations from the vetoed measure. On December 17, President Nixon signed H.R. 19830 into law—Public Law 91–556.

Important aspects of the poverty program and urban programs are financed through the HUD portion of this appropriation which amounted to $3,343,081,000—a sum $300 million less than the vetoed allocation but more than $350 million over the administration request. Despite the reduction from the vetoed figure there was a $200 million increase over the President's sum for urban renewal allowing the final disbursement for urban renewal to be $1.2 billion. The rent supplement program was allotted $55 million. Although the administra-

tion had requested no funds for housing loans for the elderly and handicapped, Congress provided $10 million for this program. The water and sewer facilities grants, having been reduced to $350 million, were still $200 million more than the budget request.

The General Services Administration—GSA—received a total funding of $721,767,300—an increase of $25,173,800 over the budget request. The major increase in this allocation was a $31,895,800 increment over the administration requests in the GSA budget for construction of Federal buildings, totaling $133,560,300 for this item. The final appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—$3,268,675,000—was $142,203,000 less than the authorization figure. The largest cut in the NASA disbursement was a $41 million deletion from the administration request for research and development—the final amount being $2,565,000,000. The total allocation to the Veterans' Administration was $9,065,528,000. Of this figure $59 million was allotted for construction of veterans hospitals and $1,857,200,000 for veterans' medical care. The National Science Foundation received $513 million, representing a $24.7 million reduction from its authorization.

Among the independent agencies also funded by H.R. 19830 are the following: Civil Service Commission, $95,980,000; Commission on Government Procurement, $1,500,000; Federal Communications Commission, $24,900,000; Federal Power Commission, $18,210,000; Federal Trade Commission, $20,500,000; Securities and Exchange Commission, $21,716,000; Selective Service System, $75,000,000; Appalachian regional development program, $293,500,000; disaster relief, $65,000,000; Civil Defense—Defense Department—$72,100,000; and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, $85,000,000.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT ACT—H.R. 17123, PUBLIC LAW 91–441—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT—H.R. 19590

On October 1, 1970, Congress cleared H.R. 17123, the Military Procurement Act for fiscal 1971. A total of $19,929,089,000—$676,400,000 less than the amount requested by the administration, $642,400,000 more than approved by the House, and $686,200,000 more than approved by the Senate—was authorized in Public Law 91–441.

Authorized by this bill were such major weapons programs as the ABM, the C–5A cargo plane, MIRV missiles, F–14 and F–15 fighter aircraft, ships and submarines, and continued military operations in Southeast Asia.

Final aircraft authorization in H.R. 17213 was for $5,964,300,000. Missiles were authorized in the amount of $3,490,300,000; naval vessels, $2,711,900,000; tracked combat vehicles, $252,600,000; and other weapons, $74,389,000.

Total research authorizations came to $7,101,600,000.

In addition, H.R. 17213:

Set the fiscal 1971 average strength of the Army National Guard at 400,000; the Army Reserve at 260,000 the Navy Reserve at 129,000; the Marine Corps Reserve at 47,715; the Air National Guard at 87,878; the Air Force Reserve at 47,921, and the Coast Guard Reserve at 15,000.

Prohibited the obligation of $283 million for the F–111 aircraft until the Secretary of Defense gave assurances the plane had passed certain tests.

Required that beginning in the fiscal 1972 authorization bill a special authorization be required for naval torpedo procurement.

Expressed the sense of Congress that the National Science Foundation should receive a large share of U.S. support funds.

Specified that the special $200,000,000 in the bill for extra C–5A spending be limited to costs directly connected with the aircraft and directed the Comptroller General to review the spending of the funds and to report to Congress.

Required that all research and development programs have a potential relationship to a military activity, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

Prohibited funds for independent research by contractors receiving more than $2,000,000 in the previous fiscal year unless a ceiling had been previously negotiated, and required the Secretary of Defense to report annually to Congress on the negotiations and payments.

Prohibited procurement of delivery systems for lethal chemical-biological—CBW—agents; required special safety precautions for disposal of lethal CBW agents, including their detoxification, except in emergencies or in routine laboratory disposals; required a finding by the Secretary of State that no international laws would be violated before there could be any foreign testing, dumping or storage of CWB agents, and directed a study of ecological and physiological impact of herbicides.

Placed a ceiling of $2.8 billion on U.S. aid to the Vietnamese and to other free world forces in support of Vietnamese forces and local forces in Laos and Thailand.

Prohibited the financing of military operations by the South Vietnamese or other allied troops in support of the Cambodian or Laotian Governments.

Prohibited the U.S. payment of special combat or overseas duty pay to U.S. allies in Southeast Asia which was higher than that received by U.S. servicemen for the same purpose, except to fulfill agreements negotiated before July 1, 1970.

Prohibited the transfer to third parties of weapons or military equipment furnished to Southeast Asia allies, except by approval of the United States.

Encouraged longer tours of duty for military personnel and directed the Secretary of Defense to study ways of accomplishing this.

Required yearly congressional approval of personnel strengths for the armed services, based on an annual Presidential request.

Authorized the transfer of an unlimited amount of aircraft and supporting equipment to Israel by sales, credit sales or guaranty, as a means of assistance in providing for the security of that nation until September 30, 1972.

Prohibited the disclosure of defense contract awards by any person until after an announcement had been made by the Secretary of Defense.

Prohibited the use of funds in the bill at colleges and universities that as a matter of policy had barred military recruiters, except when the Secretary of Defense determined such funds were part of a continuing contract necessary for U.S. defense; required the Secretary to report semiannually the names of institutions barring military recruiters.

Actual appropriations for procurement were contained in the Defense Appropriations Act, cleared by the Congress on December 29.

As finally approved, H.R. 19590 appropriated $66,595,937,000 for fiscal 1971, a total of $2,149,729,000 below the administration's request, $210,624,000 less than the amount approved by the House, but $178,860,000 more than the Senate-approved figure. It was also slightly more than $3 billion less than the amount appropriated in the fiscal 1970 Defense Appropriations Act—Public Law 91–171.

More than $20.7 billion was appropriated for military personnel, more than $3.1 billion for military retirees, and $16,029,110,000 for procurement with an additional $6,975,800,000 for research and development. More than $19 billion was appropriated for operation and maintenance costs. A sum of $300 million was appropriated for the Vietnamization program by which the President hopes to accomplish withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam while insuring a strong armed forces for that country.

H.R. 19590 also:

Authorized the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, to transfer up to $700,000 of the funds between various programs funded in the bill if he notified Congress.

Prohibited the U.S. payment of special combat or overseas duty pay to U.S. allies in Southeast Asia if the payment was higher than that received by U.S. servicemen for the same purpose, except to fulfill agreements entered into before July 1, 1970.

Prohibited financing by the United States of military operations by the South Vienamese or other allied troops in support of the Cambodian or Loatian Governments, except to support actions to promote the safe and orderly disengagement of U.S. troops from Southeast Asia or to aid in the release of American prisoners of war.

Directed that no procurement funds in the bill would continue to be available if not obligated by June 30, 1970, shipbuilding funds by June 30, 1975, and research funds by June 30, 1972.

In line with the expressed intention of the President of the United States, prohibited the use of funds in the bill to finance the introduction of U.S. ground combat troops into Laos or Thailand.

Prohibited the use of funds in the bill to support more than 138,000 defense intelligence or security personnel past June 15, 1971.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT—H.R. 18515

Funds for the operations and activities of the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and

Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity were appropriated in H.R. 18515.

A total of $18,696,392,500 were provided by this bill, a little over $200 million above the amount requested by the President.

The amount appropriated for the Department of Labor was $1,969,040,500 for such agencies as Manpower Administration, $1,754,017,000; Labor-Management Relations, $16,600,000; Wage and Labor Standards, $155,012,500; Bureau of Labor Statistics, $16,150,000; and the Office of the Secretary, $9,812,000.

The amount appropriated for HEW was $15,570,722,000. Principal operations funded by these moneys are those of: First, the Food and Drug Administration, $89,549,000; second, environmental health services, $170,717,000; third, health services and mental health administration, $1,422,410,000; National Institutes of Health, $1,688,799,000; fifth, social and rehabilitation service, $9,483,492,000; sixth, Social Security Administration, $2,599,886,000; seventh, special institutions, $66,975,000; eighth, Office of Child Development, $5,917,000; and for departmental management, $43,027,000. It will be remembered that funds for the Office of Education were separately appropriated in earlier action by the Congress. H.R. 18515 was not cleared until near the close of the second session.

Moneys for related agencies granted in H.R. 18515 were: $39,430,000 for the National Labor Relations Board, $2,394,000 for the National Mediation Board, $1,323,400,000 for the Office of Economic Opportunity, and $23 million for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, among others.

PEACE CORPS AUTHORIZATION—H.R. 16327; PUBLIC LAW 91–356—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS ACT—H.R. 17867

In addition to supplying moneys to fund our military and economic assistance to foreign nations, the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act funds as well the operations of the highly successful Peace Corps, one of the great legacies of the Kennedy administration. The annual authorization required for the Peace Corps was cleared by the Congress and signed into law in July of 1970. H.R. 16327 authorized $98,000,000 for the operations of the Peace Corps. This sum was $800,000 less than the amount approved by the House and requested by the President, but $8 million more than approved in the Senate.

The Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act was not cleared until late in the session. H.R. 17867 appropriated $90 million for the Peace Corps. A total of $1,571,435,000 was appropriated for economic assistance and $350 million for military assistance. Credit sales appropriations were at $200 million. Other foreign assistance, as for example, development banks, funded at $349,125,000. A sum of $2,534,310,000 was appropriated in H.R. 17867. This figure was more than $340 million below the budget request, but more than $300 million above the House-passed figure, and more than $69 million below the Senate-passed figure.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE SUPPLEMENTAL ACT—H.R. 19911—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION SUPPLEMENTAL—S. 4557—FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1971—H.R. 19928

Supplemental appropriations provide those funds not granted in regular appropriations, often because Congress has enacted legislation during the session which increases expenditures for an agency, or, in addition, because the President has requested special funding to meet needs arising during the year.

A substantial portion of the $1,853,372,792 allocated in the First Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1971—H.R. 19928—was in response to President Nixon's supplemental foreign aid requests: $500 million for military credit sales to Israel—authorized in the Defense Procurement Act—H.R. 17123, Public Law 91–441—and funding for military and economic assistance to other countries provided in the Supplemental Foreign Assistance Authorization Act—H.R. 19911—including $85 million in military assistance to Cambodia, $150 million in military assistance to Korea, $30 million in military assistance to Jordan, and lesser amounts of military assistance to other countries, as well as for economic assistance, totaling altogether $550 million.

H.R. 19911 included, in addition, important provisos concerning U.S. military involvement in Cambodia. These were: first, a prohibition on the sending of U.S. troops or advisers to Cambodia; second, a policy statement that aid furnished Cambodia shall not be construed as a commitment to defend that country; and third, a requirement that the President notify Congress prior to giving Cambodia additional aid through use of the emergency authority granted him in the 1961 Foreign Assistance Act.

In H.R. 19928 Congress appropriated $1,002,500,000 to fund foreign assistance. The remaining funds were for other agencies and departments. DOD was granted $3 million to continue research into the surface effects of various ship programs. The District of Columbia received $12,119,000 for various operations. Continued congressional concern for the environment was reflected in the $21.4 million granted to the new Environmental Protection Agency. On its own initiative Congress allocated $15 million to HUD to finance urban research and technology. In like fashion $8.5 million was appropriated to the Appalachian regional development program for airport projects to prevent future air disasters such as that which annihilated the Marshall University football team.

A total of $14,150,000 was appropriated to the FBI for 1,000 additional agents, 702 supporting personnel, and for equipment to deal with aircraft hijackings and campus disorders. The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, in the Department of Justice, was allotted $7 million to finance an additional 300 agents and 335 other employees.

H.R. 19928 appropriated the full $25.5 million authorized in S. 4557, a supplemental AEC Authorization Act, to finance the installment of fire safety modifications in Atomic Energy Commission plants. These additional funds were both authorized and appropriated in response to the fire which hit the AEC's Rocky Flats plant in Colorado in 1969.

H.R. 19928 also appropriated the following amounts: $84,900,000 for the Labor Department's Manpower Administration; $16,400,000 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; $77,172,700 for the Department of the Interior; $2,280,000 for the Department of State; $100 million for the disaster loan fund of the Small Business Administration; and $89 million for the Federal Aviation Commission in DOT.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION—H.R. 15694, PUBLIC LAW 91–261—AND THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS ACT—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1421

Actual funds for the operations of the Coast Guard are appropriated in the DOT Appropriations Act. Existing law requires an annual authorization for the Coast Guard, however, which was granted in Public Law 91–261, to authorize $100 million for vessel construction and improvements—including a new series of polar icebreakers—for aircraft, and for the development and establishment of Coast Guard installations and facilities.

Opposition in the Senate to funds provided for development and construction of the supersonic transport in H.R. 17755, the fiscal 1971 Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, prevented final approval. Accordingly, Congress passed House Joint Resolution 1421, to continue appropriations for the Department of Transportation, and other agencies funded in H.R. 17755, at the level provided in that bill but only until March 30, 1971. It is anticipated that Congress will resolve the dispute over the supersonic transport early in 1971.

By agreeing to House Joint Resolution 1421, the Congress funded the operations of the Department of Transportation, through March 30, at a level equivalent with the $2,180,755,937 appropriated in H.R. 17755. Agencies funded by this title include: the Coast Guard—at a level of $650,292,937—the Federal Aviation Administration—at a level of $1,201,385,000—the Federal Highway Administration—at a level of $4,593,000, excluding trust fund financing—the National Highway Safety Bureau—at a level of $42,935,000—the Federal Railroad Administration—at a level of $24,845,000—the Urban Mass Transportation Administration—at a level of $9,325,000—and the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Transportation—at a level of $247,380,000.

Related agencies funded in House Joint Resolution 1421 include: the National Transportation Safety Board—at $6 million—the Civil Aeronautics Board—at $61,134,000—the Interstate Commerce Commission—at $30,216,668—and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, Federal contribution—at $330,028,000.

The moneys directly appropriated in House Joint Resolution 1421 for the Department of Transportation and related agencies total at the level of $2,608,134,605 which is both more than the $2,579,579,937 provided in the House-passed H.R. 17755, and the $2,453,923,605

in the Senate version of H.R. 17755, but less than the budget request of $2,741,827,437. Funds provided in fiscal 1970 for these several agencies totaled $2,246,365,423.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. Speaker, there are two items of interest in the area of voting and equal rights which received positive action in the House during this Congress and which demonstrate the innovative nature and character of the 91st Congress.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965 AMENDMENTS H.R. 4249, PUBLIC LAW 91–285

On June 22, 1970, President Nixon signed into law a bill extending the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the most successful voting rights legislation ever enacted. The success of the 1965 act cannot be underestimated. During the time it has been in effect more than 1 million Negroes have been added to the rolls of registered voters in 11 Southern States. During that same period of time the number of Negroes holding elective office has climbed to a total of more than 1,500 across the Nation.

Public Law 91–285 extends for an additional 5 years the period of time States and their political subdivisions are covered by the "triggering" provisions of the act. Those States or political subdivisions which maintained a test or device as a prerequisite to registration or voting as of November 1 of either 1964 or 1968 and had a voting age population of which less than 50 percent were registered or actually voted in the 1964 or 1968 presidential election are subject to three sanctions which do not apply generally. These are first, a ban, prohibiting the States from using any test or device to limit voting eligibility; second, Federal oversight, permiting the Attorney General, under specified circumstances, to send in Federal examiners to list eligible, but nonregistered, voters—the Attorney General may also send in Federal observers to inspect the polling places and the counting of votes; and third, advance clearance, requiring any covered State or political subdivision enacting new voting qualifications or procedures to obtain advance approval of the Attorney General or a declaratory judgment from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the effect that the new practice does not have either a discriminatory purpose or effect. This part of the act is identical to the 1965 act with the exception that 1968 dates were added to bring more areas under the triggering formula.

An important new provision of the Voting Rights Act bans nationwide all literacy tests until August 6, 1975.

In order to protect the right to vote in presidential elections in today's mobile society, Congress included a new provision in the Voting Rights Act stipulating that no citizen shall be denied the right to vote in a presidential election because of residence requirements if he applies for registration in his State no later than 30 days prior to such election. Every State is also required by this section of the law to permit any resident to vote in a presidential election by absentee ballot if he applies no later than 7 days prior to the election. Those persons who move to another State fewer than 30 days prior to a presidential election shall be permitted to vote in their State of former residence. These provisions will enable any voter who wishes to vote in future presidential elections to do so.

Title III of the Voting Rights Act is another new feature. It grants the right to vote to all citizens 18 years of age in Federal, State, and local elections. The Congress felt most strongly that our young people between 18 and 21 are entitled to vote and included this provision in the act solely on its own initiative.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 264, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 231

On August 10, 1970, the House of Representatives passed an equal rights amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The amendment had been introduced each year for 47 years but had never been considered on the floor of the House. The vote followed a successful drive to bring the bill to the floor by means of the discharge rule. The Senate debated the measure but did not pass it.

The equal rights amendment as it passed the House read:

Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex. Congress and the several states shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Under the amendment, men and women would share equally, under the law, the rights and responsibilities of American citizenship.

COMMUNICATIONS

NEWSPAPER PRESERVATION ACT—S. 1520, H.R. 279, PUBLIC LAW 91–353

Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 1970, the Senate agreed to the House-amended version of the Newspaper Preservation Act, which exempts from antitrust laws certain operating arrangements between newspapers in danger of financial failure.

This legislation was prompted by the financial failure and resulting disappearance of many publications. Many areas have been left with only one major newspaper. It is expected that this legislation will encourage the existence and competitive efforts of newspapers within the same areas by preserving independent news and editorial operations where economic realities might have put all but one paper out of business.

Joint newspaper operating agreements are to be considered valid only if they include the establishment of joint production facilities. However, such arrangements may not include the merger of editorial or reportorial staffs. Editorial policies must be independently determined as well.

This legislation does not apply to either magazines or advertising circulars. It does apply to joint newspaper operations already in effect if, at the time of the agreement, one of the papers was "failing." A "failing newspaper" is defined as one which, regardless of its ownership or affiliations, is in probable danger of financial failure. Joint operating agreements not already in effect must be approved by the U.S. Attorney General.

The provisions of Public Law 91–353 are to be applied in judging any pending action against a joint operating agreement. Also, any previous judgment declaring joint agreements illegal under antitrust laws is to be revised to allow reinstatement of the agreement to the extent consistent with the law's provisions.

PUBLIC BROADCAST FINANCING—S. 3558, H.R. 17982, PUBLIC LAW 91–437

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which was created by the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, is a federally chartered, independent, nonprofit corporation whose mandate is to encourage and facilitate expansion and development of noncommercial broadcasting, and to promote diversity in that medium. During its short lifespan, the Corporation has begun to fulfill its purpose.

When the original legislation was enacted, $9 million was authorized to be appropriated to enable the Corporation to come into being. This was intended to be "seed money" pending a long-range financing plan to be submitted by the administration. To date, however, no plan has been submitted.

Meanwhile, with the $5 million which was ultimately appropriated in October 1968, and the little over $2 million contributed from private sources, the Corporation became operational.

Since the initial authorization for funding the Corporation was for 1 year only, it was necessary for the Congress to authorize another appropriation the following fiscal year. That authorization which was for fiscal year 1970 was $20 million and ultimately $15 million of that amount was appropriated.

The authorization agreed to for fiscal years 1971 and 1972 is set at not more than $30 million with an additional amount of not more than $5 million for each fiscal year to match contributions to the Corporation from non-Federal sources. S. 3558 was signed into law on October 7, 1970.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to strengthen protection for the American consumer, the 91st Congress has enacted legislation providing for child protection, regulation of credit cards, and establishment of fair credit reporting procedures. On November 6, 1969, the President approved the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act which amends the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles which are considered hazardous. The 1969 amendments, Public Law 91–113, expand coverage to include toys which present electrical, mechanical, and thermal hazards such as toy ovens, metal casting sets, electrical irons, and archery sets. Another provision of the act requires manufacturers, distributors, and dealers to repurchase banned hazardous substances from their purchaser, with the right for industry to appeal to a Federal court.

In the first session, Congress also extended the life of the National Commission on Product Safety until June 30, 1970, and authorized the Commission to

make its legislative recommendations to Congress in November 1969—Public Law 91–51.

FAIR CREDIT REPORTING AMENDMENTS—H.R. 15073, PUBLIC LAW 91508

During the second session legislation was approved to protect the consumer from unsolicited credit cards and to insure fair credit reporting practices. Public Law 91–508 prohibits the issuance of unrequested credit cards except as renewals or substitutes for cards previously issued and sets a maximum liability of a cardholder for unauthorized use of his card at $50. The act removes liability for unauthorized use of cards under any circumstances for any customer who has not requested or received them or signed and used them. Unauthorized use of credit cards is now a Federal criminal offense in cases involving $5,000 or more. State criminal law would apply to cases involving less than this amount.

Public Law 91–508 also contains provisions requiring all agencies reporting credit information to follow reasonable procedures to assure accuracy of information. Any user of the report who rejected a consumer for credit, insurance or employment is required to inform the consumer of the source of the report, and consumers were granted the statutory right, through court proceedings, to obtain identification of sources of information about them in credit reports.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES, CHILD PROTECTION—S. 2162

In December Congress cleared S. 2162 providing for child-resistant packaging to protect children from serious personal injury or serious illness resulting from the handling or ingesting of any hazardous household substance. This bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to determine those substances that are to be specially packaged and to establish packaging performance standards. Penalties have been set for failure to conform to those standards.

LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING—H.R. 19172

In another action the House gave its approval for an authorization of $30 million over 2 years to assist local governments in the development of programs to eliminate lead-based paint poisoning. A Federal demonstration and research program to study the extent of the lead-based paint poisoning problem would be established and recommendations made available to those cities and communities receiving financial assistance.

In the Senate H.R. 19172 was amended to fund the programs authorized in the bill at $24.5 million annually for 3 years.

Following a House-Senate conference, H.R. 19172 was cleared late in the session with authorizations of $10 million for fiscal 1971, and $20 million for fiscal 1972.

Passage of this act should help to curtail the mental retardation, and even death, which afflicts those children who eat lead-based paints. Almost 400,000 children each year are injured and as many as 200 each year die from eating lead-based paint.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

During the past several years, the Government and residents of the District of Columbia have assumed increased responsibility for the District. Two bills of major importance to the District were passed during the first session of this Congress. Public Law 91–106—H.R. 12982—authorized $105 million in Federal payments to the District for fiscal 1970 and approved increased and additional sales and excise taxes. The revenue act, in an effort to discourage inflationary trends, imposed limitations on hiring and on busing policies. The National Capital Transportation Act of 1969, Public Law 91–143, authorized up to $1,470,044,000 for the construction of a rapid rail transit system in the Washington metropolitan area. Extensive discussion continues, however, over the size of the system, the need for improved freeway systems and the adequacy of the funds authorized.

In the second session additional action was taken to provide the residents of the District with more representative government.

NONVOTING DELEGATE IN THE HOUSE—S. 2163, H.R. 18725, PUBLIC LAW 91–405

Representation of the District in Congress has been a highly debated issue for the past several decades. President Nixon approved Public Law 91–405, September 22, 1970, to provide for a nonvoting delegate for the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives. For the first time in nearly 100 years a delegate from the District will assume a seat in Congress. The general election is scheduled for March 23, 1971. Certainly, passage of this act is one of the most highly significant legislative actions of this Congress.

Besides amending the District's election laws, Public Law 91–405 establishes a Commission on the Organization of the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia government has mushroomed in size and the problems of the conflicting agencies and departments are becoming more and more complex. This "little Hoover Commission" will study and recommend procedures for economy, efficiency and improved service in the District's public business. The Commission is required to submit a report by September 22, 1971.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT REFORM AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE ACT OF 1970—S. 2606, H.R. 16196, PUBLIC LAW 91–358

Due to the unique system of government in the District of Columbia; Congress, police, prosecutors, defense counsel, the courts, and the community share a joint as well as individual responsibility for assisting one another to ameliorate crime conditions and improve judicial procedures in the District. In an effort to shoulder its responsibility and assist others in assuming theirs, Congress enacted the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970. Public Law 91–358 was approved July 29, 1970.

Title I involves the organization and jurisdiction of the courts. Along with establishing a joint commission to supervise removal of judges for disability or misconduct and authorizing an executive officer to manage court operations, Public Law 91–358 authorizes 17 additional judges for the Superior Court. The Superior Court, established by the act, will incorporate the existing general sessions, tax and juvenile courts. The District of Columbia Court of Appeals will function similarly to a State supreme court. All local matters will, over a 3-year period, be transferred from Federal courts to the District of Columbia system. The act also provides that some persons now considered juveniles will be prosecuted as adults when charged with felonies at the age of 15. Juveniles are to be entitled to counsel at all critical stages of public and judicial proceedings.

Title II pertains to criminal law and procedure. Sentencing rules are changed to allow imposition of life imprisonment for a third felony, to impose a 3-year maximum sentence for robbing a vending machine, parking meter, or coin telephone, or to set a mandatory minimum additional sentence of 5 years for a second armed crime of violence. The possession, construction or use of any incendiary device is banned in the District. Title II also allows the government to appeal an order suppressing evidence against a defendant. With certain qualifications the act provides for nighttime search warrants, so-called "no-knock" search and arrest warrants and "no-knock" entry without warrant authorization. Within the conditions of the 1968 Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, Public Law 91–358 sets the standards for use of wiretapping and electronic surveillance in the District and provides penalties for their misuse. Title II sets conditions for 60-day pretrial detention of prisoners.

Titles III through VIII of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 establish a public defender service which will represent up to 60 percent of the persons unable to obtain adequate representation and provide means for finding private counsel for the remaining 40 percent; authorize the District of Columbia government to enter into the Interstate Compact on Juveniles for cooperation in the return of runaway juveniles; and provide that the District's Corporation Counsel will represent any police officer sued for wrongful arrest or will pay the officer's attorney fees. The Commission on Revision of the Criminal Laws of the District of Columbia is abolished. The act authorizes Federal payment of $5 million in fiscal 1971 to the District for reorganizing the courts and Legal Aid Agency, for facilities, for the additional court personnel, and for expansion of the bail agency.

Of no small importance to members of the younger set in the District, the act repeals the law prohibiting kite flying in the District of Columbia.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE, AND FIREMEN'S AND TEACHERS' SALARY ACTS AMENDMENTS OF 1907—H.R. 17138, S. 2694, PUBLIC LAW 91–297

Public Law 91–297, approved June 30, 1970, provides for an average increase in police and firemen's salaries of 13 percent and provides an overall increase in teachers' salaries. Personnel who provide the public services required in the police, fire and teacher force of the District are to be commended for their

work and well deserve these increases. The act also authorizes a one-time Federal payment of $8 million to assist in financing the salary increases.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1970—H.R. 19885

Within the last 7 years Congress has enacted five laws increasing the Federal payment to the District of Columbia. Even though the population of the city has decreased since the 1950 census, governmental size and expenses have increased.

On December 21, 1970, Congress cleared H.R. 19885 to increase the annual Federal payment to the District from $105 million to $126 million and to extend the District's borrowing authority for 2 years. The bill provides a 2 percent tax on rental linens and continues the 2-percent rate on all laundry. It also repeals property tax exemption on housing owned by nonprofit charitable organizations if such property is aided by Federal rent supplement or interest subsidy.

H.R. 19885 authorizes a $6.2 million appropriation for District of Columbia medical and dental schools—Georgetown and George Washington. It authorizes HEW grants of not over $5,000 per medical student and $3,000 per dental student for fiscal years 1970 and 1971. Land-grant college funds are to be shared equally by Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute. Higher education institutions in the District are to be exempt from any interest ceiling in borrowing money.

Among the other provisions of H.R. 19885 are those: deleting the limit of $150,000 authorized for preservation of the Old Georgetown Market; exempting District of Columbia motor carriers regulated by ICC from the District of Columbia minimum wage provisions; limiting future District of Columbia minimum wage orders to no more than 10 percent higher than Federal fair labor standards; and authorizing the District of Columbia government to enter into leases for space for up to 20 years. Expected to save the District of Columbia $200,000 annually is the provision permitting the sale in District of Columbia of milk and dairy products inspected, certified, and meeting HEW standards, obviating duplicate District of Columbia inspection.

EDUCATION

Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the 91st Congress, we passed Public Law 91–61 to establish a National Center on Educational Media, charged with expanding the scope of educational opportunities available to America's handicapped children.

Public Law 91–86 recognized the vital need for private action in the fields of education and day care and specified that the Federal Government was not to inhibit voluntary labor-management cooperation in these areas.

Public Law 91–95 authorized special interest allowances for lenders, with respect to insured student loans under title IV–B of the Higher Education Act of 1965, in order to assure that students would have reasonable access to such loans for financing their education.

These were some of the actions taken by Congress in 1969 to improve educational opportunities for our children.

In 1970, Congress demonstrated its continued interest in education, considering and passing a number of bills which will bring us ever closer to our goal of making available the best possible education for all Americans.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS—H.R. 514, PUBLIC LAW 91-230

Public Law 91–230—H.R. 514—incorporating three bills passed by the House of Representatives in 1969—H.R. 13304, H.R. 13310, and H.R. 13630—extends the major programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act through June 30, 1973, authorizes several changes to existing programs, and establishes new programs.

It authorizes a 3-year spending level of approximately $24.6 billion, the largest amount ever authorized for elementary and secondary education. In addition, the law changes funding procedures to permit advance funding by extending the previous fiscal year's authorizations for another year, should Congress fail to provide new authorizing legislation.

Major changes in existing programs include:

First, extending aid to federally impacted areas to include children living in federally financed public housing;

Second, increasing from $3,000 to $4,000 the maximum income level for determining eligibility for programs of aid to school districts with children from low-income families, and stipulating a matching requirement of State and local funds;

Third, authorizing a special incentive grant program of $50 million annually for States which exceed the national effort for public education;

Fourth, providing assistance to a State education or other agency when it has assumed the responsibility for education programs dealing with institutionalized, handicapped, neglected, or delinquent children from a local agency, when that agency is not performing satisfactorily;

Fifth, requiring that aid to children of migrants be used as a basis for calculating aid to State education agencies for teaching these children;

Sixth, broadening the bilingual education program to include Indian children living on reservations and attending tribal schools or U.S. Department of the Interior schools;

Seventh, consolidating the supplementary education centers and services program with the guidance, counseling, and testing program and stipulating that each State must spend annually at least 50 percent of its fiscal 1970 NDEA allocation for guidance, counseling, and testing;

Eighth, amending the Adult Education Act of 1966—Public Law 89–750—to include secondary school programs for adult basic education, including high school equivalency; and

Ninth, extending the existing loan forgiveness provisions of NDEA student loans to include allowances for military service at a rate of 12.5 percent per year of service.

New programs established by H.R. 514 include:

First, aid to State and local education agencies for planning and research;

Second, demonstration projects to improve health and nutrition services in schools with large numbers of children from low-income families;

Third, grants to provide for innovative programs for strengthening local education agencies;

Fourth, aid for children with specific learning disabilities;

Fifth, establishment of a Student Teacher Corps to utilize on a part-time basis the talents of high school and college students, community residents, and others;

Sixth, establishment of a Teacher Corps program to deal with juvenile delinquents; and

Seventh, special grants to urban and rural school systems with high concentration of low-income families.

Mr. Speaker, this was an excellent act in which we can take pride. It demonstrates forcefully the continuing concern of the Congress for the children of this great Nation.

SCHOOL LUNCH AND CHILD NUTRITION ACTS AMENDMENTS—H.R. 515, PUBLIC LAW 91–248

Public Law 91–248 expands and improves the program of free and reduced-price lunches for needy schoolchildren. The law:

First, authorizes appropriations 1 year in advance for child nutrition programs;

Second, provides an open-ended authorization for the special assistance program for children from low-income families;

Third, authorizes $25 million for the school breakfast program for fiscal 1971;

Fourth, authorizes the following sums for nonfood assistance—equipment for school food service programs: $38 million for fiscal 1971; $33 million for fiscal 1972; $15 million for fiscal 1973; and $10 million for each succeeding fiscal year;

Fifth, requires that for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 States must provide at least 4 percent of the State matching requirement from State tax revenues; for fiscal 1974 and 1975, 6 percent; for fiscal 1976 and 1977, 8 percent, and for each fiscal year thereafter, 10 percent;

Sixth, limits to 20 cents the cost of reduced-price lunches for children;

Seventh, provides that all needy children are to be offered free or reduced-price lunches, with first priority to be given by school administrators to the neediest children;

Eighth, establishes the standard for "needy," after January 1, 1971, as the Federal income poverty guidelines set by the Secretary of Agriculture. Until that date, the determination of need is to be made by local school authorities on the basis of criteria including family size and income and the number of children in school.

Ninth, allocates special assistance funds to the States according to the ratio of children in families with incomes under $4,000 to the total number of children in the State;

Tenth, requires every State as a condition for receiving funds for the child nutrition program to submit an annual

report to the Secretary of Agriculture on its program for the following fiscal year. The State is to detail how it intends to furnish a free or reduced-price lunch to every needy child and how it proposes to extend the lunch program to every school in the State;

Eleventh, limits the special assistance funds disbursed to each school to a maximum per meal amount established by the Secretary of Agriculture for all States and

Twelfth, establishes a National Advisory Council on Child Nutrition.

CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966, MILK PROGRAM AMENDMENT—H.R. 554, PUBLIC LAW 91–295

Public Law 91–295 amended the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to provide a special milk program for children. It made permanent authority for the program at the current authorization level, $120 million. The purpose of this act is to encourage increased milk consumption by children. In addition, it is intended to help maintain a healthy fluid milk dairy economy by expanding the market for fluid milk. Nutritionists have long contended that children of school age need a minimum of 1 quart of milk per day to insure sufficient calcium intake. Statistics have demonstrated that these needs are not fulfilled, especially with respect to children of low-income areas. The special milk program has made progress toward correcting this deficiency. Since 1960, the number of students served has increased by one-third, from 13 to 17 million, and the number of participating outlets has been increased by nearly 15 percent. The special milk program has had the dual effect of encouraging increased consumption of milk by 17 million children as a nutritional measure and reducing purchases of dairy products by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

TEMPORARY EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE FOR CHILDREN—H.R. 11651, PUBLIC LAW 91–207

Public Law 91–207—H.R. 11651—amends the National School Lunch Act to authorize an additional $30 million for the purpose of providing free or reduced-price meals to needy children in States which would have run short of funds before the end of the 1969–70 school year. This emergency measure assured that thousands of schoolchildren in 34 States continued to receive nutritious school lunches daily. The school lunch is, for many needy children, the only dependable, nutritious meal of the day.

SURPLUS DAIRY PRODUCTS FOR THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM—S. 2595, PUBLIC LAW 91–233

Public Law 91–233—S. 2595—amends the National School Lunch Act to give the school lunch program top priority in the use of surplus dairy products acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price-support operations.

The purpose of the law is to provide for distribution of healthful dairy products to children and other needy persons and to effect a more economical operation of the existing price support program for dairy products. It permits high priority donation of dairy products, which are held by the Government, for school lunch programs, to assist other needy people, and for charitable institutions, including hospitals, without the present requirement that such donations shall not be made unless the products cannot be sold. This makes it possible to avoid the present expensive and duplicative process of selling Government-held products and then having to purchase the same type products for food distribution programs.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE ACT—S. 1519, H.R. 10666, PUBLIC LAW 91–345

Public Law 91–345—S. 1519, H.R. 10666—establishes a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as an independent agency within the executive branch. The law:

First, establishes the Commission and provides it with necessary administrative services from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Second, gives the Commission authority to accept grants, gifts or bequests;

Third, states it to be the Commission's functions to advise the President and Congress on national policy developments in its field; to conduct studies, surveys, and analyses of the library and information needs of the Nation; to appraise adequacies and deficiencies of current library and information resources; to develop overall plans for meeting national library needs; to promote research and development activities to improve the Nation's libraries; to submit to the President and Congress not later than January 31 of each year a report of its activities; and to draw up and publish reports;

Fourth, sets the membership of the Commission to include the Librarian of Congress plus 14 members appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate;

Fifth, appropriates $500,000 for fiscal year 1970, and $750,000 for fiscal 1971 and each succeeding fiscal year.

DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES SERVICES AND FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1970—H.R. 14237, S. 2846, PUBLIC LAW 91–517

This act assists the States in providing comprehensive services to persons affected by mental retardation and other developmental diseases. The law:

First, amends the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act of 1963 to provide grants for planning, provision of services, and construction and operation of facilities for persons with developmental disabilities;

Second, authorizes appropriations of $60 million in fiscal year 1971, $105 million in fiscal 1972 and $130 million in fiscal 1973 for these purposes;

Third, defines developmental disability as a disability attributable to mental retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, or another neurological condition which originates before an individual reaches age 18, which can be expected to continue indefinitely, and which constitutes a substantial handicap to the individual;

Fourth, entitles States to allotments—formula grants—from the sums appropriated, based on population, need for services and facilities, and the financial need of the respective States, and specifies that the allotment for any State should not be less than $100,000 for any fiscal year;

Fifth, authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to use up to 10 percent of authorized appropriations for project grants of national significance to assist the developmentally disabled;

Sixth, establishes a National Advisory Council on Services and Facilities for the Developmentally Disabled to evaluate program effectiveness;

Seventh, requires States to assure that special financial and technical assistance is available for services and facilities for the developmentally disabled in poverty areas;

Eighth, limits Federal funds for any individual construction project to two-thirds of the costs of construction or 90 percent for projects in urban or rural poverty areas;

Ninth, limits the Federal share of funds for planning, administration, and services to 75 percent of costs incurred by a State for fiscal years 1971 and 1972, and to 70 percent for fiscal year 1973; limits the Federal share to 90 percent for fiscal years 1971–72 in urban and rural areas, and to 80 percent in fiscal 1973 for the same areas;

Tenth, establishes a new program of grants for administering and operating demonstration facilities and interdisciplinary training programs for personnel to serve the developmentally disabled, and authorizes for fiscal 1971, $15 million; fiscal 1972, $17 million; and fiscal 1973, $20 million;

Eleventh, authorizes for construction of university-affiliated facilities $20 million annually for fiscal 1971–73; and

Twelfth, permits a State to consolidate grant funds functionally either within the State or by interstate pooling of allotments.

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1970—H.R. 14252, PUBLIC LAW 91–527

Public Law 91–527—H.R. 14252—authorizes funds for 3 years for drug abuse education programs in order to educate the public on the problems of drug abuse and to provide for the training of personnel. It is hoped that this legislation will assist greatly in alleviating a serious social problem which affects many Americans. The law:

First, authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to local educational agencies and other private and nonprofit organizations for community information programs on drug abuse. Grants may be used to develop curriculums, disseminate educational materials, provide training programs for teachers and law enforcement officials, and offer community education programs to parents and others;

Second, authorizes $5 million in fiscal year 1971, $10 million in fiscal 1972, and $14 million in fiscal 1973 for drug abuse education programs;

Third, authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to public or private nonprofit agencies for community-oriented education projects on drug abuse; and

Fourth, authorizes $5 million in fiscal year 1971, $10 million in fiscal 1972, and $14 million in fiscal 1973 for community education projects.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION AMENDMENTS OF 1970—S. 3318, H.R. 19363, PUBLIC LAW 91–600

Public Law 91–600—S. 3318, H.R. 19363—extends for 5 years the programs carried out under the Library Services and Construction Act. Its purpose is also to simplify and strengthen Federal, State, and local administration of library programs.

The Library Services and Construction Act has benefited 85,000,000 people to date. Over 1,500 library facilities have been established, enlarged, or remodeled, and, with Federal and local funds, over 45 million books and other library materials have been acquired.

In addition to continuing the program of grants to the States for library services and library construction, the law:

First, authorizes for fiscal 1972, $207 million, and continues in subsequent years to make modest annual increases through fiscal 1976, when the authorization is $252,350,000;

Second, increases the minimum allotment to the States from $35,000 to $200,000, with remainder allotted on the basis of population, under the program of grants to the States for library services;

Third, includes explicit authority for library service programs for the disadvantaged, requiring that the annual State plans specifically outline the program designed to assure that priority will be given projects serving urban and rural areas with high concentrations of low-income families;

Fourth, increases the basic minimum State allotment under the program of grants to States for public library construction from $20,000 to $100,000; and

Fifth, continues the program for interlibrary cooperation, and raises the Federal share from 50 to 100 percent.

EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT OF 1970—H.R. 19466

On December 21, 1970, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 19446, to provide funds for school districts in the process of desegregating or trying to overcome racial imbalance. The bill was not, however, passed by the other body.

Mr. Speaker, as can be seen, our record of accomplishment in education during the two sessions of the 91st Congress testifies again to our continuing commitment to provide a superior education to all American children and to adults seeking to further or complete their education.

ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Speaker, in the environmental protection field, Congress has moved decisively and on its own initiative toward molding strong environmental standards and pollution controls.

Congress, in 1969, enacted the National Environmental Quality Act, one of the most important and far-reaching environmental and conservation measures acted upon by Congress in recent years. Public Law 91–190 authorizes extensive studies, surveys, and research relating to ecological systems, natural resources, and the general quality of the environment.

Title II established the Council of Environmental Quality Advisers to advise the President on the Nation's environmental problems, to establish a national policy on the environment, and to submit its findings annually. Consequently, on August 10, 1970, the first annual report of the new Council was submitted by the President to Congress. The report discussed a number of problem areas—water and air pollution, weather modification, solid wastes, noise, pesticides, radiation, population, and land use. It contained recommendations, some of which have already been implemented by this Congress.

The Environmental Quality Act of 1969 is a significant starting point in the task of renewing our environment. It makes clear that Congress is responsive to the needs of present and future generations.

In the first session, Congress also approved Public Law 91–15, extending the life of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development until June 30, 1970. Congress in 1966 passed landmark legislation—the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act—which established the Council in the Executive Office of the President. The 1969 act directed the President to appoint a 15-member commission to undertake a comprehensive study of marine programs and to recommend a plan for coordinating existing Government activities for a national ocean program. A total of $1.2 million was authorized for fiscal year 1972.

Also in the first session, the Great Plains Land Conservation Act of 1956 was extended for 10 years, and authorizations totaling $300 million for contracts through December 31, 1981, were approved—Public Law 91–118. The Federal saline water conversion program was extended through fiscal year 1972 with authorizations of $26 million. Public Law 91–43 also provided for a 10-percent limit on the fund transfer between the various sections of the act.

Congressional approval of H.R. 11363 prohibited the importation into the United States of any endangered species which the Secretary of the Interior determines is threatened with extinction on a worldwide basis. Amending and supporting the Endangered Species Act of the 89th Congress, Public Law 91–135 makes it unlawful for anyone to knowingly put into interstate or foreign commerce any such species captured contrary to Federal, State, or foreign law.

As the Nation is placing more and more priority on the preservation of the quality of the environment, Congress has been acting to curb the pollution of our air, water, and land resources and to take the necessary steps to reclaim and improve the environmental quality of those areas which have been degraded. So, final mention is in order, Mr. Speaker, of congressional enactment in the first session of amendments to the Air Quality Act of 1967, extending for 1 year research grants totaling $45 million for studies in air pollution resulting from fuel combustion.

CLEAN AIR AMENDMENTS OF 1973—H.R. 17255, PUBLIC LAW 91–604

During the second session Congress took an important step to shape the Clean Air Act into probably the strongest air pollution control bill ever considered by Congress. H.R. 17255 authorizes a $1.1 billion, 3-year extension of the Clean Air Act, for research and aid to the States, providing a new authority for the establishment of nationwide air-pollution standards. States are required over the next 4 to 6 years to establish and enforce clean air programs to meet the national standards. The Attorney General is also empowered, if the States fail to act, to bring suit seeking abatement of pollution, with penalties up to $10,000 per day.

The new act more than doubles Federal funds to fight air pollution and authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to undertake major research efforts concerning fuels and vehicles and the effects of air and noise pollution. The Secretary is also required to formulate national ambient air pollution standards and to complete the designation of air quality control regions across the Nation. A new category of extremely hazardous pollutants, to be banned entirely, was established.

As reported by the House-Senate conference, H.R. 17255 imposes an absolute deadline of January 1, 1976, for auto industry production of a virtually pollution-free engine. The compromise measure provides that the final deadline could only be extended by an act of Congress. Under the final provision, the auto industry must come up with an engine by January 1, 1975, that will reduce emissions of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon by 90 percent from the maximum 1970 permissible levels. The Administrator the Environmental Protection Agency is empowered to grant a 1-year extension, but after that no new cars may be sold which fail to meet the new standards, unless Congress otherwise provides. A similar deadline, applicable January 1, 1976, with a 1-year extension possible from the EPA, would apply to oxides of nitrogen, another major pollutant from autos.

This legislation also establishes Federal controls on pollutants from aircraft. Under the act, the new Environmental Protection Agency has been given the power to set limits on emissions of pollutants from aircraft and to set standards banning use of aircraft fuels dangerous to public health. The Federal Aviation Administration is authorized to enforce SPA standards. If the Federal Government does not act either to approve or ban the use of specified fuels or additives, such as lead, any State is authorized to put their own ban into effect.

Other key provisions of the Clean Air Act of 1970 require major new factories and powerplants and similar stationary sources of pollution to install the best available cleanup devices; permit citizens' suits for enforcement—including suits to compel enforcement by lax administrators; and provide $25,000 fines and 1-year imprisonment as a first penalty for knowing violations.

WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT—H.R. 4148, PUBLIC LAW 91–224

Congress has moved on another important front in the effort to improve environmental quality with the enactment of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970. Public Law 91–224, cleared early in the second session, is landmark legislation in that it firmly establishes legal requirements for cleaning up our Nation's waterways. A national policy of water pollution control was formulated in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 which stated that it was the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in controlling water pollution and to support and aid technical research to perfect methods of treatment of industrial wastes. Subsequent legislation in 1956 and 1965 made permanent the national water pollution control program begun in 1948 and established the Water Pollution Control Administration and procedures for determining and enforcing water quality standards. During the last 2 years, Congress has introduced and approved legislation that strengthens its national water pollution control policy in establishing new procedures for industry, for the control of marine sanitation, for removal of oil from navigable waters, and for expanded waste treatment works.

The Water Quality Act of 1970, provides for research relating to the discharge of so-called hazardous substances into streams and for enforcement procedures which extend to Federal agencies and Federal licenses, such as urban renewal projects, and powerplants licensed by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Federal Power Commission. Any applicant for a Federal permit or license to construct or operate any facility which may result in any discharge into the navigable waters of the United States must now provide certification from the State in which the discharge originates that such facilities or related activities can be expected to comply with applicable water quality standards. The act further provides for the control of oil and other sea-carried pollutants, sewage from vessels, acids and other pollutants from mines, and pollution from any federally operated source. It also provides for research grants and a scholarship program for students for programs instituted by the Secretary of the Interior.

Public Law 91–224 authorizes the executive branch to determine by regulation what quantities of oil may be discharged without violating the act, and to designate those discharges, other than oil, which constitute dangerous substances.

Penalties have been provided for failure to give proper notification of knowing discharge of oil in violation of restrictions. The Government is authorized to act to remove oil, if not properly done by the responsible owner or operator. The act further provides for a national contingency plan for removal of oil, and provides, in the event a marine disaster has created a substantial threat of a pollution hazard, for removal of the threat.

Barring an act of nature, war, U.S. Government negligence, or an act or omission by a third party, liability to owners or operators for a vessel discharge is not to exceed $100 per gross ton or $14 million, whichever is less. For an onshore or offshore facility liability is a maximum $8 million, unless a discharge results from willful negligence or misconduct, for which full liability may be assessed.

Provisions are also included for pollution control of the Great Lakes, Alaska village demonstration projects, and cooperation by all Federal agencies in the control of pollution.

Title II establishes the Office of Environmental Quality and authorizes it to provide the professional and administrative staff and support for the Council on Environmental Quality, established by Public Law 91–190. The Office is authorized to assist Federal agencies and departments in appraising the effectiveness of existing and proposed facilities, programs, policies, and activities of the Federal Government which affect environmental quality; to review existing systems for predicting environmental changes; and to assist in coordinating agencies and departments involved in environmental preservation.

To finance these programs Public Law 91–224 authorizes an appropriation of $348 million for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY EDUCATION ACT—H.R. 18260, PUBLIC LAW 91–516

During the second session Congress enacted the Environmental Quality Education Act establishing a new program of grants for environmental education in the Office of Education. For this purpose $45 million was authorized for fiscal 1971 through fiscal 1973 for curriculum development, teacher training, establishment of community education programs, support for State and local educational agencies for elementary and secondary school programs, preparation and distribution of materials suitable for the mass media, and planning of outdoor ecological study centers. Public Law 91–516 stipulates that the Federal share of the cost of these programs is not to exceed 80 percent for the first year, 60 percent for the second year and 40 percent for the third year. A program of small grants for civic groups and other public and private organizations was established for the purpose of conducting courses and conferences for interested adults and community groups.

The U.S. Commissioner of Education is authorized to establish educational programs to create in the Nation an understanding of Federal policies and support of activities designed to enhance environmental quality and to maintain ecological balance. An Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality Education was established to aid in implementation of such programs and to render technical services to educational agencies and organizations which are now authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any Federal, public, or private agency.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE—H.R. 19576

The second principal recommendation of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources was for establishment of an advisory committee to serve as the link between the Federal Government and State and local governments, private industry, and the scientific and academic community.

Based upon the Commission's recommendations, the House approved in December 1970 the establishment of a National Advisory Committee on the Oceans and Atmosphere, responsible for monitoring the progress of the Nation's efforts in the fields of marine and atmospheric science, and for advising the Secretary of Commerce with respect to the proposed programs of the committee. The committee, whose 21 members are appointed by the President for staggered 3-year terms, would be required to report annually to the President and Congress. The Senate, however, did not pass this bill.

NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE AND PROGRAM ACT EXTENSION—H.R. 11766, PUBLIC LAW 91–349

Another bill, H.R. 11766, which Congress passed, and the President approved July 23, 1970, amends the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966 to extend programs through fiscal 1973, authorizing $20 million for fiscal 1971, $25 million for fiscal 1972 and $30 million for fiscal 1973. The sea grant program, presently administered by the National Science Foundation, provides support through full-scale institutional grants, grants for individual research projects, and through a third category called "coherent" area support for institutions seeking assistance for studies and research work.

In 1969 there were eight full-scale laboratories receiving sea grant institutional support. Three new institutional grants were made during 1970. In addition, one planning grant, two coherent projects, eight educational, 15 research projects, and one travel grant were funded. The sea grant program brings industry and the Federal Government into cooperative planning. In view of the campaign against abuse of the environment, the sea grant, with its emphasis on environmental protection, is a valuable service to the Nation.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1117

The House has given further evidence of its concern for the numerous interrelated environmental problems the Nation faces in its approval of House Joint Resolution 1117, establishing a Joint Committee on the Environment. To be composed of 11 Members of the Senate and 11 Members of the House, this body would be a nonlegislative committee charged with the following functions: first, to make a continuing study of the character and extent of environmental change; second, to study methods, including financial and technical assistance, to foster harmonious relations between man and nature; third, to develop policies that would encourage maximum private investment in environmental improvement; and fourth, to review any recommendation made by the President

relating to environmental policy—including the environmental report required to be submitted pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 91–190.

The Senate passed an amended version of House Joint Resolution 1117 and agreed to a conference December 15, 1970. Unfortunately, final action on this bill could not be completed prior to adjournment. It is hoped the 92d Congress will consider this matter early in the year.

RESOURCE RECOVERY ACT OF 1970—H.R. 11833, PUBLIC LAW 91–512

After a year of study the House and Senate completed action on H.R. 11833, the Resource Recovery Act of 1970, authorizing a 3-year, $462.75 million extension of Federal solid waste disposal programs. The bill was rewritten in conference, with the conferees incorporating major provisions from both House and Senate versions. The conference agreement gave greater emphasis than existing Federal programs to recycling and recovery of materials and energy from solid waste. Most Federal programs up to this time had been concerned only with the disposal of solid wastes.

Public Law 91–512 establishes major research programs and sets up a program of demonstration and construction grants for innovative solid waste disposal systems serving a variety of different types of communities. It also establishes a 2-year, $2 million study by a new National Commission on Materials Policy. Under the act, the authority of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is expanded through the promotion of research on health and welfare effects of waste, operation, and financing of solid waste disposal programs, reduction of the amount of waste, development and application of better methods of collecting and disposing of solid waste and of processing and recovering materials and energy from solid wastes and components of solid waste. The Secretary must report annually to the President and Congress. The act authorizes planning grants of up to two-thirds of the cost for single municipalities, and three-quarters of the cost for other areas, for making surveys of solid waste problems, preparing solid waste disposal plans, developing proposals for pilot projects, and planning programs for collecting and processing abandoned vehicle bulks.

Public Law 91–512 also authorizes grants to public agencies for demonstration of resource recovery systems or construction of innovative solid waste disposal facilities. The Federal share of demonstration grants is to be 75 percent with the Federal share of construction grants to be 50 percent if the project serves only a single municipality but 75 percent in other cases. Federal funds are to be used only for design and construction, in addition to first-year operation and maintenance costs in the case of demonstration grants. Not more than 15 percent of annual authorization may be granted to any one State.

Grants are authorized for public agencies, education institutions, or any other organizations which train personnel to work in solid waste programs. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is to formulate guidelines for solid waste recovery, collection, separation, and disposal systems, as well as model codes and ordinances.

ENVIRONMENTAL DATA SYSTEM—H.R. 17436

At this time, as at no other time, there are numerous and diverse studies, programs, and projects generating data on the environment. Too often the decisionmakers in Government, industry, and public interests organizations do not have available to them adequate information, or knowledge of consequences in the management of natural resources, for maximum productivity with minimum environmental degradation. In December, the House took a positive step toward a consolidation of all Government-held information relating to the environment when it approved establishment of the National Environmental Data System within the executive branch under the aegis of the Council on Environmental Quality. The Senate, however, did not complete action on this bill.

GEOTHERMAL STEAM ACT OF 1970—S. 368; PUBLIC LAW 91–581

In our search for a clean source of power, which will not pollute the atmosphere, Congress has recognized the potential of geothermal energy. The Nation has a potentially enormous geothermal power resource underlying public lands. It can be developed and used in the public interest. Nature has provided us with what may someday be a vital source of electrical power, that has as yet not been fully tapped. We do not know at the moment what share of our energy it could supply, nor how dependable a source it would be, but a broad search is underway to discover geothermal sources in all parts of the world. The United States has just begun consideration of the use of geothermal steam, and for the past 10 years the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has conscientiously endeavored to put to use this valuable asset of geothermal steam.

Under the provisions of the newly enacted Geothermal Steam Act of 1970, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into leasing arrangements with private organizations for the development of these geothermal resources. The leases will be subject to competive bidding and will result in a small but potentially significant source of new Federal revenue. In addition, the Government will receive a royalty on the value of steam or other form of energy produced. While the companies who will be doing the bidding on the leases hope to produce steam for the generation of electric power, the utilization of geothermal brine for distillation of fresh water could be an added bonus.

Equally important, geothermal power production is extraordinarily desirable in this environment-conscious day and age. This is clean power—power produced in a closed, uncontaminated, and uncontaminating system. It is estimated by the Interior Department that the Nation's potential sources of geothermal steam underlie 1,350,000 acres of federally owned land in Western States. S. 368 spells out rules for granting geothermal steam leases on these lands.

Soon, perhaps in five years, many areas of the United States may be receiving electricity and fresh water produced from geothermal energy. Both will be cheap and clean. But before that a large store of fundamental scientific knowledge will have to be gathered and studied. The Geothermal Steam Act opens the door, placing the United States finally in a position to utilize these valuable natural resources to the benefit the public and the environment.

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT AMENDMENTS—H.R. 18679; PUBLIC LAW 91-560

Congress, in December, cleared H.R. 18679, an omnibus bill amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The first section of the measure eliminates from the Atomic Energy Act the provisions which required the AEC to find a "practical value" before licensing a production facility for commercial or industrial purposes, thus making it easier for AEC to issue licenses for nuclear facilities. It also requires the Justice Department to conduct an antitrust review for any applicant who wishes to construct or operate a facility. The review could not take more than 180 days, and the Attorney General would be required to submit his opinion to the Commission. If the Attorney General found there might be antitrust violations involved, the AEC must hold hearings on the matter. The final ruling of whether or not antitrust violations exist would be made by the AEC.

PUBLIC LAND UTILIZATION PROGRAM—S. 3598, PUBLIC LAW 91–343

The absence of a rational land use policy continues to be a major cause of destruction associated with the random and scattered development of society today. The danger that exists is not that the present patterns of growth will consume all the Nation's land, but that population centers will become so ill-planned and so spread out as to destroy their livability. In July Congress, cognizant of the pressing threats, passed the Land Utilization Program Act, Public Law 91–343, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization.

The thrust of this measure is to authorize the Secretary to bear an equitable portion of the costs of executing waterbased fish and wildlife or recreational projects developed under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. Cost-sharing would be limited to water-based developments, but in no event would more than one-half of the cost of land rights and basic facilities be borne. To be eligible for cost sharing a project must be part of an approved statewide plan. There must be no other avenue of Federal assistance available, and only one such project for each 75,000 acres in a development area. At present Federal assistance is limited to planning assistance and loans, while grants are not authorized for installation assistance. Currently there are 55 projects in the operational stage and 13 in the planning stage, with 47 additional areas that have

already requested planning assistance. Public Law 91–343 will make possible programs to meet these demands, while aiding local communities to develop recreational lands, which in turn will provide a source of economic growth to the communities involved. Program measures will continue to include improved processing and marketing facilities, new and expanded industries, vocational training, tourist developments, and other actions designed to strengthen the rural economy.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATIONS FUND ACT AMENDMENTS—S. 1708; PUBLIC LAW 91–485

Congress approved legislation making more money available to State and local governments for the development of outdoor recreation. Public Law 91–485 amends the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to authorize the transfer through donation or sale of surplus Federal property to local and State governments for parks and recreational purposes.

The 1965 act authorized a Federal program to expand outdoor recreation facilities by permitting the Secretary of the Interior to assist States financially in expanding outdoor recreation programs and by enabling Federal agencies to acquire land for that purpose. As of December 1968 surplus Federal lands were located in 48 States, as well as the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, with much of this land well suited for park and recreational development. Although present law has provided State and local governments with a 50-percent discount for acquisition of land for recreational purposes, the present surplus property laws have not been as effective as desired, particularly in urban areas where the need is greatest.

The provisions of Public Law 91–485 provide a means to better meet a part of this demand without requiring the appropriation of new funds and without requiring the use of condemnation authority. The provisions of S. 1708 also provide a means whereby surplus Federal lands which are suitable for recreation may continue to be retained in public ownership for public use and enjoyment.

Congress gave its consent to an increased level of authorizations to the fund ($300 million as compared to an original $200 million). Revenue for the fund is to continue to come from entrance and user fees, Federal motorboat fuel taxes, and revenue from the sale of surplus real and related personal property.

NATIONAL RECREATION AREAS—H.R. 12870, PUBLIC LAW 91–475; S. 621, H.R. 9306, PUBLIC LAW 91–424; AND H.R. 18776, PUBLIC LAW 91–479

Congress approved the establishment of several conservation-recreation areas during the second session.

One of the more notable is the establishment of the King Range National Conservation Area in California—H.R. 12870. The conservation area would comprise about 44,500 acres of rugged chiefly undeveloped land along the westernmost bulge of California's Pacific coast. The act would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to purchase or exchange the acreage not already owned by the Federal Government for other Federal holdings and authorizes $1.5 million for acquisition and $1.5 million for acquisition and $3.5 million for improvements.

In September 1970 Congress approved the creating of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore on Lake Superior in northern Wisconsin and authorized $9.25 million for land acquisition and development of the park—S. 621.

In October 1970 the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore was established on Lake Michigan, authorizing $38.5 milion for the acquisition and development of 60,748 acres—H.R. 18776.

WILDERNESS AREAS ESTABLISHMENT—S. 3014; PUBLIC LAW 91–504

In October Congress cleared S. 3017, designating 23 new wilderness areas in 12 States. These wilderness areas total 201,212 acres, including national parks, national monuments, wildlife refuges, national forests, and other lands already owned by the Federal Government.

Established in 1964, the National Wilderness Preservation System is designed to preserve substantial land areas of the Nation in a wild, unspoiled condition. In 1969, 158,197 acres were added to the system. The 201,212 acres added by the 1970 legislation comprised the fourth addition to the system.

This land is to be safeguarded permanently against commercial use, such as cutting of timber, extensive livestock grazing, and construction of buildings and highways. Recreational facilities that would mar the wilderness character of the landscape also were forbidden.

MINES AND MINERALS POLICY ACT—S. 719; PUBLIC LAW 91–631

This session, Congress, recognizing the need for a national mining and minerals policy to guide both the Federal Government and private industry, passed S. 719 which approves the encouragement of the development of an economically sound and stable domestic mining and minerals policy, and the orderly and economic development of domestic mineral resources and reserves.

S. 719 will foster and encourage private enterprise in mining, mineral, and metallurgical research, including the use and recycling of scrap, and the study and development of methods for the disposal, control, and reclamation of mineral waste products, and the reclamation of mined lands, so as to lessen any adverse impact of mineral extraction and processing on the physical environment.

The Secretary of the Interior is directed to carry out the provisions of the act and to report annually on the state of our mining and minerals industry, analyzing trends in the utilization and depletion of mineral resources. As a final responsibility the Secretary is charged with the duty of making necessary legislative recommendations to carry out Government policy objectives.

There appears to be little argument about the need for a broad national policy to guide the Federal Government and private industry with respect to the country's long-range minerals' position. The country requires a sound mineral base, whether viewed from peacetime needs or for mobilization in times of emergency. Our future well-being and national security are directly tied to the supply and availability of minerals.

S. 719 is a major step in the right direction to foster improvement in all aspects of the industry. This legislation will focus attention on the industry while requiring long-range planning and the formulation of long-range objectives.

OMNIBUS RIVER AND HARBOR ACT—H.R. 19877

Late in the session Congress approved H.R. 19877, the Omnibus River and Harbor Act of 1970. H.R. 19877 is another move forward in the extension of the Federal river and harbor program, which has produced the best system of navigable harbors and waterways possessed by any nation in the world.

Since Congress initiated the program in 1824, considerable sums of money have been appropriated for improving and maintaining the Nation's navigable waterways. These improved waterways carry commerce and have made possible free, easy, and unobstructed interstate commerce, and have more than justified the Federal expenditure.

H.R. 19877 authorizes 11 navigation projects—estimated Federal cost: $153,354,000—and 20 flood control projects—estimated Federal cost: $407,301,200. It expands a comprehensive river basin plan previously approved by Congress while providing means for protecting the environment. Section 107 authorizes the Secretary of the Army to conduct a survey of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway to determine the feasibility of extending the navigation season. Section 111 provides for construction of contained, spoil-disposal facilities in the Great Lakes in order to eliminate pollution associated with disposal of contaminated, dredged spoil. This section provides that in any case where the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency determines that dredged spoil from an area within an authorized Federal navigation project is significantly polluted, and the Secretary of the Army thereafter determines that dredged spoil disposal facilities are available for the disposition of such spoil, the open water disposal of such dredged spoil is to be discontinued. The Secretary of the Army is then authorized to construct contained, spoil-disposal facilities as soon as practicable.

FEDERAL AID TO FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION—H.R. 12475, PUBLIC LAW 91–503

This Congress has passed a series of important bills aimed directly at improving of fish and wildlife. Public Law 91–503, approved October 23, 1970, revises the Federal Aid to Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act by making numerous administrative changes in both fish and wildlife preservation programs.

Public Law 91–503 encourages comprehensive planning by State fish and game departments and authorizes alternative use of comprehensive long-range plans rather than plans made on a project-to-project basis, as presently required. It also amends the wildlife program by applying certain firearms excise taxes directly to the wildlife restoration funds,

and by giving States the option of using up to half their shares of the fund for hunter safety programs or for regular wildlife restoration programs. The protection, conservation, and management of these resources are financed largely from State hunting and fishing license fees.

Since Congress, in 1937, enacted the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, more than $355 million has been made available to State fish and game departments for wildlife projects through fiscal 1969. Since that date over 1,800 wildlife management areas have been established, and wildlife program research activities have been greatly expanded. Existing management areas and resources must be increased in productivity and size even more to accommodate anticipated additional recreation and hunting pressures. Efforts must be made to identify new species of game in order to relieve hunting pressure on overharvested species. This Act provides for expanded management and research programs, while organizing agencies in State and local governments for a concerted long-range planning effort. A significant advantage of long-range planning will be the promotion of a more efficient use of Federal aid funds and revenue from State license fees.

WATER BANK ACT OF 1970—H.R. 15770, PUBLIC LAW 91–559

In another major effort to protect the Nation's wildlife, Congress approved the Water Bank Act of 1970 to protect nesting and breeding areas for migratory waterfowl. Each year untold areas of valuable waterfowl habitat are lost. These lands are rapidly disappearing because of the accelerated pace in which marshes and swamps are being ditched dredged, drained, filled, paved, and polluted in order to meet the demands of modern civilization. These enroachments are caused by the constant need for more agricultural lands, industrial sites, urban housing developments, roads, and more airports.

H.R. 15770 provides owners and operators of wetlands essential to migratory waterfowl an economic alternative to drainage of those lands by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to enter into 10-year renewable contracts with them to preserve waterfowl nesting and breeding areas.

HUNTING OF WILDLIFE FROM AIRCRAFT, PROHIBITION—H.R. 15188

In related action, the House passed legislation to put an end to one of the most unsportsmanlike practices known to mankind—hunting of fish and wildlife from aircraft. The bill, however, was not passed by the other body.

H.R. 15188 would have amended the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to provide a criminal penalty for the shooting or harassment of birds, fish, and other animals from aircraft. While many States have enacted laws to regulate hunting from aircraft, H.R. 15188 would have supplemented State laws in this regard. H.R. 15188 not only provided penalties for those actually shooting at wildlife, but also made it unlawful for anyone to knowingly participate in the use of an aircraft for such a purpose. Violators would be subject to a fine of $5,000, or 1 year imprisonment, or both.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS—S. 1076, PUBLIC LAW 91–378

In June the House passed S. 1076 establishing a 3-year pilot program, the Youth Conservation Corps, to employ 3,000 youths aged 16 through 18 in summer jobs in the Interior and Agriculture Departments. In an effort to help meet the need for summer jobs for young people, S. 1076, Public Law 91–378, provides them an opportunity to learn about conservation and natural resources while at the same time providing labor for needed conservation work. A total of $3,500,000 was authorized to be appropriated for the program for fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973.

INTERNATIONAL BIOLOGICAL PROGRAM—H.J. RES. 589, PUBLIC LAW 91–438

During the second session, Congress passed a resolution expressing the support of Congress—and to urge the support of Federal departments and agencies, as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private—for the international biological program.

In 1965 the United States elected to participate in the international biological program with 49 other nations. The program which has been under development since 1959 has a broad objective of providing information about the changing relations between man and his environment. The focus of the program is to maintain continuous study of organic production on the land, in fresh water, and in the seas, so that adequate estimates may be made of the potential yield of new as well as existing natural resources and to conduct a worldwide study of human adaptability to the changing conditions of the environment. The United States' effort is also concerned with the study of population increase and the impact of these increases on the world's ecological system. At present many Federal departments and agencies are involved in the IBP.

Public Law 91–438 authorizes Federal departments and agencies to obligate or transfer money from appropriate funds, and to provide such other support as may be appropriate, to the program. While the resolution provides no new authorization or specific appropriation, it is designed to assure that agencies will be able to support the international biological program.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the 91st Congress we passed a number of significant measures in the fields of foreign affairs and national defense.

On December 2, 1969, House Resolution 613 was approved, endorsing President Nixon's efforts to secure a just peace in Vietnam. Public Law 91–14, provided for U.S. participation, in the amount of $480 million over 3 years, in the International Development Association. We also passed Public Law 91–124, which changed the method of selecting draftees under our Selective Service System through the institution of a draft lottery. The Export Control Act was modified in Public Law 91–184 to make clear the intent of Congress with respect to trading with Communist-bloc countries, and to extend export control authority through June 30, 1971.

Additional legislation was forthcoming during our 1970 session.

VIETNAM PRISONERS OF WAR—HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 454

On February 18, 1970, the Senate agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 454. This resolution, passed by the House on December 15, 1969, calls for the humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam and the Vietcong. The Committee on Foreign Affairs had determined that there was "clear evidence that the North Vietnamese, despite their ratification of the 1949 Geneva Convention on prisoners of war, have violated virtually every provision of that agreement" with regard to American captives. The committee therefore recommended the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 454, which declared "that the Congress strongly protests the treatment of U.S. servicemen held prisoner by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam." House Concurrent Resolution 454 calls on these parties to comply with the 1949 Geneva Convention. It approves efforts by the United States, the United Nations, the International Red Cross, and others, to obtain humane treatment for and release of U.S. prisoners of war. At the very least, it is hoped that this expression of concern will exert pressure on Hanoi to divulge all the names of U.S. prisoners which it holds.

SOUTHEAST ASIA STUDY COMMITTEE—HOUSE RESOLUTION 976

On June 8, 1970, the House approved House Resolution 976 which created a select committee to study firsthand the recent developments in Southeast Asia and report its findings to the House within 45 days. The report of this bipartisan 12-member committee presented an evaluation of the progress of the Vietnamization program. It recommended that U.S. troop withdrawals continue "at least as fast as now scheduled." The committee concluded that "the weakest link in South Vietnam's chain is its economy." A "fairly large level" of economic aid will be required to revive the economy, according to the report, and "other industrial nations, particularly Japan, should be given every possible encouragement to share this burden."

AMENDMENTS TO THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT—S. 3302, H.R. 17880, PUBLIC LAW 91–379

Public Law 91–379, amending the Defense Production Act of 1950, was approved on August 15, 1970. This measure extends the provisions of the Defense Production Act to June 30, 1972, to assure defense production in case of emergency and to guarantee loans to contractors. The law also adds space-related firms to the list of industries covered by the original act, and provides for the creation, by a board headed by the Comptroller General, of uniform cost-accounting standards for negotiated defense, atomic energy, space, and other stockpiling or military assistance contracts.

In addition, in an effort to help solve the economic crisis facing the country,

this measure also granted the President authority, if he sees fit, until February 28, 1971, and subsequently extended to March 31, 1971, to freeze prices, rents, wages, and salaries at levels not lower than those prevailing on May 25, 1970.

WAR POWERS OF CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1355

On November 16, 1970 the House approved House Joint Resolution 1355. This measure, concerning the warmaking powers of Congress and the President, was prompted, like others, by the Cambodian incursion in May 1970. It reaffirms the right of Congress, under the Constitution, to declare war and states that it is the sense of Congress that whenever feasible the President should seek appropriate consultation with the Congress before involving U.S. troops in armed conflict. In any case in which the President commits U.S. military forces to armed conflict or commits combat-equipped forces to foreign territory or substantially enlarges military forces already located in another nation "without specific prior authorization by the Congress," the resolution would place upon the President a requirement to promptly report his actions to the Congress.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT ACT—H.R. 19567

H.R. 19567, a bill which would continue until the close of June 30, 1971 the President's authority to carry out and enforce certain provisions of the International Coffee Agreement of 1968, was passed by the House on December 18, 1970, and by the Senate in the closing days of the session.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT—H.R. 15628, S. 3429

H.R. 15628, amending the Foreign Military Sales Act of 1968, was passed by the House on March 24, 1970. The House version authorized appropriations of $275 million for fiscal 1970 and $272.5 million for each of fiscal years 1971 and 1972 for the military sales program. It also established a foreign military sales credit ceiling of $350 million in fiscal year 1970 and $385 million in each of fiscal years 1971 and 1972. Another provision of the bill restricted sales of arms to Latin American and African states by continuing presently applicable ceilings. Other provisions of the measure broadened the existing prohibition on sales and guarantees to dictators and expressed the sense of Congress that the President should negotiate with the Soviet Union and other powers a limitation on arms shipments to the Middle East for the sake of stability in that area and that the President should initiate multilateral discussions with major powers on the control of worldwide trade in armaments in the interest of international peace and security.

It is no secret that this measure became in the Senate a forum for extensive debate on the Cambodian incursion, leading ultimately to passage of the Cooper-Church amendment.

As passed by the Senate, H.R. 15628, would authorize appropriations of $250 million in each of fiscal years 1970 and 1971 for foreign military sales. It would establish a foreign military sales credit ceiling of $300 million in each of fiscal years 1970 and 1971. All these amounts were smaller than those in the House-passed version.

The Cooper-Church amendment to H.R. 15628 would prohibit funds for most U.S. operations in Cambodia unless specifically authorized by law.

Among numerous other amendments added to the bill by the Senate is one which would, upon adjournment of the second session of the 91st Congress, repeal the Tonkin Gulf Resolution—Public Law 88–408—which is generally regarded as the congressional authority under which U.S. military operations in Vietnam were greatly expanded.

TRADE ACT OF 1970—H.R. 18970

The Trade Act of 1970 was passed by the House on November 19, 1970. In the Senate, similar provisions to those in H.R. 18970 were attached to the social security bill—H.R. 17550—but eventually dropped. The Congress did not take final action on this measure.

As passed by the House, H.R. 18970 would have extended to July 1, 1973, the powers of the President to enter into new trade agreements and to reduce certain duties. It would also have increased his authority to act against import restrictions or other acts of foreign countries which unreasonably burden or discriminate against U.S. commerce.

The Trade Act Would have, in addition, "liberalized" those criteria for determining that a domestic industry is suffering serious injury from increased imports, with the Tariff Commission responsible for making such decisions. Criteria for making a determination would have included, first, the proportion of the market taken over by the imported item; second, the effect the sale of an imported item was having on American industry profits and man-hours worked or wages paid; and third, a comparison of selling prices.

H.R. 18970 also would have provided that individual firms or workers injured by import competition could petition for assistance directly to the President, rather than to the Tariff Commission.

The Trade Act would have provided that total quantities of certain wool and synthetic textiles and nonrubber footwear would be limited by category and country of origin beginning in 1971. The extent of the limitations was specified, but the President was to have the authority to exempt imports from such limitations, first, if it was determined that they were not "disrupting" the U.S. market, or second, if an exemption was in the national interest, or, third, if the domestic supply were insufficient to meet demand at reasonable prices.

The quotas set forth in H.R. 18970 were to terminate July 1, 1976, unless the President found that an extension for periods not to exceed 5 years would have been in the national interest. In addition, the President was authorized to negotiate voluntary agreements under which imports of textiles and footwear would be voluntarily controlled.

The Trade Act, in another provision would have authorized the President to repeal the American selling price—ASP—system for calculating duties on certain articles if he found that the interest of the United States was reciprocally met by concessions granted by other countries.

H.R. 18970 included an export incentive. Certain companies, whose gross receipts and assets are substantially export-related, would have benefited from new tax benefits.

H.R. 18970 would have retracted from the President authority to adjust imports by the imposition or increase of any duty.

Another provision involved dumping—the selling of a product on our market at prices substantially below the price prevailing for the exporter's own market. H.R. 18970 would have required the Secretary of the Treasury to make a determination on a dumping charge within 4 months of its being brought to his attention.

H.R. 18970 included still other provisions. One would have increased the number of commissioners on the Tariff Commission from six to seven. Another authorized the President to suspend trade with any nation which permitted uncontrolled trafficking in certain narcotic drugs.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. Speaker, we have been especially active in passing legislation during the 91st Congress which affects the structure and functions of the Federal Government. In the first session President Nixon asked that the Executive Reorganization Act be extended to allow him to transmit to Congress plans for reorganization of departments and agencies within the executive branch. The plans would take effect after 60 days unless either House passed a resolution of disapproval during that time. Through Public Law 91–5, the reorganization authority was extended through April 1, 1971.

Public Law 91–1, signed by President Johnson January 17, 1969, provided for an increase in the President's salary from $100,000 to $200,000. This was the first raise in Presidential income since 1948.

Public Law 91–93, signed on October 20, 1969, increased employee and agency retirement fund contributions to 7 percent for civil service employees, to 7½ percent for congressional employees, and to 8 percent for Members of Congress. All contribution increases became effective in January 1970. Annuities are now computed on a high-3-year average, rather than a high-5-year average. Moreover, service credit for unused sick leave will be included in annuity computations. Formerly, no credit was given for unused sick leave.

To offset a 6-month lag between cost-of-living surveys and annuity adjustments, the act added 1 percent to the actual change in the consumer price index in granting each increase in the cost of living. The act also granted a 5-percent increase to over 900,000 retirees on the rolls at the time of approval; extended it to anyone retiring by October 31, 1969; and provided for several increases in survivor benefits.

Public Law 91–114 increased the maximum daily travel allowance from $16 to

$25 for employees traveling on official business inside the continental United States. Other sections increase the maximum reimbursement for trip expenses inside the continental United States from $30 to $40 a day, and increase travel allowances for trips outside the United States.

Public Law 91–129 established a 12-member Commission on Government Procurement to study and investigate the present statutes affecting Government procurement; the procurement policies, rules, regulations, procedures, and practices followed by the executive branch; and the organizations responsible for procurement, to determine the extent to which they are promoting efficiency, economy, and effectiveness in Government procurement. The Commission is directed to make a report to Congress, by November 26, 1971, of its findings and its recommendations.

During the first session, the House of Representatives passed and sent to the Senate H.R. 12884, revising certain laws governing the decennial census. Citizens would be required to answer census questions, but instead of the present jail penalties for noncompliance, a provision for fines would be substituted. Other provisions of the bill included a congressional review of the content of the census questionnaires after the 1970 census and additional safeguards against improper disclosure of census information. The Senate took no action on the bill.

In the second session additional legislation in the area of general government was enacted.

ACTION ON REORGANIZATION PLANS

Reorganization Plan No. 1, submitted by President Nixon, proposed the establishment of an Office of Telecommunications Policy in the Executive Office of the President. The Director of Telecommunications Management in the Office of Emergency Preparedness would be abolished. Provisions of this plan became effective April 15, 1970.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 proposed the establishment of a Cabinet-level Domestic Council in the Executive Office of the President, in order to coordinate policy formulations in the domestic area. The plan also proposed that the Bureau of the Budget be redesignated the Office of Management and Budget and placed emphasis on assessing the extent to which programs are actually achieving their intended results. House Resolution 960, to disapprove the plan, was rejected by the House on May 13, 1970, and the plan became effective July 1.

Reorganization Plan No. 3 proposed the establishment of a new independent Environmental Protection Agency to coordinate programs dealing with air, water, and land pollution. A number of functions would be transferred to this agency from the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Council on Environmental Quality. This plan became effective October 3, 1970.

Reorganization Plan No. 4 proposed the establishment of a new National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce to coordinate policy in exploration of the oceans and atmospheric problems, and in utilization of marine resources. A number of functions were transferred to this agency from the Departments of Defense, Interior, and Transportation, from the National Science Foundation, and from the Environmental Science Services Administration, which was previously in Commerce. This plan became effective on October 3, 1970.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY ACT OF 1970—H.R. 16844, S. 3690, PUBLIC LAW 91–231

Approved April 15, 1970, Public Law 91–231 provided a 6-percent pay increase to civil service, military, foreign service, and other Federal employees, except those whose rates of pay are set administratively. With certain exceptions, congressional employees were granted the same increase. The act also provided an increase in compensation for judges in the District of Columbia, and an increase from $80,000 to $96,000 a year in staff allowances for former Presidents.

POSTAL REORGANIZATION AND SALARY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1970—H.R. 17070, PUBLIC LAW 91–375

A major postal reform was accomplished by Public Law 91–375, which established a U.S. Postal Service as an independent agency of the Federal Government. An 11-member Board of Governors will direct and establish all powers of the Postal Service. Nine of the members are to be appointed by the President, with no more than five coming from the same political party. These nine members will appoint the Postmaster General, and he, together with the nine members, will choose the Deputy Postmaster General. The Board is to have broad authority over postage rates, rates of pay, postal services, and postal finances.

Collective bargaining is authorized for wages, hours, grievance procedures, seniority rights, promotions, and other matters, with final and binding arbitration to resolve impasses in place of the right to strike. An 8-percent salary increase was granted for postal employees, to be effective retroactively to the first day of the first pay period that began on or after April 16, 1970. Moreover, the Postal Service is required to negotiate a new wage schedule that will compress from 21 to 8 years the time necessary for an employee to reach the maximum pay level.

An independent 5-member Postal Rate Commission is established to recommend postal rates and classifications on request of the Board. These recommendations are subject to veto by a unanimous decision of the Board of Governors or by the courts. The Postal Service is empowered to raise up to $10 billion through the issuance of bonds. Through this new U.S. Postal Service, we expect a more efficient, modern, and effective method of handling the Nation's mail.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 681, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Interest in electoral college reform culminated in the passage by the House of Representatives of House Joint Resolution 681. The vote, taken on September 18, 1969, was 339 to 70. As an amendment to the Constitution, the resolution proposed that the electoral college be abolished and replaced by the direct popular election of the President and the Vice President. Election would require at least 40 percent of the popular vote. In the event that a presidential ticket fell short of 40 percent, a runoff election would be held between the two tickets winning the greatest number of votes.

House Joint Resolution 681 also included a provision to permit Congress to establish uniform national residence requirements for voting in presidential elections, while leaving to the States the power to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding presidential elections. Moreover, the resolution would authorize Congress to provide a method for filling vacancies caused by the death, resignation, or inability of presidential candidates before the election, and a method for filling postelection vacancies caused by the death of either the President-elect or the Vice-President-elect. Regrettably, the proposed constitutional amendment did not clear the other body.

HEALTH BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—S. 1772, H.R. 16968, PUBLIC LAW 91–418

Contributions by the Federal Government to its employees' health insurance programs began in 1960. The Government's share represented 38 percent of the cost, but, because of increases in insurance costs, by 1970 the Federal share had dropped to 24 percent. In Public Law 91–418, approved September 25, 1970, the Government increased its contribution to 40 percent of the average of the high-option premiums charged by the six largest plans. The adjustment becomes effective at the beginning of the first applicable pay period which commences after December 31, 1970. Health coverage was also extended to noncitizens actively employed by the United States in the Panama Canal Zone.

SURVIVOR ANNUITIES—S. 437

The purpose of S. 437 is to remove certain inequities in existing law. At present, a retiree who accepts a reduced annuity in order to provide a survivor benefit for hs wife, cannot apply that survivor annuity to a subsequent spouse. Under this bill, the new spouse would qualify if married to the retiree at least 2 years immediately before the retiree's death. The bill also extends to widowers of deceased female employees the same treatment accorded widows of male employees; provides credit for periods of separation due to injuries incurred while performing official service; allows a retiree, unmarried at the time of retirement, to provide survivor benefits for a subsequent spouse, upon election to accept a reduced annuity; and increases the annual allowance for former Presidents from $25,000 to $60,000.

FEDERAL PAY COMPARABILITY ACT OF 1970—H.R. 13000

On October 14, 1969, the House passed H.R. 13000 to establish procedures that would give Federal employees annual pay raises. The object was to adjust Government employees' salaries each year to

keep Federal pay levels comparable to wage scales in private industry. Under the provisions of the bill, a Federal Service Salary Commission would make studies and set up salary schedules to meet the principle of pay comparability. Employees covered by this procedure include the GS grades, the postal field service, the foreign service, and certain pay schedules in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

The Senate passed the bill on December 12, 1969, with amendments, but no conference action was forthcoming for almost a year due to the enactment of other pay legislation. On December 9, 1970, a conference report on H.R. 13000 was filed. The conference substitute eliminated reference to the postal field service employees, since they were subject to the provisions of the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970. The conference substitute also directed the President to make the annual adjustments in pay rates, whereas under the House bill adjustments in pay rates would become effective only after Congress approved adjustments recommended by the Commission. In the event of a national emergency or economic conditions affecting the general welfare, the conference substitute permitted the President to submit an alternate plan to Congress. The plan would take effect within a prescribed time period unless disapproved by a resolution from either House of Congress.

PAY SYSTEM FOR PREVAILING RATE EMPLOYEES—H.R. 17809

On September 9, 1970, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 17809 to establish a revised system for fixing and adjusting pay rates of Federal employees who are paid at prevailing wage rates for comparable work in their areas of employment. These employees did not receive the 6-percent pay increase under Public Law 91-231. Instead, prevailing-wage or "wage board" employees have their pay rates adjusted under Civil Service Commission regulations. The purpose of H.R. 17809 is to establish by law the system which is now being run administratively.

The Senate passed the bill on September 10, 1970, with some amendments. The 8-percent pay raise granted by the House for wage-board workers employed at the highest pay level was reduced to 4 percent. The Senate also deleted pay differentials for work done in the late evening or early morning hours, and eliminated a fifth pay step which had been adopted by the House.

The conference report submitted on December 15, 1970, supported the Senate version and it was agreed to by the Senate and the House. However, in a most unfortunate action, the President saw fit to veto this important measure.

OBSCENE MAIL—H.R. 11032 AND H.R. 15693

On two separate occasions in 1970 the House of Representatives passed legislation to restrict the flow of obscene material in the mails. H.R. 11032, to prohibit the use of interstate facilities—including the mails—to transport unsolicited obscene advertising, passed the House on August 3. H.R. 15693 would exclude from the mails sexually oriented materials offered for sale to minors. The bill also permitted persons not wishing to receive such matters to file statements with the Postmaster General. Neither of these bills was enacted.

IMPROVING JUDICIAL MACHINERY—H.R. 17901

On October 5, 1970, the House passed H.R. 17901 to authorize the creation of Federal circuit executives for the 11 Federal courts of appeals. Duties of the circuit executives would include administration of the personnel system, maintenance of property control, and administration of the budget of the court of appeals of the circuit. By relieving the chief judge of the court of appeals of day-to-day managerial chores, the circuit executive will contribute to improved efficiency in our Federal appellate system.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT—H.R. 17654, PUBLIC LAW 91-510

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970—H.R. 17654—passed the House on September 17, 1970, by a vote of 326 to 19. The Senate took up the House-passed bill rather than its own measure, S. 844, and passed it on October 6, 1970, by a 59 to 5 vote. The President signed the measure into law on October 26, 1970.

H.R. 17654 evolved from the work of a Special Subcommittee on Legislative Reorganization of the House Rules Committee. That committee began its work on April 22, 1969, reviewing the many reform proposals introduced in the House, holding extensive public hearings, and drafting the final version of the bill H.R. 17654 for floor consideration. It should be noted that the foundation for the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 was laid in 1965 when the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was established.

The major features of H.R. 17654 included the following: Title I extensively revised committee and floor procedures in both Houses, and altered committee jurisdictions and limited committee assignments in the Senate. One of the most significant amendments added to title I was that requiring the recording of teller votes in the Committee of the Whole.

Title II of H.R. 17654 provides Congress with additional fiscal and budgetary information, analytical support, and new procedures. Title III expands committee staff resources and provides for increased research and analytical assistance from the Legislative Reference Service, renamed the Congressional Research Service by the act. Title IV establishes a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations and a Congressional Office of Placement and Office Management, and deals with a number of housekeeping matters including the Capitol guides, pages, and a recess for Congress. The effect of all the provisions should be to increase the ability of Congress to grapple with and resolve the major problems facing the Nation.

FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES ACT—S. 2108, PUBLIC LAW 91-572

Late in the second session Congress cleared S. 2108, to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand, improve, and better coordinate the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government. Under this bill, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will:

First, enter into agreements with public and nonprofit private entities to assist in the establishment of voluntary family planning services;

Second, make formula grants to State health authorities to assist in planning, establishing, maintaining, coordinating, and evaluating family planning services;

Third, enter into agreements providing for the training of personnel for providing family planning services;

Fourth, enter into agreements for research and research training relating to family planning and population; and

Fifth, enter into agreements to assist in developing and making available family planning and population growth information.

In addition, the legislation establishes an Office of Population Affairs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

POLITICAL BROADCASTING ACT—S. 3637, H.R. 18434

In September 1970, Congress enacted S. 3637, the Political Broadcasting Act. Its major provisions were:

First. Repeal of the "equal time" provision of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, applying to presidential and vice presidential candidates. Such repeal would permit broadcasters to present debates and appearances by major party presidential and vice presidential candidates without having to give equal time to fringe and splinter party candidates.

Second. Restriction of fees made by broadcasting stations for political broadcasts by candidates to the lowest unit commercial charged by a station for the same amount of time in the same broadcast time period.

Third. Radio-TV spending limitations for candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, U.S. Senator, and Representative, and Governor and Lieutenant Governor in general elections at 7 cents per vote in the preceding election or $20,000 whichever is greater.

Fourth. Spending limitations at one-half the above amount for primary elections, except for persons seeking nomination as candidates for President and Vice President who are exempted from primary spending limitations.

Fifth. An option permitting the States to impose similar restrictions on spending by candidates for other State and local offices.

Sixth. Requirement that candidates authorize any broadcast made by or on their behalf; stations to keep those certifications on record.

Seventh. The provisions of S. 3637 were to take effect 30 days after enactment.

In a time of a rapid increase in campaign spending, this bill represented an important first step toward curtailing spending in political campaigns. For example, on the basis of the 1968 election, the 7-cents formula would limit spending by presidential and vice presidential candidates in 1972 to $5.1 million. In the 1968 campaign, candidates Richard M. Nixon and SPIRO T. AGNEW spent $12,-

697,953 on television and radio appearances, and candidates HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and EDMUND S. MUSKIE spent $6,143,277, according to figures compiled by the Federal Communications Commission.

On October 11, 1970, however, President Nixon vetoed S. 3637. The President listed a number of reasons for his veto, among them the fact that the bill discriminated against the broadcast media and that it could not effectively accomplish its purpose of limiting campaign spending. The Senate, on November 13, 1970, failed to override his veto.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE BY REPRESENTATIVES—HOUSE RESOLUTION 796

On May 26, 1970, the House passed House Resolution 796. It amends House Rule 44 in two major respects: first, by requiring Members, officers, principal assistants to Members, and professional staff members of committees to report publicly first, the sources of all honorariums of $300 or more, and second, the identity of creditors to whom $10,000 or more is owed for 90 days or longer without any specific security or collateral for the loan.

The resolution further requires specification of honoraria amounts and of unsecured debt amounts in required sealed reports, which are opened only if the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct so votes.

COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS OF LOBBYING AND CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS—HOUSE RESOLUTION 1031

On July 8, 1970 the House passed House Resolution 1031, amending clause 19 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to lobbying practices and political campaign contributions affecting the House of Representatives. House Resolution 1031 placed jurisdiction over these areas in the Committee on Official Standards.

The resolution authorized the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to study and investigate lobbying practices and the raising, reporting, and use of campaign contributions by candidates for the House.

Subsequently, the committee held hearings on both subjects and is to be commended for its response to these new duties.

COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE—S. 27001, H.R. 15165, PUBLIC LAW 91213

Public Law 91–213, signed into law March 16, 1970, creates a bipartisan Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. Its purpose: to inform the American public about the problems associated with overpopulation.

Overpopulation is a problem of magnitude not only in the United States but the world as well. The Congress passed S. 2701 so that we might have expert information regarding the consequences of population growth. To this end, the Commission will study:

First, the probable course of population growth, internal migration, and related demographic developments between now and the year 2000;

Second, the resources in the public sector of the economy that will be required to deal with the anticipated growth in population;

Third, the ways in which population growth may affect the activities of Federal, State, and local government;

Fourth, the impact of population growth on environmental pollution and on the depletion of natural resources; and

Fifth, the various means appropriate to the ethical values and principles of this society by which our Nation can achieve a population level properly suited for its environmental natural resources, and other needs.

As a result of this measure, a comprehensive approach has been institutionalized to identify and anticipate the implications of population growth, thereby helping the Congress to shape policies to deal with this problem.

ADDITIONAL FEDERAL JUDGES—S. 952, PUBLIC LAW 91–272

Public Law 91–272, passed in May of 1970, authorized 58 additional permanent district judgeships.

S. 952 embodied the recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States, stated first by that organization in September 1968 and reiterated in March and September 1969. In 1968, after an extensive study of the caseload situation in our Federal district courts, the Judicial Conference recommended the creation of additional district judges throughout the United States. Two committees of the Judicial Conference, the Committee on Judicial Statistics and the Committee on Court Administration, studied the nature and extent of case accumulation, the rate of attrition in case backlog, the trends in case filings, as well as a comprehensive weighted caseload per judgeship.

For many districts the statistics document delay and congestion in our courts. These statistics show there has been a qualitative as well as a quantitative change in the business of many district courts. Not only is there a greater flow of litigation, but there has also been an increase in the number of cases raising complex issues which place heavier demands on the time of each trial judge.

This measure provides for additional judges to man our courts and relieve the crowded dockets. Where there is a paucity of judges, justice is often delayed and sometimes denied as a result. This measure will help provide the means to dispense equal and impartial justice to all.

UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AND LAND ACQUISITION POLICIES ACT—S. 1, H.R. 4578, PUBLIC LAW 91–646

The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Land Acquisition Act—S. 1—will establish a uniform policy with respect to relocation assistance and land acquisition involving Federal and federally assisted programs.

There are currently more than 50 Federal programs which result in the condemning of land and, quite literally, the bulldozing of hundreds of thousands of people from their homes and businesses annually. Often these people are low-income earners. Many are elderly. Some are small farmers or small businessmen. In most cases, their entire life and economic and social well-being have centered around the property or neighborhoods from which they are uprooted. This legislation, which cleared Congress late in the session, seeks to help those people who are displaced.

Nearly all federally assisted programs have differing, if not conflicting, provisions for helping the displaced. They range from no assistance in some cases to liberal benefits and protection in others. This lack of uniformity is a source of irritation and confusion. It projects an unfortunate image of the Federal Government at both the State and local level.

This act will establish a uniform policy for Federal agencies, and State and local recipients of Federal funds in dealing with property owners and others displaced by Federal or federally aided land acquisitions. Specifically, S. 1 does this in two ways: First, it provides for relocation payments, advisory assistance, assurance of available relocation housing, and economic adjustments and other assistance to owners, tenants, and others displaced; and second, it establishes policies to guide all Federal and federally assisted agencies in negotiations with owners for the acquisition of real property for public use.

THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PERSONNEL ACT OF 1970—S. 11

The House, December 21, 1970, passed the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970, a measure adopted by the Senate on October 29, 1969. This measure is designed to strengthen the quality of administration of State and local governments by assisting them to deal more effectively with their personnel management, recruiting and training problems, particularly in the administrative, technical, and professional categories. There is widespread concern among officials of government at all levels over the shortage of personnel properly qualified to carry the responsibilities of modern-day government.

The Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 is designed to meet some of these needs, including:

First. Strengthening intergovernmental cooperation and administration of grant-in-aid programs;

Second. Extending State and local merit systems to additional programs financed by Federal funds;

Third. Providing grants for improvement of State and local personnel administration;

Fourth. Authorizing Federal assistance in training State and local employees;

Fifth. Providing grants to State and local government for the training of employees;

Sixth. Authorizing interstate compacts for personnel and training activities; and

Seventh. Facilitating the interchange of Federal, State, and local personnel.

With the great growth in governmental activity at the State and local level, as witness the 150 percent increase in employees at this level from 1946 to 1967, and the 543 percent increase in State and to local governments during this same time span, there is a growing concern about program administration,

and with it a concern for improvement of public personnel management. S. 11 is a major effort to accomplish that improvement. It will help both State and local governments improve their capacity to solve the major problems of the day by helping them obtain enough qualified personnel.

HEALTH AND HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. Speaker, in the first session of the 91st Congress, Congress passed a law of great concern to miners and mine operators. Public Law 91–173 grants authority to the Secretary of the Interior to establish mandatory health and safety standards in underground mines as well as authority to carry on health and safety research and programs for education and training of miners and mine operators in accident control. It also provided for payment of benefits for death or total disability due to pneumoconiosis or black lung.

Public Law 91–56, passed in the first session of the 91st Congress, amended title XIX of the Social Security Act which provides grants to the States for medical assistance programs. The amendments prohibit the States from reducing cash payments to public assistance recipients at the time they adopt their medicaid assistance plans and extend from 1975 to 1979 the period by which all States must have in operation a comprehensive medical assistance program in order to qualify for Federal funds. The last amendment provided that any reduction in scope or extent of care and services provided under a State's medical assistance plan must be approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare before it can be put into operation.

Public Law 91–54 approved in August 1969 adds to the Contract Work Hours Standards Act a provision assuring that any laborer, mechanic, or other employee shall not be required to work in any place or under any working conditions which are unsanitary, hazardous, or dangerous to a man's health or safety. However, only construction financed wholly or in part by Federal loans or grants is covered by this law. This law aims to reduce the number of persons killed in construction work accidents because of hazardous and unsafe working conditions.

During the second session, the Congress has proven equally active in the field of health.

PUBLIC HEALTH CIGARETTE SMOKING ACT—H.R. 6543, PUBLIC LAW 91–222

On April 2, 1970, the President signed into law H.R. 6543, the Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act. Public Law 91–222 continues the requirement for annual reports on smoking and health to Congress from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and from the Federal Trade Commission on cigarette labeling and cigarette advertising. In addition the law strengthens the warning label which must appear on all cigarette packages. It will now read:

Warning: the Surgeon General Has Determined That Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous to Your Health.

Finally, this law bans all cigarette advertising on radio and television after January 1, 1971.

MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION AND MODERNIZATION AMENDMENTS—H.R. 11102, PUBLIC LAW 91–296

Congress also passed over the President's veto H.R. 11102 extending for 5 years the present program of grants for construction and modernization of hospitals and other health facilities. President Nixon had vetoed the bill because he felt it was too expensive. This was the first veto to be overridden in 10 years. Public Law 91–296 authorized $2.79 billion over the next 3 years for grants and loans to construct and modernize hospitals and other health facilities. The law also contains an amendment requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make an annual report on the health consequences of marihuana.

As the costs and needs of health care increase, the demands for more and better equipped hospitals and health facilities accelerates. In order to ensure that our citizens receive the best of medical care available, the 91st Congress overrode the President's veto. More than 3,800 communities have received Hill-Burton grants over the past 22 years.

MEDICARE, MEDICAID, SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1970—H.R. 17550

On May 21, 1970, the House passed H.R. 17550, the Social Security Amendments Act of 1970 which, inter alia, made numerous changes in the operations of medicare, medicaid, and maternal and child health programs. The House attempted to correct some of the abuses in the medicare and medicaid programs. It authorized the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set reasonable limits on the cost of health care funded by the medicare program. Such limits are to be based on the costs of services in any particular geographical region. H.R. 17550 also limits physician fees, basing increases only on justifiable higher costs. It also increases the Federal matching percentages for certain outpatient services provided under medicaid but decreases the matching percentages for more expensive long-term institutional care.

This measure did not become law. However, it is anticipated that social security legislation and welfare reform will receive the highest priority in the 92d Congress.

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING AND SERVICES ACT OF 1970—H.R. 18110

On August 11, 1970, the House passed H.R. 18110, the Comprehensive Health Planning and Service Act of 1970, to extend and expand for 3 years authorization for Public Health Service grants for health services and facilities research and development. The bill did not become law. In 1966 Congress enacted the partnership for health program authorizing comprehensive planning and coordination of public health services among States and regions. This program is a key effort at reshaping the Nation's $60 billion-a-year health industry into a better organized, more efficient and effective system.

COMMUNICABLE DISEASE CONTROL AND VACCINATION ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1970—S. 2264, PUBLIC LAW 91–464

Public Law 91–464, the Communicable Disease Control Amendments of 1970 signed by the President on October 16, 1970, authorizes a 3-year program of project grants to continue a Federal commitment to the States and local governments for assistance in eliminating diseases that are controllable by vaccination and other developing communicable disease control programs. Contagious diseases such as tuberculosis, venereal disease, and measles pose a threat to the health not only of the afflicted individual but to a whole community. This law aims to prevent the spread of such communicable diseases as tuberculosis, venereal diseases, rubella, measles, poliomyelitis, diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough, and Rh disease, by granting funds to the States to purchase vaccines and develop other programs to control communicable diseases.

GRANTS TO SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH—S. 2809, PUBLIC LAW 91–208

President Nixon approved Public Law 91–208 on March 12, 1970, extending until June 30, 1975, authorizations to make formula grants to schools of public health for the training of both additional and better-prepared public health personnel. As our Nation has become more urbanized the need for public health services has increased. Our Government has recognized these needs and this law helps to meet them by encouraging more people to go into the public health field. At present there is a critical shortage of public health personnel. This legislation will help to alleviate that shortage by providing Federal funds for scholarships and traineeships for those going into public health.

HEALTH TRAINING IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1970—S. 3586, H.R. 13100, PUBLIC LAW 91–519

On November 2, 1970, the President approved Public Law 91–519, the Health Training Improvement Act of 1970. This law expands and extends for 3 years the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966 which authorized four types of assistance to training centers: First, grants for construction of teaching facilities; second, grants for improvement of education programs; third, grants for advanced traineeships for preparation of teachers, supervisors, administrators, or allied health specialists; and fourth, grants for development of new methods.

The persons benefited by this act assist doctors, dentists, and other medical professionals in their work. As the need for doctors, dentists, and so forth, has increased so has the need for assistants. In addition health assistants free doctors from many tasks enabling them to perform more essential tasks. Allied health personnel covered by this legislation include dental hygienists, medical technologists, medical illustrators, dieticians, therapists, and medical record librarians.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTER AMENDMENTS OF 1970—S. 2523, PUBLIC LAW 91–211

The Community Mental Health Center Amendments of 1970 was signed into law on March 13, 1970, Public Law 91–211. This law extends for 3 years, through fiscal 1973, the Federal program of construction of community mental health centers and authorizes new aid for mentally ill children and for centers in

poverty areas. Federal matching grants for the operation of mental health centers is extended to 8 years. The legislation authorizes appropriations of $30 million in fiscal 1971, $35 million in fiscal 1972, and $40 million in fiscal 1973 for construction, operation and special project grants to construct and staff facilities for rehabilitation of alcoholics and narcotics addicts. The Federal share of construction costs and staffing was authorized up to 90 percent in poverty areas; less in other areas. The aim of this legislation is to encourage local community mental health centers to provide a comprehensive program to meet the needs of our emotionally disturbed children and adolescents as well as to come to terms with the ever pressing problems of alcoholism and drug addiction in our communities.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT FOR MIGRANT FARM WORKERS—H.R. 14733, PUBLIC LAW 91–209

Public Law 91–209, the Public Health Service Act for migrant farm workers was approved March 12, 1970. This law extends for 3 years the Public Health Service Act program of assistance for health services for domestic migrant agricultural workers. Migrant and seasonal workers have long been ignored. Their health needs are among the greatest of any socioeconomic group in our country and they are among the least able to afford adequate medical care. Statistics indicate that migrants' use of medical care is about one-seventh, their use of dental care about one-twentieth, and their use of hospital care about one-fourth that of the general population. The Migrant Health Act attempts to make health care accessible to migrants through helping States and communities adapt their health care system to the migrant's unique situation and need. More than 117 single or multicounty grant-assisted projects now serve migrants in 35 States.

FAMILY PRACTICE OF MEDICINE ACT OF 1970—S. 3418, H.R. 19599

The Family Practice of Medicine Act of 1970 provides $225 million for a 3-year period to assist hospitals and medical schools in relieving the shortage of doctors in general practice. The purpose of this legislation is to reverse the trend toward specialization and encourage more persons to take up family medicine. In order to do this, this legislation provides grants to public and private nonprofit medical schools to establish a separate department to teach family medicine and to construct any necessary facilities in connection with this goal. Students who are in need and who are interested in specializing in family medicine would receive financial assistance. Last, this law authorizes funds for the study of malnutrition in the medical schools. The President vetoed this bill.

HEART DISEASE, STROKE, CANCER, AND KIDNEY AMENDMENTS OF 1970—H.R. 17570, PUBLIC LAW 91–515

On October 30, 1970, the President signed Public Law 91–515, the Heart Disease, Stroke, Cancer, and Kidney Amendments of 1970. This law amends title IX of the Public Health Service Act to encourage and assist in the establishment of regional cooperative arrangements among medical schools, research institutions, and hospitals for research and training, and for demonstrations of patient care in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and kidney disease through grants and contracts. In addition the law will aid the medical profession and medical institutions through cooperative arrangements, the opportunity of making available to their patients the latest devices in the prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation of these diseases. Title II provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall develop plans for health care systems or a national health insurance program designed adequately to meet the health needs of our citizens. The plans are to be completed and submitted to Congress no later than September 30, 1971. Title II also provides for grants to the various States for comprehensive State health planning, for areawide health planning, and for comprehensive public health services. Finally title VI provides for the creation of a National Advisory Council on Comprehensive Health Planning Programs.

MEDICAL LIBRARY ASSISTANCE—H.R. 11702, PUBLIC LAW 91-212

The Medical Library Assistance Act, Public Law 91–212, approved March 13, 1970, extends for 3 years the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 which provides financial assistance for the construction of medical library facilities; training of biomedical librarians and information specialists for service and research; projects of research development, and demonstrations in medical library science and health communications; and development of regional medical library programs. The need to improve and expand the facilities and resources, manpower, and technological assistance for processing health science information is widely known. This legislation will help to alleviate these shortages and provide for expanded knowledge and research in our medical sphere.

COMPREHENSIVE ALCOHOLISM PREVENTION, TREATMENT, AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1970—H.R. 18874, S. 3835

On December 19, the Senate passed and sent to the White House S. 3835—H.R. 18874—the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970.

The passage of this important legislation represents a step forward for the estimated 9 million Americans who suffer from this disease. Dr. Roger Egeberg, Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs testified before House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that alcoholism and alcohol abuse are among the Nation's most important health problems.

The bill provides for the establishment of a National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism within the National Institute for Mental Health to administer the programs established by this act.

The new law requires the Civil Service Commission to establish alcoholism prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs for Federal civilian employees and to guarantee employees with alcoholism the same employment conditions and benefits as persons who are ill from other causes—except for those civil servants in jobs which are classified as "sensitive."

There are authorized by the act grants totaling $300 million over the next 3 years. These grants fall into two categories; formula grants totaling $180 million which will help State governments develop and administer programs for dealing with alcohol abuse and alcoholism; and project grants totaling $120 million which will be channelled to public and private nonprofit groups and organizations to help finance specific alcoholism prevention and treatment projects.

In order to determine how effective these programs are, the act provides for the establishment of an independent National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism to insure outside evaluation of Federal efforts in this area.

Finally the act requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to issue a report to Congress, similar to the earlier report on cigarette smoking, which would set out the health consequences of using alcoholic beverages.

EMERGENCY HEALTH PERSONNEL ACT OF 1970—S. 4106, H.R. 19860

On December 18, 1970, the House passed H.R. 19860, to authorize the assignment of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service to areas with critical medical shortages. Subsequently this passage was vacated, and S. 4106, a similar Senate-passed bill, was passed in lieu after being amended to contain the language of the House bill as passed.

The purpose of S. 4106 is to provide for the use of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service to provide health services to persons living in communities and areas of the United States where health personnel and services are inadequate.

S. 4106 amends part C of title III of the Public Health Service Act to provide for establishment of a National Advisory Council on Health Manpower Shortage Areas, consisting of 15 members, to consult with and make recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and authorization of $10 million for fiscal year 1971, $20 million for fiscal 1972, and $30 million for fiscal 1973.

After receiving a request from a State or local health agency, and certification by State and district medical societies for an area, that health personnel are needed, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines which communities or areas may receive assistance.

Persons receiving services through this program shall be charged at rates prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. If payment for services is authorized under medicare or medicaid, or through other insurance programs, the Secretary is required to collect from such program. Amounts paid for services rendered under the legislation will be deposited in the U.S. Treasury.

The House incorporated an amendment into H.R. 19860, which was included

in the bill as passed, which provides for Federal Government defense if malpractice suits are brought against health personnel.

On December 21, 1970, the Senate agreed to the House amendments to S. 4106, thus clearing the bill for the President.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Public Law 91–152, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969, passed by Congress during the first session of the 91st Congress, contained a 1-year extension of authorizations for existing programs, such as Federal Housing Administration programs, urban renewal, model cities, rent supplements, and public housing. The 1-year authorizations for fiscal 1971 amounted to $4.8 billion, with an additional $75 million a year in subsidies authorized to local housing authorities to enable them to extend public housing to the very poor. The act stipulated that housing tenants shall pay no more than 25 percent of their income for shelter.

In another 1969 action, designed to fight inflation and to provide a boost for small business and housing—the two areas most severely hurt by tight money, Congress passed Public Law 91–151, the Mortgage Credit Act. The act granted the President authority to instruct the Federal Reserve Board to regulate terms, amount, and interest rates on all forms of credit, if he deems it necessary to prevent or control inflation. Public Law 91–151 also extended, until March 22, 1971, the authority of regulatory agencies to establish flexible ceilings on rates paid by financial institutions on time and savings deposits and waived anti-trust regulations, enabling credit institutions to adopt voluntary credit controls comparable to those initiated during the Korean conflict.

Mr. Speaker, Congress passed additional legislation during the second session.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1970—H.R. 19436, S. 4368

On December 18, 1970, Congress cleared H.R. 19436. This covers the many housing and urban development programs of the Federal Government including programs involving mortage finance. Among other things, H.R. 19436 provides for the establishment of a national urban growth policy, to encourage and support proper growth and development in our States, metropolitan areas, cities, counties, and towns, with emphasis upon new community and inner city developments. It also extends and amends laws relating to housing and urban development.

Major provisions extend Federal Housing Administration programs by authorizing new funds through fiscal year 1972. Important among these are the interest subsidy programs under section 235 and section 236 of the National Housing Act. Authorizations are increased by $25 million for each of these programs for fiscal 1971, and by $80 million for fiscal 1972, making a total available authority of $150 million for fiscal year 1971 and $200 million for fiscal 1972. This level of funding should help meet the persistent demand for these funds and keep us on schedule as we move to meet national housing goals.

Other provisions amend and perfect existing FHA laws to make them more effective in carrying out the intent of Congress. The act earmarks 10 percent of subsidy funds under section 235 for use in connection with rehabilitated housing. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to use up to 30 percent of section 235 subsidy funds for existing housing. The Secretary is also authorized to compensate purchasers of section 235 subsidized existing housing for structural defects. Sellers of such property must agree to reimburse the Secretary for such compensation. The Secretary is urged to tighten up his supervision, particularly in connection with limiting eligibility to lower income families who cannot afford to obtain decent homes without benefit of the subsidy.

H.R. 19436 provides new contract authority for public housing, urban renewal, and other housing assistance programs. It also makes certain changes in existing law to improve the administration of these programs. For public housing programs $320 million is authorized for fiscal year 1971 and $225 million for fiscal 1972.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to finance congregate or dormitory housing under public housing and FHA programs, with eligibility limited especially to the elderly, displaced, and handicapped. No more than 10 percent of public housing, section 236, or rent supplement funds are to be used for this purpose.

The act also contains authority to continue the urban renewal program through 1972. The model cities program is authorized an additional $200 million for fiscal year 1972.

Under the open-space land program, $100 million is authorized to provide grants, which requires land to be withheld from development in order to promote desirable patterns of urban growth.

The act consolidates research and technology programs under HUD. It extends the demonstration housing allowance program and authorizes a new program to test methods of arresting housing abandonment. For the next 2 fiscal years $20 million was authorized for each of these programs.

The 1970 HUD bill also contains provisions authorizing the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide crime insurance in each State where a finding is made that such insurance is unavailable or available only at a prohibitive cost. The Secretary is required to conduct a continuing review of the market availability of crime insurance at affordable rates in each of the several States. Upon determining that such insurance is not available in any State, the Secretary is authorized to provide crime insurance in that State on or after August 1, 1971. This lag affords State legislatures a reasonable period of time in the early part of next year to provide for adequate crime insurance programs in order to avoid the Federal Government undertaking such a program.

H.R. 19436 authorizes a new program of urban growth and new community development. A biennial report on urban growth must be transmitted by the President to the Congress. Also established is a greatly expanded program of guarantees, loans, and grants for new community development. In this respect, H.R. 19436 authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide grant assistance to State and local bodies and to developers to plan new community development programs.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 19436 is a beneficial reordering and expansion of the Nation's several housing laws.

EMERGENCY HOME FINANCE ACT OF 1970—S. 3685, H.R. 17495, PUBLIC LAW 91–351

Public Law 91–351 is designed to encourage and expedite the construction of new and the financing of existing homes. Primary emphasis is placed on the expansion of mortgaged credit facilities and the creation of new secondary market facilities to broaden the availability of mortgage credit. The act seeks to attain these ends by: first, authorizing an appropriation of $250 million, to be used by the Federal Home Loan Board, for disbursements to Federal home loan banks for the purpose of providing funds for mortgaged financing, at reduced rates of interest, to home buyers and other borrowers; second, by establishing, both within the Federal National Mortgage Association and within the Federal home loan bank system, new secondary mortgage market facilities to include conventional mortgages; third, by establishing the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, which would be authorized to purchase mortgages on residential property from any Federal home loan bank or any other financial institution which is insured by an agency of the Federal Government; fourth, by increasing the authorization for Government National Mortgage Association—GNMA—special assistance purchases, under terms acceptable to the President, by $1.5 billion immediately; fifth, by subsidizing middle-income mortgages purchased by the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation; and sixth, by extending the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to set maximum interest rates on FHA–VA mortgages.

Other provisions of Public Law 91–351 direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to conduct a joint study of settlement costs in the financing of FHA–VA assisted housing and to prescribe standards governing the amounts of such costs.

EMERGENCY COMMUNITY FACILITIES ACT OF 1970—H.R. 17795, S. 3938, PUBLIC LAW 91–431

Public Law 91–431, which became law without the President's signature, is a major congressional response to findings that many of the Nation's communities are unable to finance the construction of urgently needed public facilties, and that there is an immediate need for such facilities to provide basic safeguards for the health and well-being of our citizens, to check widespread water pollution, and to provide an effective and practical method of combating rising unemploy-

ment. H.R. 17795 continues the monetary authorization for basic water and sewer facilities provided for in title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, while providing for an additional authorization of $1 billion. It extends for 1 year—until October 1, 1971—the time within which a community may qualify for a basic water and sewer facilities grant, even if its program for an areawide system, has not been completed by then. The act provides a total authorization of $1,350,000,000 available through fiscal year 1972.

This act is a prime example of the responsible and responsive manner in which this Congress acted to provide much needed funds for the protection of the Nation's health and environment.

IMMIGRATION

NONIMMIGRANT VISAS—S. 2593, PUBLIC LAW 91–225

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the Members of the House a measure of importance affecting the Nation's immigration procedures.

This measure, Public Law 91–225, amended the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act regarding foreign exchange visitors. It facilitates the temporary admission into the country of Western Hemisphere executive, managerial, and specialist personnel of international organizations. In addition, it expedites entry for persons of distinguished merit and ability and for fiances and fiancees of U.S. citizens. The way in which Public Law 91–225 eases nonimmigrant entry is by excluding officers and employees of Western Hemisphere businesses from the Western Hemisphere immigration quota.

INDIANS

Mr. Speaker, the 91st Congress has enacted more than 40 laws pertaining to the Indian. More than 20 bills were approved to authorize the use of judgments recovered against the United States. Of these, at least two were for compensation, at least 11 for disposition of judgment, and at least nine for the transfer of land.

During the first session Congress approved a joint resolution extending and funding the life of the National Council on Indian Opportunity for 5 years. The pasage of Senate Joint Resolution 121 underlined our recognition of the necessity for a working relationship between the Indian and the Federal Government in the establishment and implementation of Indian policies.

The council, established by Executive order in March 1868, is designed to encourage full use by Indians of Federal programs and to appraise continuously the impact of Federal programs on Indians, whether as individuals or as members of tribes. Its membership consists of the Vice President as chairman and seven Cabinet officers—the Secretaries of Interior; Agriculture; Commerce; Labor; Health, Education, and Welfare; Housing and Urban Development; and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity—in addition to six Indian members appointed by the President for 2-year terms.

The Council's specific functions are to review programs for Indians, to make broad policy recommendations, and to insure that Federal programs reflect the needs and desires of the Indian people. One of the Council's first projects was an investigation of the problems of urban Indians. At present a major independent research organization is engaged in preparing for the Council a detailed study of the experience of two Indian communities in utilizing various Federal programs for Indians. This study will serve as a blueprint for less advanced Indian communities, aiding them in organizing their structure, identifying needed and appropriate Federal assistance programs, applying for those programs, and finally carrying them through to accomplishment.

Originally it was anticipated that the funds and staff necessary for the successful operation of the Council would come through assessment of member departments. However, Public Law 90–479, the Public Works Appropriation Act, contained language making it unlawful for appropriated funds to be used to finance interdepartmental boards, councils, or commissions. This act led to the request for specific congressional authority for the Council to receive appropriations for fiscal year 1970. Senate Joint Resolution 121 provided this funding for the Council, authorizing an amount not to exceed $300,000 annually for the next 5 years.

FHA LOANS TO INDIAN TRIBES—S. 227, PUBLIC LAW 91–229

In the second session action Congress provided authority for the Farmers Home Administration to make loans to Indian tribes for the purchase of land within their reservations. Under Public Law 91–229 any tribe is permitted to mortgage its land as security for such a FHA loan and is permitted to waive immunity from suit without its consent as a part of its loan agreement. Trust land, however, is excepted from a provision that land mortgaged to secure a loan is subject to local taxation. In addition the act provides that apart from making direct loans to Indian tribes the FHA may insure loans made by commercial lending institutions.

GRANTING TRUST TITLE TO LAND OF TAOS PUEBLO INDIANS—H.R. 471, PUBLIC LAW 91–550

Of particular interest was congressional approval of H.R. 471, giving to the Pueblo Indians title to approximately 48,000 acres taken from the tribe in 1906 and incorporated into the Carson National Forest. Previously the groups of Pueblo Indians have only been permitted to use the grounds in the forest housing their religious shrines. Under Public Law 91–550's provisions Pueblo title to the land will be held in trust by the Interior Department. It can be terminated only by Congress. By the conveyance of clear title to the land, the Taos Pueblos have been assured privacy and the means by which to preserve their culture and their sacred Blue Lake.

LABOR

The 91st Congress has seen us, Mr. Speaker, most active in passing legislation beneficial to America's workers.

During the first session two bills of particular note were enacted into law. Public Law 91–53 accelerated Federal unemployment tax collection by providing for its collection in quarterly installments during each taxable year. Public Law 91–169 altered provisions concerning working and off-duty hours of employees engaged in or connected with the movement of trains.

RAILROAD SUPPLEMENTAL ANNUITIES—H.R. 13300, PUBLIC LAW 91–215

During the second session we passed Public Law 91–215 which amended the Railroad Retirement Act to provide supplemental pension annuities overdue to about 60,000 retired railroad workers. It also encouraged retirement at 65 while eliminating supplemental payments for employees who reach age 68 in 1970 yet continue to work into 1971. It also provided an excise tax on railroads beginning April 1, 1970, at a rate calculated by the Railroad Retirement Board, to cover the costs of the supplemental annuities program negotiated in 1966 between the railroads and unions. In addition, this measure makes the annuities program permanent; gives the Railroad Retirement Board authority to borrow from the railroad retirement account enough money to pay pensioners to whom annuities are overdue; and finally, provides a moratorium on program changes until July 1, 1974.

INCREASE IN RAILROAD ANNUITIES—H.R. 15733, PUBLIC LAW 91–377

An increase in railroad annuities took effect when Public Law 91–377 was approved August 12, 1970. This measure increases railroad retirement benefits for some 717,000 persons by an average of 15 percent, but by not more than $50 monthly for a retiree or $25 monthly for his spouse. It is retroactive to January 1, 1970, and will continue until June 30, 1972. The act requires the new increase to be reduced by any amount received by a retiree under a 15-percent increase in social security benefits enacted December 1969. A retiree will, however, receive at least $10 monthly increase under railroad retirement and his spouse $5 monthly regardless of their increased benefits under social security. Survivor annuities are also increased under this law and an independent five-member Commission on Railroad Retirement has been established with a report due by the end of June 1971.

RAILROAD SHOPCRAFT DISPUTE SETTLEMENT ACT—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 190, PUBLIC LAW 91–226

Public Law 91–226 was approved on April 9, 1970. This administration-backed proposal provided for settlement of a labor dispute between railroad carriers and four shopcraft unions—machinists, electricians, boilermakers, and sheetmetal workers—congressional action averted a nationwide strike. The measure ended a 17-month contract dispute. Terms of this settlement were those contained in a memorandum of understanding dated December 4, 1969, and agreed to by all the negotiators for the disputing parties but subsequently ratified by the general membership of only three of the four unions involved.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION—H.R. 14705, PUBLIC LAW 91-373

Public Law 91-373 was approved August 10, 1970, and provides for extension of and improvement in the Federal-State unemployment compensation program. It extends unemployment compensation to about 4.7 million previously uncovered workers and provides extended benefits to all eligible workers during periods of high unemployment. This measure extends program coverage to employers who employ one or more workers in each of 20 weeks or who have quarterly payrolls of $1,500. Unemployment compensation coverage was extended to certain agricultural processing workers and to certain employees of nonprofit organizations and institutions of higher education. This act improves the financing structure of the program by increasing the taxable wage base from $3,000 to $4,200, effective January 1, 1972, and by increasing the Federal part of the tax, effective upon enactment of the law, from 0.4 to 0.5 percent of the covered payroll.

RAILWAY LABOR-MANAGEMENT DISPUTE—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1413, PUBLIC LAW 91-541

Late in the second session Congress acted to avert a nationwide strike against the railroads scheduled for 12:01 a.m. on December 10. On December 9 Congress debated and in the early hours of December 10 passed Public Law 91-541, providing for an 81-day moratorium coupled with a 13½ percent pay increase for the workers. The President signed House Joint Resolution 1413 at 2.10 a.m., December 10.

Despite Congress' 11th-hour efforts, the unions, representing three-fourths of the railroad industry's 600,000 employees, shut down the Nation's rail system but less than 24 hours later, the striking workers returned to their jobs.

Not later than 15 days prior to the moratorium's March 1, 1971, expiration date, the President shall submit to Congress a full and comprehensive report on the progress, if any, of negotiations between the carriers and the unions, along with recommendations for any solution to this dispute that he deems appropriate.

Finally, Public Law 91-541 provides all employees represented a 5 percent pay increase, effective January 1, 1970, and a 32 cents per hour boost, retroactive to November 1, 1970.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT—S. 2193, H.R. 16785, PUBLIC LAW 91-596

Mr. Speaker, the first legislation authorizing comprehensive health and safety standards for all industries cleared conference December 14, 1970.

This act authorizes the Secretary of Labor to establish standards, inspect plants, and initiate enforcement proceedings. Adequate balances are established to protect industry; including judicial review of standards and the vesting of enforcement powers in a three-member independent board appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The protection previously given mine and railroad employees will now be extended to all industrial employees, reducing, it is hoped, job-related deaths and disabling injuries. In the case of dangers caused by new processes, equipment, and materials, or emergency situations, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to ask for court injunctions closing affected plants until standards are met.

There are at least 13 ways in which S. 2913 will insure safer and more healthful working conditions for American workers. These are:

First, by encouraging employers and employees in their efforts to reduce the number of occupational safety and health hazards at their places of employment, and to stimulate employers and employees to institute new and to perfect existing programs for providing safe and healthful working conditions;

Second, by providing that employers and employees have separate but dependent responsibilities and rights with respect to achieving safe working conditions;

Third, by authorizing the Secretary of Labor to set mandatory occupational safety and health standards applicable to businesses affecting interstate commerce; and by creating an Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission for carrying out adjudicatory functions under the act;

Fourth, by building upon advances already made through employer and employee initiative for providing safe and healthful working conditions;

Fifth, by providing for research in the field of occupational safety and health, including the psychological factors involved, and by developing innovative methods, techniques, and approaches for dealing with occupational safety and health problems;

Sixth, by exploring ways to discover latent diseases, establishing causal connections between diseases and work in environmental conditions, and conducting other research relating to health problems, in recognition of the fact that occupational health standards present problems often different from those involved in occupational safety;

Seventh, by providing medical criteria which will assure insofar as practicable that no employee will suffer diminished health, functional capacity, or life expectancy as a result of his work experience;

Eighth, by providing for training programs to increase the number and competence of personnel engaged in the field of occupational safety and health;

Ninth, by providing for the development and promulgation of occupational safety and health standards;

Tenth, by providing an effective enforcement program which shall include a prohibition against giving advance notice of an inspection and sanctions for any individual violating this prohibition;

Eleventh, by encouraging the States to assume the fullest responsibility for the administration and enforcement of their occupational safety and health laws by providing grants to the States to assist in identifying their needs and responsibilities in the area of occupational safety and health, to develop plans in accordance with the provisions of this act, to improve the administration and enforcement of State occupational safety and health laws, and to conduct experimental and demonstration projects in connection therewith;

Twelfth, by providing for appropriate reporting procedures with respect to occupational safety and health which procedures will help achieve the objectives of this act and accurately describe the nature of the occupational safety and health problem;

Thirteenth, by encouraging joint labor-management efforts to reduce injuries and disease arising out of employment.

LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the 91st Congress a select committee to study crime in the United States was created by the House. Seven Members of the House of Representatives, designated by the Speaker, were authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of crime in the United States. In creating this committee, the Congress has taken responsibility for the study of the growing criminal activity in the United States, and for the recommendation of corrective measures. The Select Committee on Crime continues its work under the able direction of Representative CLAUDE PEPPER of Florida.

ORGANIZED CRIME CONTROL ACT—S. 30, PUBLIC LAW 91-452

Additional action has been taken in the second session. Of special importance is the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, passed by the House October 7, 1970, and approved October 15, 1970.

Organized crime derives a major portion of its power through money obtained from such illegal endeavors as syndicated gambling, loan sharking, the theft and fencing of property, the importation and distribution of narcotics and other dangerous drugs, and other forms of exploitation. This money and power are increasingly used to infiltrate and corrupt legitimate business and labor unions and to subvert and corrupt the democratic process, thereby undermining the general national welfare. It is the purpose of this act to seek to eradicate organized crime in the United States by strengthening the legal tools in the evidence-gathering process, by establishing new penal prohibitions, and by providing enhanced sanctions and new remedies to deal with the unlawful activities of those engaged in organized crime.

Public Law 91-452 is comprised of 12 sections, as follows:

Title I provides for the summoning of special grand juries in major metropolitan areas, for the purpose of investigating organized crime activities, and authorizes such juries to issue reports on conclusion of their terms.

Title II repeals all previous witness-immunity laws and authorizes legislative, administrative, and judicial bodies to grant witnesses immunity from prosecution based on their testimony, but not from prosecution for any act mentioned in their testimony.

Title III codifies existing Federal civil contempt procedures designed to deal with recalcitrant witnesses in grand jury and court proceedings, authorizing confinement for civil contempt until com-

pliance is made with the court order—but such confinement is not to exceed 18 months. Witnesses who flee State investigative commissions to avoid giving testimony are hereby made subject to the Federal process. It is herein made a Federal crime to flee across a State line to avoid being served notice to testify.

Title IV authorizes a conviction for perjury based on obviously contradictory statements made under oath—eliminating the rules that there must be direct proof and the testimony of two witnesses in order to obtain a perjury conviction.

Title V authorizes the Attorney General to protect and maintain Federal or State witnesses—and their families—in organized crime cases.

Title VI authorizes the taking of pretrial depositions from Federal Government witnesses in criminal cases, and permits the use of such depositions as evidence in subsequent prosecutions.

Title VII limits to 5 years the period within which Government action to secure evidence can be challenged as illegal, and requires court review of Government records prior to their being disclosed to a defendant who has established that their origin is illegal. The effect of this title is restricted to Federal proceedings and surveillance occurring before June 19, 1968.

Title VIII declares it a crime to plot to obstruct State law, through bribery of governmental officials, in order to facilitate an "illegal gambling business."

Title IX declares it a crime to plot to use income from organized crime to acquire or establish a business engaged in interstate commerce, and authorizes use of forfeiture, antitrust, and special investigative procedures against such crimes.

Title X provides for increased sentences—up to 25 years—for dangerous adult offenders.

Title XI establishes a system of Federal controls over the interstate and foreign commerce of explosives through licensing and permits, while strengthening and expanding the scope of Federal law with regard to the illegal use of explosives.

Title XII establishes, effective January 1, 1972, a National Commission on Individual Rights, to review certain Federal laws and practices and to make a final report to the President and Congress by January 1, 1978.

OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT AMENDMENTS—H.R. 17825

One of the most significant legislative actions of the session was the passage of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act.

H.R. 17825, the House bill, amended the 1968 Crime Control and Safe Streets Act—Public Law 90-351—to authorize vastly increased funds for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA—through fiscal 1973, to streamline the administrative structure of LEAA, to reorder program priorities toward high-crime areas and correctional programs, and to require a greater State role in providing matching funds.

As passed by the House in June of 1970, H.R. 17825 authorized appropriations to LEAA of $650 million in fiscal 1971, $1 billion in fiscal year 1972, and $1.5 billion in fiscal 1973. In addition, it:

First. Abolished the existing three-man board directing LEAA and vested its powers in a single administrator;

Second. Established a new grant program to improve correctional facilities. Under the program, grants may be for up to 75 percent of the cost of any particular project and up to 50 percent of the funds in this category may be granted directly to local or city agencies;

Third. Allocated 25 percent of all law-enforcement funds for correctional programs;

Fourth. Required that all State plans provide for allotment of an adequate share of funds for each project undertaken by a local agency within the LEAA program;

Fifth. Provided that LEAA discretionary grants may, in certain circumstances, be made to cover up to 90 or 100 percent of the costs of a program;

Sixth. Removed all restrictions upon the use of discretionary grants for salaries and made clear that limitations on block grants—one-third—apply to the salaries of police and regular law-enforcement personnel.

Subsequent to House action, the Senate in October passed H.R. 17825, but included as separate titles four bills which the Senate had previously passed. They were:

S. 3650, strengthening Federal laws concerning the illegal use, transportation, or possession of explosives;

S. 2896, banning unauthorized entry into buildings on grounds of temporary residence by the President;

S. 642, making it a Federal crime to assassinate or assault a Member of Congress;

S. 3132, setting forth procedures for appeals by the United States in criminal cases.

Additional Senate amendments to H.R. 17825 included provisions for:

First. Delay until fiscal 1973 in effecting the requirement that 50 percent of non-Federal matching funds for grants be included in a specific appropriation from State or local units;

Second. Stricter sentences for criminals using firearms in committing a Federal crime;

Third. Granting flexibility to the National Wiretapping Commission in filing its report, and in its hearing, subpena and immunity powers;

Fourth. Authorization of LEAA grants to universities to allow students to serve internships with law enforcement agencies; and

Fifth. Establishment of the President's Award for Distinguished Law Enforcement Services.

Conferees reconciled the differences between the House and Senate versions as follows:

First, they authorized appropriations for the current and 2 succeeding fiscal years at levels provided in the Senate version:

$650 million, fiscal 1971; $1.5 billion, fiscal 1972; and $1.75 billion, fiscal 1973.

Second, they authorized a program for the construction, acquisition, and renovation of corrections facilities on the basis of need, not on the basis of population as provided in the House bill. The conference substitute also adopts the principle of the House bill in allotting a portion of future funds for the corrections program.

Third, they required that LEAA approval of State plans be based on an express finding that areas of high crime incidence and high law enforcement activity receive adequate assistance.

Fourth, they required that the States contribute—or "buy in"—one-quarter of the non-Federal share of funding for law enforcement programs of local government. This element in the House bill is retained in the conference substitute but its operable date is deferred until July 1, 1972.

Fifth, they revised the matching ratios with provision for a higher level of Federal contribution up to 75 percent of program costs. Thus, the State or local matching requirements are reduced to 25 percent beginning in the current fiscal year, which should afford immediate and substantial relief to financially hard-pressed State and municipal governments.

Although the House bill authorized Federal expenditures under discretionary grants up to 90 percent of program costs, the conference substitute provides that both block grant funds and discretionary grant funds carry the same matching ratios: that is, 75 Federal, 25 State or local.

Sixth, the conference substitute adopts the Senate version with respect to the three-man board directing LEAA. The House version abolished the three-man board and substituted a single administrator. The Senate amendment which retained the three-member administration vested all administrative responsibility in the administrator who was designated as executive head of the agency. It further provided that all policy determinations should be exercised by the administrator with the concurrence of at least one of the associates. Thus the conference substitute eliminates the requirement of unanimity which has hampered administration.

Seventh, the conference substitute provides for the reallocation of block grant funds as discretionary grants whenever a State has failed to have a plan approved either because it submitted no plan or because the plan it submitted was unacceptable. It also permits reallocation of block grant funds when a State fails to comply with the assurances it has given in its plan, the provisions of the act, or LEAA regulations.

Eighth, the conference substitute also contains a variety of miscellaneous provisions designed to improve the training and educational programs of LEAA. These include: authority to establish and support a training program for State and local prosecuting attorneys and authority to establish law enforcement internships.

In addition, the conference substitute adopts five of the additional titles added in the Senate version:

First, an amendment to the Gun Control Act of 1968 designed to impose stricter sentencing with respect to persons who use a firearm to commit, or

who carry a firearm unlawfully during the commission of, a Federal felony.

Second, an amendment to the Criminal Appeals Act to broaden and clarify the right of the Government to appeal dismissals of criminal cases;

Third, making it a Federal offense to kill, kidnap, or assault any Member of Congress of Member-of-Congress elect.

Fourth, establishing Federal penalties for unauthorized entry into any building or the grounds thereof where the President is or may be temporarily residing;

Fifth, reinstatement of the Wiretap Commission which had been created in 1968 but repealed in the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970.

Conference action deleted three amendments which the Senate had added to H.R. 17825. They were: First, the title establishing a law enforcement group life insurance program; second, the provision establishing a President's Award for Distinguished Law Enforcement Service; and third, the title expanding Federal laws controlling explosives.

COMPREHENSIVE DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT OF 1970—H.R. 18583, PUBLIC LAW 91–513

On October 14, 1970, the House approved H.R. 18583, the Comprehensive Drug Prevention and Control Act of 1970, to provide for expanded programs for rehabilitation, treatment, and drug abuse education; to unify and revise Federal narcotics laws; to revise the entire penalty structure for violations of those laws; and to provide new tools for enforcement.

This act is an appropriate and reasoned response to the growing problem of drug abuse in the United States. Narcotic drug law violations in 1968 were more than four times as great as arrests in 1960. Or, expressed differently, narcotic and marihuana arrests have increased 322 percent since the beginning of the 1960's. A National Institute of Mental Health survey indicates that as many as 50 percent of high school students in certain areas have experimented with marihuana.

Increased drug use inevitably results in a rising illicit drug traffic, both domestic and international. An unknown quantity of the nonmedical and nonprescription drugs, for example, heroin, cocaine, and marihuana, are being continuously smuggled into this country, while at the same time a substantial amount of prescription drugs—stimulants, depressants, and tranquilizers—are being diverted into illegal channels. For example, the National Institute of Mental Health estimates that 50 percent of the over 8 billion annually produced amphetamine pills are diverted into nonmedical channels.

Public Law 91–513, the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, is comprised of four titles, containing the following provisions:

Title I—rehabilitation—authorizes the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to increase its programs of rehabilitation, treatment, and prevention of drug abuse. See Health and Health Insurance.

Title II—control and enforcement—authorizes the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to add at least 300 agents to its present staff, and authorizes an annual appropriation of $6 million for that purpose, beginning in fiscal 1971.

Title II further:

First. Vests authority in the Attorney General for control over the dangerous substances specified in the title but requires him to seek, and be bound by, the advice of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare before placing a substance under control or removing it from control;

Second. Classifies drugs to be controlled into five schedules to be updated regularly. The schedules are based on the degree of abuse potential, the known effect, harmfulness, and level of accepted medical use. Heroin, marihuana, LSD, mescaline, and peyote are classified under schedule I, which includes substances with a high potential for abuse and no accepted medical use in the United States. Methadone, currently used in drug treatment programs as a substitute for heroin, and liquid injectable methamphetamine—"speed"—are classified under schedule II, which includes substances with a high potential for abuse and a restricted medical use. Most other amphetamines and barbiturates are classified under schedule III, which includes substances with currently accepted medical use and lower physical dependence—although high potential psychological dependence—than the drugs in schedule I and II;

Third. Authorizes the Attorney General to adopt rules for the registration and control of the manufacture, distribution and dispensing of substances classified as controlled;

Fourth. Revises the entire penalty structure for drug offenses, eliminating all mandatory minimum sentences except for professional criminals and, for the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing or possession with the intent to manufacture, distribute or dispense a controlled substance or counterfeit;

Fifth. Provides that possession of a controlled substance by a first offender, for his own use, be treated as a misdemeanor punishable by up to 1 year in prison and a fine of up to $5,000 or both; and provides that such a person, if under 21 at the time of the offense, may seek a court order expunging his police record;

Sixth. Provides that anyone 18 or older who distributes a controlled substance to someone under 21 shall receive twice the authorized penalty for that offense;

Seventh. Provides that any professional criminal trafficking in drugs shall receive a mandatory minimum sentence of 10 years and a maximum fine of $100,000 for a first offense and a minimum term of 20 years and a maximum fine of $200,000 for a second;

Eighth. Provides that the penalty for distributing a small amount of marihuana be the same as that for mere possession;

Ninth. Provides special sentencing procedures under which dangerous drug offenders can be given more severe sentences—up to 25 years—than the usual prescribed penalty for their offense;

Tenth. Authorizes the Attorney General to carry out informational and research programs directly related to enforcing drug laws;

Eleventh. Provides for search warrants which specifically allow enforcement officers to enter without notice—"no-knock"—premises to be searched, if there is probable cause to believe that the substance sought will be destroyed or that notice will endanger someone's life or safety;

Twelfth. Creates a Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse to report to Congress, within 1 year, on marihuana and, within 2 years, on the cause of drug abuse; and

Thirteenth. Authorizes $60 million for the Justice Department in fiscal 1972, $70 million in 1973 and $90 million in 1974 to carry out the provisions of title II.

Title III—import and export—provides for control of, and restriction on, the importation and exportation of dangerous substances listed in title II.

Title IV—Advisory Health Council's report—directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to report annually—to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—on activities of all advisory councils set up by the Public Health Service—Public Law 78–410—or the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963—Public Law 88–164. See Health and Health Insurance.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SHERMAN ANTITRUST ACT REGARDING CRIMINAL SUITS—H.R. 14116

H.R. 14116, passed by the House February 16, 1970, increases from $50,000 to $500,000 the maximum fine which may be imposed on a corporation in a criminal suit for a violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act.

PUBLIC DEFENDER SYSTEM—S. 1461, PUBLIC LAW 91–447

Signed into law October 14, 1970, Public Law 91–447 expands and improves the coverage of the Criminal Justice Act of 1964 and authorizes creation of Federal community defender systems thereby. As approved, Public Law 91–447:

First. Expands the coverage of the Criminal Justice Act of 1964 to authorize appointment of and compensation for counsel for persons—including juvenile delinquents—charged with a crime but financially unable to secure counsel, or first, charged with violating probation; second, under arrest and for whom counsel is required by law; third, subject to revocation of parole; fourth, who are or were material witnesses in custody, or fifth, who sought collateral relief;

Second. Includes a provision which would extend coverage of the act in instances where future judicial decisions or Federal laws might require the appointment of counsel;

Third. Provides for appointed counsel in all proceedings related to the actual trial procedure;

Fourth. Increases the hourly rate of payment for court-appointed counsel to $30 for hours in court and $20 for hours out of court—raising the maximum pay-

ment for each attorney in a case, but providing for waiver of the maximum provision in some instances;

Fifth. Provides that any district or part of a district—or two adjacent districts or parts of districts—in which at least 200 persons annually require court-appointed counsel may establish a Federal public defender organization and/or a community defender organization;

Sixth. Provides that a Federal public defender organization will consist of salaried Federal attorneys operating under the supervision of a Federal public defender appointed by the circuit's judicial council;

Seventh. Provides that a community defender organization, defined as a nonprofit defense counsel service administered by an authorized organization, can initially be funded by a Federal grant and can receive periodic sustaining Federal grants; and

Eighth. Bars a Federal public defender or any attorney appointed by him from engaging in the private practice of law.

EXPEDITING ACT AMENDMENTS—H.R. 12807

Differing versions of an act to amend the Expediting Act of 1903 were passed in 1970 by the House and Senate.

The House bill, passed on July 6, 1970, amends the Expediting Act of 1903 so as to provide that in certain civil antitrust cases where the United States is plaintiff and action has been brought in a Federal district court, the Attorney General may file a certificate deeming the case to be "of general public importance." Upon filing of this certificate it shall be the duty of the presiding judge to assign the case for hearing at the earliest practicable date and to cause the case to be "in every way expedited." The bill was not enacted.

MANPOWER TRAINING, JOB OPPORTUNITY, AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Speaker, during the first session Congress enacted two laws of major importance in the areas of job opportunity and regional development.

Near the close of the first session, Congress, in Public Law 91–177, extended the Economic Opportunity Act through June 30, 1972, authorizing $2,195,500,000 for fiscal 1970, and $2,295,500,000 for fiscal 1971. Public Law 91–177 contained new programs to combat alcoholism and drug addiction.

We also passed Public Law 91–123, extending the Appalachian Regional Development Act until June 30, 1971, authorizing $294 million for development, exclusive of highway construction funds. The $695 million was authorized for highway funds for a 4-year fiscal period through June 30, 1973. Public Law 91–123 placed new emphasis on health care, especially for children and for coal miners' occupational diseases such as black lung.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act sections of Public Law 91–123 extended that act, with some changes, for 2 fiscal years with an authorization of $255 million.

Mr. Speaker, these measures of considerable merit obtained congressional approval in the second session.

EXTENSION OF THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965—H.R. 15712, PUBLIC LAW 91–304

In June 1970 we passed H.R. 15712, extending through June 30, 1971, authorization for the Economic Development Administration to provide grants, loans, and technical assistance to aid economic growth in areas with either high unemployment or underemployment.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT EXTENSION—H.R. 19401

The State-Federal program of vocational rehabilitation has represented, through the years, a true partnership in serving and rehabilitating handicapped individuals. In fiscal year 1970, State vocational rehabilitation agencies served approximately 870,000 disabled individuals and rehabilitated 266,975 persons.

The number of persons rehabilitated during fiscal year 1970 was the highest achieved in the history of the State-Federal program of vocational rehabilitation, the first time that the one-quarter-of-a-million milestone has been exceeded in a single year. The 266,975 persons rehabilitated represent nearly an 11-percent increase over the number rehabilitated during fiscal year 1969.

To continue the worthy work of vocational rehabilitation, Congress passed H.R. 19401, extending for 1 year programs authorized by the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. No substantive changes in the programs were made and no change was made in the levels of authorization. The authorization for fiscal 1972 is $1.01 billion, the same as that for fiscal 1971.

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1970—S. 3867

Action was completed December 10, 1970, on a $9.5 billion bill to finance manpower training programs and to authorize public service jobs. This significant and important congressional initiative was vetoed by the President on December 16.

S. 3867 would have extended for 3 years, and reorganized, manpower training programs designed to enable unemployment and unskilled persons to learn skilled and find jobs. The $5 billion was authorized for these manpower programs.

The legislation included a new feature, a public service job program for which $4.5 billion was authorized. This provision would have permitted persons, unable to find work in private industry, to be employed by State and local governments to work in schools, hospitals, police and fire departments, or in recreation, conservation, and transportation programs. Governors and mayors would have had the authority to designate which jobs could be filled under this program, with 80 percent of the cost borne by the Federal Government. Workers would have received the national minimum wage of $1.60 an hour or the prevailing pay for the type of work in the community, whichever was higher.

It is to be greatly regretted that the President vetoed this measure because of its public jobs provision. Surely in a time when the rate of unemployment approaches 6 percent, it makes better sense to employ the unemployed in the furtherance of public service than to force them onto the unemployment relief rolls.

MONETARY, BANKING, TAX, AND FISCAL POLICIES

Mr. Speaker, the state of our economy has prompted considerable action by Congress affecting national monetary and fiscal policies. The Congress, and indeed the country, has been increasingly concerned about continued inflation and rising unemployment.

Following brief summaries of three important first session accomplishments are remarks on those major bills receiving consideration in the Congress, or just the House, during this second session.

In 1969 we extended the income tax surcharge to January 1, 1970, at a rate of 10 percent by a provision of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act—Public Law 91–53. It was extended to July 1, 1970, at a rate of 5 percent by the Tax Reform Act of 1969—Public Law 91–172.

The Tax Reform Act of 1969 provided for personal income tax relief of various sorts, including tax relief for unmarried persons, for a reduction of the oil depletion allowance from 27½ to 22 percent, and for an increase in social security benefits.

Among other things Public Law 91–172 established a new low-income allowance designed to remove 5.5 million of the poor from Federal tax rolls. New regulations were placed on charitable foundations, and a minimum income tax of 10 percent was imposed on so-called sheltered income. Also, real estate depreciation was affected by the restriction of double depreciation to new housing.

Public Law 91–172 was the most comprehensive tax measure passed by the Congress in more than a decade.

We also passed Public Law 91–128 in the first session extending the interest equalization tax until March 31, 1971. This tax is designed to reduce the outflow of dollars by increasing the cost to foreigners of raising capital in the United States and by decreasing the desirability of foreign securities to Americans, exclusive of direct investment in foreign businesses.

BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT—H.R. 6778

The House and Senate conference report on H.R. 6778, was agreed to on December 18, 1970. H.R. 6778 extends the coverage of the Bank Holding Act of 1956 to include all one-bank holding companies.

In the late 1960's, a large number of banks began converting themselves into one-bank holding companies in order to avoid regulation by the Federal Reserve Board under the Bank Holding Company Act. In addition, many significant nonbank corporations, including major conglomerates, began acquiring one bank, thus mixing banking and nonbanking in complete contravention of the purpose of both Federal banking laws going back to the 1930's and the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

This wave of one-bank holding company creations alarmed many people on Capitol Hill, in the administration, at the Federal Reserve Board, and significant professional observers of the American economic system. It seemed to be leading toward an erosion of the traditional separation of powers between the suppliers of money, that is, the banks, and the users of money, that is, commerce and industry.

H.R. 6778 plugs up the one-bank loophole which made evasion possible. It eliminates the partnership exemption. It authorizes the Federal Reserve Board to determine what bank-related activities a bank holding company may engage in, and specifies that certain activities are not related to the business of banking, and are thus not to be allowed. It subjects to potential Federal Reserve Board jurisdiction all bank holding companies, no "anti-tie-in" created. It contains an "anti-tie-in" provision covering all banks, bank holding companies, and subsidiaries of bank holding companies. Nonbank competitors of bank holding companies are given legal standing to challenge before the Board and in the courts applications filed under this act.

BANK RECORDS AND FOREIGN TRANSACTIONS ACT—H.R. 15073, S. 3678, PUBLIC LAW 91–508

Public Law 91–508 contains a variety of provisions, including several concerning credit cards and credit reporting—see section on Consumer Affairs. Other provisions pertain to financial recordkeeping.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Act is amended to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe regulations requiring insured banks to maintain appropriate records which have a high degree of usefulness in criminal, tax, or regulatory investigations or proceedings. The Secretary is also authorized to prescribe similar regulations for uninsured financial institutions. In addition he may require that banks and other institutions retain records of the identity of individual persons involved in certain financial activities of these institutions.

This legislation also authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to require that reports are made and records are kept having to do with certain foreign transactions, especially those involving the transfer of currency from the United States to another country and vice versa. Again, the Secretary may require that the records include the identities of all persons involved in the transactions.

FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT AMENDMENTS—H.R. 2, PUBLIC LAW 91–206

H.R. 2 removes the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and creates the National Credit Union Administration as a separate, independent agency. Passed by the House in 1969 and the Senate in 1970, the measure provides for an Administrator and Board of Governors to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Those so appointed are to be individuals of "tested credit union experience." All powers of the Bureau are to be transferred to the new agency, but this law does not add any new powers.

Credit unions are cooperative organizations formed to provide members with financial services, such as savings accounts and personal loans. Members often have some common characteristic, such as employment in the same profession or by the same company.

Credit unions may be chartered by a State or by the Federal Government under the Credit Union Act of 1934. There are more than 23,400 credit unions in the United States of which slightly more than half are federally chartered. They have a membership of more than 20 million persons and assets of more than $14 billion. The credit union movement has enjoyed phenomenal growth since World War II. Most credit unions are small; more than 75 percent have assets of $500,000 or less.

Because of their growth and importance it was felt that the credit union regulatory agency should have an independent status equal to that enjoyed by agencies regulating banks and savings and loan associations.

FEDERAL SHARE INSURANCE FOR CREDIT UNIONS—S. 3822, PUBLIC LAW 91–468

Within the United States there are more than 24,000 credit unions which hold savings of over 22 million Americans. These savings, which total almost $14 billion, represent in large part the earnings of the "little man" who can least afford to sustain an unprotected loss. The fact that these savings are not provided some form of insurance protection highlights the necessity for Federal legislation to insure such savings. In fact, credit unions are the only federally chartered thrift institutions that currently do not have such protection.

Although the losses suffered by credit union members over the past years have been unusually small, the fact is there have been cases wherein liquidated insolvent credit unions have caused members to suffer losses and imposed severe hardships on certain individuals. Such losses can now be eliminated by our passage of S. 3822, which provides mandatory share insurance for member accounts of all Federal credit unions and optional share insurance for member accounts of credit unions organized and operated under the laws of any State, territory, or possession of the United States as well as those operating under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense. Applicant credit unions must meet certain standards, and a Federal union which does not meet these standards will, after 1 year, lose its charter. Insured credit unions will pay a premium charge into an insurance fund. This fund may also receive loans from the U.S. Treasury.

The Administrator of National Credit Union Administration may make loans to individual credit unions whenever such action will reduce the risk of loss to the fund or protect the interests of the members of a credit union.

The Administrator is also provided with certain regulatory powers. He may terminate the status of insured unions under certain conditions. He may also remove from office a director or other officer whose actions violate fiduciary duty and risk substantial financial damage to a union.

INTERSTATE TAXATION ACT—H.R. 7906

H.R. 7906 was passed by the House on June 25, 1969. It died in the Senate Finance Committee.

It would have established uniform limitations on the power of States to tax small, out-of-State firms doing business within their boundaries. Also, double taxation of individual income would be prohibited; that is, States would be prohibited from levying a tax on income received while a person was not domiciled within the State unless the source of the income was in the State. The taxpayer's home State would have to allow a credit on taxes paid the State in which the income was earned.

STATE INCOME TAX WITHHOLDING FOR INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION EMPLOYEES—H.R. 10634, S. 2044

H.R. 10634 was sent to the White House on December 11, 1970. It would amend the Interstate Commerce Act, and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, to exempt under certain conditions, pay of employees in interstate transportation work from tax withholding under the laws of States or subdivisions other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence. However, nad State in which the employee earned more than 50 percent of compensation by his interstate carrier employer would be entitled to require withholding.

BANKRUPTCY LAWS COMMISSION—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 88, PUBLIC LAW 91–354

It is generally agreed that the present body of laws comprising our bankruptcy system is obsolete, uneconomical, and incapable of adequately meeting the requirements of our modern economy. Consequently, Congress passed Public Law 91–354 to establish a nine-member Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States to study, analyze, evaluate, and recommend changes in the bankruptcy laws. The Commission is directed to submit a report of its activities to the President and the Congress within 2 years.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENTS—S. 4247, H.R. 18871, PUBLIC LAW 91–467

Passage of S. 4247 brought closer to fruition an effort begun in 1955 to remedy a defect in Federal bankruptcy law. Although Federal courts have exclusive jurisdiction over bankruptcy cases, State courts may determine whether a specific debt is discharged after a Federal court has granted a discharge from debts to a person who filed for bankruptcy.

State jurisdiction has given rise to an abuse by creditors, chiefly in the growing number of "consumer" bankruptcies—more than 90 percent of all bankruptcies in recent years. Debtors adjudged bankrupt and discharged of their debts have been harassed for payment of debts for which they were not legally liable. Default judgments have often been granted against debtors who for various reasons did not appear in State courts in response to suits over debts actually included in bankruptcy discharges.

S. 4247 was signed into law on October 10, 1970. It is meant to eliminate such abuses. Is clarifies the grounds for discharge from debts and gives bankruptcy courts exclusive and final jurisdiction to determine whether or not a debt has been discharged. It establishes time limits within which creditors may claim that a debt was not discharged. Credi-

tors are enjoined from commencing or continuing actions to collect debts for which bankruptcy courts have disharged a debtor of personal liability. S. 4247 also broadens and clarifies those causes for which a discharge can be revoked.

INVESTMENT COMPANY AMENDMENTS ACT—S. 2224, H.R. 17333, PUBLIC LAW 91-547

S. 2224, signed into law on December 14, 1970, provides for the limiting of mutual fund sales charges and establishes broader authority for the regulation of mutual funds. It embodies the first substantial change in the regulation of mutual funds in 30 years, and is the culmination of legislative effort begun in December 1966.

Public law 91-547 prohibits excessive mutual fund sales' charges with the National Association of Securities Dealers—NASD—being initially responsible for preventing excessive charges. It requires the Securities and Exchange Commission to establish regulations for securities dealers not subject to NASD regulation. It places certain restrictions on front-end-load plans—under which up to half of the first year's payments under contractual monthly payment plans have been allocated to sales charges.

This act also establishes a fiduciary duty to shareholders on the part of investment advisers and managers, and empowers a shareholder or the SEC to sue fund advisers and managers for breach of fiduciary duty. Fees for management are allowed, subject to certain adjustments. Restrictions are placed on the creation and operation of mutual-fund holding companies.

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT—S. 3431

S. 3431, which cleared Congress in December 1970, amends the Securities Exchange Act to provide additional protection for investors. Coverage is extended to encompass acquisitions of and tender offers for equity securities of insurance companies.

The full disclosure provision of the present law is extended to acquisitions and tender offers of over 5 percent of a company's stock. Under present law this provision applies only to acquisitions and tenders offers of over 10 percent. An investment of between 5 and 10 percent of the securities of a company can have a significant impact on the public market for that company's stock. Shareholders of the target company are entitled to full disclosure when over 5 percent of their company's stock is to be acquired by an outside group. These acquisitions may lead to important changes in the management or business of the company and the shareholders should be fully informed. Similarly, management of a target company should be advised of a tender offer for securities in an amount of over 5 percent of its stock in order to appropriately protect the interests of its security holders.

In addition S. 3431 extends the provisions of present law which protect stockholders involved in cash acquisitions and tender offers and gives the Securities and Exchange Commission additional rulemaking power to deal with certain types of fraudulent, deceptive, and manipulative practices. Finally, S. 3431 directs the SEC to differentiate between control persons and issuers in applying certain requirements of section 13(e) of the Securities Exchange Act.

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT OF 1970—H.R. 19333, S. 2348

Since the beginning of 1969, 102 New York Stock Exchange members out of 630 then existing have gone out of business. This has resulted both from economic conditions and from the overwhelming increase in paperwork in the last few years. In protecting customers of some of those firms forced out, the New York Stock Exchange used up the entire proceeds of a $55 million security fund.

The Securities Investor Protection Act, passed in December, is designed to protect investors against loss of cash and securities held by broker-dealers, as well as to bolster investor confidence, forestalling thereby further broker bankruptcies.

With certain exceptions all registered brokers and Stock Exchange members will become members of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation. A fund of $150 million will be established through assessments on the members. The initial assessment will be one-eighth of 1-percent of gross revenues. Continuing assessments will be held below one-half of 1 percent, ordinarily, but could be boosted up to 1 percent "when good times occur." If these resources become insufficient to meet claims, SIPC is empowered to borrow up to $1 billion from the Treasury.

Individual investors will be guaranteed against losses up to $50,000, with no more than $20,000 in cash and the rest in securities.

SIPC will be governed by a board made up of seven directors: One each appointed by the Treasury and Federal Reserve Board from among their own personnel, five named by the President of which three shall be from the securities industry, and two from the general public. The latter two will serve as chairman and vice chairman.

In addition to setting up the Securities Investor Protection Corporation, this legislation invests the Securities and Exchange Commission with broad new rulemaking powers concerning the use of customer's funds, including a requirement of minimum cash reserves to be maintained by brokers against free credit balances held in customer's names.

EXCISE, ESTATE, AND GIFT TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1970—H.R. 19868

The Excise, Estate, and Gift Tax Adjustment Act of 1970—H.R. 19868—was passed by the House on December 11. In the Senate this bill was attached to H.R. 16199, the Treasury working capital fund bill, and passed on December 29.

This act amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to accelerate the collection of estate and gift taxes, to continue excise taxes on passenger automobiles and communication services, and to fulfill certain other purposes.

H.R. 19868 will continue for calendar years 1971 and 1972 the present excise taxes on passenger cars and communications services. This extension of excise taxes will provide a revenue increase in the estimated amount of $630 million for fiscal year 1971. In fiscal year 1972, the extended excise taxes on passenger cars and communications services are expected to increase tax collections by $1,865 million.

The bill would also shorten the period for the filing of the return and payment of estate taxes from 15 months after the decedent's death to 9 months after death. The legislation will also change from an annual basis to a quarterly basis the filing of returns and the payment of gift taxes. However, an exception is made for fully charitable transfers. Because of the speedup in gift tax collections which will result from the enactment of H.R. 19868, an increase of tax revenues in the estimated sum of $100 million is projected for fiscal year 1971. Similarly, the shortening of the period for the payment of estate taxes is expected to result in an increase of $1,500 million in tax receipts for fiscal year 1972.

In addition, there will be a revenue savings in interest costs because of the gift and estate tax acceleration.

WAGERING TAX AMENDMENTS OF 1970—H.R. 322

In January 1968, the Supreme Court, in *Marchetti* v. *United States* (390 U.S. 39) and *Grosso* v. *United States* (390 U.S. 63), held that a person may validly refuse to comply with the Federal wagering tax statute by asserting the self-incrimination privilege of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, where complying with the statute could incriminate him. The Court found that persons complying with the wagering taxes had no assurance under existing law that information given to the Internal Revenue Service in connection with such compliance would not be used against them in criminal proceedings based upon their gambling activities. As a result of the Marchetti and Grosso cases, the wagering taxes have become largely unenforceable.

For this reason it was deemed necessary to revise the wagering tax laws. The wagering tax amendments are designed to do just that.

The bill provides that no Treasury Department official or employee may disclose, except in connection with the administration or enforcement of internal revenue taxes, any document or record supplied by a taxpayer in connection with such taxes, or any information come at by the exploitation of any such documents or records. Additionally, the bill provides that certain documents related to the wagering taxes, and information come at by the exploitation of such documents, may not be used against the taxpayer in any criminal proceeding, except in connection with the administration or enforcement of internal revenue taxes.

To insure that Government personnel comply with these nondisclosure provisions, the bill provides—at section 7213 of the code—a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both, for any officer or employee of the United States who violates the wagering tax nondisclosure provisions.

H.R. 322 also increases the occupa-

tional taxes on wagers from $50 to $100, for principals and agents. It imposes a $100 occupational tax upon pickup men, employees, and punchboard operators. It provides a credit against both the tax on bets and the occupational tax, in the case of those persons who pay similar taxes to State and local governments. H.R. 322 also increases the criminal penalties of existing law.

This bill passed the House on December 22, 1970.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND PENSION PLANS

Mr. Speaker, during the first session, Congress included a 15-percent, across-the-board increase in social security benefits, necessitated by the 9.1-percent rise in the cost of living since the prior increase in 1968, in the provisions of the Tax Reform Act of 1969—Public Law 91–172.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1970—H.R. 17550

Inflation has continued to erode the purchasing power of the American consumer in 1970. It hits those on fixed incomes the hardest so the House, in the second session, passed yet another social security benefit increase and included a cost-of-living provision so that increases in the future shall occur as necessary and without delay.

H.R. 17550, as it passed the House May 21, 1970, increased social security benefits by 5 percent, effective January 1971. It also sets the bottom of the tax base at $9,000 and provided for an increasing tax base thereafter as earning level rises.

Among other provisions of H.R. 17550 are increased widow's benefits, revised the schedule of social security taxes, and improved the operation of the hospital insurance program.

The House version also included the medicare and medicaid provisions described in the "health and health insurance" section of this report.

December 29, 1970, the Senate passed H.R. 17550, amended. The Senate version provided for a 10-percent increase in benefits which would raise minimum monthly payments from $64 to $100. Insufficient time remained for conference action on the two versions, but as indicated previously in this report, social security legislation will receive the highest priority in the 92d Congress.

TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been quite active during 1970 in enacting legislation affecting America's transportation system.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1970—S. 3154, H.R. 18185, PUBLIC LAW 91–453

Public Law 91–453 amends the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 by providing for a Federal commitment of $10 billion over a 12-year period for urban mass transportation programs. The act gradually increases authorizations up to a limit of $3.1 billion after fiscal year 1975, and authorizes a new program of 18-year loans to States and local public bodies for the acquisition of real property reasonably expected to be needed for mass transportation purposes.

It requires the Secretary of Transportation to determine that a project is the best alternative available for protecting the environment, and requires State and local public bodies seeking loans to hold public hearings if a project substantially affects a community or its mass transit system. The act stipulates that 7.5 percent of the aggregate amount of funds authorized shall be held in a discretionary fund to be used by cities in need which have exceeded the maximum grants permitted them.

Federal financial assistance, up to $3.1 billion, is authorized for long-term financing for urban mass transportation programs. The funding is to be established by direct annual appropriations. The long-term program of Federal financial assistance, combined with authorized contract authority, is necessary to provide assurance of continuing Federal assistance at a level adequate for the present, while anticipating future urban mass transportation needs and providing sufficient time for necessary planning, decisionmaking, and financing arrangements which will ensure orderly development of urban mass transportation systems.

AIRPORT AND AIRWAYS DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1970—H.R. 14465, PUBLIC LAW 91–258

In 1969, the House passed and sent to the Senate an administration supported bill—H.R. 14465—which authorized a 10-year program of improvement and expansion of our national airport and airway network. Costs of the program are to be financed largely by new taxes on airway users.

H.R. 14465 became law in May 1970. It repeals the Federal Airport Act of 1946—Public Law 79–377—the basic legislation providing Federal aid for aviation facilities, and authorizes a new long-range program of expansion and improvement. Revenues from user charges will be paid into a trust fund similar to the existing highway trust fund.

Public Law 91–258 establishes a nine-member Aviation Advisory Commission, composed of private citizens appointed by the President, to formulate recommendations for land use surrounding airports, for ground access to airports and for airways and airports. The Commission must make its final recommendations by January 1, 1972. It also directs the Secretary of Transportation to formulate, within 2 years, a national airport system plan, after consultation with other Federal agencies.

The Secretary of Transportation is also required to recommend an appropriate method for allocating costs among users of the airport and airways system. The amount available for obligation for improvement of the airways system shall be no less than $250 million annually between January 1, 1970, and June 30, 1980. The amount available for airport assistance during the same time span is $2.5 billion. Further amounts are authorized for the planning of locations and development of airports; for the construction and modernization of airports, needed to relieve air traffic congestion; and for grants to develop reliever airports.

Airline safety is a personal concern to all the millions who take advantage of air transportation each year. Therefore, the bill requires Federal certification of air carrier airports to insure that they meet minimum safety standards. To provide for the maximum satisfaction and well-being of the citizens who reside near airports, provisions are included which require public hearings on proposed airport locations and stipulate that no construction of an airport be authorized if found to have an adverse effect on natural resources and the environment, or if inconsistent with local urban planning.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped that the airport-airways system trust fund will prove equal to our pressing need for more airports.

NATIONAL TRAFFIC AND MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY ACT—H.R. 10105. PUBLIC LAW 91–265

Due to the slaughter on our highways today, it is imperative that every effort be made to provide safer vehicles and equipment. Toward this end, Congress passed Public Law 91–265, the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act. The law authorizes $103 million through fiscal 1972 for the administration of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966. It further authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to plan facilities for traffic safety testing. The Secretary is also authorized to set minimum safety standards for vehicle safety equipment.

The public has recently been made aware of the inadequacy of existing systems for testing tire quality. Therefore, H.R. 10105 provides for new tire research and test facilities.

To protect the consumer against the possibility of operating a vehicle on defective tires, this law provides that tire manufacturers maintain a file of distributors and first owners in the event that recall becomes necessary. Car manufacturers are required to supply car buyers with general consumer information. Public Law 91–265 also sets an age limit for retreading of car tires.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1970—S. 4418, H.R 19504

On December 17, 1970, the Congress cleared H.R. 19504. This legislation extends construction authority for the Interstate Highway System through 1976, and increases the total authorization for the interstate program by $9,775,000,000. In addition to this, H.R. 19504 extends the authorization for primary, secondary, and urban road programs through fiscal 1972 and 1973 at $1.1 billion. Other programs for forest highways, public lands highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads, parkways, and Indian reservation roads and bridges are extended at various amounts.

This legislation also creates, for the first time, a Federal-aid urban system to take care of the extremely urgent problem of traffic movement within urbanized, congested areas. Additionally, the bill provides grants for urban public transportation, so that high-speed express lanes may be built to link central cities to the fringe parking areas authorized in 1968. These preferential bus lanes will encourage more people to use mass transportation and curtail the congestion that is too often found in our cities.

It also contains other important features among which is authorization of a 2-year period for funding the highway safety program partially out of the highway trust fund.

Also provided for in the act are economic-growth-center-development highways, to aid in the dispersal of population and the decentralization of industry into areas capable of absorbing them. In addition, the bill also creates a National Highway Institute to provide safety training for Federal, State, and local highway officials and to further safety research.

The act authorizes the completion of the Inter-American Highway through the Darien Gap below the Panama Canal. Additionally, the act establishes a program to replace old, unsafe bridges, and an emergency relief program to replace those bridges already closed for safety reasons.

The Secretary of Transportation is directed to tighten controls over economic, social, and environmental impact of highway construction.

RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE ACT OF 1970—H.R. 17849, S. 3706, PUBLIC LAW 91–518

In October 1970, Congress passed Public Law 91–518 creating a National Railroad Passenger Corporation to provide intercity rail service. It is to be a semipublic, profitmaking corporation. The act will enable railroads to transfer their intercity passenger operations to the Corporation in exchange for money, equipment, or services. A railroad may receive either common stock or a tax deduction, but not both, equal to the value of the goods and services given the Corporation.

The basic purpose of Public Law 91–518 is to prevent the complete abandonment of intercity rail passenger service and to preserve a minimum of such service along specific corridors. Railroads which join the Corporation will be relieved of further responsibility to provide passenger service. The Corporation will attempt to revitalize rail passenger service in the expectation that the rendering of such service along certain corridors can be made a profitable commercial undertaking.

Railroads can turn over their passenger operations in toto to the Corporation by March 1, 1971, or gradually during a period from March 1, 1973, to January 1, 1975. Railroads choosing not to make a transfer during these periods are prohibited from discontinuing any passenger trains for 5 years, until January 1, 1975.

The National Railroad Passenger Corporation is to be administered by 15 directors—eight selected by the President, seven by industry. Also created is a 15-man financial advisory board to be appointed by the President; $340 million is authorized for Federal grants and loan guarantees to finance the program.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this legislation marks an auspicious beginning in straightening out the the chaos which besets passenger train service in our country.

FEDERAL RAILROAD SAFETY ACT—S. 1933, PUBLIC LAW 91–458

Public Law 91–458 was approved in October 1970. It will promote safety in all areas of railroad operation in order to reduce railroad related accidents, deaths, and injuries to persons, and damage to property caused by rail accidents involving carriers of hazardous materials. Prior to enactment of S. 1933, railroads had been the only major mode of commercial transportation in the United States not subject to comprehensive Federal safety regulations. Existing fragmentary laws were 50 to 75 years old.

The new law establishes uniform Federal railroad safety standards, and authorizes a study of all modes of transporting hazardous materials. It empowers the Secretary of Transportation to set rules and standards for railroad safety and to conduct research and investigations to that end. Collective bargaining is permitted on such matters not inconsistent with the rules and standards established by the Secretary, but the Secretary has the emergency power to stop any train deemed a public safety hazard.

Car-train accidents at highway and railway crossings are almost always fatal to the occupants of the car. Therefore, the Secretary is authorized to study and finance ways of improving highway grade crossings.

S. 1933 provides civil penalties for failure to adhere to safety rules and standards. The Attorney General is empowered to seek injunctions against violators. States are permitted to participate in investigations and the surveillance of areas covered by Federal regulations. They are also permitted to continue to regulate areas not covered by Federal regulations.

The Federal Railroad Safety Act strengthens Federal control over the movement of hazardous materials, and it directs the Secretary of Transportation to establish the proper facilities and technical staff to study this issue. The Secretary is required to submit a comprehensive annual report on the administration of the act.

Congress authorized appropriations of $22 million to meet the requirements of the act for each of the fiscal years 1971 through 1973.

AIRCRAFT HIJACKING—H.R. 19444

In September 1970, the House passed H.R. 19444, a bill to provide revenue to cover the cost of training guards on U.S. air carriers. The Senate did not act on the bill.

As passed by the House, the bill authorized expenditures, until July 1, 1972, from the airport and airway trust fund to pay for the training, salaries, and other expenses of guards who guard American air carriers.

Guards are now being used for such purposes under authority of existing law.

INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL ACT AMENDMENTS—H.R. 14685, S. 1289, PUBLIC LAW 91–477

Public Law 91–477 extends authorizations for the U.S. Travel Service through fiscal 1973, and increases authorizations to $15 million per year from $4,700,000.

The U.S. Travel Service was established by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the International Travel Act of 1961. USTS is charged with developing, planning, and carrying out a comprehensive program to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries as a means of promoting friendly understanding and goodwill among peoples of foreign countries and the United States. Moreover, by promoting tourism to the United States from abroad, USTS helps to alleviate the deficit in our international balance of payments.

The International Travel Act amendments strengthen this program by authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to grant to States, or to contract with private firms, up to 50 percent of the cost of projects for encouraging travel to any State by residents of foreign countries. The act also establishes a National Tourism Resources Commission, charged with studying and recommending the most efficient way of promoting tourism from abroad in the United States. Up to $750,000 is authorized to the Commission over a 2-year period.

MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1970—H.R. 15424, S. 3872, PUBLIC LAW 91–469

Public Law 91–469 provides for building 300 merchant ships in the next 10 years.

In foreign commerce, U.S. merchant vessels are in direct competition with foreign-flag carriers for available cargo. Since cargo rates are the same for all ocean carriers, at least where conferences exist, the U.S. operator is at a competitive disadvantage with his foreign competition, because the U.S. standard of living is higher than the standard of the other maritime nations, thus increasing the cost of operations of our merchant vessels. Since the U.S. merchant marine is important to our economic strength, it needs to be subsidized to remain competitive in world trade.

The 1970 Merchant Marine Act, therefore, provides for annual subsidies. Starting at 50 percent, the subsidies are to decrease to 35 percent by 1976. Operating subsidies are to be continued, but are to relate to an index to wage increases received by labor generally. Subsidies will be provided for all types of vessels, including tankers and bulk carriers. H.R. 15424 also provides that subsidized carriers may continue up to 20 years' foreign-flag operations for which they had previously contracted. Operating subsidies "shall equal" the difference between U.S. and foreign operating expenses.

The new law establishes a seven-member, Presidentially appointed Commission on American Shipbuilding to review the status of the industry toward achieving the goal of decreasing subsidy levels. It also establishes the new position of Assistant Secretary of Commerce for maritime affairs. This position is to be combined with the position of Maritime Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, Public Law 91–469 gives a needed boost to the American shipping industry.

EMERGENCY RAIL SERVICES ACT OF 1970—H.R. 19953

On December 22, 1970, the House passed H.R. 19953, the Emergency Rail Services Act of 1970. It is designed to prevent a clear threat to the public welfare due to the possibility that the Nation's largest transportation system, Penn Central, might cease operating within a matter of weeks, with an over-

whelming impact to be felt throughout the United States. Moreover, three other railroads, serving critically important centers in the Northeast, are in perilous condition. All are bankrupt. Their survival so tenuously hangs in the balance that the severity of this winter could bring them to a permanent halt.

At jeopardy is utility power to 74 million people, foodstuff to eight of the Nation's largest cities, and major movements of iron ore, steel, and other commodities basic to our economy. This legislation is an interim measure to avert an immediate crisis. It will reach only essential rail services which now face cessation. And it will reach them only if no other fiscal means can be found to keep these railroads running.

This legislation will be administered by the Secretary of Transportation acting after consultation with the Interstate Commerce Commission. Its benefits will be limited at this time to the Penn Central, the Central of New Jersey, the Boston & Maine, and the Lehigh Valley railroads.

The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to guarantee the payment of certificates issued by the trustees of these railroads, but only after making detailed written findings required by the legislation.

Thus, there is no direct grant or loan of Federal moneys involved. However, so-called back-door financing has been incorporated in this act to permit payments if there is default on the guaranteed certificates. This is essential if the certificates are to be sold on the market.

In return for guaranteeing the certificates, the Secretary is required to obtain for the United States the highest lien on the railroads property exclusive of certain rolling stock, and priority in payment under the Bankruptcy Act. At any time, the aggregate amount of outstanding certificates guaranteed by the Secretary cannot exceed $125 million.

On December 30, the Senate agreed to H.R. 19953 without amendment, thus sending the bill to the White House.

VETERANS

The outstanding record of the 91st Congress reflects the concern we all share for those Americans who have served our country so ably and bravely in our military forces. Six major bills affecting veterans and their survivors have become law during the second session. One other bill had passed the House.

In addition, in the first session we passed Public Law 91–96, increasing dependency and indemnity compensation for widows and children of veterans.

We can take pride in this impressive legislative record of assistance for the veteran in the areas of education, medical care, home loans, increased disability benefits, and the like.

PENSION INCREASE—H.R. 15911, PUBLIC LAW 91–588

H.R. 15911, passed by the House, September 21, 1970, increases the rates of pension payable for non-service-connected disabilities or death to veterans of World War I or later conflicts and to those veterans of Mexican border service in 1916 and 1917. The Senate agreed to the House action December 17, and the President signed H.R. 15911 into law December 28, 1970.

The non-service-connected pension program dates back many years in the history of VA benefits; the existing program was authorized by Public Law 86–211 which became effective July 1, 1960. Veterans who were on the rolls prior to that date are classified as eligible for pensions under the "old law"; the rates of their pensions have largely been left at the 1960 level. This bill does increase the annual income limitation for these veterans from the present $1,600 for a single veteran or widow to $1,900, and for a veteran with dependents or a widow with a child, from $2,900 to $3,200.

For veterans not under the old law the bill revises the income limitations applicable to such pensions so as to increase the number of income categories and raise the maximum amount of other income an individual may have while still remaining eligible for some pension. In addition the bill makes similar changes in the payment rates and income limitations applicable to dependency and indemnity compensation for the parents of veterans who die from service-connected causes. The measure also eliminates certain income reporting requirements for persons aged 72 and over and excludes certain additional types of income in determining income limitations for pension purposes.

VETERANS' HOUSING ACT OF 1970—H.R. 16710, S. 5656; PUBLIC LAW 91–506

Public Law 91–506 provides for the removal of the termination date on applying for housing loan guarantees administered by the Veterans' Administration. Under the previous law the entitlement for World War II veterans had ended July 25, 1970.

Public Law 91–506 also establishes a guarantee program within the VA for the purchase of mobile homes—provided that the mobile home is to be occupied by the veteran as his own home—for lots for mobile homes, and for lot development. Under the new provisions, veterans otherwise eligible for home loan guarantees will now be able to purchase a home in a condominium development.

In addition the Veterans' Housing Act of 1970 provides that veterans with permanent and total service-connected disabilities—paraplegics, quadraplegics, the blind—will be able to receive grants for up to 100 percent of the remodeling costs of their homes in order to adapt their homes to their disabilities.

HOME LOAN FINANCING FOR VETERANS—H.R. 18253

In order to make it easier for our veterans to obtain their own homes, the House passed on July 20, 1970, H.R. 18253 a bill to increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans. In addition to making home loan financing more available to veterans the bill increases the income of the national service life insurance fund.

If enacted into law this session, the measure will establish, on a revolving fund basis, in an amount not to exceed $5 billion, an investment fund from which home loan financing would be available through commercial sources with the proceeds being repaid into the fund as the loans are repaid each month. The $5 billion would come from the national service life insurance trust fund which is a trust fund created from the proceeds of the premiums paid by World War II veterans on their insurance policies. The yield on this fund would be increased to 7½ to 8½ percent interest—paid by the veteran home loan borrower—less 1 percent administration fee. The national service life insurance fund would continue to be fully guaranteed by the U.S. Government with no possible loss to a policyholder or his beneficiary.

VETERANS EDUCATION AND TRAINING ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1970—H.R. 11959; PUBLIC LAW 91–219

Reorientation of returning veterans to society is greatly aided through education assistance. To assist our young men in achieving the levels of education which they desire, the House through the Veterans Education and Training Assistance Amendments Act, increased the benefits for Vietnam war veterans by 27 percent over existing levels. The Senate amended H.R. 11959 to provide for a 46 percent increase in those benefits. The conference report arrived at a 34-percent increase. Both Houses agreed, and the President approved the act on March 26, 1970.

The 34-percent increase in the educational provisions included a raise in the monthly educational allowances and an authorization for the Veterans' Administration to pay undereducated veterans attending college $50 per month for up to 9 months for "individualized tutorial assistance."

Under the vocational rehabilitation provisions, subsistance allowances for disabled veterans were also increased.

Also established by this act was a predischarge educational program—PREP—which pays up to $175 per month to institutions conducting courses for undereducated servicemen with more than 6 months active duty; this program is designed to lead to a high school diploma.

In addition the act increased the educational assistance payments to veterans and war orphans, widows, and wives of permanently disabled veterans; payments and loans to veterans engaged in flight training; and financial assistance to veterans engaged in on-the-job training in farm cooperatives. The legislation also established a new "outreach" service to seek out recently discharged veterans to inform them of assistance programs.

DISABILITY COMPENSATION INCREASE—S. 3348, H.R. 17958; PUBLIC LAW 91–376

This act—Public Law 91–376—provides for an average increase to veterans of approximately 10 percent for in-service-connected rates of disability compensation. The provision stipulates that these increases shall be based on the amount of disability instead of need. For example, veterans whose disabilities are rated 50 percent through 90 percent will receive an increase of 11 percent while the totally disabled will receive a 12 percent increase.

The law also reflects the concern of Congress for the problems of former

prisoners of war with particular provisions for the long range harm caused by various kinds of malnutrition, forced labor, or inhumane treatment. In addition any psychosis which becomes manifest to a degree of 10 percent or more within 2 years from the date of separation from the service shall be covered under these increased benefits.

Another important provision permits widows who remarry to become entitled again to Veterans' Administration benefits if the remarriage is ended by death or divorce.

Finally the law clarifies and reaffirms the immunity of the Veterans' Administration from judicial review of its decisions with respect to noncontractual benefits.

SERVICEMEN'S GROUP LIFE INSURANCE AMENDMENTS—S. 1479, H.R. 16661; PUBLIC LAW 91-291

Congress, in order to increase the amount of life insurance available for servicemen, passed the servicemen's group life insurance amendments.

The major purpose of this legislation is to increase the amount of servicemen's group life insurance available for members of the uniformed services. Under the present law, active duty servicemen are insured for $10,000 unless they choose either not to be insured or to be insured for $5,000. Servicemen pay premiums based on comparable civilian mortality rates; the premium for $10,000 in servicemen's group life insurance is currently $2 per month. The Federal Government pays that portion of the cost of the insurance due to the extra hazard of active duty. Public Law 91-291 increases the maximum policy of $15,000 and increases the monthly premium to $3.

VETERANS MEDICAL CARE—H.R. 693; PUBLIC LAW 91-500

Congress, on October 13, 1970, cleared for the President the veterans medical care bill—H.R. 693—removing the requirement that veterans 65 years of age or older must certify that they are unable to pay hospital expenses in order to be treated for a non-service-connected disability in a Veterans' Administration hospital.

As originally passed by the House on June 2, 1969, the bill provided for a cutoff at age 72 for the certification requirement and extended eligibility for medical care disabilities to veterans of the Mexican border conflict of 1916-17. The Senate twice deleted both of these provisions and the House on October 13, 1970, by voice vote agreed to the final Senate version. The President approved the bill on October 22.

Public Law 91-500 also provides that in the case of persons receiving or eligible for increased compensation or pensions because they are in need of regular aid and attendance or are housebound, the VA may, without regard to the nature of their illness, furnish necessary medical services and prescription drugs.

WELFARE

Mr. Speaker, during the first session, we passed Public Law 91-116—House Joint Resolution 934—which, without altering the food stamp program, authorized $610 million for use by the Secretary of Agriculture in dealing with the problems of hunger and malnutrition.

We also passed Public Law 91-41—H.R. 8644—which, inter alia, repealed that provision of the Social Security Amendments Act of 1967 which imposed a freeze on Federal funds for the aid to dependent children program.

During the second session, major action in the area of welfare has included House passage of the administration's welfare reform act and a bill amending the 1964 Food Stamp Act.

FAMILY ASSISTANCE PLAN—H.R. 16311

H.R. 16311 provided for a comprehensive reform of the welfare program in the United States. As passed by the House April 16, 1970, it created a formula whereby a family of four with no income would be eligible for an annual Federal payment of $1,600 while families with income up to $3,920 would be eligible for lesser benefits. All adult recipients of the family assistance payments would have been required to register for work or job training with the exception of mothers with pre-school-age children or mothers in a family in which the father is registered. Any adult refusing work or training would be deemed ineligible for benefits.

The bill would have repealed the aid to families with dependent children program. It required the States to supplement the family assistance payment for families with no income to bring benefits up to the level they had been in the State previously under the AFDC program or to the poverty level, if that is lower. Federal matching at a rate of 30 percent was authorized for these State supplemental payments. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would have been required to provide necessary child care services for welfare recipients.

The bill provided three alternative administrative arrangements for the program: First, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could make arrangements with a State for the Federal Government to administer both the family assistance plan and the State supplementary program; second, the Secretary could make an agreement under which the State would assume full administration responsibility or third, administration could be shared by the Federal and State Governments.

H.R. 16311 repealed the existing programs for the needy aged, blind and disabled and established a new joint Federal-State program which required the States to: First, provide a payment sufficient to bring an individual's income up to at least $110 a month, or the existing level in the State if higher than that rate; second, follow the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare's definitions of blindness and disability; third, make applicable to the disabled the mandatory disregard of the first $85 a month of earned income plus one-half of the remainder, now applicable to the blind; and fourth, make applicable to the aged, on an optional basis, the same earnings exemption applicable to the family assistance plan.

The Federal Government was authorized to pay 90 percent of the first $65 of average payments made to eligible adults under the blind, disabled, and elderly programs, and 25 percent of the remainder up to a limit to be set by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It was also authorized to pay 50 percent of the administrative costs of the blind, disabled and elderly programs. Appropriations would have been authorized to meet up to 90 percent of the cost of the training programs; this includes funds providing each trainee with an allowance of $30 per month.

The Senate failed to clear the family assistance legislation in the final days of the 91st Congress, but as indicated elsewhere, this is an item of highest priority in the next Congress.

AMENDMENTS TO THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964—H.R. 18582; S. 2547

In the last days of 1970 Congress cleared H.R. 18582 which would amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964. Foremost among changes which this bill would make in the law are: First, inclusion of an amendment which would require able-bodied adults to register for and, if available, accept employment as a condition to obtaining stamps; second, allowing families of four whose income is less than $30 per month to receive free food stamps; and third, authorization of self-certification for welfare recipients only. The House bill also authorized persons 60 years of age or older who are participating in the program to use stamps to purchase meals delivered to them if prepared by an instrumentation of a political subdivision or a nonprofit organization. H.R. 18582 authorizes appropriations of $1.75 billion for fiscal 1971 and for fiscal 1972 and 1973.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear from this summary of the legislative accomplishments of the 91st Congress that this has been a hard-working Congress, an innovative Congress, and above all, a responsible Congress. Members can take pride in the manner in which they have fulfilled their responsibilities as Members of this great legislative body. In the past 2 years we have compiled, in my view, a most impressive record of accomplishments. The legislative record of the 91st Congress reflects the concern of this body for the dignity of man. I am proud of this Congress and extend to all Members my appreciation for their assistance in compiling this remarkable record.

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, PHILIP PHILBIN is a gracious and kindly man, an able legislator, and a distinguished American. It has been my great pleasure to share a close friendship with him since he came here at the beginning of the 78th Congress. For a time we were asso-

ciated together on the great Committee on Armed Services of the House. I have observed his acceptance through the years of constantly increasing responsibilities, and now at the time of his retirement he has just become chairman of that very important committee.

Congressman PHILBIN enjoys the esteem and confidence of Members on both sides of the aisle. He has given service in the highest order to his State and to our Nation. I am proud to have been associated here with him, and I know full well that the House has lost an able and popular Member, and an outstanding American. He can look back with pride on the fine accomplishments which were his as a Member of the U.S. Congress. My best wishes and those of Mrs. Sikes go with PHILIP and his family in all their future endeavors.

BETTER BUSINESS BUREAU EXPANDED CONSUMER PROTECTION PROGRAM

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, recently Elisha Gray II, board chairman of the Whirlpool Corp., who is also chairman of the Council of Better Business Bureaus, Inc., announced that the council had launched a new 14-point consumer protection program.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his statement as well as a statement by the newly elected president of the council, Mr. H. Bruce Palmer, and the council's program be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY ELISHA GRAY II, CHAIRMAN, COUNCIL OF BETTER BUSINESS BUREAUS, INC.; CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, WHIRLPOOL CORP.

Thank you ladies and gentlemen of the press for being here. We want to talk to you this morning about an enterprise so full of potential impact on the social and economic scene that being a spokesman for it is one of the most stimulating jobs I have ever had.

Before I get into the details of that enterprise, let me give you the background against which it developed.

A swelling tide of consumer complaints and frustrations threatens to shake the foundations of the private enterprise system. The level of consumer expectation has risen to a new threshold of expectation that didn't exist even five years ago. We've reached the point where either business is responsive to consumer needs or the choice for voluntary action will be taken out of its hands.

Responsible businessmen are being judged by the ethics of the least worthy operator. To whatever degree any person engaged in a business transaction deceives or irritates the consumer, the best of us get blamed, and then possibly saddled with a regulation designed to protect against the worst.

The responsible businessman will see the consumer's demand for help in the complex marketplace as a worthy challenge to his skills and as a tremendous opportunity to assert leadership in his own backyard. Right now, the businessman has a chance to respond to the consumer's needs voluntarily. The days remaining in which that choice will stay in his hands are numbered, unless the businessman takes action in the area of consumer assistance forcefully, imaginatively, unequivocally, before other forces in society do it for him.

That brings us to today's subject: Leaders representing responsible business have created a program to make this happen . . . an exciting plan . . . to create the strong, viable, effective and highly visible unified consumer assistance agency of national stature that will become the preferred alternative to any governmental or other device.

The program grew out of the recognition by aroused businessmen who picked up the challenge and decided to act. We began putting it together less than three years ago. The deeper we probed, the more convinced we became that our goals could best be accomplished not by establishing a new agency which would, at best, only add to the confusing proliferation of existing groups, bureaus and committees, but by building onto an organization that had been in operation and very successfully so, for 58 years—the Better Business Bureaus.

The bureaus, numbering 139 in the U.S. and 11 in Canada, with a group of dedicated professionals, could be used as a foundation to build a really effective national self-regulation force for private enterprise.

They are good, respected by many consumers, experienced and, most importantly, constituted an incomparably far-reaching consumer-oriented apparatus. In a nutshell, the machinery is there and the programs are in existence—at least in pilot stages, for just about every phase of self-regulation that one could contemplate. We knew that one of every 12 households in 1969 and 1970 had had contact with a bureau. This represents seven million citizens. There were shortcomings that we took a hard look at. Although the level of performance was generally high, it was uneven from bureau to bureau.

Consumers were being frustrated and alienated by that great modern relationship-breaker: the persistent telephone busy signal. Four out of ten consumers on a national average were unable to reach the bureaus because of lack of facilities.

The bureaus had different reporting methods, which made a unified coordinating function difficult, if not impossible.

And, while businessmen generally thought the bureaus served a useful purpose, in many areas they weren't getting behind the bureaus sufficiently to give them the wherewithal they needed to move ahead as they should.

In August we took the first concrete step to revitalize the Better Business Bureau chain, when we formed the Council of Better Business Bureaus, Incorporated. This replaced two existing national bodies which had loosely held the bureaus together as a network.

We recognized at the outset that we had to give the Council three essential elements if it was to succeed.

First, we needed a comprehensive statement of the Council's responsibilities which captured both the immediate goals and the long range aspirations of the group. It must also provide flexibility for action by the men who would serve on the Council. We have framed that declaration of responsibilities and a copy of the full text of it is in your press kit.

Secondly, we felt we needed imaginative and vigorous new programs and plans to revitalize the operations of the bureaus, building on the best of the programs the bureaus had implemented already. A full outline of the programs is also included in your kit—14 of them in all—but let me give you a feeling for their potential impact in the marketplace.

Top priority is being assigned to helping local bureaus expand and improve their capacity for handling consumer contacts. For example, I mentioned before the overload on the bureau's telephone service for consumers. We are going to put a stop to this exasperating condition. Our people, no matter how well meaning, certainly can't help if the consumer can't even reach them when he needs them.

Some of the ways under consideration for increasing contact capability are the creation of more local bureaus, the establishment of branch or "satellite" offices for existing bureaus and toll-free telephone service to a central office.

We are also taking a long, hard look at consumer education. We intend to make our consumers the wisest and toughest in the world and our businessmen the most responsive to their needs. Many bureaus have already taken an aggressive role in education. For example, five bureaus have special vans equipped to show consumer education films "on location," especially designed to get into low-income, lower educated groups. Others have consumer councils which hold educational seminars and serve as a highly effective presence in encouraging business self-regulation.

We are exploring the possibility of special consumer membership which will entitle the member to receive educational materials periodically and to serve on market research test panels. We are also looking into new complaint and appeal procedures to give the disenchanted consumer future means of redress when other methods fail.

Already in the planning stage is a national Resource Center which will take advantage of modern data processing techniques to organize and disseminate information gleaned from consumer contacts. Most important of all, we are investigating systems for the evaluation of these programs so that we may be able to measure and evaluate our performance.

The third and final element we needed to make the Council work was a proven leader, a first-string, star quarterback—I mean a real pro—to run the operations of the Council. It had to be a man of impeccable character, integrity, flexibility and outstanding credentials as a leader.

We are indeed honored and proud to announce today that we have found such a man and have persuaded him to take the position as president of the Council, effective January 1st.

This man hardly needs an introduction. His record of accomplishments is indeed impressive. He was formerly president of The Conference Board, former president of The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company, former president of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, a member of the board of trustees of the Council for Latin America, a member of the board for Fundamental Education, a former board member of the Committee for Economic Development . . .

The list goes on and a full dossier is included in your press kit.

Ladies and gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure to introduce the new president of the Council of Better Business Bureaus, Mr. H. Bruce Palmer.

REMARKS BY H. BRUCE PALMER, PRESIDENT, COUNCIL OF BETTER BUSINESS BUREAUS, INC.

Thank you, Mr. Gray and members of the Council board.

I suppose it would be in order for me to say that taking on this job is a privilege and a pleasure. I have no question about the first part of the statement—it surely is a privilege to have a role in something as fundamental as seeking an accommodation between the world's greatest system for production of goods and services on the one hand . . . and the confused, irritated, increasingly disaffected customers of that system on the other.

Furthermore, I am privileged indeed to be in the company of so many dedicated businessmen on the Council and Bureau, people who have laid the groundwork for me. If you want to see why, just take a look at the names of the directors in the blue book in your press kits. I intend to borrow from that dedication and the expertise and the will to succeed of these men and women.

I have no illusions, however, that the assignment will necessarily or could even conceivably be an unmitigated pleasure. What I am certain of is that it will be the greatest challenge of my life.

I have been a businessman a good part of my life. I am—we all are—consumers. The problems connected with the establishment of a smooth relationship between the two are by no means simple, nor are they constituted to insure a good night's sleep. Mr. Gray told me recently he spent the early hours one morning trying to iron out a problem that the head of a Bureau had half way across the country.

Yet above all, it is a situation filled with opportunity and promise. It is interesting that the tide of consumer criticism had occurred in a period when paradoxically business really has a seemingly good track record.

For example, business has adopted a whole new dimension to its responsibilities—namely that of social responsibility. Much of the social progress that has evolved in our society in the last three years springs from the new programs of business.

Consider that never were there more innovative and useful products and services.

Our atmosphere is charged with the kind of restless inquiry and consumer insistence on value received for money paid that is healthy to the private enterprise system. It is one in which we are confident we can get the job of self-regulation done because we absolutely have to get it done. There is some irony in all this—the very success of our system—the great range of product selection and the host of new products and services—has played a major part in creating consumer dissatisfaction.

I have carefully studied the plans which the Council has outlined. They are so vital that I simply could not turn down the chance to be part of this effort. There is, in my judgment, no more important role for a businessman today, than to devote his energy toward solving this complex problem. And I can think of no other program that could possibly compare with the potential that this one has.

One important thing I want to convey is that this is not pie-in-the-sky stuff we are talking about. Please do not forget that as we are talking there are more than 850 people in 139 bureaus in the U.S. and 11 in Canada helping the consumer right now. In addition, bureaus are assisting some 800 Chambers of Commerce provide assistance in areas where there are no bureaus.

I want to strongly underline what Mr. Gray has said: the machinery is there—right now—it is working—right now.

It is the job of the Council to marshall the necessary backing by business—by all business—to greatly augment those resources, to help the Bureaus expand their already considerable services to the consumer.

Some of the revitalizing, as Mr. Gray indicated, will be undertaken immediately. Things such as solving the telephone busy signal situation. Much of it will involve encouraging and developing imaginative new programs which are already outlined. Some programs will take varying amounts of time before they are really effective.

It is a great program and one worthy of support by business. I have complete confidence that business will buy it and that the Better Business Bureau network will become the effective force of self-regulation and consumer assistance that we know it can be.

Thank you.

PROGRAMS FOR COUNCIL OF BETTER BUSINESS BUREAUS, INC.

In order to achieve the goals and objectives which have been established by the Council of Better Business Bureaus, two types of programs will be needed; internal operational programs and programs directed to the public sector.

1. *Make help available to all consumers who seek it.* During 1969, four out of every ten persons who called a local Better Business Bureau got either a busy or a no-answer signal. Top priority should be assigned to helping member Bureaus increase their capacity for handling consumer contacts.

2. *Broaden Bureau coverage.* At the present time, there are 139 bureaus in 42 states and 11 in Canada. This leaves a large segment of the population with no Bureau to turn to for help. The Council should correct this situation by providing direction and assistance in:

a. Establishing new Bureaus;

b. Establishing branch or satellite offices for existing Bureaus;

c. Inaugurating free telephone service to a designated Bureau office.

3. *Standardize Bureau operating procedure.* A uniform system for recording and distributing consumer contact information should be developed immediately. Although each local Bureau is, and should remain, an autonomous unit, more effective service can be rendered to both consumer and business if Bureau activities and information are coordinated and standardized.

4. *Establish qualifications for membership in a Bureau.* These qualifications will include a record of satisfactory consumer relations and acceptance of Better Business Bureau standards of fair business practices.

5. *Help existing Bureaus improve and expand their service.* A staff of field representatives from the Council should be organized to give local Bureaus professional assistance. A planned program of visits and exchanges of information among Bureaus should also be instituted.

6. *Set up Consumer Councils.* The Council should encourage and provide active assistance to all local Bureaus in establishing Consumer Councils as vehicles to promote consumer education and to create a consumer presence that will encourage business in self-regulation.

7. *Encourage consumer participation in Better Business Bureau activities.* This can be done by establishing a consumer-type membership Bureau. On the payment of a nominal membership fee, the consumer member will periodically receive educational literature and materials and, depending on the local Bureau, will have the opportunity to participate in discussion groups and test market panels among other local projects.

8. *Expand and diversify consumer education techniques.* Consumer education can be accomplished in a wide variety of ways. For example, local Bureaus should conduct programs through schools and seminars; by use of "consumer mobiles" which take the message to the consumer; by "show how" houses; by supplying service groups with programs. The local Bureau should investigate the possibility of using any or all of these ways of communicating with the consumer and should develop programs suited to its particular needs. In addition, the Council should also act as liaison between local Bureaus and the Consumer Product Information Center of the GSA, established by Executive Order, October 26, 1970.

9. *Serve as a channel of communication with national businesses.* The Council, acting either on its own initiative on or information from a member Bureau, will speak for the Better Business Bureau when it is necessary to call to the attention of a national business any unethical practice. The Council will communicate directly with the chief executive officer, if necessary, to stop that practice.

10. *Assist in the monitoring of national advertising* and call for the immediate correction of advertising that is false or misleading advertising.

11. *Cooperate with business in the development of national trade practice programs.* These programs should be designed to elimnate any malpractice in the marketing of goods and services. Bureau-supervised codes covering advertising standards, used car marketing and book and magazine selling may be useful as patterns of successful programs.

12. *Establish consumer complaint and appeal boards in pilot cities.* Many local Bureaus have found arbitration boards a highly successful method of dealing with consumer complaints and determining fair settlements, especially in the dry cleaning, automotive, home improvement and furniture fields. Pilot programs should be reviewed and evaluated after the first year's operation and the findings distributed to member Bureaus. At the same time, the Council should explore other possible methods of handling consumer complaints.

13. *Establish a national resource center* on which local bureaus, business and consumer groups can draw for information, educational materials and operational aids. This resource center will include a library for films and printed material and will also encompass the data accumulated by the various Bureaus and handled by modern data processing methods. This data bank will have many practical and useful applications, including source data for the formulation of public policy and legislation, for market research and for economic forecasting.

14. *Develop a creative and aggressive public relations program.* This program, which should be professionally directed, should have as its objective and goal the establishment of the Bureau as the credible voice of responsible business at all levels, national and local. It should be planned to insure that business and government leaders and consuming public are fully informed about the goals, programs and accomplishments of the Bureau.

These programs will require the wholehearted financial and moral support of responsible business. Once operational, they will increase the stature . . . and the influence . . . of both the Council and the member Bureaus by increasing their usefulness to both consumer and business. They may represent the last hope of business to regulate its own activities.

HON. JOHN McCORMACK

HON. ABRAHAM KAZEN, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join other Members of the House in honoring a man who leaves us today, but will always be with us in spirit. JOHN McCORMACK has been a giant among men. His 42 years of service in this House have spanned the most significant years of our Nation's history. His leadership has helped our country meet those challenges. His tireless efforts have been marked by wisdom and dignity.

Those of us who came to the House in

his later years, perhaps felt a bit awed by our new responsibilities. We found Speaker McCORMACK a strong, yet gentle man. I shall ever be grateful that the Speaker always had time to see me, always made me feel at ease, always offered good counsel.

I shall treasure the memories of serving with Speaker McCORMACK. His great friend and predecessor, Sam Rayburn of my State, was once asked under how many Presidents he had served. His answer was, "I have served with eight Presidents." That was JOHN McCORMACK'S attitude toward every Member of this House. He "served with" us, and made us feel that we "served with" him.

He was a great leader of the House, of the Democratic Party, and of this Nation. We are all in his debt. He leaves with our gratitude, and with our prayers for him and his beloved wife.

IN TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM T. MURPHY

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, as the 91st Congress nears adjournment, the congressional career of one of our most distinguished colleagues is also drawing to a close. Representative WILLIAM T. MURPHY, of Illinois, is retiring from Congress after 12 years of outstanding service to his constituents and the Nation.

During his six terms in Congress, Mr. MURPHY has won the admiration and affection of all who have worked with him. He is held in great esteem by the other Members of Congress as well as the voters of the Third District of his State who have so often returned him to office.

Prior to assuming his legislative duties, Mr. MURPHY held a variety of other high offices including membership on the City Council of Chicago from 1935 to 1959. He has also served his party with distinction as a delegate to the Democratic National Conventions of 1944 through 1959. An attorney, he is also a licensed professional engineer and a registered land surveyor. Truly his wide range of interests and abilities attests to his remarkable capacity for knowledge and leadership.

Mr. MURPHY is known for his work on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, where he is chairman of the Subcomittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs. This has put him in a position to wield great influence on matters affecting the State of Hawaii and our interests in this important area of the world.

In all of his work, Mr. MURPHY has shown great compassion for people everywhere and sensitivity to their needs and interests. He has worked effectively to implement a philosophy of government based on the ideals of public service and progressive idealism.

As one who has long held great respect for Congressman MURPHY, I join my colleagues in wishing him well in all his future endeavors. I know he will be truly missed by all of those with whom he has served, and for whom he has toiled so diligently.

THE HONORABLE PHILIP J. PHILBIN

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, our good friend PHIL PHILBIN was elected to the 78th and succeeding Congresses—a span of 28 years. During that historic period America has engaged in three major wars. During much of that period Representative PHILBIN has been a member of the House Armed Services Committee. In that key position he has played a prominent role in the defense and security of our country. And he has given an exceedingly good account of his stewardship.

This distinguished Member has devoted himself with great zeal to his responsibilities. His career has been capped by being elevated to the position of chairman of the committee.

Having been elected to the 78th Congress myself, and having had the high privilege of serving for more than 20 years with PHIL on the Armed Services Committee, and having served on subcommittees with him, I have had an opportunity to observe his performance and his devotion to duty. He has been the recipient of many accolades, and they have been highly deserved. When PHIL leaves the Congress he will leave behind him a record of which he can be justly proud. He has done much for his country.

PHIL PHILBIN has always been the perfect gentleman. Always affable and courteous, he is universally respected by all who have known him. His influence here has been wholesome and effective. He has performed as an expert, an unusually knowledgeable Member, and he has never wavered in making the best possible use of his talents.

Mr. Speaker, PHIL'S district, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the entire Nation, have been most fortunate in having the presence here of such an alert and able man. His shoes will not be easy to fill.

As he leaves the Congress I extend to my friend my congratulations on a job well done, and my best wishes in his future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM T. MURPHY

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Hon. WILLIAM T. MURPHY of Illinois, who leaves Congress after 12 years of distinguished service to his country and his constituents.

BILL MURPHY worked hard at his job and it paid off in the respect of his colleagues. Chicago is losing a very able and effective legislator and so is this House. I wish him and his wife, Rose, the best of everything in their well-earned retirement.

BILL CRAMER: A REAL GENTLEMAN AND GREAT AMERICAN

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the 91st Congress draws to a close, I would like to take this opportunity to reflect on one distinguished Member who has made a lasting mark on this body. BILL CRAMER was elected to the House in 1954 to represent the people of Florida's Eighth Congressional District and for eight successive terms he diligently served the interests and needs of his constituency. In 1970 he ran for the U.S. Senate and gave up his House seat by so doing, he conducted his campaign with fervor and accepted its results with dignity.

I have served with BILL 3 years on the House Public Works Committee and have valued his friendship and greatly benefited from his legislative experience and prowess. Through his dedication and initiative, we have made great strides in building the kind of brick and mortar projects that are so essential for the continued growth and devolpment of our Nation. The recently enacted Federal Aid Highway Act is a testament to his drive and hard work.

BILL CRAMER is a real gentleman and truly a great American. We all owe him a debt of gratitude for the unselfish contribution he has made to our country.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM T. MURPHY

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to WILLIAM T. MURPHY of Illinois, who is retiring at the end of the 91st Congress.

When BILL MURPHY first came to the House of Representatives in 1959, he brought with him a long and distinguished record as a public servant in the city of Chicago, and an interest and expertise in urban affairs.

Following his assignment to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, BILL MURPHY soon demonstrated as keen an understanding of international matters as well. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, BILL MURPHY contributed much toward cementing better relations between our country and the Pacific and Asian nations.

Mr. Speaker, in 1965, I had the privilege of visiting a number of foreign countries with BILL MURPHY and other members of his subcommittee, then chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. ZABLOCKI. BILL MURPHY showed an uncanny knowledge of the geography, history, and problems of all the countries we visited and proved himself an invaluable member of that committee.

Mr. Speaker, WILLIAM T. MURPHY has proved himself to be not only a great American, but also a true citizen of the world. His services in the Congress will be sorely missed, not only by his constituents in Illinois, but also by all Americans everywhere.

As a personal friend I will certainly miss him, and I wish BILL and his lovely and most affable wife, Rose, many years of good health and good fortune and much happiness together.

HON. BYRON ROGERS

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I keenly regret that the distinguished career of such an able legislator as BYRON ROGERS is terminating in Congress. BYRON has served on the Committee on the Judiciary for 20 years, and as a senior member of the committee, I have observed that he has an excellent legal mind, has the ability to concisely and briefly express his opinions—the mark of an able lawyer. BYRON had already had a distinguished career before he came to Congress in 1951, and his professional background provided him with ample experience for the duties he was to undertake, and which he has performed with fidelity and zeal.

I join with my colleagues in extending to BYRON the wish that his future will be rewarding and that he will enjoy many years of good health and happiness.

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend and colleague from Ohio, MIKE FEIGHAN.

As one who has had the good fortune of knowing and working with MIKE since I became a Member of Congress, I would like to take this opportunity to salute MIKE for the fine job he has done for the people of Ohio and the Nation for the last 28 years.

As a Member of the Congress and the House Judiciary Committee, he has reflected a concern, an understanding, and a dedication of the highest order. Always willing to lend a helping hand, MIKE FEIGHAN will be sorely missed by us all I wish MIKE well in his future endeavors. I am confident that he will bring to his new undertakings the same sense of purpose and determination that he has exhibited during his tenure as a Member of the House of Representatives.

LOCKHEED WOES COST THE UNITED STATES

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today's newspapers are replete with stories of the Defense Department's decision to pour between $700 million and more than $1 billion into saving the Lockheed Corp.

Neil Sheehan wrote about this possibility over 2 weeks ago in the New York Times. In that article Mr. Sheehan stated:

> By choosing the alternative of rescuing the corporation rather than letting it go bankrupt, the Pentagon is also setting a precedent for Government behavior toward other major military manufacturers that might flounder financially and need help.

The key to Lockheed's problem is the C–5A. In 1965, when the contract was signed it was estimated that 120 of the transports would cost $3.4 billion. By 1969 the estimate had jumped to $5.2 billion with costs still spiraling. The administration then decided to settle for 81 planes at a cost to Lockheed of $4.585 billion or $758 million above the funds owed to Lockheed by the Government.

The Government has stated that Lockheed is responsible for that $758 million. According to Sheehan, Lockheed argues that—

> The so-called repricing clause in the contract was intended to protect the contractor "against catastrophic loss." In the Corporation's view, the $758 million would be a catastrophic loss and was therefore not intended by the original agreement.

The Government does not have to rescue Lockheed. Other alternatives include nationalizing on the grounds of national security those divisions of Lockheed working for military contracts, or bankruptcy. Apparently the Department of Defense feels they need Lockheed as much as Lockheed needs them. As one aircraft industry spokesman is quoted by Mr. Sheehan:

> They're not the enemy, they're co-belligerents.

The proposed Lockheed rescue is a natural result of an ongoing policy of continual, spiraling military commitment. Certainly when there seems to be a lack of adequate public funds to get food to the hungry, legal services to the poor and self-help to our inner cities while funding is available for support of our military manufacturers in financial peril, something is intrinsically and glaringly wrong with our priorities.

Sheehan's article tells a succinct and familiar story of this country's commitment of public funds to maintaining an abundant military output while ignoring our human resources.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 13, 1970]

LOCKHEED WOES MAY COST U.S. PUBLIC $600 MILLION

(By Neil Sheehan)

WASHINGTON, December 12.—The Defense Department and the beleaguered Lockheed Aircraft Corporation are resolving their differences in a way that will keep Lockheed solvent at an apparent minimum cost to the public of about $600-million.

By choosing the alternative of rescuing the corporation rather than letting it go bankrupt, the Pentagon is also setting a precedent for Government behavior toward other major military manufacturers that might flounder financially and need help.

Lockheed is among the top two or three defense contractors in the country. It was running out of money from escalating production costs.

ONE ACTION; TWO DEEDS

Congress is going along with the Lockheed rescue so far. The Senate this week voted the first increment of $200-million approved earlier by the House, toward covering unexpected costs of $758-million on the C–J–5A jumbo jet transport that Lockheed is manufacturing for the Air Force. Disputed costs on two other projects, the Army's Cheyenne helicopter and ships for the Navy, are also being settled.

Publicly, the Defense Department maintains that it is only seeking to provide what funds are necessary to salvage the military contracts Lockheed has. Privately, knowledgeable sources in Congress and the Pentagon concede that salvation of the military projects and a financial rescue of the corporation are synonymous.

They argue that a collapse of Lockheed would damage the national defense posture and have unforeseeable but probably serious economic repercussions. The Armed Services and appropriations committees in Congress have tactily concurred.

BIG SHARE FOR TAXPAYERS

Opponents of the rescue, like Senator William Proxmire, Democrat of Wisconsin, contend that the risks ought to be run to serve notice on industry that the Government and the taxpayers will not tolerate inefficiency and mismanagement. The opponents have been unsuccessful, however, because they have been unable to convince the majority of Congress that the lesson justifies the perils involved.

The negotiations between Lockheed and the Defense Department are thus proceeding on the assumption that the corporation will not be allowed to lapse into bankruptcy.

What remains to be settled, and what is therefore still unclear, is what portion of the total financial burden will be borne by the taxpayers and how much Lockheed will end up assuming. It is obvious that the taxpayers will be absorbing the greater share.

More than $1-billion is involved—about $758-million in unexpected costs on the C–5A Galaxy, $135-million on the advanced Cheyenne helicopter, and $160-million in disrupted costs for the ships.

Assured by the course the Government is taking, Lockheed's principal creditors have lent the corporation $30-million more for its short-term needs and have tentatively agreed to lend $250-million on top of this if Lockheed's negotiations with the Pentagon end favorably. The total of $280-million would assure production of the L–1011 trijet airbus, the new civilian airliner that Lockheed hopes will recoup much of its fortunes.

The quick $30-million came from 24 commercial banks, led by the Bankers Trust Company of New York. The banks would provide

$150-million of the $250-million remaining, with three airlines—Eastern, Trans World and Delta—making additional advance payments of $100-million for L–1011's.

The banks had already loaned Lockheed $320-million, and Eastern, Trans World, Delta and other airlines had made previous down payments of about $100-million for airbuses that Lockheed will not begin to deliver until next November.

The collapse of the aircraft maker because of grave troubles with its military contracts would thus have spelled disaster for both banks and airlines.

PACKARD IN NEGOTIATIONS

David Packard, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and Daniel J. Houghton, Lockheed's board chairman, are overseeing the negotiations between the Pentagon and the corporation.

They intend to reach final agreement before this January or early February, when a plan to resolve the differences must be presented to the Armed Services and Appropriations committees.

By that time Lockheed will have almost exhausted the money the Government acknowledges that it owes under the original C–5A contract. To continue production, Lockheed will have to use some of the $200-million additional voted by Congress, and Congress made the spending of the money contingent on a settlement plan.

The C–5A problem is the obvious center of the imbroglio, since its resolution will cost everyone the most money.

The original estimate when the contract was signed in 1965 was that 120 of the transports would cost about $3.4-billion. By mid-1969 the cost estimate had risen to $5.2-billion and the Nixon Administration decided to settle for 81 planes. The plane is to be the largest ever built—six stories high and nearly the length of a football field.

It is impossible at this point to determine precisely how much of the cost overrun was due to the corporation's mismanagement and how much was caused by inflation and the turmoil that struck the aircraft industry as a whole in 1966, when the demands of the Vietnam war were heaped atop an already high civilian aircraft production. Aircraft parts that had been taking eight years to forge or cast in 1965, suddenly began taking 18 weeks in 1966.

SAME COST, FEWER PLANES

The 81 C–5A's the Pentagon is settling for will, in any case, cost $4.585-billion under current estimates, nearly as much as the mid-1969 estimate for 120 planes.

Of this $4.585-billion, the actual cost for 81 planes, the Government contends that it legally owes $3.827-billion under the terms of the contract and that Lockheed is responsible for the remaining $758-million.

Lockheed officials will not say what the concern believes it owes. They do argue, however, that a so-called repricing clause in the contract was intended to protect the contractor "against catastrophic losses." In the corporation's view, the $758-million would be a catastrophic loss and was therefore not intended by the original agreement.

Robert H. Charles, the former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force who designed the contract—a new type called Total Package Procurement—says the repricing clause was aimed at setting an outside loss limit of $150-million. He also believes that the intent of the clause was to avoid breaking the corporation with a catastrophic loss.

Neither side will now acknowledge that a loss figure of $150-million was ever considered, although Lockheed could end up with a theoretical loss in this range.

An official Air Force analysis of the C–5A problem last August was made public by Senator Proxmire in September as part of his unsuccessful attempt to block a rescue. It estimated that Lockheed would be stuck with a loss $300- to $400- million if the contract dispute went to the courts for resolution.

The prospect of extended litigation with no more funds coming in for the C–5A would drive the corporation into bankruptcy, however, the Air Force noted, and this alternative would be unacceptable to the Government.

Someone must also come up with $758-million by mid-1973 if the 81 C–5A's are to be produced on the current schedule. Lockheed obviously does not have the money.

Here is how the settlement is being arranged:

The entire $758-million will initially be paid out from public funds to keep production going. The negotiations will decide what portion of this $758-million Lockheed will pay back. This portion will be termed the corporation's loss on the contract. The Pentagon has no hope of collecting the entire $758-million from Lockheed. "How do you collect it?" one official asked.

A $300 MILLION TOP LOSS

The precise loss figure that Pentagon negotiators are trying to persuade Lockheed to accept is unknown. Defense sources say that it lies between $150-million and $300-million. The taxpayers will thus have to absorb a minimum of $458-million on the C–5A.

Lockheed sources indicate the corporation might be willing to take a loss of $150-million or more, depending on repayment provisions. In the aircraft industry, as in many others, the flow of ready cash that a company has to pay for its ongoing operations is more important than long-term debt.

The Air Force analysis suggested that Lockheed repay the Government at $10-million a year and 6 per cent interest, or 10 per cent of net corporation profits before taxes, whichever is greater. Repayment would start in 1973, after most of the 81 planes have been delivered.

The first $200-million increment just voted by Congress will be spent by next July. $300- to $400-million must be voted and spent in the next 1972 fiscal year and the rest of the $758-million in the 1973 fiscal year.

When a final settlement is reached, it will be incorporated in a new contract, and the original C–5A contract will be scrapped, Defense sources said.

The Government's precise negotiating positions in the other two disputes, the Cheyenne helicopter and the shipbuilding contracts, are also unknown.

Lockheed contends that the Government owes it $135-million for the aborted Cheyenne production, canceled by the Pentagon for alleged default by the company in mid-1969, and $160-million on the ships Lockheed is still building for the Navy.

Escalating cost were the rub in both instances. The Cheyenne, a radical advance in helicopters that incorporates the landing and take-off advantages of rotors with a 250-mile-an-hour speed of fixed wing aircraft, burgeoned from an original estimate of about $1-million a machine to $3.5-million each before production was canceled.

Some military sources believe the Army procurement bureaucracy was as much to blame as Lockheed for trying to cram too much exotic electronics gear into the Cheyenne. "Everyone's little invention was the best thing since sliced bread," one officer said.

Lockheed officials concede that the company was guilty of not forseeing the technical problems. "We thought we were adding one and one but we got four," one official said. The Pentagon has continued a smaller development contract, for which Congress voted $17-million more this year, to cure technical deficiencies.

Defense sources indicate that the Cheyenne production and shipbuilding disputes may be settled by roughly halving Lockheed's claims on each, about $65-million on Cheyenne and $80-million on the ships.

The overall settlement of these two issues and the C–5A dispute could thus end up costing the taxpayers at least $600-million.

Although Lockheed will clearly take a loss on the immediate contract for the 81 C–5A's and in the two other disputes, the corporation could come out ahead in the long run.

The C-5A will be able to ferry 112,000 pounds of cargo for 5,500 nautical miles. Civilian versions could revolutionize the air freight business.

The Air Force could use other military versions for giant air-to-air refueling tankers, airborne command posts and even as a flying platform to launch intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Foreign governments may also buy C–5A's for their own air forces.

If Lockheed can sell enough C-5A's for these manifold uses, it can profit.

The Army may make the same true with Cheyenne by going back into production in the next year or two. There is still argument within the Army over the wisdom of buying the helicopter, but some of the most influential senior officers want it.

TWO ALTERNATIVES REJECTED

The Army would like to use the Cheyenne primarily as an airborne antitank missile platform that could knock out Soviet armor at night and in bad weather if a land war erupted in Europe.

And production of Cheyenne could mean a new $1-billion contract for Lockheed.

Implict in the Government's decision to keep Lockheed solvent was the rejection of the two other alternatives that lay at the end of the arguments that Senator Proxmire and others who opposed a rescue operation were making. These alternatives go bankrupt or effectively nationalizing on the grounds of national security, these divisions of Lockheed that were working on military contracts.

Theoretically, the Government could still have obtained the 81 C-5A's, new Cheyennes and the ships by paying the production cost to court-appointed bankruptcy trustees who would have taken over Lockheed management.

The Government would have run the risk with either alternative of becoming entangled in a long court battle.

The conversations with knowledgeable sources made clear, however, that this risk was not the major reason for the Government's decision to have the corporation.

Rather, Mr. Packard and others within the Government seem to have recoiled from the shock waves and unforeseeable consequences that would have hit the aircraft industry, and the banking and airline communities, if Lockheed had collapsed.

When the grim choice of bankruptcy or salvation was posed, the Defense Department and the military services apparently decided that they needed a leading military manufacturer, which currently obtains about 80 per cent of its revenues from the Government, as much as Lockheed needed them.

One aircraft industry source put the matter succinctly. "They're not the enemy, they're co-belligerents," he said of Mr. Packard and other senior defense officials.

In a minority view appended to the Senate-Armed Services committee report last July, Senator Richard S. Schweiker, Republican of Pennsylvania, who had also vainly opposed a rescue, warned that approval of the $200-million first increment in extra costs for C–5 would set the precedent under which other military manufacturers who might get into financial peril from cost over-

runs could expect the Government to save them.

"I believe Congress must use this issue to draw the line," he said. "Denial of this request for $200-million will serve notice loud and clear that although both Government and industry have been sloppy in the past, we are going to demand efficient performance by contractors and strict adherence to contract prices and specifications in the future."

The Pentagon has already taken precautions against future bankruptcy choices by reverting to a modified form of the old cost-plus type contracting of the 1950's and by abandoning the total package procurement system that Robert Charles initiated under former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as we come to the close of this session we are mindful that each delegation may be saying farewell to one or more of its members. This is so with the California delegation. One of our departing brethren, JEFFERY COHELAN, having fallen victim to the vicissitudes of political life, will not be in this House in the next Congress.

This body in general and our delegation in particular will sorely miss JEFFERY. He is that wonderful mixture of dedication, talent and wit that contributes so constructively in the accomplishment of the heavy duties of the House. When the difficult and involved matter of funding education programs was before us this year, for instance, one of the soundest, in-depth presentations was made by the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN). That presentation was typical of the high caliber of his service and reflected as well his value to this House.

Aside from his unquestionable attributes as a scholarly legislator, JEFFERY is a thoroughly decent and kind human being, mindful of the needs and wants of others and ready with a patient ear and a willing hand. His kind makes the service in this body much more of a satisfying experience than would otherwise be the case.

The Committee on Appropriations will miss his careful and detailed work. The floor will miss the thorough, documented presentation he so ably presented. Our delegation will miss his service as our secretary and his contributions to our joint deliberations. I will miss him as a close and valued friend.

I join with his myriad of warm and well-wishing colleagues in predicting for him a successful and satisfying career in the new work he will be undertaking. I congratulate the organization which will now enjoy the commitment and employment of one of the warmest, finest and most able men it has been my pleasure to know and serve with, JEFFERY COHELAN, of California.

OPERATION KEELHAUL

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times recently carried a most informative article by Julius Epstein on Operation Keelhaul.

Mr. Epstein, who is a scholar working at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, has for some time now been attempting to get the U.S. Government to declassify the files of Operation Keelhaul which for the past 25 years have been labeled top secret.

Since the forcible repatriation of Soviet citizens at the end of World War II was an act performed by both the United States and the British Government, the United States now takes the position that the British must agree to the declassification of these files before it can be carried out.

It is my fervent hope that the British Government will agree to the declassification for, indeed, we can learn much from Operation Keelhaul.

All of us were outraged recently when a Coast Guard cutter turned over to Soviet authorities the refugee Simas Kudrika after he sought asylum on an American ship.

Operation Keelhaul is no less scandalous and, in my judgment, no more deplorable than the Kudirka affair.

I would hope that both our Defense Department and our State Department will continue pressing the British authorities to agree on the declassification of the files on Operation Keelhaul so that we can open up yet another chapter on Soviet chicanery and deceit.

The New York Times article follows:

A CASE FOR SUPPRESSION

(By Julius Epstein)

Doing research on forced repatriation of anti-Communist prisoners of war and displaced persons during and after World War II, I discovered early in 1954 in the Army's Historical Records Branch in Alexandria, Va., an index card marked "Forcible Repatriation of Displaced Soviet Citizens—Operation Keelhaul—383-7-14."

When I asked for the dossier, I was told that it was Top Secret and that the index card should not be in a public catalogue. It was immediately removed. Since then, I have tried to have the "Operation Keelhaul" files de-classified and released.

What does "keelhaul" mean? According to Webster, Second Edition, "keelhaul" means: "To haul under the keel of a ship, either athwartships or from bow to stern by ropes attached to the yardarms on each side. It was formerly a punishment in the Dutch and British Navies and a methods of torture used by pirates." The Army chose "Operation Keelhaul" as the code-name for a collection of documents dealing with the forcible repatriation of millions of anti-Communists to Stalin's Soviet Union.

Through my study I became convinced that forced repatriation, as carried out by the American and British military authorities, was a violation of the Geneva Convention of 1929.

That forced repatriation of anti-Communists to Stalin's slave labor camps was in violation of international law as well as in violation of the American tradition of asylum for political exiles can be documented by statements made by President Eisenhower, General Marshall, Dean Acheson and many others.

To give just one example: When the North Koreans demanded forced repatriation of North Korean and Chinese prisoners of war, Acheson said in his speech before the United Nations Oct. 24, 1954: "It was quite unthinkable to the United Nations Command that it should use force to drive into the hands of the Communists, people who would be resisting that effort by force. Finally, they say that the Geneva Convention and international practice require this forcible repatriation. We, on the other hand, have said that we have lived up to the humanitarian principles of the Geneva Convention."

Soon after the "Freedom of Information Act" went into force on July 4, 1967, I filed a lawsuit against Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor for release of "Operation Keelhaul." Congressman John E. Moss declared in a sworn affidavit that it was the intent of Congress to give the courts the "broadest latitude" in examining secret documents—in camera—in order to find out whether they have been properly classified.

If the judge finds that disclosure would not endanger foreign policy or national defense, he has the duty to enjoin the government agency from withholding the documents. Although it was clear that the Keelhaul documents could never endanger American foreign policy or national security, the courts found that they had not the power to subpoena the documents and that classification was "appropriate." How they could decide that classification of about 300 documents was appropriate without having seen a single one, is hard to explain.

The Supreme Court denied my petition for a writ of certiorari. The only justice in favor of granting certiorari was Justice Douglas. Since the courts declared the "Freedom of Information Act" a dead letter. Congress will have to amend the act in order to revive it.

On Oct. 22, 1970, the White House informed me that President Nixon has removed the main obstacle for declassification of the Keelhaul files. The letter states: "The U.S. Government has absolutely no objections (based on the contents of the files) to the declassification and release of the 'Operation Keelhaul' files. However, given the joint origin of the documents, British concurrence is necessary before they can be released and this concurrence has not been received. Thus, we have no alternative but to deny your request."

Since the Keelhaul files contain many purely American documents, classified by American military authorities, I hope that I shall succeed in persuading the Administration that these American documents should be released. If this should finally be denied, it would amount to the admission that a foreign government has still the power to prevent the American people from learning their own history based on American evidence.

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to one of our colleagues who is retiring from Congress at the conclusion of this session.

While Congressman WILLIAM T. MURPHY and I often have found our votes tallied on opposite sides of the roll, in his six terms as a Member of this body he has demonstrated an appreciation for many of the same ideals which I also honor. Most notably, Congressman MURPHY has voiced his concern for the plight of millions of persons imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain, for which he was awarded a Captive Nations 10th Commemorative Medal in 1964. I wish my Illinois colleague happiness in his retirement.

HON. MICHAEL FEIGHAN

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged through the years to enjoy an unusually warm and close friendship with MIKE FEIGHAN. I have appreciated his fine work in the House of Representatives, and his courageous stand for those principles for which he has stood for and upheld. His legislative interests have been many, and his contributions important in each of these fields. He has been a fighter against activities which threaten America's future and its security. For this he has been recognized on many occasions by patriotic organizations. These important awards attest to the measure of his courage and his devotion to America.

As the ranking member of the important Committee on the Judiciary of the House, he has accepted great responsibilities, and time after time he has been a champion for the sound policies which are so vital to our Nation's survival.

His fine standing on both sides of the aisle in Congress attest also to the esteem with which he is held here and the effectiveness of his work.

Mrs. Sikes and I wish for MIKE and his family the very best in success and happiness in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER McCORMACK

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay sincere tribute to a distinguished American legislator and statesman, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK of Massachusetts.

As his 9 years as Speaker of this body come to a close, it is clear that JOHN MCCORMACK served his constituents and his country with great devotion and skill.

I shall remember him not as the leader of the opposition party in the House, but as a great Speaker whose allegiance to country transcended partisan objectives and who had the confidence, respect, and admiration of Members from both sides of the aisle.

I shall also remember him as a kind and thoughtful man who, despite the press of his official duties, was never too busy to assist new Members or advise those of us in the minority. I shall always remember his kindness in taking the time to inquire as to my health when I was in the hospital a couple years ago.

In his retirement, I join all my colleagues in wishing him happiness and success. We shall miss his great skill as the Speaker and his personal friendship.

REPORT OF HON. GERALD R. FORD

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the second session of the 91st Congress, 1970.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of the bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

The report follows:

1970

Rollcall No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 19	Call of the House	Absent.[1]
2	Jan. 26	Quorum call	Present.
3	do	do	Do.
4	Jan. 27	H.R. 15149: To approve the conference on the 1,500,000,000 foreign aid appropriations bill (passed, 202–162).	Yes.
5	do	H.R. 860: To approve the bill providing for employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products (passed, 189–186).	No.
6	Jan. 28	Quorum call	Present.
7	do	H.R. 13111: On the motion to override the President's veto of the 1970 Labor-HEW appropriations bill (defeated, 226–191, a 2/3 vote being necessary).	No.
8	Jan. 29	Quorum call	Present.
9	do	H.R. 14864: To adopt the Defense Facilities and Industrial Securities Act of 1970 (passed, 274–65).	Yes.
10	Feb. 5	Quorum call	Present.
11	Feb. 16	do	Do.
12	do	H.R. 1049: To suspend the rules and pass the bill amending the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act of 1965 (passed, 300–19).	Yes.
13	Feb. 17	Quorum call	Present.
14	do	H.R. 15062: In a motion to strike title I (H.R. 3723: For the relief of Robert G. Smith) from the Omnibus Private Claims bill (defeated, 59–287)	No.
15	do	H.R. 15062: On a motion to strike title II (H.R. 5000: For the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido) from the Omnibus Private Claims bill (defeated, 56–289)	No.
16	do	H.R. 15062: On a motion to strike title III (H.R. 6378: For relief of Noel S. Merston) from the Omnibus Private Claims bill (defeated, 67–288)	No.
17	do	H.R. 16062: On a motion to strike title IV (H.R. 2214: For the relief of the Mutual Benefit Foundation) from the Omnibus Private Claims bill (defeated, 51–306)	No.
18	do	H.R. 15062: On the final passage of the Omnibus Private Claims bill (passed 315–51)	Yes.
19	do	Quorum call	Present.
20	do	do	Do.
21	Feb. 18	do	Do.
22	do	H.R. 15165 (S. 2701): To affirm the bill establishing a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future (passed, 37–13)	Yes.
23	Feb. 19	Quorum call	Present.
24	do	do	Do.
25	do	H.R. 15931: On the motion to adopt the previous question on the Labor-HEW appropriations bill and all amendments thereto (passed 238–156)	Yes.
26	do	H.R. 15931: On a motion to recommit to committee the Labor-HEW appropriations bill in order to limit expenditures to 97.5 percent of the total appropriation (defeated, 189–205).	Yes.
27	do	H.R. 15931: On final passage of the revised Labor-HEW appropriations bill (passed, 315–81)	No.
28	Feb. 24	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
29	do	H.R. 10937: On the passage of the bill to authorize a study of the Eisenhower Memorial Arena and Convention Center in Washington, D.C. (defeated, 136–230)	Do.[3]
30	do	H.R. 10335: On the passage of a bill to revise the laws relating to offenses against hotels, motels, etc., in the District of Columbia (passed, 246–117)	Do.[2]
31	do	H.R. 14608: In passage of a bill relating to the procedure for return and cancellation of class A liquor licenses in the District of Columbia (defeated, 97–262)	Do.[3]
32	Feb. 26	Quorum call	Present.
33	do	S. 2523: To adopt the conference on the bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act (passed, 369–0)	Yes.
34	do	H.R. 799: To adopt the resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12025, the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act (defeated, 150–228)	Yes.
35	Mar. 3	Quorum call	Present.
36	do	H.R. 15931: On a motion to lay on the table a motion to instruct the House conferees to agree to the amendments of the Senate on the HEW appropriation bill (defeated, 164–220).	No.
37	do	H.R. 15931: On the motion to instruct the House conferees to agree to the amendments of the Senate on the HEW appropriation bill (passed, 228–152)	Yes.
38	do	Quorum call	Present.
39	do	H.R. 15931: To approve the conference report on the Labor-HEW appropriations bill (passed, 324–55)	Yes.
40	Mar. 4	H.J. Res. 1112 (S.J. Res. 180): To adopt the resolution providing for a temporary prohibition of strikes or lockouts with respect to the current railway labor-management dispute (passed, 343–15).	Yes.
41	Mar. 5	Quorum call	Present.
42	do	H. Res. 862: To approve the resolution providing for considering of S. 2910 authorizing additional funds for the Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building (passed, 289–62).	Yes.
43	do	S. 2910: To recommit to committee the bill authorizing additional funds for the Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building until all necessary designs, plans, and specifications have been completed (defeated, 150–197).	No.
44	Mar. 5	S. 2910: To approve the bill authorizing additional funds for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building (passed, 209–133)	Yes.
45	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.

Footnotes at end of table.

1970—Continued

Rollcall No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
46	Mar. 11	H.R. 15945: To authorize appropriations for the construction and operation of ships in the merchant marine and other purposes (passed, 370–12)	Yes.
47	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
48	do	H.R. 15143: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to provide the rank of lieutenant general for an officer serving as Chief of the National Guard Bureau (passed, 269–44).	Yes.
49	do	H.R. 14896: To suspend the rules and pass the bill establishing a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the nation (passed, 317–9).	Yes.
50	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
51	do	do	Do.
52	Mar. 18	do	Do.
53	do	do	Do.
54	do	S. 952: To approve the bill providing for the appointment of additional federal district judges (passed, 366–18)	Yes.
55	Mar. 19	Quorum call	Present.
56	do	H.R. 16196 (S. 2601): To approve the District of Columbia Omnibus Crime bill (passed, 294–47)	Yes.
57	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
58	do	do	Do.[1]
59	do	H.R. 15728: On the bill authorizing extensions of certain naval vessel loans and new loans (passed, 281–66)	Do.[2]
60	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
61	do	H.R. 15628: On the bill to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act (passed, 351–26)	Yes.
62	Mar. 25	H.R. 844: To authorize funds for the operation of the House Committee of Internal Security (passed, 307–52)	Yes.
63	do	H.R. 4148: To adopt the conference report on the Water Quality Improvement Act (Federal Water Pollution Control Act) (passed, 358–0)	Yes.
64	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
65	do	do	Do.
66	do	H.R. 514: On the adoption of the conference report on the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969 (passed, 312–58)	Yes.
67	do	H.R. 15733: To provide a 15-percent increase in annuities and make other changes in the Railroad Retirement Act (passed, 379–0)	Yes.
68	Apr. 8	Quorum call	Present.
69	Apr. 9	do	Do.
70	do	H.R. 16844: On a motion to recommit to committee the Federal employees' salary bill in order to omit sections regarding remote worksite allowances for employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged in floating plant operations (passed, 261–124).	Yes.
71	do	H.R. 16844: (S. 3690) To approve the Federal employees salary increases (passed, 371–7)	Yes.
72	Apr. 13	Quorum call	Present.
73	do	H.R. 16900: To approve the Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office 1971 appropriations bill in amount of $9.2 billion (passed, 333–3)	Yes.
74	Apr. 14	Quorum call	Present.
75	do	H.R. 909: On the adoption of the previous question on the resolution providing for House concurrence to the Senate amendments to House amendments to S. 3690, the Federal employees salary increases (passed, 309–65).	Yes.
76	do	Quorum call	Present.
77	Apr. 15	H.R. 916: On the adoption of the closed vote for consideration of H.R. 16311, The Family Assistance Act of 1970 (passed 204–183)	Yes.
78	do	Quorum call	Present.
79	do	do	Do.
80	do	On a motion to adjourn (passed 81–75)	Yes.
81	Apr. 16	Quorum call	Present.
82	do	H.R. 16311: On a motion to recommit to committee the Family Assistance Plan in order to define "suitable employment" (passed 248–149)	Yes.
83	do	H.R. 16311: On final passage of the Family Assistance Act of 1970 (passed 259–11)	Yes.
84	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
85	do	H.R. 10666: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Informational license as an independent agency (passed 259–11).	Yes.
86	do	H.R. 780: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct and operate the Merlin Division Rogue River Project Oregon (passed 271–15).	Yes.
87	Apr. 23	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
88	do	do	Present.
89	do	H.R. 16516: To approve the $3,570,000,000 authorization for NASA (passed 229–105)	Yes.
90	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
91	do	H.R. 14714: To recommit to committee the bill to authorize appropriations for promoting travel in the United States and to our national parks (defeated 111–222)	No.
92	do	H.R. 14714: To approve the bill authorizing appropriations of $250,000 and $750,000 for fiscal years 1971 and 1972 for the promotion of travel in the United States and to our national parks (passed 238–94).	Yes.
93	do	H.R. 14385: On a bill to the expenditures of $150,000 during the next 2 years to subsidize the cost of transportation for certain employees of the Public Health Service whose headquarters were transferred (defeated 64–273).	No.
94	Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
95	do	H.R. 16200: On a motion to recommit to committee the Arms Control and Disarmament bill in order to reduce the 2-year authorization from $17,500,000 to $13,125,000 (defeated 87–280).	No.
96	do	H.R. 15963: To approve the bill designated to minors and postal patrons against obscene mailing (passed 375–8)	Yes.
97	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
98	Apr. 30	do	Present.
99	May 4	do	Do.
100	do	S.J. Res 193: To suspend the rules and pass the resolution providing for the appointment of James E. Webb as citizen regent of the Smithsonian Institution (passed 309–16).	Absent.
101	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
102	May 6	do	Do.
103	do	H.R. 17123: On a motion to order the previous question on the motion to recommit to committee with instructions the Military Procurement Authorization bill (passed 248–146).	Yes.
104	do	H.R. 17123: To approve the $20,000,000,000 Military Procurement authorization bill (passed 326–69)	Yes.
105	May 7	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
106	do	do	Do.[1]
107	do	H.R. 17399: On a motion to order the previous question on the motion to recommit to committee the Second Supplemental Appropriation bill (passed 20–134)	Do.[2]
108	do	H.R. 17399: To approve the $5,700,000,000 Second Supplemental Appropriations bill (passed 333–8)	Do.[2]
109	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
110	do	H.R. 17138: To approve the committee's amendment to the D.C. employee's pay bill setting the salary for beginning teachers at $7,800 (passed 183–142)	Yes.
111	do	H.R. 16595: To recommit to committee the bill authorizing appropriations for the National License Foundation in order to cut the authorizations by $27,600,000 (defeated 137–188).	Yes.
112	do	H.R. 16595: To approve the authorization bill for the National License Foundation (passed 312–6)	Yes.
113	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
114	do	do	Absent.
115	do	do	Present.
116	May 13	do	Do.
117	do	H.R. 14465: To adopt the conference report on the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 (passed 361–3)	Yes.
118	do	H. Res. 960: To adopt the resolution rejecting Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1970 (defeated 164–193)	No.
119	May 14	Quorum call	Present.
120	do	H.R. 17575: To adopt the $3,100,000,000 appropriations bill for the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary (passed 321–14)	Yes.
121	do	H.R. 14685: To approve the bill amending the International Travel Act of 1961 (passed 173–88)	Yes.
122	May 18	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
123	do	S. 2624: To suspend the rules and pass the Customs Court Act of 1970 (passed 301–0)	Do.[2]
124	do	S. 1508: To suspend the rules and pass the bill permitting Federal judges with 20 years of service to retire at age 60 (defeated 109–198)	Do.[3]
125	do	H.R. 3328: To suspend the rules and pass the bill relative to the water supply for the Saboda Indian Reservation (passed 286–11)	Do.[3]
126	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
127	do	S. 952: To approve the conference report on the bill providing for appointment of additional judges for the District of Columbia (passed 331–21)	Yes.
128	May 20	Quorum call	Present.
129	do	do	Do.
130	do	H.R. 17604: On a motion to order the previous question the motion to recommit to committee the Military Construction Authorization bill (passed 251–133)	Yes.
131	do	H.R. 17604: On final passage of the Military Construction Authorization Act (passed 334–47)	Yes.
132	May 21	H. Res. 1022: On a motion to order the previous question on the motion to adopt the "rule" for consideration of H.R. 17550, the Social Security Amendments of 1970 (passed 201–181).	Yes.
133	do	H. Res. 1022: To adopt the rule under which H.R. 17550, the Social Security Amendments of 1970, will be considered (passed 297–83)	Yes.
134	do	Quorum call	Present.
135	do	H.R. 17550: On a motion to recommit to committee the Social Security bill in order to amend the bill providing for automatic increase in benefits when there is an increase of 3 percent or more in the cost of living (passed 233–144).	Yes.
136	do	H.R. 17550: To approve the Social Security Amendments of 1970 (passed 344–32)	Yes.
137	do	H.R. 15424: On final passage of the bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act (passed 307–1)	Yes.
138	May 25	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
139	do	H.R. 17601: To exempt FHA and VA mortgages and loans from interest and usury laws of the District of Columbia (defeated 118–176)	Do.[3]
140	do	H.R. 15073: To approve the bank records and Foreign Transactions Act (passed 302–0)	Do.[2]

Footnotes at end of article.

1970—Continued

Rollcall No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
141	May 25	H.J. Res. 1117: To approve the resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Environment and Technology (passed 285–7)	Do.[2]
142	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
143	do	H. Res. 796: To approve the resolution amending the rules of the House relating to financial disclosures by Members (passed 335–1)	Yes.
144	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
145	May 28	do	Absent.[1]
146	do	H.R. 17755: On a motion to order the previous question on the motion to recommit to committee the Department of Transportation appropriations bill (passed 176–162).	Yes.
147	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
148	June 2	do	Do.
149	June 3	H. Res. 1051: On ordering the previous question on a motion to adopt the "rule" tor consideration of H.R. 17902, the bill to increase the public debt limitation (passed 273–85).	Yes.
150	do	H.R. 17802: To approve the bill raising the permanent limit on the national debt to $380,000,000,000 with a temporary limit at $395,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1971 (passed 236–127).	Yes.
151	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
152	do	H.R. 17867: To approve the $2,300,000,000 foreign assistance appropriations bill (passed 191–153)	Yes.
153	June 8	Quorum call (passed 236–127).	Absent.[1]
154	do	H. Res. 976: On an amendment to the resolution authorizing a select committee to study developments in Southeast Asia increasing the number on the committee from 11 to 12 (6 from each political party) (passed 227–95).	Do.[2]
155	do	H. Res. 976: On ordering the previous question on the adoption of the resolution authorizing a select committee to study developments in Southeast Asia (passed 246–80).	Do.[2]
156	do	H. Res. 976: On adoption of the resolution to establish a select committee to study developments in Southeast Asia (passed 233–101)	Do.[2]
157	do	H. Res. 976: To approve the committee to the preamble of the resolution establishing a select committee to study developments in Southeast Asia (passed 210–84).	Do.[2]
158	June 9	Quorem call	Present.
159	do	do	Do.
160	do	do	Do.
161	June 10	H.R. 11102: To adopt the conference report on the Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Amendments of 1970 (passed 377–0)	Yes.
162	do	H. Res. 1069: To adopt the rule for the consideration of the Clean Air Amendments of 1970 (passed 335–40)	Present.
163	do	Quorum call	Yes.
164	do	H.R. 17255: To approve the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970 (passed 374–1)	Yes.
165	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
166	do	do	Do.
167	do	H.R. 17970: To approve the Military Construction Appropriation bill for 1971 (passed 308–57)	Yes.
168	June 15	H.R. 17958 (S. 3348): To suspend the rules and approve the bill increasing the rates for VA disability compensation (passed 313–0)	Yes.
169	do	H.R. 15361: To approve the bill establishing a pilot program designated as a youth conservation program (passed 255–54)	Absent.
170	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
171	do	H. Res. 1077: To order the previous question on the "rule" under which H.R. 17070, the postal reform bill is to be considered (defeated 139–219)	Yes.
172	do	Quorum call	Present.
173	do	do	Do.
174	June 17	do	Do.
175	do	H. Res. 914: To order the previous question on the resolution agreeing to the Senate amendment to the voting rights bill lowering the voting age to 18 years (passed 224–183).	No.
176	do	H. Res. 914: To approve the resolution agreeing to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4249 (Voting rights amendment) lowering the voting age to 18 years (passed 272–132).	Yes.
177	do	Quorum call	Present.
178	June 18	do	Do.
179	do	H.R. 17070: On a motion to recommit to committee the postal reform and pay raise bill in order to strike out the postal reform provision (defeated 77–306)	No.
180	do	H.R. 17070: On final passage of the postal reform and pay raise bill as amended (passed 359–24)	Yes.
181	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
182	do	S. 2315: To approve the bill restoring the Golden Eagle passport for entrance to national recreational areas (passed 314–1)	Yes.
183	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
184	do	H.R. 11833: To approve the Resource Recovery Act of 1970 (passed 337–0)	Absent.[2]
185	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
186	do	do	Do.
187	June 25	do	Do.
188	do	H.R. 11102: To override the Presidential veto of the Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Amendments of 1970, (passed 279–98)	No.
189	do	H.R. 17399: To agree to a Senate amendment to the second supplemental appropriation bill adding $587,500,000 for urban renewal programs (defeated 136–236)	No.
190	do	H.R. 17495: To amend the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970 by striking out title V which provides for the establishment of a National Development Bank (passed 214–113).	Yes.
191	do	H.R. 17495: On final passage of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970 (passed 322–2)	Yes.
192	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
193	June 30	do	Do.
194	do	H.R. 16916: To table the motion instructing the House Conferees to agree to the Senate amendments to the Office of Education appropriations bill which would strike out provisions that prohibit use of funds for forced busing and provides freedom of choice school desegregation plans (passed 191–157)	Yes.
195	do	H.R. 17825: To approve the bill amending the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (passed 343–2)	Yes.
196	do	S.J. Res. 88: To approve the joint resolution creating a Commission to study Bankruptcy Laws (passed 334–12)	Yes.
197	do	H.R. 16065: To approve the bill amending the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (passed 262–78)	Yes.
198	July 6	Quorum call	Present.
199	do	S. 3592: To suspend the rules and pass the bill amending the Federal Meat Inspection Act to clarify provisions relating to custom slaughtering (passed 296–2)	Yes.
200	July 7	Quorum call	Present.
201	do	H.R. 16327: To recommit to committee the Peace Corps authorization bill in order to cut the authorization from $98,800,000 to $70,000,000 (defeated 118–244)	No.
202	do	H.R. 16327: On final passage of the $98,800,000 Peace Corps authorization bill (passed 316–46)	Yes.
203	do	H.R. 8673: To approve the bill providing consumer protection for gold and silver articles (passed 351–9)	Yes.
204	July 8	Quorum call	Present.
205	do	H.R. 1031: To approve the resolution relating to political campaign contributions affecting the House of Representatives (passed 381–0)	Yes.
206	do	H.R. 279: To approve the Newspaper Preservation Act (passed 292–87)	Yes.
207	July 9	H.R. 15628: On ordering the previous question on the motion to send to conference the Foreign Military Sales Act as amended by Senate (passed 247–143)	Yes.
208	do	H.R. 15628: To lay on the table the motion to instruct the conferees to agree to the Cooper-Church amendment (barring funds for retaining U.S. forces in Cambodia) to the Foreign Military Sales Act (passed 237–153).	Yes.
209	do	H.R. 17070: To lay on the table the motion to instruct the conferees to insist on the House amendment to the Postal Reform Act prohibiting the union shop (defeated 153–230).	No.
210	do	H.R. 1070: On the motion to instruct the House conferees to insist on the freedom of choice provision of the postal reform bill (passed 225–159)	Yes.
211	do	H.R. 16968: On the motion to recommit to committee the bill on Federal employees health benefits in order to reduce the Government contribution from 50 to 38 percent (defeated 147–199).	Yes.
212	do	H.R. 16968: To approve the bill raising the Governments contribution to Federal employees health benefit plan (passed 284–57)	Yes.
213	July 13	S. 3215: To agree to the conference report on the bill to amend the National Foundation on Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (passed 237–69)	Yes.
214	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
215	July 15	do	Do.
216	do	S. 2601: To approve the conference report on the D.C. Court Reform and Criminal Procedures Act of 1970 (passed 332–64)	Yes.
217	do	H.R. 16595: To approve the conference report on the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1971 (passed 311–76)	Yes.
218	July 16	Quorum call	Present.
219	do	H.R. 14685: To agree to the conference report on the bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 (defeated 174–207)	No.
220	do	H.R. 16916: To agree to the conference report on the Office of Education appropriation bill (passed 357–30)	Yes.
221	July 20	H.R. 18253: To suspend the rules and pass the bill increasing availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans (passed 326–0)	Yes.
222	do	H.R. 14114: To suspend the rules and pass the bill relative to the administration of the National Park System (passed 325–0)	Yes.
223	do	Quorum call	Present.
224	do	do	Do.
225	July 21	do	Do.
226	do	do	Do.
227	July 22	do	Do.
228	do	H.R. 17619: To approve the conference report on the 1971 appropriations bills for the Department of Interior and related agencies (passed 387–3)	Yes.
229	do	Quorum call	Present.
230	July 23	do	Do.
231	do	H.R. 14075: On a motion to recommit to the Conference Committee with instructions to agree to the Senate amendment extending unemployment compensation to agricultural labor where at least 8 workers are employed for 26 weeks or more (defeated 170–219).	No.
232	do	H.R. 14705: To approve the conference report on the Employment Security Amendments of 1970 (passed 388–3)	Yes.
233	do	H.R. 18515: To approve the 1971 appropriation bill for Departments of Labor and HEW and related agencies (passed 361–14)	Yes.
234	July 27	Quorum call	Absent.
235	July 28	do	Present.
236	do	do	Do.

Footnotes at end of table.

Rollcall No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
237	July 29	Quorum call	Present.
238	do	H.R. 17548: To recommit to committee the Conference Report on the Independent Offices and Department of HUD appropriation bill (defeated 156–227)	Yes.
239	do	Quorum call	Present.
240	do	do	Do.
241	July 30	do	Do.
242	do	H.R. 15733: To adopt the conference report on the bill to provide a temporary 15 percent increase in annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act (passed 344–0).	Yes.
243	do	H.R. 13100: To pass the bill extending programs for training in the allied health professions (passed 343–1) (S. 2846)	Yes.
244	do	H.R. 14237: To approve the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act (passed 338–0)	Yes.
245	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
246	do	do	Do.
247	do	H.R. 17880: To recommit to committee the Defense Production Act amendments in order to add an amendment providing for a freeze on prices, rents, wages and salaries as of May 25, 1970 (defeated 11–270).	No.
248	do	H.R. 17880: To approve the Defense Production Act amendments (passed 257–19)	Yes.
249	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
250	do	H.R. 18260: To suspend the rules and pass the Environmental Education Act (passed 289–28)	Yes.
251	do	H.R. 11032: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising (passed 332–4).	Yes.
252	do	H.R. 2076: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing Federal agencies to withhold local income taxes of Federal employees (defeated 115–184)	Yes.
253	do	Quorum call	Present.
254	Aug. 4	do	do.
255	Aug. 5	H. Res. 1117: To authorize an annual salary ot $38,000 tor the Executive Director of the House Democratic Steering Committee and the Staff Director for the Republican Conference (defeated 90–284).	Yes.
256	do	H.R. 18645: To recommit to committee the Agricultural Act of 1970 in order to strike out titles I, IV, V, VI and VIII (defeated 167–218)	No.
257	do	H.R. 18546: To approve the Agricultural Act of 1970 (passed 212–117)	Yes.
258	Aug. 6	Quorum call	Present.
259	do	H.R. 17070: To approve the conference report on the bill to reorganize the Postal Service (passed 338–29)	Yes.
260	do	S. 1933: To approve the Railroad Safety and Hazardous Materials Control bill (passed 358–0)	Yes.
261	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
262	do	H.J. Res. 264: On a motion to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of the constitutional amendment to provide equal rights for women (passed 332–22).	Yes.
263	do	H.J. Res. 264: On a motion to recommit to committee the joint resolution providing for equal rights for women (defeated 26–344)	Yes.
264	do	H.J. Res. 264: On final approval of the constitutional amendment providing for equal rights for women (passed 350–15)	Yes.
265	do	H.R. 18619: To approve the bill providing for a nonvoting delegate in both the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives (passed 338–23)	No.
266	do	H.R. 18725: To approve the bill providing for a nonvoting delegate from the District of Columbia to the U.S. House of Representatives and to establish a commission to study the D.C. government (passed 300–57).	Yes.
267	Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
268	do	do	Do.
269	do	H.R. 18110: To approve the Comprehensive Health Planning and Services Act of 1970 (passed 375–1)	Yes.
270	do	Quorum call	Present.
271	do	H.R. 18434: To approve the bill revising the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934 relative to political broadcasting (passed 272–97)	Yes.
272	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
273	do	do	Do.
274	do	H.R. 8298: On a motion to substitute for the committee-approved bill on the water-carrier mixing rule, an amendment permitting the mixing of regulated and nonregulated cargoes and deleting the provision calling for the publication of rates by nonregulated carriers (defeated 182–193).	Yes.
275	do	H.R. 8298: On a motion to recommit to committee the bill on the water-carrier mixing rule (defeated 141–230)	No.
276	do	H.R. 17570: To approve the Heart Disease, Cancer, Stroke, and Kidney Disease Amendments of 1970 (passed 365–0)	Yes.
277	Aug. 13	Quorum call	Present.
278	do	H.R. 16916: On the motion to override the President's veto of the Office of Education appropriations bill (passed 289–114)	No.
279	do	H.R. 17548: On the motion to override the President's veto of the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill (defeated 203–195; ⅔ vote being necessary).	No.
280	do	S. 3302: To approve the conference report on the amendments to the Defense Production Act of 1950 (passed 216–153)	No.
281	do	S. 3547: To adopt the conference report on the bill authorizing construction and operation of the Narrows unit, Missouri River Basin project, Colo. (passed 337–4)	Yes.
282	do	Quorum call	Present.
283	do	H. Res. 1182: To order the previous question on adoption of the resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 17809, the bill concerning the pay system for certain Government employees (passed 235–86).	No.
284	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
285	Sept. 9	do	Do.
286	do	do	Do.
287	do	H. R. 17809: To approve the bill relating to the prevailing rate pay systems for Government employees (passed 231–90)	No.
288	do	H.R. 16542: To pass the bill requiring that unsolicited credit cards be sent by registered mail (passed 301–0)	Yes.
289	do	Quorum call	Present.
290	Sept. 10	H.R. 17795: To approve the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970 (passed 282–32)	Yes.
291	do	H.R. 11913: To approve the Communicable Disease Control Amendments of 1970 (passed 312–1)	Yes.
292	do	Quorum call	Present.
293	do	H.R. 9306: To recommit to committee the bill providing for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in Wisconsin (defeated 29–197)	No.
294	Sept. 14	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
295	do	H.R. 18306: To approve the bill authorizing U.S. participation in increases in the resources of certain international financial institutions (passed 177–140)	Yes.
296	Sept. 15	Quorum call	Present.
297	do	do	Do.
298	Sept. 16	Quorum call	Do.
299	do	H.R. 16900: To approve the conference report on the $2,900,000,000 Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill (passed 341–8)	Yes.
300	do	S. 3637: To approve the conference report on the political broadcasting bill (passed 247–112)	Yes.
301	do	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
302	Sept. 17	do	Present.
303	do	do	Do.
304	do	H.R. 17654: On the amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act which would prohibit proxy voting in committee (defeated 156–187)	Yes.
305	do	H.R. 17654: On final passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act (passed 326–19)	Yes.
306	Sept. 21	Quorum call	Present.
307	do	S. 2763: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing the acquisition of extra equipment on government automobiles (passed 307–41)	Yes.
308	do	H.R. 14678: To suspend the rules and pass the bill strengthening the penalties for illegal fishing in the territorial waters of the United States (passed 315–0)	Yes.
309	do	H.R. 15911: To suspend the rules and pass the bill increasing nonservice connected veterans pensions and income limitations (passed 314–0)	Yes.
310	do	H.R. 16710: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing guaranteed and direct VA loans for mobile homes if used as permanent dwellings (passed 297–0)	Yes.
311	Sept. 22	H.R. 18127: On a motion to agree to the Senate amendment earmarking $807,000 in planning fund for the Dickey-Lincoln power project in Maine (defeated 131–230).	No.
312	Sept. 23	H. Res. 1220: To adopt the resolution citing Arnold S. Johnson for contempt of Congress (passed 337–14)	Yes.
313	Sept. 24	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
314	do	do	Present.
315	do	H.R. 18583: To approve the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (passed 341–6)	Yes.
316	Sept. 28	Quorum call	Present.
317	do	S. 2264: To adopt the conference report on the Communicable Disease Control Amendments of 1970 (passed 292–2)	Yes.
318	do	S. 1933: To approve the conference report on the bill to provide for railroad safety and hazardous materials control (passed 310–0)	Yes.
319	Sept. 29	Quorum call	Present.
320	do	H.R. 17123: To adopt the conference report on the armed services procurement authorization bill for 1970 (passed 341–11)	Yes.
321	do	H.R. 18185: On a motion to cut the authorization in the Urban Mass Transportation bill from $5,000,000,000 to $3,000,100,000 (passed 200–145)	Yes.
322	do	H.R. 18185: To approve the $3,100,000,000 Urban Mass Transportation bill (passed 327–16)	Yes.
323	Sept. 30	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
324	do	H.R. 18679: To amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to, among other things, eliminate the requirement of a finding of practical value in the licensing of a nuclear facility (passed 345–0).	Do.[2]
325	do	H.R. 19444: To approve the bill increasing the tax on airline tickets by ½ percent, providing security guards, and repealing the ban against a statement of tax on the ticket (passed 323–17).	Do.[3]
326	Oct. 5	H.J. Res. 1388: To approve the bill making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971 (passed 284–9)	Yes.
327	do	S. 1461: To suspend the rules and pass the bill relating to representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases (passed 277–21).	Yes.
328	Oct. 6	Quorum call	Present.
329	do	H.R. 14685: To agree to the Senate amendment to the International Travel Act and an amendment reducing funding by $500,000 (passed 254–93)	Yes.
330	do	H.R. 15424: To adopt the conference report on the bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act (passed 343–4)	Yes.
331	Oct. 7	Quorum call	Present.
332	do	S. 30: To approve the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 (passed 332–26)	Yes.

Footnotes at end of table.

1970—Continued

Rollcall No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
333	Oct. 8	Quorum call	Present.
334	do	do	Do.
335	do	do	Do.
336	do	do	Absent [1]
337	do	H.R. 19590: On a motion to recommit to committee the Defense appropriation bill (defeated 46–264)	Do.[3]
338	do	H.R. 19590: On final passage of the $66,600,000,000 appropriation bill for the Department of Defense (passed 274–31)	Do.[2]
339	Oct. 13	Quorum call	Do.[1]
340	do	H.R. 17604: To agree to the conference report on the Military Construction Authorization bill for 1971 (passed 360–20)	Do.[3]
341	do	H.R. 18546: To agree to the conference report on the Agriculture Act of 1970 (passed 191–145)	Yes.
342	Oct. 14	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
343	do	do	Do.[1]
344	do	do	Do.[1]
345	do	do	Do.[1]
346	do	do	Do.[1]
347	do	H.R. 16408: To approve the bill amending the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (passed 304–1)	Do.[2]
348	Nov. 16	Quorum call	Present
349	do	S. 2455: To suspend the rules and pass the bill increasing the annual authorization for the Commission on Civil Rights from $2,600,000 to $3,400,000 (passed 271–58).	Yes.
350	do	S. 3758: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing educational assistance to dependents of members of armed forces missing or captured (passed 331–0)	Yes.
351	do	H.R. 19318: To suspend the rules and pass the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970 (passed 298–32)	Yes.
352	do	H.J. Res. 1355: To suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution concerning the war powers of Congress and the President (passed 288–39)	Yes.
353	Nov. 17	Quorum call	Present.
354	do	do	Do.
355	do	H.R. 19519 (S. 3967): On a motion to recommit to committee the Comprehensive Manpower Act (defeated 89–275)	No.
356	Nov. 18	Quorum call	Present.
357	do	H. Res. 1225: On a motion to order the previous question on the rule under which H.R. 18970 (Trade and Tariff amendments) are to be considered (defeated 189–204).	Yes.
358	do	H. Res. 1225: On the adoption of an amendment to the rule relating to H.R. 18970 which would permit debate on various provisions on the bill and make in order a vote to strike out any matter in the bill (defeated 192–201).	No.
359	do	H. Res. 1225: To adopt a closed rule for the consideration of H.R. 18970, the Trade and Tariff bill (passed 203–187)	Yes.
360	Nov. 19	Quorum call	Present.
361	do	H.R. 18970: On a motion to recommit to committee the trade Act of 1970 (defeated 172–207)	No.
362	do	H.R. 18970: On final passage of the Trade Act of 1970 (passed 215–165)	Yes.
363	Nov. 23	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
364	Nov. 24	do	Present.
365	do	H.R. 16785: To substitute the bill H.R. 19200 for the language of the Occupational Safety and Health Act as contained in the committee version on H.R. 16785 (passed 220–172).	Yes.
366	do	H.R. 16785 (S. 2193): On final passage of the Occupational Safety and Health Act as amended by the substitution of H.R. 19200 (passed 383–5)	Yes.
367	do	H.R. 19830: On approval of the 1971 Independent Offices-HUD appropriation bill (passed 375–10)	Yes.
368	do	H. Res. 1267: On adoption of the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 19504, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970 (passed 287–60)	Yes.
369	Nov. 25	Quorum call	Present.
370	Nov. 30	do	Do.
371	do	H.R. 18884 (S. 1181): On a motion to recommit to committee the Market Promotion and Import Restrictions bill (defeated 130–187)	Yes.
372	Dec. 1	Quorum call	Present.
373	do	H.R. 19333: To approve the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 (passed 159–3)	Yes.
374	do	H.R. 19599 (S. 3418): To approve the bill providing assistance for training in the field of family medicine (passed 346–2)	Do.
375	Dec. 2	Quorum call	Present.
376	do	H. Res. 1270: On a resolution to increase the telephone and telegraph allowance for Members of the House of Representatives (passed 187–164)	No.
377	do	H. Res. 1271: To approve the rule under which the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (H.R. 19436) will be considered (passed 344–22)	Yes.
378	do	Quorum call	Present.
379	Dec. 3	do	Do.
380	do	do	Do.
381	do	H.R. 19436: On final passage of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 as amended (passed 328–30)	Absent.[3]
382	do	Quorum call	Do.
383	do	H. Res. 1147: To provide certain allowances for House Members and former Members in the area of insurance and medical care (defeated 89–192)	Do.[3]
384	Dec. 7	Quorum call	Present.
385	do	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the quorum call (passed 312–28)	Yes.
386	do	Quorum call	Present.
387	do	H. Res. 1282: On the resolution of commendation for efforts to rescue American prisoners of war (passed 347–15)	Yes.
388	Dec. 8	Quorum call	Present.
389	do	H.R. 17755: On a motion to lay on the table the motion to instruct the House conferees to agree to the Senate amendment to the Department of Transportation appropriation bill eliminating funds for the development of the SST (passed 213–174).	Yes.
390	do	H. Res. 1290: To adopt the rule under which to consider S. 3070, the plant variety protection Act (passed 331–27)	Do.
391	Dec. 9	Quorum call	Present.
392	do	H.J. Res. 1413: To approve the amendment to the bill prohibiting the railroad strike until Feb. 17, 1971, which amendment orders a 5-percent wage increase to striking railroad employees effective Jan. 1, 1970, and a 32-cent-per-hour increase as of Nov. 1, 1970 (passed 203–184)	No.
393	do	H.J. Res. 1413: To approve the measure prohibiting the railroad strike until Mar. 1, 1971, and to order the retroactive wage increase (passed 220–166)	No.
394	do	H.R. 19911: To approve a $550,000,000 supplemental foreign assistance authorization (passed 249–102)	Yes.
395	do	Quorum call	Present.
396	do	do	Do.
397	do	H.J. Res. 1413: To adopt the conference report on the bill prohibiting temporarily the railroad strike and setting a retroactive wage settlement (passed 198–131)	No.
398	Dec. 10	Quorum call	Present.
399	do	H. Res. 1303: To approve the rule, waving points of order, for consideration of H.R. 19928, the supplemental appropriations bill (passed 391–28)	Yes.
400	do	H.R. 19928: To approve the supplemental appropriations bill for 1971 (passed 344–21)	Yes.
401	do	S. 3867: To adopt the conference report on the Employment and Manpower Act (passed 177–159)	No.
402	Dec. 11	Quorum call	Present.
403	do	H. Res. 1296: On the motion to adopt the rule under which to consider H.R. 19868, the excise, estate, and gift tax adjustment (passed 242–22)	Yes.
404	do	Quorum call	Present.
405	do	H.R. 13956: To approve an additional appropriation for the Smithsonian Institution (passed 214–53)	Yes.
406	Dec. 14	Quorum call	Present.
407	do	H. Res. 1306: On a motion to table a motion to move the previous question on the resolution to order the printing and distribution of a report of the Committee on Internal Security entitled "Report of Inquiry Concerning Speakers' Honoraria at Colleges and Universities" (defeated 55–301).	No.
408	do	H. Res. 1306: To adopt the resolution to order the printing of a report of the Commission on Internal Security entitled "Report of Inquiry Concerning Speakers' Honoraria at Colleges and Universities" (passed 302–54).	Yes.
409	do	H.R. 19885: To adopt the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1970 (passed 272–58)	Yes.
410	Dec. 15	Quorum call	Present.
411	do	H.R. 17755: On a motion for the previous question to recommit to committee the conference report on the Department of Transportation appropriation bill (passed 205–185).	Yes.
412	do	H.R. 17755: To adopt the conference report on the appropriation bill for the Department of Transportation (passed 319–71)	Yes.
413	do	H.R. 6114: To request a conference with the Senate on the bill for the relief of Elmer H. Grade as amended to provide a 3-year extension for the "Delta Queen" (passed 295–73).	Yes.
414	Dec. 16	H.R. 17867: To adopt the conference report on the foreign assistance appropriations bill (passed 199–151)	Yes.
415	do	H.R. 19590: To approve the conference report on the Department of Defense appropriations bill (passed 327–30)	Yes.
416	do	H.R. 6778: To adopt the conference report on the bill amending the Bank Holding Company Act (passed 365–4)	Yes.
417	do	Quorum call	Present.
418	do	H.R. 18582: On approval of an amendment to the Food Stamp bill which primarily prohibited the issuance of food stamps to strikers (defeated 172–183)	Yes.
419	do	H.R. 18582: On final passage of the bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (passed 290–68)	Yes.
420	Dec. 17	S. 1181: On a motion to send to conference the bill providing for potato and tomato promotion programs (passed 214–145)	No.
421	do	S. 2193: To adopt the conference report on the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (passed 308–60)	Yes.
422	do	H.R. 17809: To approve the conference report on the bill relating to the pay system for governmental prevailing rate employees (passed 271–89)	No.
423	do	Quorum call	Present.
424	do	do	Do.
425	Dec. 18	do	Do.
426	do	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the quorum call (passed 307–10)	Yes.
427	do	Quorum call	Present.
428	do	do	Do.
429	do	do	Present.
430	do	H.R. 19504: To adopt the conference report on the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 (passed 319–11)	Yes.

Footnotes at end of table.

Rollcall No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
431	Dec. 19	Quorum call	Present.
432	do	H.R. 19436: To adopt the conference report on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (passed 168-104)	No.
433	do	S. 578: On approval of the bill extending to Federal firefighters the same retirement benefits as other Federal employees engaged in hazardous duty (passed 158-104).	No.
434	Dec. 21	Quorum call	Present.
435	do	H.R. 14233: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to exempt from the reporting requirements of the Gun Control Act .22 caliber rimfire ammunition (passed 246-59).	Yes.
436	do	H. Res. 1308: To adopt the rule under which to consider H.J. Res. 1146 relating to the expansion of the U.N. headquarters (passed 189-107)	Yes.
437	do	Quorum call	Present.
438	do	H.J. Res. 1146: On a motion to recommit to committee the resolution providing funds for expansion of the U.N. headquarters in order to amend the bill prohibiting the appropriation of funds until all delinquent dues and assessments of member nations are paid (defeated 124-168).	No.
439	do	H.J. Res. 1146 (S.J. Res. 173): On final passage of the resolution authorizing funds for expansion of the U.N. headquarters (passed 152-134)	Yes.
440	do	Quorum call	Present.
441	do	H.R. 19446: On a motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House to consider the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970 (passed 147-84)	Yes.
442	do	H.R. 19446: On a motion to strike out the enacting clause of the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970 (defeated 109-130)	No.
443	do	H.R. 19446: On final passage of the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970 (passed 159-77)	Yes.
444	Dec. 22	Quorum call	Present.
445	do	do	Do.
446	do	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the quorum call (passed 278-9)	Yes.
447	do	H. Res. 1238: To adopt the resolution granting certain privileges for a period of 2 years to the retiring Speaker of the House (passed 218-69)	Yes.
448	do	H.R. 1315: To adopt the rule under which to consider H.R. 19953, the Emergency Rail Services Act of 1970 (passed 263-30)	Yes.
449	do	H.R. 19953: To approve the Emergency Rail Services Act of 1970 (passed 165-121)	No.
450	Dec. 29	H.R. 14984: On a motion to agree to the Senate request that the bill relating to the Sioux Indians be returned to the Senate (passed 235-20)	Yes.
451	do	S. 1181: To approve the conference report on the bill providing promotion programs for milk, potatoes, and tomatoes (passed 159-93)	No.
452	do	H.R. 19590: To adopt the conference report on the Defense appropriations bill (passed 234-18)	Yes.
453	Dec. 30	Quorum call	Present.
454	do	H.R. 18582: To order the previous question on the motion to recommit to the Committee on Conference the Food Stamp bill (passed 148-126)	Yes.
455	do	S. 4268: To suspend the rules and pass the bill amending the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (defeated 161-102; a ⅔ vote being necessary)	Yes.
456	Dec. 31	Quorum call	Present.
457	do	H.R. 13000: To suspend the rules and agree to the conference report on the Federal employee pay Comparability bill (passed 183-54)	Yes.
458	do	H. Res. 1337: On a motion for the previous question on H.J. Res. 1421, a continuing appropriations resolution for the Department of Transportation (passed 145-75).	Yes.
459	do	H.J. Res. 1421: To approve the resolution providing continuing appropriations for the Department of Transportation (passed 180-37)	Yes.

[1] Speaking engagement.
[2] If present, would hav e voted yes.
[3] If present, would have voted no.

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to have the opportunity to add my words to the many which have been spoken in praise of our esteemed colleague, Hon. MICHAEL FEIGHAN of Ohio. It will seem strange indeed that he will not be with us when the 92d Congress convenes. He was one who had already established himself as an authority in his chosen field of specialty when I first came to the House of Representatives.

His wide range of knowledge, sober judgment, and wise counsel were invaluable to all of us who were required to cope with questions involving immigration policy and the problems of refugees. We found him to be generous with his time and with the distribution of knowledge drawn from the storehouse of his experience.

Few issues whch come before us are as complicated and subject to misinterpretation as proposals to amend the immigration laws. The right of access to American citizenship is a prize beyond price to millions of persons who live in countries where personal freedom and fulfillment of human ambitions is denied by law or long-established custom. Changes in the laws governing access must be handled with delicacy and a keen sense of human values.

All of us who were present must recall with admiration his determined and successful effort to modernize our immigration laws after 20 years of discussion and debate had been without result. He will be long remembered for his accomplishment and the continuing vigor of our society will long reflect it.

I wish him many years of relaxed and pleasant retirement, and the peace of mind that comes with the inner knowledge that he has given of his best and his best has made his country a better land in which to live.

TRIBUTE TO ALLARD LOWENSTEIN

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, few Members of Congress have brought with them in their first term so wide an experience in public life and so nationally respected a reputation as ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN, our distinguished colleague, who will no longer be serving in Congress with us.

Mr. Speaker, I have known AL LOWENSTEIN for many years and therefore rejoiced when he won election to Congress and was dismayed when, as a result of a highly partisan gerrymander in his home State of New York, he was defeated for reelection last November.

AL LOWENSTEIN brought with him to Congress a reputation which his service here only deepened—a reputation as a man of courage and compassion and intelligence, a man who spoke out with a clear and perceptive voice on the great issues facing the people of our country.

Mr. Speaker, the firmness of AL LOWENSTEIN'S commitment to constructive change commanded for him great respect on the college campuses of the Nation even as his plea to young people to make our political institutions more responsive and effective often pricked their own preconceptions.

Mr. Speaker, although he served but a short time in Congress, AL LOWENSTEIN earned the respect and affection of Members of the House of both sides of the aisle and of every spectrum of opinion.

I have little doubt but that AL will make even greater contributions to our country and to mankind in the years ahead.

ROSE McCONNELL LONG

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the year just passed was a sad one for all Louisianians because we witnessed the passing of one of the truly great ladies who have graced our State in its history, Mrs. Rose McConnell Long.

She held a very special place in our hearts because she was not only our first lady, but at other times, our Senator and the mother of our present distinguished Senator, RUSSELL B. LONG. But for all the luster she has brought our State, she will be cherished in the hearts of Louisianians for reasons other than the public acclaim to which she was so richly entitled. She will be remembered, I believe, for her graciousness, her Christian strength as a wife and mother, and for the devotion she gave her family.

Greatness is an ephemeral thing by today's standards when it is accorded because of the amount of money one has, the stylishness of one's dress or the outlandishness of one's mode of living. Rose McConnell Long is accorded greatness on the basis of values, ethics, and standards of a more worthy era. We are proud of her in Louisiann; she reflected her greatness upon us all and she will be missed as she was loved.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GORE

HON. GAYLORD NELSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, each new Congress opens with melancholy because old friends and colleagues who have served the Nation with such distinction and courage are no longer in their accustomed places in the Chamber.

As the 92d Congress opens this month, many distinguished Senators will be gone. Among them, is Senator ALBERT GORE, one of the most distinguished and respected men in the Senate.

The electorate in Tennessee responding to a vigorous anti-Gore White House campaign, decided against sending GORE, affectionately known as the "Old Gray Fox," back to represent them in the Senate, and both Tennessee and the United States lost an effective, independent leader.

For 32 years—14 years in the House of Representatives and 18 years in the Senate—GORE served Tennessee and the country as a masterful and skillful legislator. His independent populist beliefs directed him unerringly, even when his party, his State, and his section of the country disagreed with him. He supported unpopular causes and spoke out on issues because he believed he was right even though his political future was on the line.

Among a few of his courageous stands was his refusal to sign the so-called Southern Manifesto condemning the Supreme Court's 1954 school segregation decision. Senator GORE would not join the effort to override the Court's decision on the matter of prayer in the public schools and he voted against the confirmation of two nominees to the Supreme Court—Clement Haynsworth and Harold Carswell—when most of his colleagues from the South were firmly supporting them.

His service and dedication to his work on the important Finance and Foreign Relations Committees earned him the respect of his Senate colleagues.

It is unfortunate that at a time when the country needs men like Senator GORE to inspire the Nation with independence, leadership, and dignity, that Senator GORE will not be at his chair when the new Congress is sworn in.

JUDICIAL MURDER IN RUSSIA

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask to insert at the conclusion of my remarks the following editorial which appeared in the Birmingham Post-Herald on December 29, 1970. I think the editorial correctly expresses the views of most Americans with regard to the treatment of Jews in Soviet Russia.

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

JUDICIAL MURDER IN RUSSIA

Sentencing in Leningrad of two Jews to death and nine other persons to prison camps for allegedly planning to hijack a Soviet airliner is a brutal, repressive act that tells much about the Kremlin's police state.

We utterly oppose aerial hijacking—whether by Soviet Jews, Arab guerrillas, Black Panthers or assorted psychopaths. It is a crime that endangers innocent passengers and deserves to be punished.

But in the Leningrad case no hijacking took place. The worst that can be charged against the 11 defendants, nine of them Jews who wished to emigrate to Israel, is that they plotted to seize a Soviet plane and fly it to Sweden. To put two "Zionists" before a firing squad for that is savagely excessive punishment.

We have no idea if the 11 are even guilty as charged. Naturally, the trial was closed to the foreign press. No trial record has been or will be made public. The Soviets say all 11 "confessed, pleaded guilty and repented their crimes."

That means less than nothing. After a few weeks in the hands of the Soviet secret police, anybody will confess to anything. This is proved by writings ranging from Arthur Koestler's great novel Darkness at Noon to Khrushchev's famous secret speech to the 20th Soviet Communist Party Congress in 1956.

Also, the efficiency with which the KGB rounded up the Leningrad 11 and some 20 other Jews indicates that the police knew about the alleged "plot" all along. It is even possible that a police agent instigated the escape effort; the tradition of police provocations is strong in Russia, going back to Czarist times.

Interestingly, the Leningrad Jews are charged with violating article 64A of the Russian federation criminal code. This makes it treason to flee the country. All we can say is any country that makes it a capital crime to try to leave is not a country, but a concentration camp.

Recently, the Kremlin has been frightened by the stirrings of the more than three million Soviet Jews, many of whom wish to escape from government fostered anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and go to Israel.

The reaction of the ruling clique of Communist hierarchs, secret police satraps and Soviet army marshals is in the purest tradition of the late despot Stalin: Arrest, beat, exact confessions, stage show trials, execute—and thus terrorize the survivors into docility.

The new repression is not only aimed at Russia's unfortunate Jews. It is also meant to silence non-Jewish dissidents, scientists, writers and intellectuals who have courageously demanded civil rights and the freedom to think and speak.

In Russia there are no independent courts or judges in political cases. The guilty verdict and death sentences in Leningrad were decided by the Communist Politburo. If Mark Dymshits and Eduard Kuznetsov die before a firing squad, mankind will remember that the trigger fingers belonged to Brezhnev, Kosygin and their cohorts.

BEST WISHES FOR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to wish my colleague, GLENN C. CUNNINGHAM, every success in his future endeavors.

During the time I have served in the House, I have come to know GLENN well. He comes from Colorado's neighboring State of Nebraska, and we have served together on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Although I am sorry that GLENN will not be with us in the 92d Congress, I do hope he will visit with us often and share with us the legislative knowledge he has acquired in his five terms.

HON. THOMAS DODD

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if you look to our Congressional Directory for the life story of TOM DODD of Connecticut you will pause before the modesty of the two lines permitted by our colleague.

You will not know of his early dedication to public service. Thirty-five years ago he headed the National Youth Administration for the State of Connecticut. Three years later he was Assistant Chief of the Civil Rights Section of the Department of Justice. In 1945 he was Vice Chairman of the Review Board and Chief Trial Counsel at the historic Nuremberg trials.

In 1947 he returned to private practice in Hartford—but the people of Connecticut recalled him to public service in the House of Representatives in 1955 and 1957—while the Senate has claimed his talents in these 12 years since 1959.

He has been a tireless legislator—dedicated against violence in our everyday life—and devoted to safeguards and opportunity for youth to whom the future belongs. The laws upon our statute books to provide a safer and saner America will be the true monument for this American.

It may be less tangible than the Presidential Citation that is his—the U.S. Medal of Freedom—the Order of the White Lion he received from Czechoslovakia—or Commander of the Order of Merit with which Italy endowed him.

But the student of history will one day do himself a service as he researches the legislative contributions of this brilliant mind and effective advocate.

I would like to recall a day in the Senate that TOM DODD said he would never forget. After a long struggle he had achieved by an overwhelming vote a better and more sensible gun control law.

The majority leader, Mr. MANSFIELD, that day praised his performance. Mr. MANSFIELD said:

> Leading the way, of course, was the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD. His vast knowledge of the subject, his fine presentation, his long experience with the matter, did much to make Senate passage a certainty. Senator DODD deserves the highest praise of the Senate for this success.

And that has been the hallmark of the Senator from Connecticut—perfection of preparation and presentation—through this more than a decade of grave decisions for our Nation.

In the critical fields of foreign affairs, judiciary, and space, his voice and his vote have made themselves felt—and the pulses of his Senate performance entitle him to look back with deep satisfaction on his labors for his country.

SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the highest honor the House can bestow on one of its own is to name him Speaker. The Speaker of the House is more than an honor, more than a symbol—much, much more. Theme upon theme has been written of the Speaker's powers, his dominance, his role as conductor of 435 diverse instruments of legislative expression. But far too little has been written of each Speaker as a man, how he met the demands of his high office as a man, how he counselled and cajoled, how he, in terms of his own personality, his generosity, his sensitive response to the individual Members who was so often lost inside the large body which is the House, could make a Member come alive to his own challenge.

These were the human ways of our beloved Speaker. For it must be known that our Speaker is a humble man. I know him to be incapable of the kind of vanity that has destroyed lesser men. I have seen him perform chores that others would have found an affront to their self-imposed dignity. He knew not only his votes as he counted them, but his voters as he assessed them.

He rose with the rise of social consciousness, and never by deed and never by word did he betray the citizens who had no power other than their trust in the integrity of the chosen representative.

All Speakers come to love the House of Representatives. Not all Speakers are loved in turn. But to Speaker McCORMACK, we give not only our respect for his integrity, applause for the excellence of the performance of his duties, honor for the dictates of his conscience, but love for the warmth and breadth of his heart.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I find it rather difficult to even think or talk about our wonderful Speaker retiring from Congress on January 3.

I have had the privilege and pleasure of serving under five Speakers during the time I have been a Member of Congress, and I do not know of any man who has served in the position of Speaker who would take his valuable time and talk with any and all Members of Congress concerning their problems, other than our present Speaker. We have had some outstanding Speakers during my 32 years of service as a Member of the House of Representatives; however, I do not know of anyone who has served as Speaker who would take the time to give new Congressmen and old Congressmen solid advice when they had a problem.

History will certainly reveal that Speaker McCORMACK is truly one of our outstanding leaders in this country. We all regret that Mrs. McCormack's serious illness makes it necessary for him to give her his undivided time. I have never known a man more devoted to his wife than Speaker McCORMACK. I think his record of devotion to Mrs. McCormack during her long illness proves that he is a gentleman of the first order. Even though he had the world's problems on his shoulders during the past few years, he would always take time out of his busy schedule to have his regular meals with Mrs. McCormack who has been almost an invalid for a number of years.

Mrs. McMillan and I greatly appreciate the courtesies the Speaker has extended us even before he became Speaker as he was an outstanding floor leader before he was designated to be Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Every Member of the House and the Nation have certainly suffered a great loss in Mr. McCORMACK's decision to retire as Speaker of the House. I will always have the deepest respect for Speaker McCORMACK—he left a real goal for all of us to "shoot for."

Mrs. McMillan joins me in expressing our best wishes to Mr. and Mrs. McCormack, and we hope that Mr. McCORMACK will get some well deserved rest.

MAINTAIN STRICT WATER POLLUTION STANDARDS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the necessary steps to combat water and air pollution deserve priority designation.

Therefore, I was pleased to support the establishment of the Environmental Protection Agency. Lest this Agency disappoint us, it must provide the necessary leadership and coordination throughout the country which is its responsibility. I feel an editorial carried by WBBM–TV Channel 2, Chicago, is a proper and timely observation on a matter of special interest to the Great Lakes States:

MAINTAIN STRICT WATER POLLUTION STANDARDS

The new United States Environmental Protection Agency is in the process of setting standards for discharge of sewage from boats.

Michigan officials have been given a look at the proposed standards—and they have raised an anguished outcry that they are—quote—"the biggest step backward the federal government has ever considered taking in the boat pollution field."

Illinois officials have had a similar reaction. The proposed federal standards, which would preempt state standards, are behind those of Michigan—and Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and the Canadian province of Ontario.

The state standards call for an owner either to treat sewage on his boat to a point approaching full purification—or retain the stuff until the boat reaches shore, where it is discharged into land treatment facilities. Reportedly, federal standards would allow the sewage to be partially treated and dumped into the water.

The retention system is the only way small boat owners can meet state standards—and many owners are already complying, with a number of pump out stations in operation. But, as you might expect, the Boating Industry groups favor the lighter, more permissive reported proposed federal standards.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency says a final decision has not been reached. We must get state reaction first. The states have already reacted with tough laws. Why should Uncle Sam weaken them?

(Full screen card: Address of Environmental Protection Agency.) You, too, can react by writing the Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C., 20242—demanding there be no dumping of any sewage from boats in the lakes and streams.

TOWNSEND FOUNDATION TESTIMONY

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, during these important times in our Nation's history, when we are evaluating the priorities that must be established for the future, I want to call to the attention of all Members of Congress certain testimony presented to the Senate Finance Committee.

I believe it is worth recording here the testimony submitted by John Doyle Elliott, secretary of the Townsend Foundation, when appearing before the Senate Committee on Finance during the last session of Congress.

These comments deal with the general welfare of millions of Americans who are faced with critical problems involving inflation, employment, and other factors of our economy.

Mr. Elliott's testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF JOHN DOYLE ELLIOTT

SUMMARY

Mr. Chairman, I am John Doyle Elliott, Sec. of Townsend Foundation, founded by the late Dr. Francis E. Townsend, 5500 Quincy St., Hyattsville, Md., 20784. Since World War II, each Congress has had more broadly to amend the Social Security Act. Now, Congress is amending it in successive sessions! After 35 years of it.

It's gratifying, in the last two years, that at long last both Houses and White House have reversed views and adopted our 35-year-old critique of evil, misnamed "welfare"—and the Senate Committee on Aging has marked *income-lack* "more than ever" the "major problem" of retired Americans, saying only a federal plan can meet it. On each count, now, they thus honor our original key positions and principles.

Now, I call up Census Bureau's yearly surveys on money-income distribution, showing the income-position of the aged *steadily declining—Not Improving*—despite ALL our public *and* private works, programs and policies. A total, unanswerable failure.

With the enclosed complete copy of H.R. 1205 (with explaining articles) embodying up-to-date application of the Townsend Plan's principles to the problems of social security and poverty—I present the thesis that it's past high time Congress (and everybody else) turn to a *great, national pension* for ALL Americans equally and alike, providing *Prosperous instead of impoverishing* retirement. Stop mismanaging abundance under the mean, obsolete rules of scarcity.

H.R. 1205 is specifically designed to implement this thesis, including the financial mechanism to support it. All alternatives, fully exhausted, have worse than failed—even failed to prevent the problem's worsening. Authentic Fact despite all earnings, investments and public and private programs—*All Combined!*

The people and our country's economy and prestige have suffered and lost mightily from this worsening instead of solving problem. In the last three decades, no other investment—economically, socially, or politically—would have benefited the people and profited the country so vastly as this great pension.

Further, I contend, the longer we go without it, the mightier become both the loss and the Need for the profit which can be gained from no other source, or action.

A system making social security a living fact of life in our land will not take money out of our economy, or out of the overall lives of honest people, business, or interests—in fact, quite the contrary. *But, it will solve problems of the great import—problems not otherwise to be solved—problems which must be solved* if we are to achieve the faith, harmony and unity necessary for the world-inspiring society we ought, by every right, to be.

My testimony also presents steps to amend present Soc. Sec. to help prompt transition to the system we ought to have. Most important, H.R. 1205 provides the specific financial mechanism—financial technology—to implement this matchless contribution towards perfected human prosperity, equality and freedom—*Social Justice*—the essential demonstration to all Mankind of the incomparable ability and beneficence of our American Way honestly applied.

As a few industries have contracts providing decent retirement for those who've spent their lives with them—I hold it's more than high time we instituted such a contract for All our people, in All occupations, All the time, H.R. 1205 is that contract.

Shall the great mechanisms of science serve man—or man serve the machines?

Mr. Chairman: Our country, born in a new vision of just freedom and equal rights for all, inspired world-wide faith and hope in honest hearts. Despite our matchless achievements, the vision's fogged, fulfillment of our promise to God and Mankind faltering by default here in our own national house. I propose through perfected Social Security the ways and means to unfog the vision and resurrect the promise—by fulfillment here in our own land, renewing Mankind's faith and courage by our success.

It's preposterous to expect success against our pyramiding problems and obligations unless dominant confrontations in our land are replaced by the faith and harmony only full social justice *enthroned as unanswerable reality* can ever make possible.

Otherwise, greed, waste and corruption, the real Inflators, will increasingly decay our material and spiritual resources—ordaining doom. Our skyrocketing producing power must promptly be fully employed, even strained in support of honest prosperity, justice, freedom, health and wisdom—not inflating greed, waste and the damning corruption they breed.

Census Bureau's yearly surveys on money-income distribution show Social Security and misnamed "Welfare" monstrously failing to support that necessity. To wit, the Facts:

MEDIAN INCOME

	Over 65	55 to 64	Inferiority	Percent [1]
Men:				
1947	$456	$2,344	$1,388	145
1968	2,652	6,717	4,065	153
1969	2,828	7,279	4,451	157
Women:				
1947	551	962	411	75
1968	1,311	2,576	1,265	96
1969	1,337	2,791	1,394	100

[1] Inferiority as percent of income for those over 65.

Add this fact: Persons over 65 increased in numbers 3.5 times FASTER than persons 25 through 64, in those same years.

There is the problem—measured—growing constantly greater—NOT BEING OVERCOME. Steadily deepening *financial depression* for that ever greater part of our adult population—to whose membership all are desirably destined—THE ELDERLY. Money-income, the VERY LICENSE TO LIVE, is excuselessly denied Americans in retirement. While the final reward in life excuselessly remains financial failure and dependency, *so long will our other works and glories stand vain and mocked by history's mark of sin.*

All our works, policies and programs, public and private combined, have failed to prevent the financial plight of the aged *from worsening*—never mind betterment. The median income for men over 65, from 1947 to 1969, rose 196%—while their inferiority to men 55 to 64 rose 221%! For women the figures are 154% and 239%. The inferiority of the elderly to still younger adults is even more marked.

Over two years ago, the Special Senate Committee on Aging named income-lack "more than ever" the "major problem" of the old, saying only a federal plan can meet it. *A full endorsement of this Movement's 35-year-old position.* Last year the Senate passed a $100 minimum Soc. Sec. benefit; killed in Conference. As yet, neither House nor White House has lifted a finger. Pray the Senate requires a very meaningful raise.

The elderlys' financial misfortune is duplicated for the disabled, for families bereaved of natural breadwinners and for those mentally and physically *competent* who are unemployable because the changes of history and progress render their skills unworthy of hire. They are unjustly misfortuned by mismanagement of the very progress which so wondrously benefits most of us—and so richly promises posterity.

Last year's 15% Soc. Sec. benefit-raise and the contemplated 5% will make but a passing ripple, like their predecessors. Proposed national standards for Welfare hint commendable awakening—*30 years late!* It's ironic that every *delinquently mean penny* of such overdue "improvements" is avidly precious to the hungered victims of our feeble policies. No decent heart can deny them the pittance, now.

But, in no sense can they contribute to the *full justice* on which depend the faith and harmony we must have. For that they are less competent than were the original enactments and their long list of amendments to them, in their times.

The plan we need exists. To discern it, you need only examine what the *difference* would be *if,* somehow, *we'd never encountered the problem.* No elderly, no disabled, no bereaved families would be in poverty. Those whose skills technology's changes make unworthy of hire would be protected—pending their acquiring needed abilities.

It's self-evident—had we never encountered the problem, that happy prosperous state for the people and the country would be "costing" dollar for dollar exactly what an honest plan to wipe out the evil would cost. "Cost" is relevant only in the sense of measuring the value of the benefit AND of the loss from the evil. "Cost" is irrelevant in the sense of burden, or loss; but, it's fully relevant measuring a highly profitable, prospering investment for every honest, human interest.

That difference between how things are and how they ought to be and would be *if* we'd never met with the problem—that difference meticulously defines, measures and spells out *what's necessary to fill the gap*—to change the shaking society around us to the happy, unchallengeable America which should exist by every good reason.

No project, no investment can so mightily profit us and all mankind so much as filling that gap. The priceless prize of peace unanswerably requires it.

One thing can wipe out that gap—a great, national pension sufficient to bar poverty even for those caught with no other resource—as the EQUAL, inherent right of every American in retirement, or encountering any of the other misfortunes noted above. The injustice which only just Soc. Sec. benefits can wipe out is authentically *measured* by the Census Bureau data above. Today, that pension would have to be over $300 a month. *The measure of the shaking, evil problem we harbor.*

The great pension is the ONE THING which could have made the difference in the past. It's the ONE THING which ever can. Without it, the inferiority of the old and others will remain and grow—the forebodings of the Riot Commission come to pass. Without it we can spend trillions to rebuild rotted cities—only to populate them with paupered legions, making future slums out-horroring the most nightmarish imaginings.

I anxiously adjure we must have a drastically reformed, freedom and equality reflecting *definition* of the so-called poverty-line. Medicare recognizes you can't relate treatment to wage-records—*you can't give somebody half an appendectomy!* Poverty exists unless a person can reasonably finance fully healthful diet, respectable clothing and housing, full medical and health insurance and care (including preventive needs)—and normal participation in recreation, social, cultural and public life and affairs. *A whole,* not *part* treatment on the counts, too!

Lacking this minimum participation in up-to-date prosperity—the minimum requirements of freedom and equality are financially precluded—and all other works in vain.

The great pension must be a floor of prosperity below which we won't allow human living because of financial lack—with earnings deducted so the benefit exhausts close to the up-to-date average. We mustn't hang people under a poverty-ceiling (as proposed) to which earnings barely raise them from a benefit-base deep in poverty, leaving them in its mire. *We must prevent people getting down to actual poverty.*

I condemn poverty-perpetuating proposals—like $1,600 a year, per famly of four, $1.10 a day per person—to taper off after they've $1,000 additional, up to a poverty-ceiling of $3,500—$2.50 a day per person. *It costs us $2.50 a day to board our cat while away from home.* Cat-and-dog pensions for American people—sickening brutality misnamed "welfare" *and Social Security, too. Thirty years obsolete!*

In contrast, the Federal Minimum Wage is $1.60 an hour, about $275 a month on a 40-hour week. Up-dated, it's over $300 a month—to keep an individual fit to work—*over $3,600 a year,* in Congress' own conscience. The least for which we can conscientiously use the time, life of another for our benefit, or profit, *according to Congress' own conscience.* What justice reduces it 75% on retirement??

Per capita income, average "cost" per human life, cradle to grave, is comparable. *How can we condone less for retired and disabled adults??* I've heard no answers.

Wrong are bills to raise the payroll tax-base up even to $15,000 (top benefits over $500 a month). So to obligate the public purse *to match retirement contributions for the prosperous is excuseless.* All the old objections falsely raised against living benefits for the misfortuned *apply fully to this public aid to the well-to-do.* We have the problem because of the misfortuned—not because of prospering people!

Use of "general revenue" would be equally wrong—in lieu of exorbitant payroll taxes. To tax progressively for general government costs is fair (tho' in practice betrayed). So to finance benefits is to *heap progression on progression*—defenseless.

By the great pension in H.R. 1205, under flat-rate contributions by all, the poor will

pay the least, but benefit the most. The prosperous will pay the most with the benefits meaning progressively less to them. *A progressive benefit to the poor.*

The great, national pension I advocate, fully defined and provided by H.R. 1205, is not a Government-spending—it is a people-spending program! It is a universal contract financially involving all our people, all occupations, all business and industry and all contracts and transactions all the time—to provide for all the people alike just about what the auto industry contract does for the 30-year man there.

This will take no money out of our economy, or out of the overall lives of honest people, honest business, or honest interests. It will benefit all, over and above its direct beneficiaries, by the greater prosperity which will prevail—and by the relief from the costly problems resulting from social injustice, now. It will end the dividing discriminations inherent in misnamed welfare and Social Security, now.

Without this achievement, we can never enthrone as unanswerable reality the full faith and harmony necessary for fulfilling our country's promise to Mankind.

Note that Administrative costs will be nothing, because we are already more than paying them now for the feeble, unjust, complicated system we have. In truth we are paying for a 1970 Cadillac—but we're getting a Model-T ride for our money!

Contrasts. Discrimination is an evil thing. As the Supreme court said, ". . inherently un-Constitutional." Just get old, or disabled and its *real meaning's cruelly taught.*

Last year's 15% Soc. Sec. raise, plus the contemplated 5%, compound to 22% over not less than two years. In terms of an 8-hour day, a 40-hour week, *it's about 13 cents an hour raise*—with no overtime, no extras.

In contrast, we've seen teamsters settling for $1.25 an hour (not 13 cents!), over 3 years. N.Y. printers about $1.40 per hour—Chicago truckers $1.85. Contrast!

How can Congress and the Nation stomach such savage discrimination?

Everybody with the power to grab—economically able to blackmail the public—seems grabbing grand pensions. Everybody who, in truth, is best able to provide for themselves. Walter Reuther left the UAW's primed to required $500 monthly pensions for 30-year auto workers. Whatever they actually get will make misnamed Soc. Sec. look prehistoric—and other unions capable of the pressure will follow. Contrast!

We recently read of a railroad's top executive, ousted as the road faces bankruptcy in history's most prosperous time and place—we read of his $114,000 a year pension. Then, we read it's a mistake—he's only—*ONLY*—good for $50,000! His salary's only been about $225,000 (plus a lot of extras), so he couldn't provide for his own retirement. $50,000, in terms of an 8-hour day etc., comes to about $192 a day, $24 an hour—alongside $6 a day, *1/32nd as much,* for the average Soc. Sec. retiree.

Which could reasonably finance his own retirement—and which is the big grabber of something for nothing?

What about professional footballers—asking for pensions up to $100,000? In public life, too, the big pensions go to the most prosperous.

Those most properly able to finance their own retirement—who've the best means for saving, investment etc. are greedily exerting economic pressure on their country for exorbitant pensions. The great majority of Americans, especially average people and outstandingly the misfortuned, are getting crusts and crumbs. Who *IS* on relief?

This is self-evident—and if not ended will doom faith and harmony in our society. The grand pensions, seized by the powerful, *are not out of their wages.* They are in *addition—out of the public pocket via prices, via taxes, graft and corruption*—for those with no excuse at all for being on relief. And that's what it is.

Every argument, urged so falsely for over 35 years against decent, living pensions for Americans generally and most fully for the misfortuned—every one applies unanswerably to these undeserved gifts from the public purse to the well-to-do. Lord!

Living pensions, reflating the deflated lives of the misfortuned—keeping up to date the lives of Americans generally—these are not inflationary. The extravagant undeserved, needless gifts to the rich, these are highly inflationary! For example.

Mr. Chairman, to have faith, harmony and unity replace the confrontations smashing our society today, without that great pension, is starkly unthinkable. Dishonest mismanagement of our abundance by the obsolete, tyrannous rules of scarcity must stop. Greed has no further claim on such excuseless benefit! Otherwise, all our achievements stand shamed by failure to serve God's Will and justice to Mankind.

In truth, the mightier our achievements and progress, the less excuse—and the worse every reason—for tolerating avoidable injustice and human woe. Poverty and it's deflation—greed, corruption and their inflation—they must go. The great pension is the sine qua non of their demise.

What must be done is vigorous transition to the great pension for the old and other unemployables, which will wipe out evil discrimination by equal, honestly sufficient Soc. Sec. for ALL, equally and alike.

H.R. 1205 provides direct transition from our present system to the great, national pension, swiftly. There is an indirect approach to the same goal, which is the very least conscientiously to do now for discontinuing the evils sapping our strength.

Vest in every person equally an *assumed* "wage in covered employment" sufficient for a retirement benefit of $175 a month. With this *one program* for all, alike, welfare and public assistance—except in very rare, extreme cases—and Soc. Sec. benefits to most adult dependents will cease. Periodically advance this minimum benefit until it bars poverty even for those caught with no other resource.

Adjust benefits in step with percapita income reflecting changes not just in living costs, but all monetary changes, annually.

Suspend earnings limitations until benefits, regardless of other assets, bar poverty.

Make retirement age 60. Cover technologically and educationally disabled over 18.

Finance transition not by payroll tax hikes, or piling up general revenue tax-rates. Use the gross receipts tax defined and provided in H.R. 1205. Free State and local governments from welfare and public assistance costs and evils.

Remove medicare limitations, including deductibles and premiums. Include chiropractic physicians. over all Soc. Sec. beneficiaries, as well as the aged.

Provide retirement and disability bonds, appreciating with percapita income, for all wanting to amplify retirement finance without traditional investment risks.

This is not just a plan. It's the plan. Without the very things it both defines and provides, the most fundamental frustrations and injuring injustices causing our country's divisions will remain in force, rampant and mounting. Without it, *trillions* will be spent to rebuild rotted cities—and to pack populations into vast suburbs until they become equally vast cities themselves—so spend *trillions* only to inhabit them with paupered legions, ordaining future slums out-horroring any nightmare. However titled, any step to correct any of these most basic wrongs will have to be part of this specific plan—*since, indeed, it has been defined and recorded.*

Truth is we must have prosperous—not paupered—retirement equally provided for all in the same way. So, too, for the other areas, both permanent and correctible, of disability and unemployability. It's time for real answers to problems.

Time's run out, Mr. Chairman, for tolerating things wrong—for callously gradual, too often fictitious, ground-losing "steps in right directions." The great, massive strike of swift, decisive, *achieving action* looms as the total necessity. I very respectfully admonish *this plan's to that end the primary essential—sine qua non.*

To what end save cities—or work any great wonders—unless we save the humanity for whose freedom and betterment all things economic exist?

We will successfully conquer no physical pollutions while we tolerate perpetuation of the moral pollutions of injustice—tolerate the exploiting greed, corruption and the crime they breed which have perpetrated, created our physical pollution.

It may well be that Mankind cannot reform its character—but, it had better very soon control and remedy its conduct—which we can do, by contract, law enforced. The fundamentals of that contract, law, are defined and provided in H.R. 1205; and implementation, transition presented in this testimony.

Progress and abundance are mismanaged when they bring hurt to anybody—and if they fail to provide bettered, not problem-plagued economic and social life for all.

Without the great pension, these truths and our country's promise to Mankind can't be honored and fulfilled.

SPECIAL MEMO—AUGUST 1970—FACTS ABOUT THE INCOME-INFERIORITY OF THE AGED

MEDIAN INCOMES

	Over 65	55 to 64	Inferiority	Percent[1]
Men:				
1947	$956	$2,344	$1,388	145
1948	998	2,412	1,414	142
1949	1,016	2,366	1,350	133
1950	986	2,494	1,508	153
1951	1,008	2,840	1,832	182
1952	1,247	3,009	1,762	141
1953	1,150	3,271	2,121	184
1954	1,268	3,195	1,927	152
1955	1,337	3,440	2,103	157
1956	1,421	3,567	2,146	151
1957	1,421	3,681	2,260	158
1958	1,488	3,968	2,480	167
1959	1,576	4,190	2,614	166
1960	1,698	4,289	2,591	153
1961	1,758	4,597	2,839	161
1962	1,910	4,800	2,890	151
1963	1,993	4,901	2,908	146
1964	2,037	4,941	2,904	143
1965	2,116	5,250	3,134	148
1966	2,162	5,750	3,588	166
1967	2,304	6,122	3,818	166
1968	2,652	6,717	4,065	153
1969	2,828	7,279	4,451	157
Women:				
1947	551	962	411	75
1948	589	857	268	46
1949	516	1,000	484	94
1950	531	918	387	73
1951	536	968	432	81
1952	654	1,175	521	80
1953	659	1,170	511	78
1954	694	1,195	501	72
1955	700	1,257	557	80
1956	738	1,364	626	85
1957	741	1,342	601	81
1958	776	1,326	550	71
1959	797	1,431	634	80
1960	821	1,415	594	72
1961	854	1,480	626	73
1962	920	1,669	749	81
1963	920	1,774	854	93
1964	952	1,910	958	101
1965	984	2,019	1,035	105
1966	1,085	2,214	1,129	104
1967	1,123	2,352	1,229	109
1968	1,311	2,576	1,265	96
1969	1,397	2,791	1,394	100

[1]Inferiority as percent of income of those over 65.

Add this fact: Persons over 65 increased in numbers at a rate 3.5 times that of persons aged 25 through 64.

There are the facts. Remember the above reports money-income from all sources—all.

Source: Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, 1947–1969, Series P–60, No. 5, Table 15; 6–12; 7–17; 9–18; 11–3; 14–3; 16–3; 19–3; 23–3; 27–18; 30–18; 33–24; 35–23; 37–23; 39–25; 41–18; 43–20; 44–6; 50–2; 52–6; 60–3; 63–6; and 70–6.

The income-status of the elderly has not improved—netting, if anything, a slight loss. But, that's not all of it. A few in certain groups, like auto workers, for example, won themselves better pensions. But, since the aged, as a whole didn't gain, the good gains of these scattered groups *means the rest generally lost, all the more!* Keep that truth in mind.

In that light study the above "Inferiority" Column and you'll see how all the programs and policies, public and private combined, have failed the aged—and how only our Bill can provide them the very license to live, money-income. Only our Bill.

It is very far past high time we had prosperous retirement—a "contract" for *all* the people, *all* the time—just as validly as contracts in the auto and other industries exist for some special few. H. R. 1205 is that contract, universally covering all, all the time, in every occupation and in every business.

The burden of proof should now rest on those who'd still insist on foolishly trying to make the demonstrably unworkable old system work—and you'll find *every reason they'll give will be a bad one!* There isn't and *there never has been any good reason* for living standards in retirement being impoverished, or in any way inferior to the earlier periods of adult life.

HON. JOHN McCORMACK

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I rise with heavy heart to say farewell to a dear personal friend, one who has been my guide and counselor during my service in this body. Before my day, he was the friend of my late father who never spoke of him as other than "my good friend JOHN McCORMACK," a sentiment with which I heartily concur. JOHN McCORMACK is a great and humane man. In the high office of Speaker, he has always maintained a deep sympathy for the affairs of the common man and has given dedicated service to the little people of his District and to the poor, unfortunate, and disadvantaged of this Nation.

His record in the Congress is distinguished not alone by its remarkable length, but, more importantly by the rare quality of leadership which he has displayed and by his outstanding accomplishments. His term as Speaker is studded with new and notable legislation bearing the mark of his fine character. The greatest record of all of the Congresses in which I have served is, in large part, directly attributable to the effective leadership which this exceptional man has shown.

Medicare and social security liberalization, legislation to better the health of all our people and for research into the cause of illness, provisions to feed the hungry, laws to improve educational opportunities of all ages and classes in our society, and measures to do away with injustice and discriminatory practices in our society have become law under his leadership.

As JOHN McCORMACK departs the Congress, he leaves a nation much better for his service, and a legion of friends and admirers who wish him and his beloved wife happiness in his retirement.

The great character and leadership of JOHN McCORMACK will be sorely missed in the Congress and it is my hope, as it is of all my colleagues, that he will return often to this great institution where he has served so well for so long.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HOLLAND

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, this year marks the retirement of a fine and distinguished Member of this body, a man whose grace and friendship have been a true inspiration to his colleagues.

The Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) is retiring after almost 25 years of service in this legislative body.

A former Governor of Florida and a Member of the Senate since 1946, the distinguished senior Senator has performed more services for his State and his country than we could list here today.

Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss all the legislative accomplishments of Senator HOLLAND, but I do wish to mention some things which I think reveal the inner quality of the man and are indicative of his character.

In particular, I commend Senator HOLLAND for his long and successful battle to eliminate the poll tax. This eloquent spokesman first introduced the constitutional amendment to prohibit the poll tax in 1949. And he continued to give direction and eloquence to the anti-poll-tax movement until its passage in 1962.

The 24th amendment to the Constitution, ratified in 1964, is a living testament to the dedication of the senior Senator from Florida.

SPESSARD HOLLAND has earned the trust and respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Those who have known him as an opponent on certain issues share the same warmth and respect for a man of great decency and integrity.

I wish to join my colleagues in wishing SPESSARD HOLLAND the joyous and healthy retirement that he so greatly deserves.

He is a man of warmth and dignity, and a person who has given much of himself. Men of his stature and dignity are the vital strength of our form of government.

Mr. President, I am honored to join my colleagues in expressing gratitude and best wishes to the senior Senator from Florida, SPESSARD HOLLAND.

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable WILLIAM T. MURPHY, who has chosen to retire at the end of the 91st Congress.

BILL is a very close friend of mine, and I will greatly miss his warm companionship and gentle humor. He is a quiet and scholarly gentleman with great personal integrity, high ideals, and a stimulating breadth of vision.

He came to Congress in 1959 after an outstanding record of service on the Chicago City Council, where he served with great distinction for nearly a quarter of a century. Through his work on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs he became intimately knowledgeable of the complex field of international relations, and has risen to become chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs.

He worked with complete dedication to serve his constituency, his State, and his Nation. He can rightfully take pride in his exemplary record of public service, and his uncommon talents will be greatly missed in this Chamber.

To BILL, his lovely wife and family, I express the sincere hope that they will enjoy good health, great happiness, and every success in their endeavors in the years ahead.

A MAGAZINE ISSUE DEDICATED TO A FORMER HOUSE MEMBER

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the Panama Canal Society of Florida recently dedicated its December 1970 issue of its magazine, Canal Record, to the former Governor of the Canal Zone—construction era—and former Member of the House of Representatives, Kentucky; Maurice H. Thatcher.

It will be recalled that on August 15, 1970, under the auspices of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C., the centenary date of Governor Thatcher, a brilliant program was observed at the Cosmos Club in this city. A complete story of the occasion was placed in the proceedings of the Senate, by Senator THURMOND, on September 9, 1970.

The Panama Canal Society of Florida is a unique institution of more thon 1,500 members, made up chiefly of U.S. retirees of the Panama Canal Service since the canal was built—though with a few canal builders—like Governor Thatcher—who yet survive. In recent years, a large number of those retiring from the Panama Canal organization find subtropical

homes in Florida, and thenceforth reside in that land of fruit and flowers. Most of these residents join the society and thus swell its proportions to a very high figure.

The society issues, in quarterly fashion, a magazine, also of unique pattern. It is a "social clearing house" for the recordation of births, deaths, marriages, and activities of retiring Canal families; legislative news from the Congress; and various other features of special interests to all such retirees.

In recognition of Governor Thatcher's long official and unofficial services, for the canal and its employees and for the Isthmus of Panama, the society dedicated the recently issued December number of the magazine to him. In it appeared a well-written and compact story, by the magazine's very capable editor, Margaret M. Ward, of his career—especially that portion of it relative to his invaluable services rendered throughout the years beginning with his tenure as Isthmian Canal Commissioner—now the only surviving member—and civil Governor of the Canal Zone. During the canal construction era which began in May 1910 and continued for more than 3 years, he began his Isthmian service. In Congress, also, during his five terms, he was able to render most useful services for the canal and its employees and ever since. Embraced in his congressional activities was the act—1928—establishing in Panama the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc. For many years he has rendered gratuitous and efficient services for these institutions.

Under leave granted, I include herewith pages of the pertinent subject matter mentioned, as set forth in the magazine, including certain poems:

"DEDICATED UNIVERSAL MAN"

(Dedicated to the Honorable Maurice Hudson Thatcher)

The words of Theodore Roosevelt, "The only homage that counts is the homage of deeds," exemplifies the life of a former distinguished Zonian who celebrated his 100th birthday on August 15, 1970—Governor Maurice H. Thatcher. Having lived for a century would in itself justify a day of celebration, but longevity, combined with an illustrious record of past and current "deeds," dating from 1892 when Maurice H. Thatcher became a Circuit Court Clerk in Kentucky and began his study of law, to 1970, warrants "Homage" as interpreted by Roosevelt's statement. Governor Thatcher has accumulated fifteen pens used by Presidents of the United States from Mr. Coolidge to Mr. Nixon in the signing into law enactments by Congress for which he was directly responsible while serving in Congress and largely responsible for after leaving Congress. He is a centenarian only by a count of years; in sponsoring such legislation, his far-seeing vision and his dedication to humanity give immortality to his "deeds."

Voluminous accounts have been written on his administrative, legislative, and legal career; therefore, details of his enviable record will be left to the research students who have abundant source material—newspapers, both in Panama and the United States, books on the construction period of the Panama Canal, the Congressional Record, Who's Who in America, and eventually in the collection of his extensive official documents and files, press and scrap books (estimated at more than 80 volumes) which are currently being placed at the Scottish Rite Temple, 16th and S Streets N.W., Washington, D.C.

A majestic bridge across the Panama Canal bearing Governor Thatcher's name was dedicated in 1962 on October 12—Columbus Day, so named for a man who also had courage and wisdom—in sailing over uncharted seas, he opened the gate to a new world. Symbolically, Governor Thatcher, as a humanitarian, has also opened the doors for many unfortunates caught in the web of man-made inequities. During his tenure on the Zone (1910–1913), many social reforms were promulgated and the efficiency of all civil departments increased. He himself stated (Congressional Record, September 9, 1970), "In my efforts, I have always been anxious to serve the 'underdogs'—men and women, who, through no fault of their own, are driven into want and need." His latest effort in combatting unjust discrimination was his effective support in the 91st Congress for beneficial legislation (HR–7517) for retired alien employees of the Canal, chiefly West Indians and Panamanians, to put them on equality with subsequent workers of the same type who were covered by Civil Service years ago. President Nixon in a note from The White House on August 5, 1970, wrote, "Dear Governor Thatcher: Several days ago, HR–7517, a bill to provide for increased payments for certain former employees of the Canal Zone, came to my desk for signature. Since your term as Governor of the Canal Zone covered the period in which the Panama Canal was constructed, I know this legislation is of particular significance to you. For this reason, I am pleased to send you the enclosed pens to commemorate my signing this legislation." Governor Thatcher sent one of the two pens to the Isthmus for Governor Leber to present to these particular retirees and reserved the other to place (the 15th) with other pens he had received in the past.

Today, 1970, conservation of our natural resources is becoming daily headline news—often with a pessimistic outlook on the depletion of our natural resources. To Governor Thatcher, while in Congress (1923–1933), protection of our nation's scenic, historic and recreational resources became a life-long project. Today, he is widely known as a conservationist in his effective services in support of National Park systems and historic shrines. His most recent conservation efforts have been directed toward the establishment of the Plymouth Rock National Memorial, embracing some 12 acres surrounding the famous landing place of the Pilgrims in 1620 in Plymouth, Massachusetts. It is believed that legislation to establish the Memorial, which has been introduced in the Senate and the House, should shortly be enacted, due largely to Governor Thatcher's efforts. All of his conservation achievements have been carried on at his personal expense with no reimbursements. "The National Park Service and the people of the nation have been most fortunate to have this rare and devoted interest directed toward preserving the intrinsic character of our rapidly vanishing landscape and history." (Congressional Record, September 9, 1970). In an industrial age, it is men like Governor Thatcher who with unflagging enthusiasm seek to preserve what is precious to many Americans.

As a diplomat, Governor Thatcher and Mrs. Thatcher formed close ties of friendship with the leaders who brought about the Panama Revolution in 1903. The Governor has been an avid believer at all times in the principles of the Good Neighbor Policy. In the course of his long career, he has received many honors, including the highest civil orders of Panama, Ecuador, and Venezuela.

The Program of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C., at their annual meeting, August 15, 1970, commemorated the 56th Anniversary of the opening of the Panama Canal and honored, with a brilliant program, Governor Thatcher on his 100th birthday. Many distinguished guests and a few old-time Canal builders were present at this outstanding event.

The testimonials and awards for Governor Thatcher were many and of exceptional character. Paul M. Runnestrand, Executive Secretary, as the special representative of Governor Walter P. Leber of the Canal Zone, flew to Washington and presented a Certificate designating Governor Thatcher as Honorary Governor of the Canal Zone, a lovely framed night picture of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge, an album containing pictures relating to Governor Thatcher's 60 years of service to the Panama Canal, special letters from Governor Leber with reference to Governor Thatcher's public service, a beautiful mola serving tray, a mounted pen and pencil set, etc., and was advised he would later receive, when minted, the first gold medallion under the recently created Panama Canal Public Service Award.

Testimonials and awards followed from the General Society of the Mayflower Descendants (Governor Thatcher has ancestral lines tracing back to early colonial days and beyond which include Elder William Brewster, one of the passengers on the Mayflower and the spiritual leader of the Pilgrims), and congratulations and his commission from the Governor of Kentucky as a "Kentucky Colonel." Admiral Galloway announced that a history of the Gorgas Memorial Institute and Laboratory, soon to be published, would be dedicated to Governor Thatcher.

Informative addresses were given by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, Jr., on Maurice H. Thatcher, the Dedicated Universal Man; by Dudley C. Bayliss on Conservationist Par Excellente; and the Panama Canal and Historical Prelude by Professor Richard Bennett O'Keeffe.

In his response, Governor Thatcher expressed his deep appreciation for the honors he had received and his gratitude "for the opportunities that had come to him to render beneficial services to the greatest industrial enterprise of the ages, the Panama Canal, and its employees of every category, and the Isthmus of Panama . . .

"Man has great potentials, but he has far to go. On this small planet, he has made great progress, and to science we owe much indeed. The miracle of today becomes the commonplace of tomorrow. The general condition, however, is at low tide; and we are plagued with unmatched violence and confusion . . . Order is Heaven's first law, and must be Man's, if ever he achieves his mission . . ."

Through the centuries, the history of man has been in part written in poetry. Governor Thatcher's contributions to humanity have not been limited to material achievements. He has honored and continues to honor, the Panama Canal, the Isthmian area, and Kentucky with impressive writing in prose and verse, much of it of universal character, which will be read for generations to come. To the Governor, his avocation of writing poetry has been an excellent form of relaxation, but he states, "I have given priority always to my public duties of official nature, and to subjects of humane and conservational character. As a result, I have never found time to collate and publish a volume of verse; and if I am ever to have any fame in this field, it will have to be posthumous nature."

It has been said that with the March of Time eventually there will be no Panama Canal Society. Little Virginia, when skeptical of the existence of Santa Claus was told, "No Santa Claus! thank God, he lives, and he lives forever. A thousand years from now, Virginia . . . he will continue to make glad the heart of childhood." The RECORD is only the outward symbol of the Society. The So-

ciety is more than that—it is that wonderful, glorious, intangible bond among the people who have served on the Canal Zone. Those fearless construction-day workers passed on to their progeny their strong loyalty to the Zone and fellow workers, and to those who went to the Zone later that "intangible something" proved contagious. Those early years, 1904–1914, are immortalized in Governor Thatcher's poem of which the first and last two stanzas are quoted.

(See hereinafter the indicated poem, Builders of the Panama Canal.)

Among the distinguished personages present at Governor Thatcher's birthday party given by the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C. were: Dr. Alexander Wetmore, former Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; Rear Adm. Calvin B. Galloway, president of the Gorgas Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine; Dr. Fred L. Soper, distinguished authority on tropical diseases; Maj. Gen. Glen E. Edgerton, former Governor of the Panama Canal; John F. Stevens II, former official of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, and grandson of former Chairman and Chief Engineer John F. Stevens of the Isthmian Canal Commission; Capt. C. H. Schildhauer, former aviation executive, now vice chairman of the John F. Stevens Hall of Fame Committee; Mrs. Ailene Gorgas Wrightson, daughter of Maj. Gen. William C. Gorgas, the great sanitarian of Cuba, and Panama; Mrs. David Pierre Gaillard, daughter-in-law of Col. D. D. Gaillard, after whom the famous Culebra Cut was renamed as Gaillard Cut; Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, pastor of the National Presbyterian Church and Chaplain of the U.S. Senate (he gave the invocation); Paul M. Runnestrand, executive secretary of the Canal Zone Government; Dr. Francis G. Wilson, author and political scientist; Ralph Townsend, author of books on transpacific affairs and former instructor of journalism at Columbia and Stanford Universities; Maj. Gen. Paul H. Streit, former president of the Gorgas Memorial Institute; Comdr. Homer Brett, Jr., historian general, Order of the Stars and Bars; and John R. Whitney, deputy governor of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants.

Maurice H. Thatcher, on the occasion of the 25th Anniversary of the formal opening of the Panama Canal, not only painted a vivid word picture of construction-day years, but in the thirteen eight-line stanzas of "Builders of the Panama Canal" paid tribute to those brave, adventurous, inspired men, both living and dead, who made possible the realization of what the skeptics called "a dream."

The poem follows, together with other poems included in the magazine article.

BUILDERS OF THE PANAMA CANAL

(In commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the formal opening—by Maurice H. Thatcher)

There were workers great, and workers small—
As judged by rank—in the Enterprise;
But glory enough there was for all,
And each was great to Seeing Eyes.
Let Fame take care that her Scroll be just,
And give to each his meed of praise,—
Else, out of the Ashes and the Dust,
The Shade of Censure shall upraise.

A laud for the work of the first Gold men
Who toiled and wrought and strove, amain,
To dig the Ditch! They began it when
Old Yellow Jack, and the blight and bane
Of Chagres Fever, took starkest toll.
They came, enlisted, and ventured all;
And wrestled Death, with body and soul,—
To linger, these—and those, to fall.

Another fever filled blood and bone
Of all, thruout. Its currents run
Until, within the stretch of the Zone,
The last lone yard of the Link was done:—
A fever, absorbing in the fire
Which single zeal forever brings;
A fever which always must inspire
That strength from which great action springs.

From a boundless field from which to choose—
The ablest Uncle Sam could find,—
Were here assembled: steam-shovel crews,
And engineers of ev'ry kind;—
Designers, trainmen, inventors rare;
Dredgers, foremen, mechanics skilled;
Electrical wizards;—and, ev'rywhere,
The art to do what the Blue-Prints willed.

Whate'er the call, whatever the task,
Each one strove for a single end;
So fair his service that none could ask
Better result, or aught amend.
He reamed the hole, and the bolt sent home;
He mixed the parts, and filled the form;
Into cores he pumped the silt and loam;
And wavered not in sun or storm.

The dirt he hauled from the deepest Cut;
Reclaimed tide-lands in manner vast;
He "toed" the dams with the huge output
Of spoil of shovel and slide and blast.
He dredged the channels in sea and lake,
And built the bounds of dock and lock;
Upreared the spillways and each intake,—
And planted all on the solid rock.

He lent the sleight of his brain and hand
To do all things the Goal required;
All things designed, and each thing planned,
Till naught was left to be desired.
The strengths of Nature—both seen and hid—
He put in bonds to do his will;
And to-day, as then, as they are bid,
They work the wonders of his skill.

For the Silver groups—a word or two;
For those of ev'ry race and soil:
Theirs were the humbler tasks to do;
They bore the brunts of periled toil.
In loyal spirit they labored here,
Thru all the great, eventful days;
They met all duty devoid of fear,
And earned their bit of deathless praise.

And back of all was the Gorgas Squad,
To hold the Bitter Plagues at bay;
With stern Hygeia's miracle-rod,
Swift were the Scourges swept away.
Strange things were done with a sturdy grace,
Until in Isthmia all was well;
Death's haunt became an abiding place
Where the Non-Immune might safely dwell.

America's Mood was here maintained;
All civil functions carried on;
Orderly government ruled and reigned,
And codes to fit all needs were drawn;—
And homes were made, and Society
Was much the same as the Homeland brings;
Here, men and women and children, free,
Lived in the midst of Mighty Things.

Executives, judges, and Q. M. D.'s;
Teachers and clerks, firemen, police;
Nurses and doctors;—and more like these,—
Bewrought, each one, his separate piece
Of the Finished Whole. Their toils, no less
Than those of the workers, "skilled" and "raw,"
Were full required for the Job's success:
All were impelled by the self-same Law.

The mountains moved, and the waters rose;
And Faith, at last, fulfilled her Dream:
Lake, Lock, and Channel—the whole World knows—
Attest the worth of a Hope Supreme!
The ships now shuttle from Shore to Shore:
Up, up, and up—and thence straight on;
Then three times downward—and on, once more,—
Into the Sunset or the Dawn!

All were as one; and They strove and wrought
To shape the Passage to the Ind.
In terms of life it was dearly bought;
In money, cheap. The Ranks are thinned
By Time and Death; but the Deed They did
Excels all others of like and kind;
Its strength and virtue cannot be hid:
It lives—all tongues and lands to bind!

OUR BEST

(By Maurice H. Thatcher)

The Years go by more swiftly than of Yore.
When Youth was prone to dally on Life's shore
As if this Mortal Round would never cease,
And Good might nought deny us of her Store.

Where are the Stars we long have sought to see?
And where the Selves we ever hoped to be?
Where are the dreamed-of rare and precious Goals?
And where our Passports for eternity?

Yet, when the Light shall wane within the West,
May we not count Ourselves as something blest.
If, on the Whole, in Justice we can say,
Our All, tho Little was and is—Our Best?

CHRISTMAS 1970

In spirit I am young, tho watchful Time
Attests mine age. My urge and pref'rence point
To many things—both lowly and sublime
Meanwhile I hold myself in strict account—
And past a tether's length I may not go;
But in its slack I am sustained and free.
Of youth I keep enough to don and show
A vital front—whatever odds there be.
These lines are writ beyond the ample date
Of years five score—and Honor's rich outpour,
And those who read can judge; and speculate
On that to come—by what has gone before.
My aims and goals inspire—they're much the same
As those bygone—as current toils proclaim.

At this blest interval you have my warm regards, Maurice H. Thatcher.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Thatcher of late has received so many awards, gifts, and honors, that it is a little difficult for all to be recounted. In addition to those received at the celebration of his centenary, and detailed in Senator THURMOND's story of the occasion placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1970, other distinguished honors have recently been conferred upon him.

In 1969, volume IV of a series of international genealogical works compiled and published in London, by authentic genealogists, was dedicated to him. The foreword of that volume was written by him and is most interesting and informative. The series of four volumes involved are entitled, "Living Descendants of Blood Royal." It is pointed out in the foreword the fact that primogeniture in Europe caused many of the nobility to seek in the New World Colonies of North America fortunes denied them in their motherlands. These emigrants all had royal ancestries, but in the American Colonies, they intermarried with other colonials, and the foreword states that there are hundreds of thousands of royal descendants in our present-day Nation, most of whom have not kept their genealogical records beyond a few generations, and are unable now to authenticate them. The most notable of our colonials was of course, George Washington. He had an authentic genalogical line as-

cending to Edward I of England and the forebears of the latter.

The four volumes mentioned, however, are filled with sketches of such descendants and their authentic lines of descent. Volume IV, for instance, has about 1,140 pages thus utilized.

At the centenary celebration, it was formally announced that a history of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., and the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, now under publication, is dedicated to Governor Thatcher. Also, it is to be noted, that the recently organized Former Members of Congress, on December 3, 1970, elected him to honoary membership in this distinguished group. And then, of course, is the dedication of the December 1970 issue of the Canal Record of Florida herein covered.

For all the gifts, awards, and honors that have thus come to him, Governor Thatcher is deeply and humbly grateful.

PHILIP J. PHILBIN

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion I join with all of those who have expressed high regard and admiration for PHIL PHILBIN, of Massachusetts. From my vantage point as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee I have been able to understand and appreciate his devotion to principle and his determination to abide by his convictions, no matter what the cost.

He held firmly to his responsibility for continuation of a strong American defense posture, mindful it would demand a high level of patriotism and a willingness to absorb criticism even when unmerited. The passage of time will underscore the value of his convictions and his actions, and will highlight his steadfastness in time of trial.

I wish him well in future undertakings. I have enjoyed the privilege of his personal friendship and have been honored to serve the people in his company. I feel we will hear of him again, in another time and place, but in continuation of his lifelong drive to make his energy and ability available to the service of his country.

REPORT ON MINE MECHANICS SCHOOL AT ELDERS RIDGE, PA.

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, less than 6 years ago, the Pennsylvania State University established a mine mechanics school at Elders Ridge, Indiana County, Pa. Since that time, 270 men have been graduated, with commencement set for another class next month.

Of the school's alumni, 169 reached in a survey by the school reported a total annual income of more than $1.5 million. A majority of those unaccounted for have joined industries other than mining and can be assumed also to be earning substantial wages.

The figures are convincing evidence that, of all manpower vocation programs, training of men for coal industry employment holds greatest promise from the standpoint of investment and return on the part of the Federal Government. This training program establishes important tax sources in opening the way to lifetime career opportunities for skilled technicians who can earn as much as $12,000 per year immediately after qualifying for positions in the mining industry. Members of the coming graduating class at Elders Ridge will, in fact, begin work at wages far surpassing those which will be offered to most young men completing college work at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, experience dictates the wisdom of increasing manpower development programs in the bituminous coal industry. The Pennsylvania State University provides additional courses to train recruits and to upgrade employed miners both on campus and in mining communities throughout the State. Nonetheless, the Federal Government must encourage expansion of both institutional and on-the-job mine training programs if nationwide energy deficiencies brought about by personnel shortages are to be averted.

Knowing of our colleagues' interest in successful government programs designed to improve job opportunities, I have appended to my remarks a tabulation of the results of the survey of graduates of the Elders Ridge manpower training program for mine maintenance mechanics.

The tabulation follows:

EMPLOYMENT SURVEY—MINE MAINTENANCE MECHANIC GRADUATES ,ELDERS RIDGE MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAM, PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Class	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	Total
Number admitted to training	80	60	60	60	60	320
Number completing training and graduating	68	51	54	54	43	270
Percent of trainees graduated	85.0	85.0	90.0	90.0	71.66	84.37
Number of responses	34	36	29	37	42	178
Employed by mining or related industry	24	30	18	30	34	136
Percent of responses from those who graduated	50.00	70.58	53.70	68.51	97.67	65.92
Percent of respondents employed in mining or related industry	70.58	83.33	62.06	81.08	80.90	76.40
Number of respondents reporting job titles related to mechanics work	19	24	18	29	30	120
Percent of respondents reporting job titles related to mechanics work	55.88	66.66	62.06	78.37	71.42	67.41
Annual income:						
$5,000 to $6,000	0	0	0	4	2	6
$6,000 to $7,000	4	0	3	1	2	10
$7,000 to $8,000	4	2	0	6	7	19
$8,000 to $9,000	3	5	4	3	11	2
$9,000 to $10,000	10	7	5	12	13	47
$10,000 to $11,000	3	6	8	4	3	24
$11,000 to $12,000	3	6	1	2	3	15
$12,000 to $13,000	3	5	3	2	1	14
$13,000 to $14,000	1	0	1	1	1	3
$14,000 to $15,000	2	3	0	0	0	5
Unanswered	1	2	4	2	0	9
Number of times changed employer:						
None	9	19	17	16	37	98
Once	14	9	8	12	3	46
Twice	5	5	2	7	2	21
3 or more	6	2	0	1	0	9
Unanswered	0	1	2	1	0	4
Number of respondents indicating they could have worked at present position without Penn State training:						
Yes	6	4	4	6	8	28
No	27	31	22	28	34	142
Unanswered	1	1	3	3	0	8
Percent of respondents working in position they could not have held without Penn State training	79.41	86.11	75.86	75.67	80.90	79.77

TRIBUTE TO ALBERT GORE

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, ALBERT GORE, in his 18 years in the Senate and 14 in the House of Representatives, left behind a legacy which few men can match.

As ALBERT GORE leaves this body, the Senate—and the Nation—lose the greatest modern day champion of the common man.

His legacy is one of great courage, of singular dedication to social and economic justice, and of extraordinary ability in pursuing the causes in which he believed.

In my 6 years in the Senate, I have been proud to call him a friend, and fortunate to have shared his side on many of the great legislative battles of our day.

Many speaking of him in tribute will call him our greatest living populist and the champion of the average man.

Yet this was no man who merely followed the popular will or submerged his convictions to political calculation. While his beliefs were, I think, always in tune with the best interests of the common people of his State and of this Nation, they were not always the most popular beliefs of the instant. Few Senators will be treated more kindly by history, but many could have been treated more kindly at the polls had they chosen to compromise their convictions.

ALBERT GORE did not choose to compromise his most fundamental beliefs. For 32 years the Congress, the Nation, and the State of Tennessee have benefited from this courage. And we will continue, I believe, to benefit from the legislation which bears his stamp and the standards which he set for courage, tenacity, and ability.

TRIBUTE TO JEFFERY COHELAN

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks after my first election to the House of Representatives, in 1958, I found myself in California on vacation and took the opportunity to get acquainted with another newly elected Member of Congress, JEFFERY COHELAN.

JEFF COHELAN and I have been close friends since that first meeting and, like many other Members of this body, I have immensely valued and enjoyed this friendship.

JEFF COHELAN brought to Congress with him a rich background of experience in public and private life.

During his 12 years of service in Congress, he has drawn on that experience as well as his fine educational background to make invaluable contributions to the work of Congress and to the Nation at large.

Mr. Speaker, I think that particularly worthy of tribute at this time, as JEFF COHELAN concludes his service in Congress, is his extraordinary leadership in working for adequate funds for the education of the young people of the United States.

It was JEFF COHELAN, as a Member of the House Appropriations Committee, who in the 91st Congress successfully led the effort to invest more of our national resources in the most valuable natural resource we have, educated men, and women.

JEFF COHELAN'S interests in Congress have ranged across a broad spectrum of concerns, from education to health to civil rights to the war in Vietnam to our defense posture and to labor-management relations.

Mr. Speaker, JEFF COHELAN is one of the outstanding Members of Congress whom I have had the opportunity of knowing during my own service in the House. I count it an honor to have served with him and I am pleased to take this opportunity to pay public tribute to him and wish him well in the years ahead.

A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ALBERT GORE

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in the Senate in paying tribute to ALBERT GORE as he leaves the Senate of the United States. ALBERT is a truly veteran in the Congress of the United States, having first come here January 3, 1939. His service has been continuous since that time, having been elected to the Senate in 1952 and re-elected in 1958 and again in 1964.

When ALBERT GORE first came to Congress, I had been here 2 years. My district in Alabama and that of Congressman GORE in Tennessee had joined. We had many things of common interest. I found ALBERT GORE always helpful.

ALBERT very soon demonstrated his ability in the House of Representatives. When he believed that a thing was right, he would work hard to get it through. When he believed a thing was wrong, he was just as diligently and forceful in fighting it in committee and on the floor of the House of Representatives. This same characteristic has marked him during the 18 years that he has been in the Senate. He is a man of strong convictions, great ability and absolute integrity.

ALBERT has had beside him during all these years the beautiful and able wife, Pauline. They were a wonderful team that worked together always on whatever mission was before them at that time. Mrs. Sparkman and I have felt very close to ALBERT and Pauline Gore through the years. We both hate to see them leave the Senate. We hope they will come back this way often.

STATE OF WASHINGTON EXPRESSES ITS CONCERN FOR JEWS IN RUSSIA

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the weekend of January 9–10, 1971, was set aside in Washington State as a "Sabbath of Concern for Soviet Jewry," as an expression of deep concern.

This is a program that should be carried to every pulpit in America. For the information of my colleagues, a statement by Washington's Gov. Daniel J. Evans regarding this serious subject appears at this point in the RECORD:

A STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

In recent months concerned people throughout the world have watched with growing apprehension the increasing harassment of the Russian Jewish community by the government of the U.S.S.R.

The apparent deliberate fostering of group and religious hatred by the Soviet Government must be deplored by all persons concerned with the right of all men to live in an atmosphere of peace and harmony.

On behalf of the people of the State of Washington, we call upon the government of the U.S.S.R.:

1. To restore freedom to the 32 Jews who have been accused of treason, but whose only apparent crime is their desire to be reunited with their families in Israel,

2. To grant exit permits to all Soviet Jews who wish to emigrate, as an act of humanity and in accord with the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (ratified by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., January 22, 1970), and in accordance with the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments of the International Declaration of Human Rights which guarantees the right of free passage,

3. To permit the full re-establishment of Jewish religious and cultural institutions and the practice of Judaism without government harassment,

4. To halt all forms of anti-Semitism and discrimination, including the publication and distribution of anti-Jewish propaganda,

5. To adhere to civilized concepts of international law and justice which regard the death sentence, or threat thereof, for unproved accusations as barbaric. We find it especially shocking that this sentence should have been invoked on the Eve of Christmas and the beginning of Chanukkah.

DANIEL J. EVANS,
Governor.

TRIBUTE TO AN OUTSTANDING YOUNG MAN

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following article from The Forumeer, national publication of the American GI Forum, about Jim Plunkett, all-American quarterback from Stanford University.

Jim happens to live in my district in San Jose and is also a student at my alma mater. With the thousands of others who know him or know about him, I share a vicarious pride in his achievement. As you know, he received the Heisman Trophy for 1970, the highest award in college football.

Jim has come from a background of poverty as a Mexican American—in a society that has often been unkind to Mexican Americans—to become the most productive quarterback in NCAA history. In praise of his achievement, I cannot improve on the words of Martin Castillo, the outgoing chairman of the U.S. Cabinet Committee on Opportunity for the Spanish Speaking. To quote from the article:

Jim is an inspiration to all of us by his example. He has demonstrated to our youth particularly, that aspiration and determination, whatever the endeavor, is not so much the gift but the will.

While I believe Mr. Castillo's words were intended primarily for a Spanish-speaking audience, I respectfully suggest they are equally relevant for us all, whatever our skin color or ethnic background.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.—The Heisman Trophy, awarded annually to the nation's top collegiate football player, belongs in 1970 to All American Quarterback Jim Plunkett of Stanford University.

The most productive quarterback in NCAA football history, Plunkett said the award should "be an inspiration to the Mexican American community. The Mexican Americans can take pride in this award."

In Washington, Martin Castillo, Chairman of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunity for the Spanish Speaking, praised Plunkett for the honor he brought to Mexican Americans throughout his athletic career at Stanford and by winning college football's most coveted award.

The 6 ft. 3 inch Plunkett was raised as a Mexican American in San Jose, Calif. His mother is Mexican American and his father, who died last year, was Irish-German.

"Plunkett might not sound Spanish, but Jim is an All Mexican American in style and heart," says Castillo. "He comes from a background typical of many Mexican American youth—born and reared in poverty but with

love and devotion to his parents who had the additional burden of both being blind.

"Jim included us in his honor when he said the award should be shared by the Mexican American community," Castillo added. "We see in Jim Plunkett the inherent qualities of the Mexican American youth who can turn adversity into challenge and ride it to the top.

"Jim is an inspiration to all of us by his example. He has demonstrated to our youth particularly, that aspiration and determination, whatever the endeavor, is not so much the gift but the will."

Since Plunkett had to sit out a year because of medical problems his college class graduated last year and Jim could have signed a very lucrative professional football contract. He chose instead to return to Stanford because he wanted "to beat Southern California and to play in the Rose Bowl." On Oct. 10th Coach John Ralston's Stanford Indians, with Jim Plunkett at quarterback, defeated USC 24–14. On Jan. 1, 1971 the Indians play Ohio State in the Rose Bowl. The young man has attained his immediate goals . . . y se gano el Heisman Trophy de pilon!

TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER McCORMACK

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues the regret and sadness at your decision to retire at the end of this Congress.

During your 42 years of service to the Nation in the House, you have established an enviable record of fair play and consideration for all the divergent issues which meet here for resolution.

Your ability to recognize the many nuisances of a problem and your skills in reaching the most satisfactory solution have enhanced your reputation as a distinguished Speaker.

You have particularly proven your great qualities of leadership in recent years as the requirements for legislation have increased in complexity with the growing population and changing technology. Your steady and even-handed guidance have enabled the Congress to make unparalleled legislative advances to meet this need.

Your unfailing record of support for improvement of the Nation, especially your support for water resources development, has earned you the gratitude of citizens throughout the land. The people of the Tennessee River area have been particularly grateful to you for your friendship to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Your awareness of the interdependence of the various sections of the country has contributed to your visionary leadership and sets a high goal for each Member to seek.

Your open and friendly manner and your willingness to counsel and advise have been appreciated by me.

You have been a significant and moving force for betterment of all men, and I take this opportunity to salute your monumental accomplishments.

In the years ahead, you have my sincere best wishes for every joy and happiness.

TRIBUTE TO OUTGOING MEMBERS

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, although we are gratified that the 91st Congress has found it possible at long last to adjourn sine die, we are fully mindful that all too many of our esteemed colleagues will not be returning as Members of the 92d Congress.

This realization is most distressing because this House simply will not be the same in the absence of the likes of such friends as those who immediately come to mind: ROSS ADAIR and E. Y. BERRY, BILL CRAMER and ED FOREMAN, TOM KLEPPE and ODIN LANGEN, KATHERINE MAY, CHET MIZE, and DICK ROUDEBUSH. May I hasten to add that I count others on both sides of the aisle in this very same category.

They all should know that they will be sorely missed by those of us who remain. I deem myself fortunate to have known and worked with each and every one. I shall treasure the memories of our associations, and I believe they will look upon their service in the House of Representatives as the most meaningful, the most productive years of their lives.

I hope they will keep in touch, and I wish for each of them every success in all future endeavors.

STEPHEN YOUNG

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the Senate loses one of its most colorful figures as the peppery and popular STEVE YOUNG chooses to return to private life and the precincts of his beloved Ohio, the State that has so many times honored him—the State that he has honored as he served his country long and well.

With his years as prosecuting attorney, STEPHEN YOUNG has a deep conviction of the dignity of the court room—and our colleague was an equal stickler for the dignity and decorum of this Senate, yet always with the accommodating geniality of the ideal colleague.

Neither Congress nor a constituent could have any doubt about the mind of Senator YOUNG—a gifted mind with a command of rhetoric that one might envy.

And his constituents had no doubt about their reliance on STEPHEN YOUNG. His terms in the Ohio General Assembly and four terms in the House of Representatives were crowned by his election and reelection to this Senate.

All of those years of service gave us a sound legislator in a period of military adventure that could use the cautious military judgment of one who had seen years of combat as well as military administration of a conquered land.

His experience entitled him to quote, as was his wont—"There never was a good war or a bad peace."

To the military honors, the medals, the battle stars with which this valiant warrior can bedeck his days of peace, we now add the plaudits of his colleagues for his achievements in this Senate—his place in the current history of our country to which STEPHEN YOUNG has been a devoted son.

May the future hold all health and satisfaction for him and may his talents be ever at the call of his country.

MONTEREY JAZZ FESTIVAL

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, one of America's traditionally great musical events is the annual Monterey Jazz Festival in Monterey, Calif.

Last September's festival—the 13th—was perhaps the best of all.

I hope that all Members of this House will have an opportunity to go to Monterey this coming fall to see what is truly one of our Nation's greatest annual musical performances.

For the benefit of my fellow Members, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two reviews of last year's festival—from the Los Angeles Times and the San Francisco Chronicle—detailing the magnificence of the events at Monterey:

ALL AGES COVERED AT JAZZ FESTIVAL

(By Leonard Feather)

MONTEREY.—The 13th annual Jazz Festival on the Monterey County Fairgrounds started out with a good premise: namely, that something had ailed the 12th annual Jazz Festival. Last year the patient underwent a rock transplant, but rejected it; this year, functioning with its own natural organs, it has demonstrated the expendability of any such operation. With a few minor exceptions, the music through Saturday night hewed to the purist line.

The most solid achievements have been racked up at both ends of the age spectrum. At one extremity the incredible Duke Ellington (who, of course, is a teenager in disguise) dipped into his bottomless well of energy and enthusiasm to put on an hour-long show crammed with surprises.

Speculation that the death of Johnny Hodges might have hurt the band irreparably was soon set aside as Norris Turney revealed his qualifications to sit in that honored chair. In addition to playing alto sax with a slight Hodges tinge, Turney lends a bright new color to the section with his agile flute work.

Woody Herman sat in for a tribute to Hodges on "I Got It Bad," but a too-fast tempo and unsteady drumming inhibited him. Joe Williams joined the orchestra on "Every Day." Ellington introduced a couple of excerpts from his newest composition, unfinished and untitled, which he announced with cryptic references to Marshall McLu-

han. The reed section voicings recalled some of Ellington's finest early hours.

FRESHEST GROUP

The youngest and freshest group heard to date has been the Tim Weisberg quintet. Dressed and coiffed like a pop combo, they featured electronic devices on vibes, guitar, bass and the leader's amplified flute.

Weisberg and his men (principally Lynn Blessing, the vibraphonist, and Art Johnson the guitarist) have assembled a series of experimental, emotionally based pieces. In their quieter moments they achieved a bucolic charm, even a Swiss music box delicacy.

In a suite called "Trinity," feeding his flute through an echo machine, Weisberg played a three-part cannon, accompanyand overdubbing his own delayed-action sounds.

An even younger entry took part in the Saturday evening's show. He was Nat Adderley Jr., 15, described by his uncle, Cannonball, as "the son of our brass section." The youth accompanied himself at the piano singing his own shock-provoking song, "The Price You Have to Pay to Be Free," later picked up a guitar to back up a vocal by his father, "Down in Black Bottom." The Adderley family can take pride in a formidable new talent.

TEEN HIT

Another teen hit was Shuggy Otis, who appeared as part of the Johnny Otis Show, his father's Saturday matinee. The junior Otis played bottle-neck-style guitar in such an authentic turn-of-the-century primitive style that it was in a sense Ellington in reverse: Shuggy must have been a septuagenarian masquerading in the body of a 16-year-old boy.

The Otis show was a three-and-a-half-hour blues barrage. Because one vocal blues can't sound that much different from its predecessor, it began to bog down after an hour or so, but was promptly lifted back into orbit by Miss Esther Phillips, whose tart, nasal tones and sardonic lyrics, about the bounties bestowed on her by the ice man, the rent man and the meat man, stopped the show.

After her, the deluge; Otis and his singers had the crowd in a dancing, shouting frenzy. Somehow this reporter, caught up in the spirit of the blues, found himself playing piano for Jimmy Rushing, thereby disqualifying himself from any objective evaluation.

Otis, who has become a focal point for the blues renaissance, deserves credit for bringing back so many rhythm and blues hit makers of the 1940s and 50s who are too rarely seen nowadays. His cast included Joe Turner, Eddie "Cleanhead" Vinson, Roy Milton, Ivory Joe Hunter, Pee Wee Crayton and Roy Brown.

BLUES PERSISTENT

The blues has been a persistent element in the festival. High points of Woody Herman's set Saturday night where a long multiform arrangement of "Blues in the Night" and a guest appearance by Jimmy Witherspoon. The Herman band also played for Joe Williams, who maintained his cool (and his warmth) while the musicians did their best with inadequately rehearsed arrangements.

Of minor interest was the reunion of Slim and Slam, a mildly entertaining duo who revived their 1938 hit song "Flat Foot Floogee."

The festival low point to date was reached Friday with the Alan Copeland vocal group, an octet of pseudo Swingle Singers that could not even be redeemed by the accompaniment of the Modern Jazz Quartet. They sang (wordlessly for the most part) as if they were walking across a frozen pond and any display of emotion would crack it.

Reviews of the two Sunday concerts will appear Tuesday.

BEAUTIFUL SOUNDS AT MONTEREY

(By John L. Wasserman)

MONTEREY.—If anyone were in doubt about where jazz has been, or where rock came from, the Friday and Saturday Monteray Jazz Festival concerts cleared up the confusion in a hurry.

In particular, Saturday afternoon (the "blues afternoon"), was an exceptional history, comprising some two dozen singers and instrumentalists and upwards of 50 songs.

The singers included Big Joe Turner and Jimmy Rushing—roughly 100 per cent of the great Kansas City males blues shouters still practicing—plus veterans Eddie "Cleanhead" Vinson, Ivory Joe Hunter, Roy Milton, Johnny Otis, Pee Wee Crayton and Roy Brown; plus relative youngsters like Little Esther Phillips, Margie Evans and Delmar "Mighty Mouth" Evans. T-Bone Walker, the Great blues guitarist is ill in New York and was unable to appear but Shuggie Otis—Johnny's son and teen-age prodigy—bore the blues guitar responsibilities nicely, moving from the ancient bottleneck style to a contemporary "Shuggie's Bogie."

To detail the highlights would require a week of columns, but—in shorthand—here are a few: Big Joe Turner, opening the show, coming on like the first bull in a corrida, singing, "Shake, Rattle and Roll" and telling about "I gotta pocketful of pencils . . . and I can't even write my name"; Johnny Otis doing his 1958 classic "Hand Jive"; Eddie Vinson breaking up the capacity crowd with "Mr. Cleanhead's Blues"; Esther Phillips, returned after a long bout with the drugs, her voice hard-edged, nasal, "Been—There—Baby," "I'm in the Mood for Love"; Jimmy Rushing classics ("Everyday I have the Blues," "Goin' to Chicago") with Los Angeles Times jazz critic Leonard Feather on piano; Ivory Joe Hunter turning back the clock with "Since I Lost My Baby"; Roy Brown coming on after all this and tearing it up with "Whole Lot of Rockin' Tonight"—somehow riveting attention to the show on stage when another show is going on in the dancing, howling, standing-on-chairs, seven-thousand strong audience.

Johnny Otis—who played piano, vibes, drums and master of ceremonies—put it all together and was the happiest man around. "Some of these men haven't worked in ten years," he said, "and they're where the music called rock came from." He did not exaggerate.

The slim and slam quartet (guitarist Slim Gaillard, bassist Flam Stewart, organist Milt Buckner, drummer Jo Jones) opened the four-hour Saturday night program with an absolutely delightful and humorous set.

Singer Joe Williams, who had appeared for a couple of numbers with Duke Ellington Friday night, then took a full set backed by Woody Herman's big band (with a euphoric John Handy sitting in on alto-saxophone). Williams has a highly effective presence—strong, yet vulnerable—a voice so solid you could lean on it, and magnificent articulation. His "All Blues" number was the high point of the festival for me to that moment.

But that gave way in the very next set—the Monterey debut of Nat Adderley Jr. on piano, vocal and guitar. The set was, of course, the Cannonball Adderley Quintet—Cannonball on alto and soprano, Nat Sr. on cornet and vocals, Joe Zawinul on electric piano, Walter Booker on bass, Roy McCurdy on drums—and the entire group played beautifully; especially on a number dedicated to the Rev. Jess Jackson, "Country Preacher." But for me it was Nat Jr.'s night. The 15-year-old boy played and sang his own composition, "The Price You Have to Pay to Be Free," and it was as articulate a Black statement as anything I've heard. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say the 15-year-old man . . .

The great Woody Herman Band of baby virtuosos closed the evening (morning) with a contemporary book—"Light My Fire," "Acquarius," "McArthur Park"—the exceptional arrangement of "Blues in the Night" by pianist Alan Broadbent, stunning solos by trumpet players Tony Klatka and Tom Harell, trombonist Ira Nepus, tenor saxophonist Frank Tiberi and another surprise—blues master singer Jimmy Witherspoon.

Friday night has faded in the Saturday explosion but "class night" had it . . . the Modern Jazz Quartet, Duke Ellington, the Tim Weisberg Quintet and the Alan Copeland Singers. Neither Duke nor the MJQ played exceptionally, but their standards are so high that it hardly matters. The Copeland singers—an octet a la the Swingle Singers—blended perfectly with the MJQ on Bach's "Air on a G String" but didn't really get together otherwise. Weisberg's group—the leader on flute, Lynn Blessing on vibes, Mel Telford on drums, guitarist Art Johnson and bassist Dave Parlato—has a lovely sound and ability to burn. More Wednesday.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR STEPHEN YOUNG

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is always a sad task to say goodbye to friends and colleagues.

During STEPHEN YOUNG'S 12 years in the Senate, he has been one of the great advocates of individual rights. He spoke with wit and independence, calling the shots as he saw them, always with candor and honesty.

I have been privileged to be associated with STEPHEN YOUNG, not only on the floor of the Senate, but also on both the Armed Services and Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committees. I have seen firsthand the dedicated and energetic manner in which the senior Senator from Ohio approached his work.

Typical of STEPHEN YOUNG—often the first to speak out on tough issues—was his early opposition to the Vietnam war. Since that time many have come to agree with him, but he was among the first to stand up and be counted.

The Senate will surely miss his voice and wit.

SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, this last day of the 91st Congress brings to a close the public career of one of the truly great Americans of this century, Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK.

Any man who has been so long in public life, holding positions of great trust and responsibility, reflects an image of infinite variations to the vast number of people whose lives have been touched by his decisions and judgments.

But what image has he reflected to

the hundreds of Members who have served in the House of Representatives during his leadership?

If there is a single descriptive word I believe it is "inspiration."

Firm but fair leadership—the steady hand on the rudder to keep the straight course through dangerous waters; the living personification of a certainty that solutions can be found to knotty problems, that agreements can be reached, that the people's will can in fact be done; the inspiration to the membership that urges them to exert themselves to the maximum toward attainment of these goals.

What is the House of Representatives?

It is the people's forum.

And who presides to make meaningful its deliberations?

The Speaker, a man who must fit the mold established in the first days of this legislative body when the American system of self-government was in its infancy.

We have all been fortunate beyond the scope of calculation to have JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, in the Speaker's chair. We will be reminded of him daily for many years into the future as the House strives to resolve controversies and to work the people's will.

In the well-earned relaxation of his retirement I hope he will have cause to take pride in our work equal to the respect we will always maintain for the quality of his leadership.

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am proud to rise and pay tribute to a great Senator and colleague, RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, of Texas.

Senator YARBOROUGH served with distinction on three vitally important Senate committees: Appropriations, Labor and Public Welfare, and Post Office and Civil Service. Consistently, he fought for the little man, the unsung citizen who makes up the backbone of the American Republic. His unstinting common man approach has done much to help alleviate America's problems.

Senator YARBOROUGH is undoubtedly one of the hardest working Senators with whom I have had the pleasure of serving. I have always listened attentively when he has spoken, for his arguments have been persuasive and based on diligent research.

During his Senate service, many compliments have been used to describe the ingredients which make his service memorable—qualities such as character, courage, integrity, wisdom, persistence. These expressions of praise ring true because they have been earned by him. We who have worked with Senator YARBOROUGH over the years can attest to their accuracy.

Shakespeare truly observed:

Some are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them.

RALPH YARBOROUGH achieved greatness by his own endeavors, entirely by his own abilities. We shall miss this man who gave so much of himself to our own proceedings and to our country. He has been a superlative Senator in every sense and we know he will yet add to his contributions to our Nation.

RALPH YARBOROUGH will be sorely missed.

NEWSLETTERS

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, our office prepares regular monthly newsletters to constituents on congressional activities and, annually, we send a questionnaire on the issues confronting the Congress to every home in the Eighth District of Virginia. A copy of our January 1971 newsletter and annual questionnaire is inserted at this point in the RECORD for the information of our Members:

BILL SCOTT REPORTS

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

JANUARY 1971.

When the 92nd Congress convenes on January 21, we will begin operating under the Reorganization Act passed last fall. Among many revisions are features: (1) making details of rollcall votes in committee available to the public; (2) authorizing radio and television broadcasting of committee hearings in both Houses; (3) for open meetings of committees; (4) for greater participation in employment of committee staffs by the minority party; (5) providing for an August recess of Congress; (6) for recording of names of members during informal teller votes; (7) expediting quorum calls by discontinuing calling names once a quorum is established; (8) establishing free conducted tours of the Capitol in lieu of the paid tours; and (9) providing additional research facilities for Congressmen by the Library of Congress and the General Accounting Office.

While an effort was made in this Act to change the seniority system, that feature was eliminated. Nevertheless, both Democrat and Republican party organizations have under consideration proposals to permit chairmen of committees and ranking minority members to be chosen either by the committee or party conferences. Perhaps the most popular change suggested is that the chairmen and ranking minority member be chosen from among the top three members in seniority. This seems to be a reasonable compromise.

JOB SAFETY

The first nationwide employment safety and health standards act has been passed by the Congress and signed into law by the President. The law allows the Labor Department to set job safety and health standards for all workers except those in mining and railroad work, which are covered by other legislation, and those in federal, state and local government jobs. Inspection and initial enforcement would be handled by the department but final enforcement would be controlled by a 3-member Presidentially appointed board. A controversial provision that would have allowed inspectors to shut down a business without first getting a court order was eliminated by the House and agreed to in conference by the Senate. The law also sets up a new National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health and a nationwide study to be completed in 1972 on the adequacy of workmen's compensation laws.

ILLEGAL FISHING IN U.S. WATERS

The President has signed into law legislation aimed at halting illegal fishing in our territorial waters by foreign fishermen. It had been estimated that less than 10% of foreign vessels illegally fishing within our 12-mile zone at remote spots such as off Alaska were actually apprehended. The new law increases the maximum penalty from $10,000 to $100,000 and authorizes the government to pay up to $5000 to informers whose information leads to a conviction. It is hoped that these features will result in a decrease in the violation of our territorial waters.

POPULATION COUNTS

The Census Bureau has issued its official population count for Virginia of 4,648,494. This decennial count represents an increase of 681,545 or 17.2% from the 3,966,949 Virginians in 1960. Our own 8th Congressional District contained 594,434 people, and the official figures for the various counties follow:

Caroline	13,925
Charles City	6,185
Essex	7,099
Fairfax (entire county)	455,021
Fairfax (8th District portion)	212,910
Fauquier	26,375
Hanover	37,479
Goochland	10,069
King and Queen	5,491
King George	8,039
King William	7,497
Fredericksburg	14,450
Lancaster	9,126
Loudoun	37,150
Louisa	14,004
New Kent	5,300
Northumberland	9,239
Prince William	111,102
Richmond	5,841
Spotsylvania	16,424
Stafford	24,587
Westmoreland	12,142

OFFICE HELP

Colleagues in the House, knowing that our District is close to the seat of government, sometimes request information about possible secretarial and administrative help for their offices. Therefore, I plan to prepare a mimeographed sheet of names, addresses and phone numbers of persons who are interested in securing employment on Capitol Hill and distribute it to all Members of the House. The pay is good, but the hours are long and contrary to popular belief, the staffs work hard. Should you be interested in being included on this listing, please send a short resume to the office. It should include your age, education, experience, type of position wanted, and salary requirements.

FAMILY PLANNING

Expanded government birth control and population research are included in a bill recently signed into law. Authority for a 3-year program to assist public and private non-profit organizations to advise people on means of controlling birth is included in the Act. None of the money that might be made available could be used where abortion is used as a method of birth control. A new Office of Population Affairs is set up in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer the new program. Separate legislation to provide funds to carry out this program will have to be passed in the future.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT

The President has vetoed a bill providing for early retirement of Federal firefighters based upon their hazardous duty. He stated

that generally a uniform retirement policy should prevail for all federal employees and there was no compelling reason to permit early retirement in their case. An exception to the general retirement law was made some years ago with a measure providing that F.B.I. agents could retire on an immediate annuity when they attained the age of 50 and had served a minimum of 20 years as special agents. This hazardous duty statute was later amended to include U.S. marshals, prison guards, Federal policemen, and Treasury agents. Other employees have asked to be included. This is a complex problem and hearings will be held early next year before our Subcommittee on Retirement to determine whether further exceptions should be made in the hazardous duty statute; whether all government employees should be permitted to retire after 30 years of service regardless of age; or whether employees should be permitted to retire when the combined total of their years of service and age reach 80. It seems reasonable to again consider how Federal firefighters as well as Air Traffic Controllers and others fit into the overall picture.

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION

To give the small investor protection similar to that given bank depositors by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 was recently enacted. Broker-held securities are protected up to a value of $50,000 with the cash portion insured up to a level of $20,000. All brokers and dealers registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission with several exceptions will be assessed according to their level of business to build up a $150-million fund from which payments would be made to investors in case of the failure of a stock brokerage firm holding their securities or funds.

ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Enclosed with this newsletter is a copy of our 5th annual questionnaire. This opinion poll involves some of the basic questions confronting the country and measures upon which I must vote as your representative in Congress. Knowing your views will help me better represent you. When the results are tabulated, they will be reported in a subsequent newsletter and will be shared with colleagues by insertion in the Congressional Record. Should you care to elaborate on your views or have ideas for specific legislation, please feel free to express them on the back of the questionnaire.

MAILING LIST

While the annual newsletter and questionnaire are sent to all postal patrons, monthly newsletters are sent only to constituents now on the mailing list and those who ask that their names be added. You may want to use the following form for that purpose. However, if you have been regularly receiving the newsletter and the address is correct, no further action is necessary.

WHAT'S YOUR OPINION, YES, NO, NO OPINION

1. To settle nationwide labor-management disputes, would you favor:
a. Compulsory binding arbitration in lieu of right to strike.
b. Compulsory binding arbitration only for industries affecting the public interest such as railroads and public utilities.
c. Permit strikes in all industries after reasonable cooling off period and negotiation.
d. Let labor and management settle all their differences without governmental restrictions.

2. To strengthen the economy:
a. The administration should urge labor and management to hold the line on wages and prices.
b. The government should put wage and price controls into effect.
c. There should be no government control of wages and prices.
d. There should be a general cutback of government spending

3. Should the development of the supersonic transport (SST):
a. Be subsidized by Federal loans.
b. Be subsidized through cooperative effort of private industry.
c. Be left to development by other nations.

4. Do you believe the busing of school children to obtain racial balance should:
a. Be required by the Federal government.
b. Be determined by state and local governments.
c. Be eliminated entirely.

5. In Vietnam and Southeast Asia, do you:
a. Support the President's methods of terminating the war.
b. Favor immediate unilateral withdrawal of all American troops.
c. Favor escalating the war to obtain a military victory.

6. Do you believe airline hijacking could be reduced by:
a. International agreements for the return of hijackers
b. Strict examination of passengers and freight before departure
c. Armed guards on flights
d. Arming the crew

7. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas:
a. Should be impeached
b. Should be left alone
c. Should be investigated and hearings had by a Congressional committee to determine whether impeachment is warranted

8. Selective Service laws should be amended:
a. To abolish the draft and have all volunteers
b. To have universal military conscription for all males
c. Continue existing laws

9. In trade with other nations, do you believe this country should:
a. Have no tariffs on imports
b. Have tariffs only to protect new industry
c. Have general tariffs to protect American industries
d. Establish reciprocal tariffs based upon those imposed on American imports by other countries

10. A National Health Program for all citizens:
a. Should be established and operated solely by the government
b. Should be established by the government, but operated through private insurance and medical organizations
c. Should not be established

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR YOUNG

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it is a great privilege to join in paying tribute to one of the most independent, hardworking and hard-hitting men I have ever met in the U.S. Senate, STEPHEN YOUNG, of Ohio.

This marks the last week of 12 active years in the Senate for STEPHEN YOUNG. He has been a source of strength and a provoker of serious thought for me and, I am sure, for every Member of this body.

He is a man who has spoken his mind on every important issue regardless of the political consequences. And, he is a man who has never hesitated to change his mind when he decided that change was what the times demanded. Expediency has never been a consideration for STEPHEN YOUNG, and I suspect that is why he has won such universal respect and admiration. I venture to say that, if the Senator from Ohio did not believe in motherhood and apple pie, he would say so here on the floor of the Senate. For he has never hesitated to challenge any of our national assumptions, no matter how engrained, nor any of our national institutions, no matter how cherished. In an age of conformity, STEPHEN YOUNG has been an invaluable Member of this body.

He did as much as any man to awaken us all to the tragedy of American involvement in Vietnam at a time when many were still uninformed, uncertain, or uninterested. Day after day he and a handful of others labored to bring the folly and the tragedy of that war to our attention and to the attention of the Nation.

As do many Members of this body, I count STEPHEN YOUNG as more than an associate and more than a colleague. We have stood on the same side of many issues. But even when we stood on different sides of an issue, I always knew that STEPHEN YOUNG was a friend, a good friend who would never sacrifice his integrity and his honesty.

There is no better example than the famous letters which STEPHEN YOUNG writes to belligerent constituents. I think that a politician who has the courage to call a voter a liar and a fool when that voter is so, does his profession a great and unusual honor. And he also does a great service to the constituent who would otherwise be led to believe that he deserves a considerate reply no matter how malicious or foolish his letter.

Yes, I hold STEPHEN YOUNG in the greatest admiration and the deepest affection. I know we will see a lot more of him and that he will continue to work for what he believes is needed in America.

I know that STEPHEN YOUNG is proud to leave the Senate with his head high. It has been his courage and honesty that help all of us to hold our heads high too.

I wish STEPHEN YOUNG a busy, active, and successful retirement.

TRIBUTE TO HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my honor to be associated with MIKE FEIGHAN since I first came to Congress in 1946. MIKE has served the 20th District of Ohio since January 1943, and in that time I have come to know and respect him as one of the most patriotic and hardworking Members of this body. Many of his colleagues have commented on his tireless and dedicated service as chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the great Judiciary Committee. I appreciate especially, Mr. Speaker, MIKE FEIGHAN'S unrelenting opposition to militant international communism in all its guises. The list of

his honorary citations and awards is ample evidence of his leading role in this struggle. He has been recognized by virtually all of the organizations which are dedicated to unmasking and rolling back Communist oppression. MIKE was particularly interested in exposing the reign of terror which fell over Eastern Europe after World War II. He has also won the gratitude of many Americans in connection with his service in the field of immigration and nationality policy.

Although he has represented one of our great urban areas, MIKE FEIGHAN has never adopted a narrow or a sectional approach. He has been a national legislator; and he has been a devoted member of the Democratic Party.

We will miss MIKE FEIGHAN in this body. We will miss his keen insights, the products of his keen intelligence and his outstanding education at Princeton and Harvard Law School. But most of all we will miss him as a warm friend and associate. Although he leaves this House, he has written a legislative record which will last as long as the Republic. Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for MIKE and his lovely family continued happiness and success.

CHARLES GOODELL, A FALLEN WARRIOR IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the quality of being forthright is much admired in political life—much more admired than practiced. Senator GOODELL, during his 2 years of distinctive service in the U.S. Senate, frequently exhibited this virtue in speaking out on the major issues of our troubled times.

CHARLES GOODELL, although not an early opponent of our abhorrent military involvement in Indochina, came to be an outspoken critic of the war. His position formed as he began to tabulate the irrational cost of the war, not only in lives lost, but also in the damage done to our claim for moral leadership in the world at large. Consequently, CHARLIE GOODELL advocated specific measures that would provide a road out of this war which has caused so much strife and dissension among Americans. He suggested a timetable at whose conclusion American troops would be withdrawn from Vietnam. This proposal, which he advanced with consistent vigor, drew controversy both within and without the Senate. His uncompromising stance as a war critic, coupled with his correspondingly forthright positions aimed at many targets of unresolved domestic neglect, drew the anger of the leaders of his own political party at the highest levels. He was not supported for reelection by the President or Vice President, both fellow Republicans. Indeed, he was actively opposed.

Yet, CHARLIE GOODELL fought on—courageous and courteously—though the odds inflicted upon him were too great and he fell victim of the modern-day "know-nothings."

CHARLIE GOODELL has served the cause of peace honorably. He has conducted himself in the highest tradition of a U.S. Senator. I regret his forced departure. I hope that he will continue to fight the good fights for America outside the Senate just as he did when he was a Member of this body.

PROJECTIONISTS VIEW OF OBSCENE MOVIES

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on December 14 the House defeated by a voice vote my bill, H.R. 2745, which would exempt certain theater motion picture projectionists from prosecution under the District of Columbia Obscenity Law. Several days later Mr. Leonard C. Whitsitt, chairman of the Obscenity Laws Committee, and former president of the Moving Picture Machine Operators' Union, Local 224, an affiliate of the AFL–CIO, wrote a letter to the editor of the Washington Post which was subsequently printed by that paper giving the projectionists' view toward the showing of obscene movies and the continuing need for legislation of this type to protect the innocent projectionist.

The projectionists believe their opinions on the obscenity laws, especially since it directly affects their livelihoods, should be heard. Since I introduced this legislation to protect the projectionists in their plight, legislation by the way that was fully supported by the government of the District of Columbia, I think it is only proper that their views be made a matter of public record.

The article follows:

PROJECTIONISTS ON THE SHOWING OF "OBSCENE" MOVIES

(By Leonard C. Whitsitt)

Reference your article "Projectionists Remain Subject to Obscenity Law," page C4, Dec. 15. Everyone but the projectionist has offered opinions on the obscenity laws, may we present ours?

Representative Wiley Mayne (R-Iowa) argued that enactment of the bill (H.R. 2745, to exempt projectionists from arrest for showing obscene film) would "pull the rug out from (under) every upright citizen who happens to be a movie projectionist in his attempt to stem the tide of smut." Newspaper items stated that Congressman Mayne issued a victory statement, saying "It is time for Congress to start strengthening the laws against pornography, rather than weaken them."

We wholeheartedly agree with his victory statement. We, too, would like to see the laws against pornography strengthened. However, contrary to Congressman Mayne's first statement, the defeat of H.R. 2745 on Monday, December 14, 1970, has pulled the rug out from under about 260 upright citizens who happen to be movie projectionists in the Metropolitan Washington area, in their attempt to stem the tide of smut.

It is ironic that Congressman Mayne's projectionist constituents in the State of Iowa are currently enjoying the protection that he would deny the projectionists in the District of Columbia. The Iowa Legislature (of which Congressman Mayne is a former member) enacted protective legislation for his State in 1967, the second state of the 16 which has done so. The District of Columbia does not have its own legislature but must rely on the Federal Congress. The District Government, through its Corporation Counsel, has recommended enactment of protective legislation for us. If we had our own legislature, we most likely would have had the protection for several years.

No projectionist in our area wants to show obscene films. They are innocent people "caught in the middle." Congress has been unable to enact laws to prevent the making and distribution of obscene films. The Supreme Court has been unable to come up with a concise definition of obscenity. How can the projectionist be expected to act as a judge of obscenity and, according to Congressman Mayne's suggestion, refuse to show obscene film? The projectionist is too busy with the mechanims of his job to view the film for obscene content—he is not qualified as a judge of obscenity. Where does he draw the line? There were lines in the picture "Guess Who's Coming To Dinner?", which was widely acclaimed as a good picture, that were offensive to me. Should I have refused to project it? I have seen no more than a half-dozen scenes of the picture I am currently showing and none of them were objectionable, but I have heard some of the dialogue on the booth monitor that is offensive to me. Should I refuse to project this film? It was given a favorable review in a local newspaper.

If Congressman Mayne will furnish us a list of the films that he wishes us to refuse to project, we will gladly comply if he will defend us against any breach of contract suit for failure to provide the services contracted for.

Among the States that have already enacted protective laws are: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington and possibly others. States in which similar bills are pending are: District of Columbia (H.R. 2745, defeated December 14, 1970), Florida, Illinois, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas and possibly others.

In the majority of instances the projectionist has not been arrested for showing obscene films but because minors were in attendance at "adults only" films. The projectionist, isolated from the audience and the theater entrance, cannot observe who is being admitted. He is only a mechanic, working for an hourly wage. He has no voice in management and no voice in the selection on the films shown. His primary concern is to do a job of professional quality and earn the wage he is paid.

The problems we face in regard to obscenity, pornography, etc., are too numerous and complex for the projectionist to solve alone. He needs the protection of fair legislation, the help of the Congress to enact adequate laws for the control of smut at its source, and the understanding of the good people among the general public. The projectionist is as much against obscenity and pornography as anyone. We welcome suggestions from the Congress, the public and anyone who can offer a solution to the dilemma we find ourselves in; it is not of our making.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HOLLAND

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the 91st Congress brings to an end the long and distinguished Government career of

Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND. During the more than 24 years he has served in the Senate, he has earned the respect and friendship of his colleagues in this body.

Senator HOLLAND has accomplished much during his years in the Senate. His State of Florida and the Nation have benefited from his successful efforts to obtain the central and south Florida flood control program, the constitutional amendment to eliminate the poll tax—which he sponsored—and his knowledge and interest in farm problems. He has been an able and effective representative for his State and the Nation.

We will miss the wise counsel of the senior Senator from Florida.

CHARLES E. JOHNSON RETIRES AFTER 18 YEARS ON THE HILL

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the close of the 91st Congress also brings to a close the Government career of one of the better known and dedicated public servants, Charles E. Johnson.

Charlie is chief counsel and staff director of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and has served on the staff since 1952, first as counsel and since 1961 in his present position.

I am the third committee chairman to whom he has given devoted service over this period, and I cannot begin to estimate the number of Members with whom he has worked over those 18 years.

His Government service actually extends back to pre-World War II days when he joined the General Accounting Office as an attorney in 1936. Like many others, his Government career was interrupted in 1943 by the call to military service in the Army where he served with distinction.

Charlie returned to the General Accounting Office and the Office of the Comptroller General in 1948 as a legislative attorney, the position he held when he was asked to come to our committee.

MY GOOD RIGHT ARM

He, indeed, has been my right arm in these 4 years I have served as chairman. His counsel and assistance have been invaluable to me since I was elevated unexpectedly to the leadership of our great committee in the 90th Congress.

During his 18 years on Capitol Hill, Charlie has made many friends and performed many services for innumerable Members and employees, as well as countless others elsewhere in Government and in private life.

When questions arose on technical matters concerning the postal service and the civil service, the always logical reaction was to call Charlie Johnson. And call Charlie they did.

In a public statement last July 30, when the House-Senate conference finally completed action on the landmark postal reform bill, I called attention to the yeoman work of Charlie Johnson. As I said then, in mentioning his intention to retire from Government service at the end of the year:

To my mind, he could leave behind no finer monument in law than H.R. 17070, the postal reform bill before us today.

It was right after the election in 1968 that I called Charlie and asked him to initiate a vigorous staff effort to put together a comprehensive postal reform bill which I could introduce on the opening day of the 91st Congress.

YEOMAN WORK OF H.R. 4

I had many consultations with Charlie and the staff on the details of this legislation and many people had a part in the final product, but no one played a greater role than Charlie Johnson in assembling the provisions of H.R. 4 for me.

We were dealing with the most comprehensive piece of legislation ever proposed for consideration in the history of our committee. There had been other nibbles at reform legislation over the years, but H.R. 4 was the forerunner of the kind of comprehensive legislation which was needed and which eventually was enacted into law by this Congress.

In citing Charlie's work on postal reform these past 2 years, I use this as only one shining example of his contributions to our committee, the Congress, and the Nation.

His efforts to improve the postal system, of course, extend back to his first association with the committee. Even then, there was concern in Congress and in the executive branch about the operation of the postal system.

BUREAU OF PERSONNEL CREATED

It was after he came with the committee that the Bureau of Personnel was created in the Post Office Department. Although there were nearly 500,000 employes and the personnel cost consumed three-fourths of the annual budget, there had been no system of personnel management and administration.

On the financial side, it was only during his early days with the committee that the always revenue-short department began receiving reimbursement for penalty and franked mail as a result of legislation drafted in our committee .

Charlie had a major role in one of the most important postal measures previously handled by our committee, the Postal Policy Act of 1958.

This measure established for the first time a firm policy of allocating expenses so as to differentiate between those costs chargeable to mail users and those costs to be borne by the Government as a part of public service.

There also was created the long-needed postal modernization fund to finance the vital research and development for more efficient handling of the mails.

AID FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

In the field of civil service, Charlie played a key role in drafting many laws to improve pay systems, benefits, and working conditions for Federal employees. One of the most significant measures was the pioneering Pay Comparability Act of 1962, which will be implemented by the Pay Comparability Act of 1970.

As Charlie Johnson retires from Government service, he closes out an exemplary career as a public servant. His record speaks for itself.

All of us on the committee—Members and staff alike—wish him well as he looks forward to new activity shortly in the private sector. It is Charlie's nature that he will not retire to a rocking chair.

While he should be able to arrange a little more regular relaxation at his favorite golf course, his broad experience and knowledge in public affairs will continue to be utilized—indeed, sought after.

THE 91ST CONGRESS—A PRODUCTIVE RECORD

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the 91st Congress, there was much talk about the legislative logjam created by extended debate in the U.S. Senate on Supreme Court nominations, the war in Southeast Asia, the supersonic transport, and other major issues, all of which caused monumental delays in the legislative timetable. It is true that some vital programs failed to clear the Congress in the closing days of the final session, but in most instances it was a choice between enacting poor, inadequate, hastily constructed legislation or waiting until early next year and doing the job properly. I feel that the latter choice was the best.

The social security legislation is an excellent case in point. On May 21, 1970, the House of Representatives passed legislation providing for increases in benefits and broadening of the various social security financed programs. It was not until December 29 that the Senate passed a very different type of social security measure. There were more than 180 differences between the House- and Senate-passed bills. It was virtually impossible to resolve these in the few days left between Senate passage and final adjournment. Therefore, the basic decision was to do the job properly in the 92d Congress—and to make the benefit increases retroactive to January 1, 1971. It is very probable that social security recipients in the months and years ahead will receive higher benefits from this decision than if we had put together a hurried compromise.

In evaluating any congressional session, or the production of any legislative body for that matter, it must be remembered at all times that a decision not to approve a proposal can be a positive action taken as a result of careful consideration. A bill, when introduced, or a Presidential message, when submitted to Congress, is a proposal and nothing more. It is a starting point for legislative debate and decision. It does not and cannot become law until the people, through their representative government, have had an opportunity to express their thoughts about any such proposition. In this legislative process, the original proposal may be amended and modified to the point that the legislative impact

would have the opposite effect from that originally intended.

Some legislation requested by the President is never enacted.

Other legislative acts of Congress are vetoed by the President.

The great majority of the legislative output, however, represents extensive debate and negotiation, compromise and cooperation on the part of both the legislative and executive branches of Government. No single branch of Government can enact laws by itself.

Herein lies the strength of the fundamental separation of powers our Founding Fathers wisely incorporated in this great Nation's Constitution. This separation of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches provides a basic system of checks and balances by which no one branch of Government can or should become the rubber stamp for another.

This is what makes our free democratic system work.

Probably the most dramatic example of this balancing of powers between legislative and executive branches of Government in 1970 came in the field of foreign affairs when the Congress placed restrictions upon the use of American troops in Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand, and set certain timetables for the removal of combat forces from all of Southeast Asia. Although the executive branch at first opposed these restrictions, it came to accept them through pressure of negotiation with Congress which was, I believe, reflecting the wishes of the public.

With these thoughts in mind, let us take a brief look at the record of the 91st Congress. The final scorecard shows, I believe, a healthy plus for the Nation as a whole and its people. The record is productive and progressive.

First, I would like to review my own personal legislative program during the 91st Congress. Some 30 bills which I authored or coauthored have been signed into law. These range from my bill to make permanent the Durum wheat allotments for Tulelake grain growers to major revisions of national disaster relief programs, the most recent of which, signed by President Nixon New Year's Eve, rewrites virtually all the disaster relief laws on a permanment basis for the first time in two decades.

Other public laws which I sponsored designate Desolation Valley as a wilderness area, provide funds for acquisition of more land at Point Reyes National Seashore, establish an urban mass transportation fund, extend the Golden Eagle passport, provide appropriate recognition for our heroic astronauts, set aside land for an Indian housing project in Alpine County, provide for wise utilization of geothermal steam resources, ratify the State-approved Tahoe regional planning compact, establish the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal as a national historical park, extend the Federal-Aid Highway Act, establish Fort Point in San Francisco as a national historic site, integrate the Black Butte water resources into the Central Valleys project, authorize construction of the Cottonwood and Merced stream group and other flood control projects, provide uniform relocation assistance in acquisition of property for Federal projects, extend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, provide easy access to Federal buildings for the physically handicapped, promote a program of drug abuse education, initiate a study of the feasibility of the Amargosa project in Inyo County.

Looking at some of the other topics of general concern to the people of the Second Congressional District, I would like to list some of the accomplishments which have been enacted into law as a result of legislative consideration by the 91st Congress. These actions are divided into general categories of concern.

ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Environmental Quality Education Act, the Water Quality Improvement Act, the Resource Recovery Act, the Nation's first real national minerals policy, an Omnibus Flood Control Act, stricter air pollution regulations and requirements, the Agricultural Act of 1970.

EDUCATION

Extension and improvement of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Act, a school milk program, the emergency food assistance for children, a National Commission on Libraries, the Library Services and Construction Act, a Drug Abuse Education Act, and public health grants to schools.

PEOPLE

Federal Meat Inspection Act amendments, Voting Rights Act amendments, Federal Employees Salary Act, health programs for Federal employees, postal reorganization and curbing of obscene mail, Legislative Reorganization Act, medical facilities construction and modernization amendments, comprehensive alcohol abuse and alcoholism prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act, community mental health center amendments, heart disease, stroke, cancer, and kidney amendments, veterans' pension increase, Veterans' Housing Act, veterans' education and training amendments, servicemen's group life insurance amendments, and veterans' medical care.

COMMERCE, INDUSTRY, AND LABOR

Newspaper Preservation Act, Public Broadcast Financing Act, unemployment compensation, railroad supplemental annuities and increase in railroad annuities, railroad shopcraft dispute settlement, Occupational Safety and Health Act, Extension of Public Works and Economic Development Act, and Bank Holding Company Act.

TRANSPORTATION

Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act, Airport and Airways Development Act, National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, Federal-Aid Highway Act, Rail Passenger Service Act, Federal Railroad Safety Act, and the Merchant Marine Act of 1970.

In conclusion, I want to list the rollcall votes for the two sessions of the 91st Congress. As has been my practice in the past, I have cast my vote on every issue except where I was unavoidably absent due to official business or other reasons, and in those instances, I have announced my position on the issues raised and, therefore, consider myself on the record 100 percent of the time.

The material follows:

91ST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION—1969

My stand, issue, and status

For. Election of John McCormack as Speaker of the House of Representatives. McCormack elected.

For. To halt debate and bring to a vote the question of seating Representative Powell. Rejected.

For. A second move to halt debate on seating Representative Powell. Rejected.

Against. To halt debate on amendment providing for investigation of Representative Powell. Rejected.

For. To bring to a vote a proposal to fine Representative Powell and strip him of senority. Passed.

For. To seat Representative Powell subject to $25,000 fine and elimination of seniority. Passed.

For. To require a Presidential elector to cast his vote for the nominee he represented on ballot. Rejected.

For. To recess for ten days. Passed.

For. To change name of Committee on Un-American Activities to Committee on Internal Security. Passed.

For. To extend Executive Reorganization Act. Public Law 91–5.

For. To establish a Commission on National Observances and Holidays. Defeated.

For. To increase the public debt limit. Public Law 91–8.

For. To authorize Procurement of additional aircraft for Armed Forces. Passed House.

Against. To send back to Committee a bill providing funds for House Committee on Internal Security. Rejected.

For. To authorize funds for the expenses of the House Committee on Internal Security. Passed.

For. To adopt Water Pollution Control Act. Public Law 91–224.

Against. To reduce in scope the extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Rejected.

For. To adopt amended Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Public Law 91–230.

For. To authorize procurement of vessels and aircraft. Public Law 91–49.

For. To create a select committee to investigate crime. Passed.

For. To extend the special milk program. Public Law 91–295.

For. To require universities seeking federal assistance for construction projects to comply with the antidisorder measures in Higher Education Act. Passed.

For. To make supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1969. Public Law 91–47.

Against. To impose a limit on farm subsidy payments which the Administration advised would prove more costly to the taxpayer in the long run. Passed.

For. To appropriate funds for the Department of Agriculture. Public Law 91–127.

For. To permit debate on Treasury Department and Post Office Department appropriations. Passed.

For. To limit second class mail subsidies. Rejected.

For. To appropriate funds for Post Office and Treasury Departments and Executive Office. Public Law 91–74.

For. To authorize Youth Camp Safety Survey Act. Rejected.

For. To broaden hospital and domiciliary care benefits for veterans 70 years or older. Public Law 91–500.

For. To extend hospital construction programs of the Public Health Service Act. Public Law 91–296.

For. To authorize appropriations for National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Public Law 91–119.

For. To limit the use of federally owned property in District of Columbia for demonstrations. Passed House.

Against. To kill legislation requiring health warnings on cigarette packages. Rejected.

For. To authorize appropriations for Atomic Energy Commission. Public Law 91–44.

For. To appropriate funds for Independent Offices and Department of Housing & Urban Development. Public Law 91–126.

For. To provide additional clerk for House Members. Passed.

Against. To approve Interstate Taxation Act as opposed by State of California officials. Passed House.

For. To make permanent the temporary suspension of duty on chicory roots. Public Law 91–41.

Against. To extend income tax surcharge and repeal investment credit. Passed House.

Against. To send back to Committee a bill authorizing additional funds for John F. Kennedy Center. Rejected.

For. To continue federal participation in the John K. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Public Law 91–90.

For. To make supplemental appropriations to finance Farmers Home Administration & other programs. Public Law 91–47.

For. To improve and extend assistance to medical libraries. Public Law 91–212.

For. To carry out the provisions of the Standard Reference Data Act. Public Law 91–131.

For. To continue Appalachian Regional Development Program. Public Law 91–123.

For. To clarify liability of national banks for certain taxes. Public Law 91–156.

For. To authorize construction of an entrance road to Great Smokey Mountains National Park. Public Law 91–108.

For. To extend and improve the National School Lunch Act. Public Law 91–207.

For. To appropriate funds for U.S. Forest Service and Department of Interior agencies. Public Law 91–98.

For. To extend and improve civil service retirement programs. Public Law 91–93.

For. To appropriate funds for Departments of Justice, State and Commerce. Public Law 91–153.

Against. To increase the number of hours a District of Columbia employee would have to work before receiving overtime. Passed House.

For. To kill bill permitting banks to deduct interest on installment loans in advance and raise the legal interest rate on some small loans to 16% in the District of Columbia. Passed.

For. To amend Federal Credit Union Act to provide a separate Federal Credit Union Agency. Public Law 91–206.

For. To continue existing tax withholding schedule pending resolution of tax reform act. Passed House.

For. To provide full funding of our education program. Passed.

For. To prohibit funds to any individual at an institution of higher education involved in campus disorders. Passed.

For. To appropriate funds for Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Passed-Vetoed.

Against. To agree to Senate amendment continuing income tax surcharge until December 31, 1969. Passed.

For. To authorize appropriations for the President's Council on Youth Opportunity. Public Law 91–176.

For. To provide for a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped. Public Law 91–61.

For. To authorize funds for Military Construction Authorization for 1970. Public Law 91–142.

For. To approve Tax Reform Act of 1969. Public Law 91–172.

For. To authorize Post Office and Civil Service Committee to conduct studies and investigations. Passed.

For. To extend National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Program. Public Law 91–265.

For. To protect children from hazardous toys and other articles. Public Law 91–113.

For. To extend a research program relating to automotive fuel and vehicles. Public Law 91–137.

Against. To reduce funds for Peace Corps. Rejected.

For. To extend Peace Corps Programs. Public Law 91–99.

For. To prevent camping in National Park areas not properly designated for this purpose. Passed House.

For. To authorize an insured student loan program. Public Law 91–95.

Against. To apportion Presidential electors by Congressional Districts. Rejected.

For. A constitutional amendment calling for direct election of the President and Vice President. Passed House.

For. To appropriate funds for the legislative branch of government. Public Law 91–145.

For. To establish a Council on Environmental Quality. Public Law 91–190.

For. To authorize Bureau of Reclamation feasibility studies, including Armagosa Valley. Public Law 91–81.

For. To extend for 2 additional years authority of VA to set interest on G.I. loans. Passed House.

For. To establish joint labor-management trust funds for scholarships and child care centers. Public Law 91–86.

For. To extend supplemental Railroad Retirement annuities. Public Law 91–215.

For. To begin debate on Military Procurement Act. Passed.

Against. To block amendment instructing Armed Services Committee to delete ABM funds. Passed.

Against. To refuse to authorize any purchase of equipment for our military services. Rejected.

For. To authorize purchase of ships, aircraft and other equipment for the armed services. Public Law 91–121.

Against. To permit coining of silverless dollar (⅔ majority required). Rejected.

For. To liberalize pension requirements for veterans and their widows. Passed House.

For. To provide special programs for children with specific learning difficulty. Passed House.

For. To approve the Gifted and Talented Children Educational Assistance Act. Passed House.

For. To extend the National Science Foundation. Public Law 91–120.

Against. To prohibit an increase water polution control funds. Passed.

For. To appropriate funds for Public Works (including $39 million for Second District). Public Law 91–144.

For. To table instructions to House conferees regarding farm subsidy limitations. Passed.

For. To approve Hours of Service Act. Public Law 91–169.

For. To approve Educational Television and Radio Amendments of 1969. Public Law 91–97.

Against. To oppose recommendations of Federal Salary Commission relating to federal salaries. Passed.

For. To approve Federal Salary Comparability Act. Conference.

Against. To adjourn and cut off speeches on Vietnam Moratorium. Rejected.

Against. To approve recommendations of Joint Commission on the Coinage rejecting silver in Eisenhower dollar. Passed.

For. To amend Higher Education Act of 1965 with regards to Guaranteed Student Loans. Public Law 91–95.

For. To provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports. Public Law 91–184.

For. To revise law governing contests of elections of Members of House of Representatives. Public Law 91–138.

For. To support House of Representatives' position regarding repair of Capitol west front. Passed.

For. To amend and extend laws relating to Housing and Urban Development. Public Law 91–152.

For. To approve Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act. Public Law 91–173.

Against. To limit consideration of draft reform to lottery system. Passed.

For. To approve Selective Service Amendment Act of 1969. Public Law 91–124.

For. To authorize grants for special educational programs concerning the use of drugs. Public Law 91–527.

For. To remove ceiling on appropriations regarding Administrative Conference of the U.S. Public Law 91–164.

For. To approve Bank Holding Company Act. Public Law 91–607.

For. To approve funds for Aviation Facilities Expansion Act. Public Law 91–258.

For. To approve Potato Research and Promotion Act. Rejected.

For. To authorize appropriations for military construction for fiscal year 1970. Public Law 91–170.

For. To extend and improve Federal-State Unemployment Compensation Program. Public Law 91–373.

For. To authorize appropriations for expenses of National Council on Indian Opportunity. Public Law 91–125.

For. To appropriate funds for Department of Transportation. Public Law 91–168.

For. To approve appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. Public Law 91–127.

For. To provide an extension of the interest equalization tax. Public Law 91–128.

For. To provide additional aircraft for defense of Republic of China. Passed.

Against. To provide arbitrary annual reductions in Economic Development Loan Program under AID. Passed.

For. To authorize funds for Foreign Aid. Public Law 91–175.

Against. To strike out funds for study of extending D.C. subway system to Dulles Airport. Rejected.

For. To authorize a federal contribution for the District of Columbia subway system. Public Law 91–143.

For. To make appropriations for the District of Columbia government. Public Law 91–155.

For. To revise the due date for cost estimate of the Interstate Systems. Passed House.

For. To begin consideration of Vietnam Resolution. Passed.

For. To request the President to press North Vietnam to abide by Geneva Convention of 1949 regarding prisoners of war. Passed.

For. To approve resolution for peace with justice in Vietnam. Passed.

For. To authorize appropriations for Department of Defense. Public Law 91–171.

Against. To provide military assistance to Republic of South Korea and Republic of China (Taiwan) in addition to those requested by the President. Passed.

For. To approve Foreign Aid appropriations. Public Law 91–194.

For. To provide continuation of authority for regulation of exports. Public Law 91–184.

Against. To weaken the Voting Rights Act. Passed.

Against. To approve weakened Voting Rights Act. Public Law 91–285.

Against. To send back to Committee supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1970. Rejected.

Against. To send back to Committee Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969. Rejected.

For. To approve Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969. Public Law 91–177.

For. To approve Social Security Act Amendments. Passed House.

For. To grant the consent of Congress to

Connecticut-New York Railroad Passenger Transportation Compact. Public Law 91–159.

For. To call for humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam. Passed.

For. To establish a Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People. Public Law 91–181.

For. To provide for additional members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian. Public Law 91–551.

Against. To permit Federal Reserve Board to purchase U.S. guaranteed mortgages. Passed.

For. To lower interest rates and fight inflation. Public Law 91–151.

For. To improve the health and safety conditions of coal miners. Public Law 91–173.

For. To authorize an adequate force for protection of Executive Mansion and embassies. Public Law 91–217.

For. To approve Foreign Assistance Act of 1969. Public Law 91–175.

For. To approve revision of interest rates and mortgage credit. Public Law 91–151.

For. To approve appropriations for Foreign Aid. Public Law 91–194.

For. To continue programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Public Law 91–177.

For. To approve appropriations for Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Passed-Vetoed.

For. To approve Tax Reform Act of 1969. Public Law 91–172.

For. To agree to amendments to supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1970. Passed.

For. To support the Comptroller General regarding spending of appropriated funds. Passed.

SECOND SESSION—1970

My stand, issue, and status

For. To approve a reduced foreign aid appropriation bill. Public Law 91–194.

For. To authorize employer contributions for joint industry promotions. Passed House.

For. To override Presidential veto of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations. Rejected.

Against. To amend Internal Security Act. Passed House.

For. To extend Anadromous Fish Conservation Act. Public Law 91–249.

Against. To reject private claim of Robert G. Smith. Rejected.

Against. To reject private claim of Pedro Guido. Rejected.

Against. To reject private claim of Noel Marston. Rejected.

Against. To reject private claim of Mutual Benefit Foundation. Rejected.

For. To approve an omnibus private claims bill. Passed House.

For. To establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. Public Law 91–213.

For. To approve a modified Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill. Public Law 91–204.

For. To authorize construction of Eisenhower National Memorial Arena. Rejected.

For. To strengthen criminal laws of District of Columbia. Public Law 91–497.

Against. To establish at $10,000 the value of District of Columbia liquor licenses. Rejected.

For. To improve Community Mental Health Center program. Public Law 91–211.

For. To permit debate of National Forest and Timber Conservation Management Act. Rejected.

For. To approve compromise Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill. Public Law 91–204.

Against. To deprive railroad unions of right to strike. Public Law 91–203.

For. To authorize construction of James Madison Memorial Building for Library of Congress. Public Law 91–214.

For. To approve maritime programs of Department of Commerce. Public Law 91–247.

For. To make Chief of U.S. National Guard Bureau a lieutenant general. Passed House.

For. To preserve historic properties throughout U.S. Public Law 91–243.

For. To provide needed additional judges for District of Columbia. Public Law 91–272.

For. To reorganize District of Columbia courts to improve handling of juvenile cases. Public Law 91–358.

For. To extend current loans of naval vessels to allied nations. Passed.

For. To amend Foreign Military Sales Act. Passed.

For. To approve expanded Federal Water Pollution Control Program. Public Law 91–224.

For. To provide funds for House Committee on Internal Security. Passed House.

For. To extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Public Law 91–230.

For. To increase annuities for railroad retirees. Public Law 91–377.

For. To authorize a pay increase for postal and other employees. Public Law 91–231.

For. To approve appropriations for Departments of Treasury and Post Office and Executive Office, Public Law 91–422.

For. To agree with amendments to bill authorizing pay increase for postal and other employees. Public Law 91–231.

For. To approve welfare reform measure. Passed House.

For. To establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Public Law 91–345.

For. To authorize the Merlin Project on the Rogue River in Oregon. Public Law 91–270.

For. To authorize reduced space program. Public Law 91–303.

For. To encourage travel to U.S. National Parks. Public Law 91–549.

Against. To subsidize transportation for Public Health Service employees. Rejected.

Against. To reduce efforts at arms control. Public Law 91–246.

For. To exclude certain pornographic material from mails. Passed House.

For. To appoint James E. Webb as a Smithsonian Regent. Public Law 91–255.

For. To authorize procurement of military equipment. Public Law 91–441.

For. To approve supplemental appropriations for Fiscal Year 1970. Public Law 91–305.

Against. To amend bill increasing salaries of D.C. policemen, firemen and teachers. Public Law 91–297.

For. To continue National Science Foundation program. Public Law 91–356.

For. To provide local communities assistance in providing adequate and safe airports. Public Law 91–258.

For. To disapprove resolution reorganizing the Executive branch of government. Rejected.

For. To appropriate funds for Departments of State, Justice and Commerce. Public Law 91–472.

For. To improve balance of payments by promoting travel to the United States. Public Law 91–477.

For. To improve the federal courts system. Public Law 91–271.

For. To approve an agreement between Soboba Indians and Southern California water agencies. Public Law 91–557.

For. To approve legislation increasing number of Federal district judges. Public Law 91–272.

For. To approve military construction authorizations. Public Law 91–511.

For. To approve Social Security Act amendments. Passed.

For. To extend Merchant Marine Act propram. Public Law 91–469.

Against. To permit higher interest rates in District of Columbia. Rejected.

For. To require more complete bank records. Public Law 91–508.

For. To establish a Joint Committee on the Environment. Conference.

For. To strengthen rules of House of Representatives relating to financial disclosure. Passed.

For. To approve appropriations for Department of Transportation. Passed House.

For. To increase public debt limit. Public Law 91–301.

For. To appropriate funds for reduced foreign aid program. Conference.

For. To authorize select House committee to investigate war in Southeast Asia. Passed.

For. To extend and improve Federal hospital construction assistance program. Public Law 91–296.

For. To provide a more effective program of air pollution control. Public Law 91–604.

For. To approve funds for Department of Defense. Public Law 91–544.

For. To liberalize benefits for disabled veterans and widows of veterans. Public Law 91–376.

For. To establish a pilot program designated as Youth Conservation Corps, Public Law 91–378.

For. To agree to amendments to Voting Rights Act extension. Public Law 91–285.

For. To improve and modernize the postal service and reorganize Post Office Department. Public Law 91–375.

For. To restore Golden Eagle passport to Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. Public Law 91–308.

For. To provide financial assistance for construction of solid waste disposal facilities. Public Law 91–512.

For. To override President's veto of hospital construction assistance programs (Public Law 91–296). Veto overridden.

For. To provide additional funds for needed urban renewal. Public Law 91–305.

For. To increase availability of mortgage credit for home construction. Public Law 91–351.

Against. To prohibit instructing conferees relative to freedom of choice school desegregation plans. Passed.

For. To extend Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act. Public Law 91–644.

For. To create a commission to study U.S. bankruptcy laws. Public Law 91–354.

For. To extend National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. Public Law 91–346.

For. To clarify provisions of the Federal Meat Inspection Act. Public Law 91–342.

Against. To reduce Peace Corps appropriation authorization. Rejected.

For. To authorize Peace Corps appropriations. Public Law 91–352.

For. To improve consumer protection relative to articles made of gold or silver. Public Law 91–366.

For. To tighten lobbying regulations. Passed.

For. To enact Newspaper Preservation Act. Public Law 91–353.

Against. To cut off debate on Foreign Military Sales Act. Passed.

Against. To table motion instructing conferees to concur with Cooper-Church amendment. Passed.

Against. To restrict negotiating authority of House conferees on postal reform. Passed.

Against. To reduce government participation in Civil Service health insurance plans. Rejected.

For. To improve Civil Service health benefits coverage. Public Law 91–418.

For. To extend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. Public Law 91–346.

For. To modernize the courts of the District of Columbia. Public Law 91–358.

For. To extend the National Science Foundation. Public Law 91–356.

For. To approve compromise International Travel Act amendments. Rejected.

For. To appropriate funds for the Office of Education. Public Law 91–380.

For. To increase availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans. Passed House.

For. To improve administration of the National Park system. Public Law 91–383.

For. To approve funds for Department of Interior and U.S. Forest Service. Public Law 91–361.

For. To extend and improve Federal unemployment compensation programs. Public Law 91–373.

For. To appropriate funds for Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare. White House.

Against. To refuse to appropriate funds for Department of Housing and Urban Development. Rejected.

For. To increase railroad retiree annuities. Public Law 91–377.

For. To extend allied health professions development. Public Law 91–519.

For. To extend Community Mental Health Centers Act. Public Law 91–517.

Against. To make mandatory a wage, price and rent freeze. Rejected.

For. To amend Defense Production Act including standby authority to impose wage and price control. Public Law 91–379.

For. To encourage environmental quality programs. Public Law 91–516.

For. To prohibit use of the mails for transportation of salacious advertising. Passed House.

For. To authorize withholding of municipal taxes for Federal employees. Rejected.

For. To increase compensation of 2 House policy employees. Rejected.

Against. To strike from farm bill payment limitation, wheat, feed grains and cotton provisions. Rejected.

For. To approve Agriculture Act of 1970. Public Law 91–524.

For. To give final approval to Postal Reorganization Act. Public Law 91–375.

For. To provide for Federal railroad safety and hazardous materials control. Public Law 91–458.

For. To permit debate on proposed constitutional amendment relative to equal rights for women. Passed.

For. to approve Equal Rights Amendment. Passed House.

For. To give the District of Columbia a non-voting delegate in the House and Senate. Passed.

For. To establish a Commission on District of Columbia government. Public Law 91–405.

For. To extend comprehensive health planning programs for local and State governments. Passed House.

For. To approve political broadcasting regulations. Vetoed.

Against. To kill proposal to modernize restrictions on water carriers. (Rejected.) Public Law 91–590.

For. To improve education and research in the fields of heart disease, cancer and stroke. Public Law 91–515.

For. To override veto of Education appropriations. (Veto overridden.) Public Law 91–380.

For. To override veto of Housing and Urban Development appropriations. Sustained.

For. To give final approval to Defense Production Act amendments. Public Law 91–379.

For. To authorize construction of Narrows project in Missouri River Basin. Public Law 91–389.

For. To provide an equitable system for adjusting rates of pay for Government employees. Vetoed.

For. To regulate mailing of unsolicited credit cards. In conference.

For. To amend Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. Public Law 91–431.

For. To provide authorization for grants for communicable disease control. Public Law 91–464.

Against. To kill bill establishing Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in Wisconsin (rejected). Public Law 91–424.

For. To authorize U.S. participation in international financial institutions. Public Law 91–599.

For. To approve appropriations for Treasury and Post Office Departments and Executive Offices. Public Law 91–422.

For. To repeal the equal-time requirements for political candidates. Vetoed.

Against. To forbid proxy voting in Committees. Rejected.

For. To approve Congressional Reform Act. Public Law 91–510.

For. To permit government systems and equipment purchasing. Public Law 91–423.

For. To strengthen penalties for illegal fishing in U.S. territorial waters. Public Law 91–514.

For. To increase veterans' pensions. Public Law 91–588.

For. To authorize loans for mobile homes for veterans. Public Law 91–506.

For. To agree to amendment earmarking funds for Dickey-Lincoln project. Rejected.

For. To cite Arnold S. Johnson for contempt of Congress. Passed.

For. To approve Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act. Public Law 91–513.

For. To provide authorization for grants for communicable disease control. Public Law 91–464.

For. To provide for Federal railroad safety and hazardous materials control. Public Law 91–458.

For. To authorize procurement of military equipment. Public Law 91–441.

For. To provide long-term financing for expanded urban mass transportation programs. Public Law 91–453.

For. To amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Public Law 91–560.

For. To provide for guards to accompany U.S. aircraft. Passed House.

For. To make further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1971. Public Law 91–454.

For. To provide representation for certain defendants in criminal cases. Public Law 91–447.

For. To amend International Travel Act. Public Law 91–477.

For. To amend Merchant Marine Act. Public Law 91–469.

For. To approve Organized Crime Control Act of 1970. Public Law 91–452.

For. To authorize appropriations for Department of Defense. At White House.

For. To approve military construction authorizations. Public Law 91–511.

For. To approve Agricultural Act of 1970. Public Law 91–524.

For. To amend resolution establishing American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. Public Law 91–528.

For. To authorize appropriations for the Civil Rights Commission. Public Law 91–521.

For. To authorize assistance to families of servicemen missing in action or prisoners of war. Public Law 91–584.

For. To provide coordination of government family planning and population research activities. Public Law 91–572.

For. To reaffirm authority of Congress and the President to declare war. Passed House.

Against. To send back to Committee the Manpower Act. Rejected.

For. To open the Trade Bill to amendments. Rejected.

Against. To approve the Trade Act of 1970. Passed House.

Against. To weaken the provisions of the Occupational Safety and Health Act. Passed.

For. To approve the Occupational Safety and Health Act. Public Law 91–596.

For. To appropriate funds for Independent Offices and Department of Housing & Urban Development. Public Law 91–556.

For. To allow debate on Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970. Passed.

Against. To send back to Committee legislation amending Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act. Rejected.

For. To provide protection for securities investors. Public Law 91–598.

For. To make grants to medical schools and hospitals in the field of family medicine. Vetoed.

For. To increase telephone and telegraph allowances of Members of Congress. Passed House.

For. To approve the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970. Public Law 91–609.

For. To permit former Members of House of Representatives to retain health and insurance benefits. Rejected.

For. To commend volunteers for efforts to rescue American prisoners of war. Passed House.

For. To table a motion to instruct conferees on Department of Transportation appropriations. Passed.

For. To begin debate on bill encouraging development of rare plants. Public Law 91–577.

For. To authorize release of railroad employee pay increases approved by fact-finding board. Passed.

Against. To extend until March 1 the railroad strike deadline. Public Law 91–541.

For. To amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. White House.

Against. To accept conference report extending until March 1 the railroad strike deadline. Public Law 91–541.

For. To authorize supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1971. White House.

For. To approve legislation assuring employment and training opportunities. Vetoed.

For. To begin debate on bill adjusting excise, estate and gift taxes. Passed.

For. To authorize additional appropriations for the Smithsonian Institution. Public Law 91–629.

For. To assert privileges of House regarding printing of Internal Security Committee report. Passed.

For. To provide additional revenue for District of Columbia. White House.

For. To approve Department of Transportation appropriations. Passed House.

For. To permit continued operation of the Delta Queen. Public Law 91–612.

For. To approve foreign assistance appropriations. Public Law 91–619.

For. To approve Department of Defense appropriations. White House.

For. To amend Bank Holding Company Act. Public Law 91–607.

For. To amend Food Stamp Act of 1964. White House.

For. To send to conference bill providing for potato and tomato promotion programs. Passed.

For. To approve Occupational Safety and Health Act. Public Law 91–596.

For. To provide an equitable system of adjusting rates of pay for Government employees. Vetoed.

For. To authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways. Public Law 91–605.

For. To approve Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970. Public Law 91–609.

For. To include firefighters in Civil Service retirement provisions. Vetoed.

For. To exempt .22 caliber rimfire ammunition from reporting requirements of Gun Control Act. Passed House.

For. To expand United Nations Headquarters. Passed.

For. To approve the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970. Passed House.

For. To facilitate the administration of the Speaker's office. Passed.

For. To assist certain railroads to continue operation. White House.

For. To return to Senate papers regarding Mississippi Sioux Indians. Passed.

For. To provide for potato and tomato promotion programs. White House.
For. To approve Department of Defense appropriations. White House.
For. To facilitate greater expansion of U.S. export trade. Rejected.
For. To approve adjustment of statutory pay systems. White House.
For. To approve further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1971. Public Law 91-645.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR TYDINGS

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today we pay tribute to an extremely capable and respected colleague, JOE TYDINGS, of Maryland.

Above all, I feel sorrow that this tough-minded and active man will soon leave the Senate. It always seems doubly unfortunate when a man who has been a real fighter for the people of his State is denied reelection to the Senate. And JOE TYDINGS has been a real fighter for the people of his State as well as the Nation as a whole.

The same things that can get a man into trouble in an election, of course, also win him the respect of his colleagues and of knowledgeable people throughout the country. Independence, integrity, and a willingness to fight long and hard for what is right are not always political assets. But they are the outstanding characteristics of the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland.

In his years of service here, JOE TYDINGS has done genuine credit to his family tradition of service—to his grandfather who was Ambassador to the Soviet Union and to his stepfather who was also a U.S. Senator from Maryland.

Senator TYDINGS knew that he was putting principle before politics when he advocated gun-control legislation. And he knew the nature of the opposition which would be mounted by the gun lobby. I can only say that my respect for Senator TYDINGS multiplies when I consider who his enemies were.

His willingness to exercise leadership in controversial causes was not limited to gun control. Early in his Senate career JOE TYDINGS also approached the issue of birth control—the mere mention of which was anathema at that time. Legislation which passed this year for voluntary family planning assistance is a tribute to his courage as well as his legislative skill.

And finally, the untiring service which he dedicated to the District of Columbia deserves great credit. Knowing full well that those less motivated by principle would say that his devotion to the District meant less devotion to his State, Senator TYDINGS persisted in being one of this city's best friends in the Senate. If any city needed a friend and a vigorous advocate, it was Washington, D.C.

Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for JOE TYDINGS and I know every Member of this body shares that respect. He worked hard and effectively for the people of his State and he has worked equally hard for the future of the Nation.

I hope to see JOE TYDINGS return to the Senate one day. But whatever he decides to do, I am sure he will continue to be a great source of strength and integrity to his colleagues.

I am honored to join in paying tribute to him today.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHN WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, we will all greatly miss the senior Senator from Delaware, JOHN WILLIAMS, who is now retiring at the end of his term in the Senate. His unique contribution to the work of the Senate, and to the country, is widely recognized; but I know I shall especially miss him.

JOHN WILLIAMS was the first Senator I met when I came to the Senate in 1947 for a 2-year term. He is one of three Republicans and nine Democrats still serving of the 98 Senators I met at that time. I have been a seat mate of his for the past 4 years, placed as I am between him and Senator AIKEN of Vermont. His company has been a great pleasure for me and, as he is the ablest member of the Committee on Finance, I have learned much from him. Acknowledged as the foremost fiscal authority in the Senate, he has saved billions of dollars for our country.

By example and action, JOHN WILLIAMS has been a constant influence for the highest standards of conduct. Without vindictiveness, he has brought to the attention of the Senate wrongdoing in both the Senate and the executive branch. And he has been faithful to the high ethical standards he has set for himself.

He is a man of simplicity and of honor, of ability and integrity. I admire him, and the best I can say is that JOHN WILLIAMS will be sorely missed by the Senate and by the people of our country.

CONGRESSMAN MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve on the House Judiciary Committee with my colleague from Ohio, MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, for the past 6 years. In addition to the close friendship which we have developed during this period, I have been particularly impressed by Congressman FEIGHAN's attention to our complex and most sensitive immigration laws.

Mr. Speaker, it required a high degree of courage to withstand the attacks which were leveled at the time of the enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965. I well recall this great legislative landmark, which was signed into law by former President Johnson with the Statue of Liberty as a backdrop.

Mr. Speaker, as one who participated with Congressman FEIGHAN in the development and passage of this legislation, I can attest to the skill and dedication which accompanied this part of his service.

In recalling this signal highlight in Congressman FEIGHAN's career, I wish also to note that his service throughout his long congressional career has been characterized by conscientious attentiveness to his tasks as a national legislator and for his courageous expounding of those principles in which he firmly believes.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Congressman MICHAEL FEIGHAN on the occasion of his departure from the House of Representatives and wish him and his wife, Florence, many years of good health and happiness.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ALBERT GORE

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I know that my good friend ALBERT GORE has insisted that the Senate not set aside any time to honor him before his departure from the Senate.

Nevertheless, I cannot pass up an opportunity to pay tribute to a man from whom we have all learned so much, and for this, I ask Senator GORE's indulgence. I intend to be brief.

I shall not attempt to list the impressive array of his legislative achievements. They span a total of 32 years in the Congress—18 of these years in the Senate, and they include such landmark measures as medicare and the Interstate Highway System.

ALBERT has consistently been outspoken on the most critical issues of the time. In the process of our painful awakening to the prevalence of racial injustice and an ill-founded war in Indochina, the voice of ALBERT GORE has been out front, leading the way toward change.

It can be said that with ALBERT GORE in the Senate, Diogenes would have needed no lantern to find his honest man.

His unswerving honesty, and his uncommon concern for the people of our Nation have illuminated this Chamber for nearly two decades.

We shall miss that light dearly.

FRENCH SEPARATISM IN CANADA

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, all of us have watched with increasing concern and sympathy the spread of political violence in our great neighbor to the North. We ourselves have experienced too much of it not to understand the profound anguish it can cause, not alone to its victims, but to those who are charged with the responsibility of maintaining order with justice.

An exceptionally able student of revolutionary movements, Prof. George Anastaplo, recently published an article in the Chicago Daily News on the subject of French separatism in Canada. He called his essay, appropriately enough, "Canada and the Dilemmas of Decent Men." I found it perceptive and judicious, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Nov. 26, 1970]

CANADA AND THE DILEMMAS OF DECENT MEN [1]

(By George Anastaplo [2])

Things in Quebec Province today are not what they seem. We have read that the Canadian federal government invoked on October 16 (for the first time in peacetime) the War Measures Act of 1914 in order to suppress in Montreal (a metropolitan area of some 2½ millions) the organized kidnappings and assassinations which threatened to get out of hand. We have also read that the people of the Province, to say nothing of the rest of Canada—French-speaking and English-speaking alike—overwhelmingly endorse the government's emergency measures. This endorsement is, it is said, evident both in public opinion samplings and in the reelection on October 25 by a vote of 92% of a Montreal mayor who is strongly opposed not only to terrorism but also to the French-Canadian separatism to which the terrorism is dedicated. (It should be noted that this mayor, who was responsible for the brilliantly successful Expo 67, received a vote of 94% at the preceding municipal elections in 1966. It should also be noted that the most decided public repudiation of the terrorists came only after the murder of one of the kidnapped officials and that this happened after the War Measures Act was invoked.)

I was surprised to learn upon visiting Montreal earlier this month (1) that the measures taken by the Canadian federal government in Quebec Province are much milder than the language employed by the government led me to expect, (2) that separatist sentiment among French-Canadians is much deeper than the publicized expressions of popular disapproval of terrorism would suggest, and (3) that the kidnappings are far less organized than the official response to them would indicate. Indeed, the lack of coordination among the groups engaged both in the kidnappings last month and in the hundreds of bombings of recent years indicates both the likely ineffectiveness of the emergency measures adopted by the government and the pervasiveness of separatist sentiment among French-Canadians. That is, I found the character of this sentiment to be such that acts regarded as expressive of it can be expected to erupt again and again (with the tacit acquiescence of much of the French-Canadian community) as soon as the immediate deterrent is removed of large-scale military intervention by a federal government which is convinced that the welfare and safety of all Canadians depend on keeping the union intact.

A federal show of force may smother temporarily the expression of separatist extremism. But the separatist inclination itself is neither coordinated nor superficial enough to be reversed by such displays. Thus, the likely principal effects of government intervention of the kind seen in October are to provide temporarily an illusion of security, to dramatize the role of the more militant separatists, and to multiply the grievances of the "occupied" French-Canadian community. Such effects may even hasten the day of the eventual dissolution of the Canadian federation, since the federal government will be under considerable pressure to resort to further, truly repressive and hence self-defeating measures in response to renewed separatist terrorism. The statesmanlike alternative to more emergency measures of the kind we have seen since October 16 would be the removal of the causes of French-Canadian separatism—but this, in the nature of things, may be virtually impossible to do for a generation or two (if at all).

That is to say, no Canadian government is in the position (no matter what its parliamentary majority) to "repeal" the 200 years of history etched deep in the French-Canadian soul, a soul scarred by memories of having been conquered by the British and subjugated thereafter to essentially alien political and economic forms. What the government *can* do is to moderate from time to time French-Canadian separatist sentiment, but that sentiment will remain and will flare up whenever other grievances accumulate. The government is not likely to be able to do enough to eradicate such sentiment without either surrendering the entire country to French-Canadian rule (and thus promoting English-speaking separatism, or which there are already significant traces in the Western provinces) or simply forcing a thorough assimilation of French-Canadians (beginning with the gradual elimination of the use in Quebec Province of French in the schools and government of the Province).

English-speaking Canadians do see the government as already surrendring to the French-Canadians, even while the French-Canadians see themselves as already being subjected to a program of forced assimilation. Thus, one can hear in Montreal today both complaints from the English-speaking (as a result of a number of concessions, linguistic and economic, made by the federal and provincial governments in recent years) that the French-Canadians are "blackmailing" the rest of the country and complaints from the French-speaking Canadians that they are forced to surrender their heritage in order to avoid being further "exploited" economically and socially by the English-speaking. Critical to the entire controversy is the repeated encounter in Eastern Canada of two different ways of life—it is this which makes the separatist controversy meaningful, persistent and (from the point of view of the French-speaking minority) even desperate. The serious threat to French-Canadians and to the culture of which their language is the most evident (and most vulnerable) manifestation comes in part from the highly visible success of the Americanized aspirations, prosperity and dedication to material progress found in the rest of Canada. The beguiling success of the Canadian economy threatens to leave behind any minority which is not equipped linguistically, culturally and technologically to compete in the North American market of 250 million customers.

The immediate grievances which today excite separatist sentiment to the point of explosion among French-Canadians include the considerable unemployment which Quebec Province is now suffering. That province, with little more than one-fourth of Canada's 21,000,000 population, has 40% of the unemployed of the country. (The Canadian rate of unemployment in 1969 was 4.7%, that of Quebec Province was 6.9%. These rates are thought to be even higher this year. We, in the United States, are quite troubled today by an unemployment rate of 5.6%.) And, to make this recurring grievance even more bitter, virtually all the unemployed in Quebec Province are found among the 70% who are the French-speaking inhabitants of that province, not among the province's English-speaking inhabitants: this means that one French-Canadian out of eleven in Quebec Province is now out of work.

These discrepancies are partly due to such factors as the superior schooling of the English-speaking and their much greater willingness both to devote themselves and their capital to commerce and to move from one part of the continent to another in search of employment (a willingness facilitated for them by their fluency in the language which dominates North American business). The competitive inferiority of the French-Canadians is also partly due, it should be added, to the refusal of their ecclesiastical and political leaders of the past two centuries to prepare them for industrialized modernity. The French-Canadian way of life (with its roots in the France *prior* to the French Revolution) has emphasized much more than that of its English-speaking competitors (who include most of the immigrants, for they learn English, not French, upon arrival in Canada) the value of the family, of land and of tradition. Indeed, the thoughtful man is obliged in Canada more than are we in this country, to face up to the serious appeals of two contending sets of opinions about the nature of the good life, each of which does have much to be said for it.

It should be emphasized that separatist sentiment is not found only among the unemployed or the unrecognized in the French-Canadian community. If that were the case, then the serious efforts by the federal and provincial governments to raise the level of training and to stimulate the economy of Quebec Province (where most of the French-Canadians are concentrated) might have permanent success in uniting the country. But sentiment for separation—with recommendations of varying degrees of social and economic association between an "independent" Quebec and the rest of Canada—may be found even among well-trained (and well-paid) employees of the governments of Quebec Province and the City of Montreal. (English-speaking citizens of prominence suspect that this sentiment influences as well the Montreal police force, which has been so ineffective in solving during the past decade the crimes committed by separatist extremists.)

The prevalence of French-Canadian sentiment should not surprise us: is not every French-Canadian what he is today because generations of his forebears refused either to migrate from Quebec or to be assimilated after the British won in 1759 the decisive battle against the French for the mastery of North America? Are not all French-Canadians descendants of generations of men and women who felt that any price (economic or political) was worth paying in order to retain their precious identity as French-Canadians.

Self-righteous, and even callous, as the English-speaking rulers of Canada have been at times, they have always been far too civilized and respectful of the rule of law to do what would have had to be done to suppress among French-Canadians their centuries-old longing to be their own masters. The restraint even today of the present Canadian government (which happens to be presided over by a bachelor, cosmopolitan, and hence

Footnotes at end of article.

unrepresentative, French-Canadian) testifies to the legacy of British moderation which goes back to the provisions for religious toleration found in the Quebec Act of 1774. I was struck, during my recent visit to Montreal, by the difference in both mood and deed from what I have encountered during the past decade in countries such as Russia and Greece. (My journalistic qualifications in these matters include expulsion from both Russia and Greece at one time or another.[3])

The foreigner can enter Canada quite casually, and even directly, into Quebec Province from New York State, without being required to give his name, to produce identification or to explain his business. One can move readily around Montreal (despite the presence of soldiers in combat gear stationed at public buildings and communications centers), making inquiries and collecting materials about the current crisis. One can (unlike either in Russia or in Greece today) easily induce critics of the Canadian regime to speak freely without having to give them assurances of anonymity. In fact, vigorous criticism of the government may be read daily in the press and in the transcripts of parliamentary debates. The foreign inquirer need not be concerned (as I often have had to be in Greece) about being followed by the security police or (as in Russia or Greece) about his telephone being tapped, or about his mail being opened or about what might happen to his notebooks or film or informants.

Most significant of all is the realization of virtually everyone in Canada that the restrictive measures adopted by the government last month are truly temporary in character, however mistaken the government may have been in resorting to such measures in the first place. Here, again, a comparison with contemporary Greece is most instructive. The Greek colonels have pretended for three and a half years now to be preparing their country for a speedy return to constitutional government, whereas it has been evident almost from the day they seized power that they intend to stay permanently and that they are willing to do whatever they believe necessary (including the systematic torture of fellow Greeks) in order to preserve their tyranny.

The principal exceptional powers currently being exercised by the Canadian government are the powers to search and arrest without warrants and to hold citizens a maximum of three weeks without charge. (In Greece, there are hundreds, if not thousands, who have been held more than three years without charge, just as there may be in Russia thousands, if not tens of thousands, held even longer.) According to the Montreal police, 447 persons have been arrested in the course of the two thousand raids conducted by them since October 16. Of these, 64 remain in custody with 51 of them now indicted on such charges as seditious conspiracy.

The War Measures Act permits the federal government to exercise several other exceptional powers, including comprehensive censorship, control of prices and wages, and strict supervision of movement in and out of the country, but these have not been made use of (except for some restrictions placed upon radio and television). Of course, no government can arrest (even if only temporarily) hundreds of citizens without affecting the willingness of some government critics to speak out. Still, it must be rare in the Twentieth Century to have had so many citizens arrested in so short a time without arousing realistic fears of a permanent dictatorship. The fundamental decency of Canadian society, in which both radicals and conservatives from the United States have found refuges in recent years, is reflected in the restrained and obviously temporary character of the measures resorted to in the face of what a frantic government may well have believed was an "apprehended insurrection."

Even so, it has been evident all along to informed onlookers that the resort by the Canadian government to these measures was not likely to contribute to the apprehension of the kidnappers who are immediately responsible for the current crisis. The hundreds arrested under the War Measures Act seem to have been for the most part the more militant separatist spokesmen, the men who have been most outspoken in voicing the grievances of their French-Canadian countrymen. No showing has yet been made, nor is any likely to be made, connecting the men arrested directly with the divergent (and curiously casual) groups responsible for the kidnappings.

Perhaps it was necessary to have the overworked police relieved by the army of routine guard duties, thereby freeing them to work on the kidnappings and subsequent murder—but the use of the army for such service (much as we use the National Guard) did not require recourse to the War Measures Act. (In fact, the army had been legally brought into Montreal the day before the Act was invoked, just as it was brought in last year during the Montreal police strike.) Thus, the Act seems to have been invoked, in a moment of panic, primarily to assure people that the government was "really doing something" in the face of mounting terrorist threats. Whatever progress has been made thus far by the Montreal police in solving the kidnap murder by separatist terrorists of a provincial cabinet member has been due neither to the powers given the government under the War Measures Act nor to the use made by the government of the army but rather has been perhaps due to the generous reward finally promised for information after all other (more vigorous) efforts had failed.

What is likely to happen now? Last year, the home of the Montreal mayor was kept for months under 24-hour police surveillance because of a series of separatist bombings in the area. One week after the guard was finally lifted, his house was bombed. We can expect that the discontent which has erupted the past decade in bombings, kidnappings and murder will return to Montreal in some equally disruptive form when the present security measures are somewhat relaxed in the months ahead. Thus, the government has done little more than buy itself some time—but at the cost of establishing precedents and expectations and grievances which can "force it" to be even more repressive next time (if only to satisfy public demands for "law and order"). If the government should be "obliged" to strike again, it will dramatize even more than it has already that small minority of separatists who are most radical not only in the means they are willing to use but even more in the constitutional and social objectives they advocate.

We Americans can learn much from a study of the Canadian crisis. We will be able to observe, for instance, not only the limits but even the self-deceptive character of an emphatic reliance upon force to secure "law and order," especially when that force is articulately countered by longstanding demands for "social justice." Even so, it is all too easy, but (for the reasons I have indicated) not really helpful, for outsiders to advise Canadian governments to address themselves to the underlying causes of separatist sentiment.

We do have a legitimate interest in the preservation of the integrity of our northern neighbor, whatever the constitutional arrangements settled upon among Canadians. It is most difficult to say what arrangement can satisfy French-Canadian sensibilities without intensifying at the same time separatist sentiment in other provinces of the country. Perhaps an economic and political status for French Canada comparable to that of Puerto Rico in the American system would be acceptable to the English-speaking and (if established soon enough) to all but the most radical French-Canadians (especially if French should be declared to be the official language of *all* politics, business and education in Quebec and if a face-saving option for complete independence should be recognized as "available").

It remains to be seen whether the Canadian federal government will be able to resist the temptation to direct its attacks in the months and years ahead against the numerous and hence politically significant moderate separatists who are readily identified and hence vulnerable. That is, will the federal government take care *not* to make it politically impossible for moderate leaders (who still have the support of the great majority of the French-Canadian separatists) to defuse among their constituents the challenge of desperate radicals before those radicals come to be seen (with the "cooperation" of the government) as the latest victims (and hence champions) of resistance to a centuries-old "English tyranny"?

One can hope that our Canadian friends pursue a more responsible government policy than that evident in Chicago both during the Democratic Convention in 1968 and during the "Conspiracy Trial" prosecution following upon the official blunders of Convention Week.[4] Even more is at stake in Canada than there was here in Chicago. Thus, a distinction must be made between firmness and harshness. It takes considerable nerve for men in authority to set and wait out a crisis, relying only on conventional police powers, on patient political action, and on the good will and the good sense of their fellow citizens. Such a restrained course is more likely than dramatic emergency measures to help responsible shapers of opinion among French-Canadians to appreciate and to proclaim in a statesmanlike manner the value for all Canadians of the moderation which their united country is capable of even in a time of serious crisis. *Prudence*, it is encouraging to remember, is spelled the same in French and in English. But so, unfortunately, is *debacle*.

FOOTNOTES

[1] This article (of Nov. 15, 1970) was published in an edited version as an "Insight" feature in the Chicago Daily News, Nov. 26, 1970, pp. 5–6. (The title assigned to the article on that occasion was, "Can Canada Keep the Lid On?")

[2] George Anastaplo is Lecturer in the Liberal Arts, The University of Chicago, and Professor of Political Science and of Philosophy, Rosary College.

[3] See on my expulsion from the Soviet Union, London Observer, August 14, 1960 (Letters to the Editor). See, also, the appendix to my doctoral dissertation, "Notes on the First Amendment" (University of Chicago, 1964). See, on my expulsion from and subsequent admission to Greece, my "letter to the editor" published (in various forms) in The International Herald-Tribune (Paris), Sept. 30, 1970, The Chicago Daily News, Oct. 6, 1970, The Guardian (London), Oct. 7, 1970, and The Manchester Guardian Weekly, Oct. 17, 1970.

My articles on Greek affairs have been reprinted in Volume 115 of the Congressional Record at pages E1875 (March 11, 1969), E2631 (April 2, 1969), E2632 (April 2, 1969), E5156 (June 23, 1969), E5978 (July 15, 1969), E6294 (July 28, 1969), and E10873 (December 20, 1969), and in Volume 116 at pages E935 (February 16, 1970), E1818 (March 10, 1970), S7535 (May 20, 1970) and E10520 (December 18 1970).

[4] See, on the "Chicago Conspiracy Trial," my article ("The Trial: Disgraceful Masquerade") in the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 22, 1970, Sec. 2, p. 2 (reprinted in the Con-

gressional Record, Vol. 116, p. E2420 (March 24, 1970)). See, also, Anastaplo, "The Constitutionalist: Notes on the First Amendment" (to be published by the Southern Methodist University Press in 1971), Appendix C.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR TYDINGS

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is with deep personal regret that I bid farewell to JOE TYDINGS.

The forthright manner and the political courage he displayed in championing legislation dealing with some of the most pressing issues facing our Nation today will be sorely missed from these halls. In only 6 years, the senior Senator from Maryland accomplished many things. With great personal and political courage he made his mark for the betterment of our country. He has faced the issues squarely, sponsoring what he believed was needed, although sometimes unpopular legislation such as gun control and family planning measures.

For the past 2 years this dynamic young man served as chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee. In this position he dealt with the critical problems facing our Nation's Capital. This is a thankless job, but a job that he did well.

We will miss JOE TYDINGS in the Senate but we also are sure that this able, courageous young man will be a leader in our Nation for years to come.

TRIBUTE TO HON. PHILIP PHILBIN

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, one of my closest friends in the Congress has been PHIL PHILBIN. He is truly one of this body's most loved and respected Members, and he will be sorely missed when he leaves. The American people know of his outstanding service over a period of many years on the House Armed Services Committee. He has earnestly and quietly served the great Bay State and the Nation. His warmth, his tolerance, and his unassuming nature are not common among great men, but in his case they added to his stature.

Mr. Speaker, PHIL PHILBIN has ably and energetically represented one of our Nation's most historic areas. It is generally an urban area. Yet he has always keenly understood the special problems of other areas of the country. He has approached legislation with a national viewpoint. PHIL will, of course, best be remembered through his high-ranking service on the Armed Services Committee of the House. But that is by no means the measure of his record, since he has over the years been an important supporter of much of the progressive legislation passed by the Congress. He has been a Member who was always accessible to his colleagues to give a word of assistance or a helping hand to a junior Member. It is for this genuine friendliness and generous spirit, together with his outstanding legislative record, that we and the American people will remember PHIL and his service here. He leaves with the respect and affection of all his colleagues. Mrs. Dorn joins me in extending to PHIL our wishes for happiness and success in whatever ventures he may enter.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MCCARTHY

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the State of Minnesota has given the Nation many great men. One of them is surely EUGENE MCCARTHY. I am privileged to join in paying tribute to Senator MCCARTHY on the occasion of his retirement from the U.S. Senate.

I know I express the sentiment of many of my colleagues and of people from all walks of life in saying I hope that GENE MCCARTHY'S retirement from the Senate will not be a retirement from public life. I am confident he will continue to make a great contribution to our Nation from outside the Senate, as he has done before.

For EUGENE MCCARTHY'S contribution has never been confined to the Senate. He was one of the men who did the most to awaken the country to the tragedy of the war in Southeast Asia, and in so doing he brought thousands and thousands of young Americans into the mainstream of our political tradition. I do not think there can be any question but that the entire country owes EUGENE MCCARTHY a great debt for his courageous action in 1967–68.

The fact that national debate today centers on how to get out of Vietnam, not on whether or not we should continue American involvement, is due importantly to his principled efforts. I think we should always be on guard against underestimating the significance of this change in national views. The war is not over yet. But the change in national attitude brought about by men like EUGENE MCCARTHY is a necessary first step to ending that war.

I have had the good pleasure of standing on the same side of many issues with Senator MCCARTHY. And I know him as a man of great warmth and style.

He has been an eloquent and reasonable representative of the causes in which he believes. And he has won the admiration and affection of many Members of this body.

I am sure every Member of the Senate feels a certain sadness that EUGENE MCCARTHY is leaving. I know I will miss his wit and his incisiveness.

But this sadness is tempered by complete confidence that he will continue to make a contribution to American public life.

A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR SPESSARD HOLLAND

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I count myself fortunate that I was elected to the Senate in time to have served with Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND during the final 2 years of his illustrious career which spans nearly a quarter of a century in the U.S. Senate.

SPESSARD HOLLAND came to the Senate in 1946 after having established an outstanding record of public service. He graduated from Emory College magna cum laude, and he was the recipient of the Nation's second highest award for valor, the Distinguished Service Cross, for service in World War I. He was an outstanding member of the Florida bar, and he served as a prosecuting attorney, a county judge, and a Florida State Senator before becoming Governor of Florida.

SPESSARD HOLLAND retires from the Senate in 1970 after having distinguished himself as a statesman par excellence. If the measure of a good solon is the quality of the counsel he gives, then Florida and the Nation are losing the active service of a great Senator. He has a keen and analytical mind which finds it easy to get right to the heart of a matter, and he has always expressed his positions with logic and clarity. While we have not been in agreement on all issues, I have always looked to his opinion and advice as among the most carefully reasoned contributions to Senate debate. I have profited greatly from his example, and I especially appreciate the assistance he has given me on the farm problem and the question of price supports.

Mrs. Cranston joins me in wishing SPESSARD HOLLAND and his charming wife, Mary, a very rewarding, serene, and healthful retirement as they return to their beloved State of Florida.

A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD

HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the U.S. Senate paying tribute to TOM DODD, senior Senator from Connecticut, TOM has served in the Senate for the past 12 years following 4 years representing Connecticut in the House of Representatives. These have been difficult but exciting years in the history of our Nation. TOM has worked throughout for causes he thought best for his own State as well as for his country.

TOM has labored long and hard in his advocacy of gun control legislation. Much of this work formed the foundation for the first comprehensive gun control law passed in 1968. Likewise, some

of the most important hearings on the problem of drug abuse here and in our Armed Forces abroad have been held by his Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

In the 91st Congress, TOM played a leading role in the adoption of a major revision in our drug laws and enactment of comprehensive crime control legislation.

I know TOM has the best wishes of all of his colleagues for good health and happiness in the years ahead.

RESPONSE TO EPA ADMINISTRATOR

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Administrator William D. Ruckelshaus of the Environmental Protection Agency on December 10, 1970, took it upon himself to issue an ultimatum to the city of Detroit, Mich., to halt violation of water quality standards in the Lake Erie Basin within 180 days or face legal action by the Department of Justice. Similar ultimatums were issued to the city of Cleveland, Ohio, and the city of Atlanta, Ga.

The Common Council of the City of Detroit unanimously adopted a resolution on December 17, 1970, responding to the EPA Administrator's ultimatum. For the information of my colleagues, I insert the text of a statement by Gerald J. Remus, general manager of Detroit's Metropolitan Water Department and the text of the resolution adopted by the Common Council at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

METRO WATER DEPARTMENT,
December 14, 1970.

Honorable Common Council:

Subject: Environmental Protection Agency 180-Day Notice.

GENTLEMEN: We've made outstanding progress on the area Water Pollution Control Program since signing the Stipulation on May 19, 1966, and there is no need to be apologetic to the Federal government.

As far as the time schedule in the Stipulation is concerned, the record shows that the Michigan Water Resources Commission realized it was extremely optimistic. Though we protested, we subsequently yielded, with the mutual hope that we would come as close to the target date as possible. It took from May 19, 1966 until November 17, 1969 for the State to get a financing program arranged and for the State and Federal governments to make the first sizeable grant offers. There has been no time lost on our account.

Further, there is no need for the Environmental Protection Agency and its administrator to try to ride our coattail to success and try to claim the credit when the work is in operation about two years hence—unless they show good faith by putting up their share of the money—NOW!

Accordingly, we have prepared the attached resolution for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

G. REMUS,
General Manager.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DETROIT

By Councilman Eberhard:

Whereas, on December 10, 1970, the newly established United States Environmental Protection Agency issued an ultimatum to the City of Detroit to halt violation of water quality standards in the Lake Erie Basin within 180 days or face Court action by the U.S. Justice Department; and

Whereas, the Detroit Metro Water Department has been and is exerting extraordinary effort to abate that pollution of the lower Great Lakes which emanates from 67 communities in Southeastern Michigan; and

Whereas, the DMWD now has more than 35 water pollution control construction contracts costing nearly $160,000,000 in action and the magnitude and complexity of the work is such that it cannot be completed in less than two years time; and

Whereas, the 180 days is contradictory to the reasonable construction time previously approved by the Federal Water Quality Administration for each individual construction contract; and

Whereas, the DMWD has preceded this construction work by extensive self-financed design and research work costing nearly $4,000,000 since 1966, and has arranged for local financing of $76,000,000 of the construction work, and has cleared 27 acres of residential land for site expansion at a cost of over $3,000,000 at its own expense; and

Whereas, a portion of the construction is already in operation and is providing a significant reduction in the amount of waste water reaching the Great Lakes; and

Whereas, to date the Federal government has offered grants amounting to about only $7,000,000 instead of the $88,000,000 it is obligated and expected to pay and has therefore burdened the local and State governments with prefinancing their remaining share of the cost; and

Whereas, there is another $60,000,000 of pollution control contracts to be let in 1971 if water quality standards are to be met in two years; and

Whereas, continuation of a program of water quality enhancement is expected to cost another $230,000,000 for the DMWD area of service by 1975; and

Whereas, it will not be possible to finance the $60,000,000 of added work in 1971 unless the Federal government forthwith fulfills its obligation to offer a grant of about $81,000,000 for the work now in action and another grant of $33,000,000 for the work to be started in 1971; and

Whereas, the federally advocated River Basin concept of pollution control has been pioneered and is being practiced by DMWD and requires the enthusiastic support (not punitive sanctions) of the Federal and State government in order to fulfill its mission; and

Whereas, the ultimatum of December 10, 1970 is deemed absurd, irresponsible, unwarranted and unconstructive, and has done much to break our hope for cooperatively developing "a mutual trust, a mutual point of view and a mutual plan of action" with the Federal government; Now, Therefore, Be It

Resolved, that the 180-day ultimatum is herewith rejected and be it further

Resolved, that further progress on the abatement of pollution from the area of Southeastern Michigan which is served by the DMWD is solely contingent on an immediate appropriation and bona-fide grant offer by the Federal government for the full 55% share of the cost on Projects No. WPC–MICH–1146, WPC–MICH–1387 and WPC–MICH–1669 as well as such appropriation and grant offer of 55% on WPC–MICH–1896 at the time it is processed by the State; and be it further

Resolved, that if the Environmental Protection Agency sincerely desires to enhance the environment and to obtain the cooperation of those it seeks to serve, then let it demonstrate more mature judgment and consideration in all future actions, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Mr. William D. Ruckelshaus, Administrator of Environmental Protection Agency, each member of the Congressional Delegation from the State of Michigan to the United States Congress, the Governor of the State of Michigan, and the Water Resources Commission of the State of Michigan.

Adopted as follows:

Yeas—Councilmen Brown, Eberhard, Hood, Levin, Rogell, Tindal, Van Antwerp, Wierzbicki and President Ravitz—9.

Nays—none.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR STEPHEN YOUNG

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I regret that I was not present last Monday to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Senator STEPHEN YOUNG. However, in no way do I intend to let this absence prevent me from speaking out today in honor of this most remarkable man.

STEPHEN YOUNG was elected to the Senate in 1958, the year when I, too, first came to the Senate. As a Member of the class of 1958 which has come to mean so much to me, STEPHEN YOUNG, my friend, will be sorely missed.

Yet we will all miss the contributions of STEPHEN YOUNG, our colleague.

His voice in the Senate has been a constant reminder that the job of a Senator is to speak out against injustices, and to lead, not merely follow, in the formulation of public opinion.

His voice has been raised against Democratic and Republican policies alike—wherever he felt that the interests of a special few were being protected to the disadvantage of the interests of the many.

He has often been abrasive in his comments.

But we could always be sure that whatever STEVE said was done so out of his conviction—and I am paraphrasing him now—that he would rather be right than Senator.

I have read the comments of my colleagues in tribute to STEVE YOUNG, and there is little that I can add.

Except to say that STEPHEN YOUNG is a remarkable human being.

UNDERCOVER WEATHERMAN

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the following newsstory has recently been published in the Los Angeles Times and would, I assume, bear investigation. I reprint it here for the information of my colleagues. These are serious charges.

The article follows:

UNDERCOVER WEATHERMAN: INFORMANT TELLS OF SUPPLYING EXPLOSIVES TO REVOLUTIONARIES

(By Richard T. Cooper)

SEATTLE.—The young radical defendants in the Seattle Seven trial are in jail for

contempt of court. Their antics in the courtroom leading to tumult, caused U.S. Dist. Judge George H. Boldt to declare a mistrial Dec. 10 on grounds the defendants had prejudiced their rights to a fair trial.

The commotion in and around the courtroom in nearby Tacoma provided the drama and national attention. But hardly less dramatic—yet little noticed—was the testimony of a Seattle businessman who worked undercover for the FBI in a unit of the violently radical Weatherman faction of the Students for a Democratic Society.

The witness, 33-year-old Horace L. Parker, testified that during more than a year among the Weatherman and other radicals, he was paid by the FBI and acted under its instructions or within its guidelines when he:

Bought five pounds of potassium chlorate, a chemical used to ignite Molotov cocktails automatically, and, after the FBI analyzed it, turned the chemical over to Weatherman.

Offered to supply dynamite and blasting caps to the Weatherman, purportedly through a friend who would steal the explosives from a mine in Idaho.

Parker said he took $120 from a Weatherman to buy two cases of dynamite and several hundred caps, but never delivered the material. He testified the FBI had told him to make the offer.

Provided the leader of the Weatherman collective he was infiltrating with an illegal tear gas gun.

Held firearms instruction, sniping discussions, and target practice sessions for Weatherman members, many of whom had seldom if ever held a gun in their hands before. Parker, posing as a former Green Beret, said he held the sessions to determine the radicals' level of skill.

Used FBI money to supply 14 cans of spray paint intended for use in a demonstration at the federal courthouse in Seattle after defendants in the Chicago Seven conspiracy case were sentenced for contempt of court last winter.

Contributed a .22-caliber automatic rifle and tear gas to the armanent of the Weatherman's collective apartment, called "The Forc," where he joined.

DRUGS PURCHASED

Parker testified that the FBI also paid for the printing of stickers that said, "Serve the People, Stop the Pig" and that his expenses as an undercover agent had included purchases of LSD, marijuana, speed, methedrine, and "coke."

The government informer said he had distributed drugs to others and had used them extensively himself while he was with the Weatherman, both as part of their life-style and to keep himself awake during the long hours he worked.

At one point, he said, he feared he was becoming addicted.

Parker said his activities included recruiting young people to the Weatherman cause, though he asserted he had always stopped short of bringing them into the organization.

TO ANY LENGTH

On cross-examination by Charles C. Marshall III, one of the Seattle Seven who acted as his own attorney, Parker acknowledged that he would go to "any length" to "get" the defendants, including lying.

Parker justified his actions in most cases as necessary to convince the Weatherman of his sincerity and to gain entrance to their quarters. He said the FBI had told him "to do anything that was necessary to protect my credibility."

"I was never allowed to cause any bodily injury or kill anbyody or do something like that," he added.

He was asked on cross-examination, "Have you ever encouraged people, anyone, since you became part of the FBI, to violate the law?"

"Yes," Parker replied.

ILLEGAL MEANS

At another point he was asked, "You felt no compunction yourself about using illegal means to get these people?"

"Sometimes it bothered me a little bit," he said.

The Seattle Seven were being tried on charges of conspiracy and interstate activity with intent to riot arising out of their alleged roles in violent demonstrations at the Seattle federal courthouse last Feb. 16, the day after defendants in the Chicago Seven conspiracy trial were sentenced for contempt of court.

Parker became an FBI informant in late July, 1969.

He said he had first discussed revolutionary ideology with a local SDS leader, Robbie Stern, in 1967. Parker said he contacted Stern again in 1969, telling him, "I was opposed to the war in Vietnam and wanted to do something about it." Stern was not a defendant in the trial.

Parker testified he attended an SDS meeting in July of 1969 at Stern's invitation and was "shocked" at its Marxist-Maoist tone.

"I found out they were Communist revolutionaries, rather than American revolutionaries," he said. A few days later he contacted the Central Intelligence Agency and was referred to the FBI.

Parker said he talked to FBI agents twice and was told, "You have an opportunity to be of service to your country." He said he discussed it with his wife and then agreed to become an infiltrator.

When the SDS split into various factions, he was instructed to concentrate on the Weatherman.

The FBI paid all of his expenses and after a time began paying him a salary that ranged from $175 to $500 a month, he said.

ARMY SERVICE

Parker, who moved from Idaho to Seattle in 1965 after two years in the Army and three years at Lewis and Clark College, has been employed as the sales manager for a building supply firm.

He said he held the job while acting as an informant, but moved away from his wife and child in March, 1970, to become closer to the Weatherman.

He testified that he lived briefly at "The Fort," then rented an apartment nearby and visited the collective regularly for meals, meetings, and other activities.

In November and December of 1969, he said, he was arrested in connection with Weatherman activities and was convicted of malicious destruction of property. Parker acknowledged he had violated his probation by returning to the University of Washington campus after the conviction.

LOADED WEAPON

Parker testified he had given a tear-gas gun loaded with military-type CS gas to Robbie Stern in September, 1969, because he feared Stern might be attacked.

He also offered to provide student bodyguards for the SDS leader.

In April, 1970, Parker said, he bought a Molotov cocktail igniter from a heroin addict. He said the FBI had told him to do so and a marked $20 bill had been used.

After the FBI analyzed the chemical. Parker said, "I returned the potassium chlorate to a member of the Weatherman. It was to be used for self-igniting Molotov cocktails."

Regarding the offer to sell dynamite, he said, "I was directed to let it be known to a member of the Weatherman that I knew a person who worked in the Bunker Hill Mine in Kellogg, Ida., who was able to rip off some dynamite without getting caught and that he was willing to sell it for $20 a case."

LATE RESPONSE

Parker said he made the offer in January or February, 1970, but got no response until July.

He went to Idaho but did not buy explosives. He said that, following FBI instructions, he told the Weatherman he had made a purchase but had buried the material on his grandfather's farm in Idaho for safekeeping.

The firearms practice sessions were held in the spring of 1970, according to Parker. He said he held two sessions for men and one for women.

Supplying spray paint for use at the federal courthouse had been a device for visiting "The Fort," Parker said, because the FBI wanted him to check for explosives.

Parker's account of his activities brought sharp reactions from some of the defendants, Marshall called upon Judge Boldt to investigate the possibility of prosecuting the information.

GOVERNMENT BLAMED

"A lot of people in the country have not taken this seriously when we say, well, the real conspiracy is in fact the federal government.

"But here you have in your own courtroom admissions of a man who was counseled by the FBI, and was in fact an employee of the FBI, to do illegal acts, and this is an outrage to the people."

During the months under cover, Parker kept a diary which the Seattle Seven sought to have admitted as evidence. Judge Boldt was studying the request when the trial ended abruptly, and thus, Parker never made his final appearance on the witness stand.

As a result, while he revealed much, many questions about his activities inside the Weatherman commune remained unanswered.

FATHER COLLINS, OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, there are some men who give of themselves for others. Because of such men the world becomes a little better place.

Such has been my experience and that of my office since the day we met Father T. Byron Collins, who came to us in behalf of Georgetown University.

Despite the fact that Georgetown ranks in the forefront of the Nation's institutions of higher learning, there was the very real possibility and almost a certainty that this great school would lose its medical college unless some help was forthcoming.

The school had used its trust funds, its principle, and made every possible effort to meet the mounting costs of training young physicians.

While States have assisted other institutions across this Nation by giving a sum of money for each student enrolled in medical colleges that are privately financed, institutions which otherwise might not survive have been able to survive and to train the men and women who nurture the sick of this land.

But Georgetown University, being in the District of Columbia, has no State government to turn to and thus came

with a plea to the Federal Government to save one of the great medical training grounds of this Nation.

When Father Collins and Dr. Seymour Alpert, vice president of the George Washington University, also located in the District, came to see us, it was a joint plea for others. Both Georgetown and George Washington could see no light at the end of the tunnel without some form of assistance.

In my opinion, it was the inspiration of Father Collins that made all of us do just a little better than we were capable in what often seemed an impossible task.

Who knows what we have accomplished? It may be that one of these young men or women who are trained as the result of this legislation might find the answer to the treatment of cancer, heart disease or the other maladies which can strike down all of the children of this land and the world.

Father Collins is a member of the Society of Jesus or Jesuits. This order operates Georgetown University. He felt keenly and strongly about saving the Georgetown University Medical School not only because of the young men and women who need this facility—and certainly there are not enough training grounds for physicians in this Nation today—but he was also keenly aware of Georgetown's mission to serve the poor in the District of Columbia.

Few people realize the service which this institution renders to the District and to mankind by taking care of those often without hope or the ability to provide for themselves.

Institutions like Georgetown have personalities like people. There is something very special about those men who are associated with the work of Georgetown—a calling that is higher than the men themselves. It is an idea, a mission, a service, a calling—something that sets an example for others to emulate.

Father Collins came to us with a vision and with faith. He never faltered at the odds, nor did the roadblocks and difficulties deter him. He would simply return to that faith which sustains him, ask for divine guidance, and continue to work.

The night that the bill providing assistance to see that the Georgetown Medical School would survive was a time of joy and accomplishment for all of us who had participated. As the chairman of the subcommittee to which this measure was assigned, I know better than most men how difficult and how dark it seemed at times. The thing that kept us going was the faith of Father Collins and the realization of the good that could be done if we were successful.

In this measure, we have partly called attention to the rising cost of medical education and how these staggering sums, in the light of advancing science and technology, can drain off the resources of other parts of a university. We have charted a new course in seas that have not been plied before, and I have a feeling that the precedent which has been set will lead to other advancements for medical education throughout our land.

Through this kindly Jesuit priest, many men are now aware of the mission of Georgetown University and have a personal interest in its success.

Certainly it is my considered opinion that those who make up the faculty, staff, and student body at Georgetown University owe this man more than they will ever know.

In expressing a sincere tribute to him, I can only speculate at the number of young men and women yet unborn who may benefit from his life.

And so for all of us, might I express a sincere note of gratitude to a man who stands tall among his fellow men, and one whom I am convinced has been inspired and blessed.

IN DEFENSE OF THE LAME DUCK

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, now that the first "lame duck" session of Congress in 20 years is approaching its end, somebody ought to tell the real story of what happened in this unusually hard-working and remarkably productive 6 weeks of legislative activity.

"Lame duck" itself is hardly a term to inspire public confidence and so many experts had predicted disaster in advance anyway that few were reluctant to admit later on that their predictions had gone astray.

But the facts speak otherwise. For one thing, it was a much harder working session than the usual ones. We worked right through the week, all the Mondays, most of the Fridays, and even several Saturdays. And almost all of these sessions ran well into the evening—8, 9, 10 o'clock—night after night, while wives and families went wild trying to figure just when daddy would be home for dinner.

Attendance was down a bit from a normal session. Most of the time there were about 70 to 100 absentees—some of them, but by no means all, lame ducks themselves. But most of the lame ducks showed up on the floor, one of them, PHILIP PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, even seeing himself honored in the closing days of the session by election as chairman—for 4 brief days—of the House Armed Services Committee.

In all there were 112 rollcalls in these 6 weeks, 71 of them record votes. I made all but two of the votes and all but five of the quorum calls, for a voting attendance record of 97 percent, and an overall attendance record of 94 percent.

We were not just spinning our wheels either. Some of the most far-reaching legislation Congress has ever passed came out of this lame-duck session. For example, a national family planning program; a vastly expanded food stamp plan; the nation's first occupational safety law; a new clean air law, requiring pollution-free automobiles by 1975; a program to protect securities investors; and an expanded housing bill with two new features, aid for "new towns", and Federally guaranteed insurance for businesses located in high crime areas.

Besides that Congress set up a new Government corporation to insure railroad passenger service across the Nation. We prevented a nationwide railroad strike at Thanksgiving time; and allocated $125 million toward keeping the Penn Central railroad in operation. We boosted outside income limits on veterans pensions; passed a resolution in the House—my resolution—to commend the Sontay POW raid; we designated—in another of my bills—the C. & O. Canal area along the Potomac, northwest of Washington, as a National recreation park.

Also we passed a manpower training program to give "last resort" public service jobs to people out of work, and set up a program to encourage the training of more "family" doctors. Unfortunately, both bills were vetoed.

Perhaps our most significant actions—for good or ill—were in the foreign policy field. The massive funds Mr. Nixon sought to aid our friends and allies—$500 million for Israel and $250 million for Cambodia—got through. But in the process two sweeping legal changes slipped by—almost completely unnoticed. We passed the Cooper-Church amendment, banning the use of American ground combat troops in Cambodia; and we repealed the Tonkin Gulf resolution, legislative background for President Johnson's original escalation of our Vietnam commitment in 1965.

People will probably be arguing for months to come just how far these limitations curb our current objectives in Vietnam, but the general feeling is that it will not hinder our present efforts at all. No one plans to send U.S. ground troops into Cambodia anyway, and U.S. air operations over both Cambodia or Laos are not included in the ban.

Beside, just to make our purposes entirely clear, we added language permitting us to support South Vietnamese or other free world forces operating in these areas, either to cover the continued withdrawal of American troops or to rescue American prisoners of war.

We have now passed all 15 of the major appropriations bills for the current fiscal year—a year that began 6 months ago, and in the process we cut the budget by $1.7 billion. Actually, to be more accurate, we passed all but one of these bills. The transportation bill, including the controversial SST, was put over until March 1, on a "continuing resolution" arrangement, simply because that was the only way we could get Senator PROXMIRE to give up his final filibuster.

Not everything, of course, got through. We could not get the proposed social security boost through, though it will almost certainly be one of the first items in the new 92d Congress. The President's welfare reform proposal did not get out either, nor the trade quota bill. And the future of both of these is somewhat uncertain in the months ahead.

Let me make just one final point. These past few days, as the lame duck session has floundered along, there has been a good deal of criticism about congressional procedures responsible for the delay. Actually, the problem is not with "Congress" at all. It is with the Senate.

The fact is that the leisurely, unlimited-debate procedures of the Senate are no longer acceptable in the face of our modern workload. The House had all but one of its appropriations bill approved last June. But the Senate took 7 weeks to debate Cambodia, and another 6 to debate the defense bill. And the tangle in the lame duck session was the result of no less than six filibusters in progress in the Senate, more or less all underway at the same time.

At the very least the Senate ought to ban the filibuster on all appropriation bills during the last 3 or 4 weeks of any session.

Whether they will actually get around to doing that when they go back on January 21 remains to be seen.

A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in the Senate in paying tribute to TOM DODD, who is leaving the Senate.

I have known TOM DODD ever since he came to Congress—first to the House and then to the Senate. I have had the privilege of serving on the Foreign Relations Committee with Senator DODD. In his work on the Foreign Relations Committee, he showed his deep convictions and was never afraid to stand by them.

TOM always had the complete support of his gracious wife. They were indeed an attractive Senate couple. I regret seeing them leave the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McCARTHY

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, often it is difficult to measure a man's place in history until long after. The influence of EUGENE MCCARTHY will linger long, however; in his home State of Minnesota, in the Senate, and throughout the Nation.

His independent leadership and his intelligence have provided the American people with an articulate voice, seldom without controversy, but a clear voice nevertheless.

Senator MCCARTHY's impact upon our Nation stems not only from his campaign for the Presidency in 1968 and the fact that he has worked for, sponsored or cosponsored much of the constructive social legislation in the last 12 years, but also from his character, warmth, and commitment to ideals.

Although he is leaving the Senate, it is impossible to envision that at the age of 54 he will become either an elder statesman or a member of the silent majority. We will be hearing from him again.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ALBERT GORE

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a great Senator and a great friend, ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee.

There is much told about the country that somehow technology has outpaced its human consumers, that problems are bigger now than they used to be, and that hope and confidence become more difficult every day. It is well known that rapid social change in this century has produced a new self-image for many people—and for many people that self-image is not satisfactory. The unsatisfactory image is one in which people become smaller and weaker in the face of social change and technological development.

I believe that this is the real source of the uneasiness that many Americans feel, of the restlessness which is common to the old as well as the young in our country today. The underlying feeling that individual people are becoming smaller and less important is the source of this uneasiness.

But it is precisely in this context that ALBERT GORE's contribution is so great. For he is a man who refuses to be dwarfed by mediocrity. He is a man who has stood on his two feet and fought many battles. He is an example of courage, and grace, a man determined to put America's resources to work for people.

His accomplishments have been many. ALBERT GORE's legislation to help the poor and the sick and the elderly is known throughout the country.

It has been my good fortune to stand on the same side of many issues with ALBERT GORE, and to be at his side in many battles. And when those battles were won, it was because of ALBERT GORE's leadership, ingenuity, and eloquence.

ALBERT GORE's brilliant work on the Foreign Relations Committee is known to all. As a member of that committee he was an early advocate of disengagement from Vietnam. And, although it was not politically popular, he spoke his mind on Vietnam from the beginning.

I also admire ALBERT GORE for his work to straighten out our national priorities. In a time of confusion, it seems that the people's true needs are often the first casualty. But ALBERT GORE has steadfastly urged a greater allocation of resources to solve our domestic problems, and he has not been intimidated by the war mentality which tells us we can afford to let these problems wait.

But more important than ALBERT GORE's strength and effectiveness and his legislative accomplishments is the man himself.

He is a great man who inspires his friends and colleagues by his own strength and vivacity.

I can think of no greater fortune than to be able to call ALBERT GORE my friend. And I am honored to wish him well today.

A TRIBUTE TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to pay my respects to the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK of Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts, on the occassion of his retirement from the House of Representatives. His performance as a Member of Congress, over the past 42 years, has won the admiration of Members on both sides of the aisle. It has been a personal pleasure and a high honor to have served with him as a colleague and under his leadership while he was Speaker.

JOHN MCCORMACK entered politics in 1917, winning election to the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention of that year. Following World War I Army service, he won election to the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and, 2 years later, he was elected to the State senate. In 1929, he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives to fill a vacancy, defeating eight other candidates, and, from that day to this, he has been numbered among the busiest, the boldest, and the best in the American political arena.

JOHN MCCORMACK is an ardent patriot of the old school, and when first he came to national prominence, in 1934, it was in the capacity of chairman of a special committee investigating un-American activities. An arch-opponent of both communism and fascism, by his strong stands against their evil designs he won the admiration of patriots of every school, as our country stood on the brink of World War II. In 1941, he was vitally involved in the successful fight for passage of the lend-lease program, which helped strengthen England in its struggle against Nazi aggression.

Winning the respect of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, JOHN MCCORMACK had strong presidential and congressional support to become the successor of Sam Rayburn of Texas as majority floor leader, when Mr. Rayburn was elevated to the Speakership. In this new position of authority, JOHN MCCORMACK distinguished himself throughout the crisis years of World War II and its aftermath, winning a reputation as the "work horse" of the Democratic cause in the House. Following the demise of Speaker Rayburn, in 1961, JOHN MCCORMACK became Speaker, in which capacity he established himself among the great leaders in recent American political history. As an advisor to and confidante of Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon, he has proven himself a master of political problems of every kind, to the distinct advantage of the country at large.

We are sorry to witness the retirement of this legislative leader, but he has decided on his course, and we therefore wish him many productive years of happy retirement, and extend our congratulations to him on a most impressive and entirely praiseworthy political career.

THE LATE MRS. ROSE McCONNELL LONG

HON. PATRICK T. CAFFERY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. Speaker, having reached the end of the 91st Congress, I would not want this session to end without personally recognizing the truly memorable life of one of Louisiana's most well-known citizens, the late Mrs. Rose McConnell Long.

She served her role in history by being the wife, companion, trusted counsel, gracious first lady, and mother to the children of the now almost legendary Huey Long. She was known for her grace and serenity and the vital function she played in her husband's career as she provided a stable and loving home life for the children of one of America's most dynamic and charismatic political leaders. The outstanding results of her efforts can be seen in those children; Mrs. Rose McConnell McFarland, Palmer Long, and my colleague, Senator RUSSELL LONG.

In addition to her domestic triumphs, she served with distinction in the U.S. Senate where her husband had served before her and where her illustrious son serves today with such dedication and brilliance.

One of the major newspapers of my State said of Mrs. Long:

> The gentleness and devotion of Rose McConnell Long to her family, holding apart from the turbulences which roared around her household from her husband's first venture into politics, were honored in this state. Men who were harsh, angry and bitter foes of her spouse would doff their hats in sincere gentility at her approach on the street, or rise in gentlemanly courtesy to a gracious and quiet lady on her entrance into a room. The memory of the goodness and gentleness of Rose McConnell Long, will be green as long as here lives one Louisianian who knew her.

I know those words speak the sentiments of the people of the State of Louisiana.

TRIBUTE TO HON. WILLIAM AYRES

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, BILL AYRES has for years been one of the hardest working and most valuable members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. As he leaves this body, we can only say that we appreciate his great service to his Nation, and to the veterans, their widows and orphans. And speaking for myself, I predict that BILL AYRES will continue to be an important force in the public affairs of Ohio and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I cherish my years of service with BILL AYRES. For years we have worked together on the only committee of the Congress concerned solely with the welfare of our veterans and their widows and orphans. Although he is a devoted member of the other party, these partisan considerations have never been a part of our committee deliberations and, of course, they have never seriously come between us in our many years of friendship. Mr. Speaker, I need not recount for the RECORD the many legislative contributions that BILL AYRES has made as the ranking member of his party on the Veterans' Committee. This record is part of the permanent legislative record of this era. But I can say only that there has not been a more dedicated member of our committee or of the entire Congress in the area of providing the best possible care and consideration for our veterans.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for BILL good health and success as he leaves the Congress.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR YARBOROUGH

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, during the past 13 years it has been my privilege to serve with one of the most active men in the history of the Senate, RALPH YARBOROUGH.

The senior Senator from Texas has compiled a most impressive record of achievements during these 13 years. He has addressed major issues of the times directly and with political courage. As a member, and later as chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Senator YARBOROUGH has been a leader for the enactment of much of the progressive health and education legislation which has benefited the individual American citizen during this past decade.

Included in the legislation which RALPH YARBOROUGH has helped bring into being are the cold war GI bill, the bilingual education program, the Job Corps, and increased medical research. These are but a few examples which demonstrate the leadership of our colleague in solving many of the problems and meeting the needs of the American people.

The Senate will miss RALPH YARBOROUGH. We will miss him because he is a doer.

NEW URANIUM ENRICHMENT CAPACITY—WHO, WHAT, WHEN, WHERE AND WHY?

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, enriched uranium is the fuel for most nuclear power reactors just as coal, oil, and natural gas are the fuels for most conventional powerplants. An adequate supply of electrical energy is vital to the functioning of our industrial society. Atomic energy will supply an increasing share of our growing electrical capacity. Thus, there will be an increasing demand for enriched uranium.

Free world electrical generating capacity at the end of 1970 was approximately 840,000 megawatts. By 1980 it is expected to total 2,100,000 megawatts. Estimates of installed nuclear capacity by 1980 vary from the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission's 240,000-megawatt figure to the International Atomic Energy Agency's 300,000 megawatts. Thus, it is predicted by 1980 that 11 to 15 percent of all free world electricity will be generated by the atom.

At the present time the U.S. Government is essentially the free world's sole commercial supplier of enriched uranium.

The process of uranium enrichment involves the separation of the fissionable isotope U–235, which constitutes only seven-tenths of 1 percent of natural uranium, from the remaining 99.3 percent which is mostly U–238. Suitable fuel for nuclear power station purposes requires enrichment factors in the range of 2 to 5 percent of U–235. This process is carried out at the AEC's $2.3 billion complex of three large gaseous diffusion plants located at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Paducah, Ky.; and Portsmouth, Ohio. Uranium enrichment is a security classified industrial process and the only sector of the nuclear power industry still entirely operated by the Federal Government.

With these weighty circumstances in mind the Nixon administration on November 10, 1969, emphasized that—

> So long as the Government is the sole source of enrichment services in this country . . . it is essential that we continually assure an adequate supply of enriched uranium for commercial and the Governmental users and to meet foreign commitments.

By careful management and operation, plus timely investments in excess of $525 million to improve and $225 million to uprate their power, the three U.S. diffusion plants will "continually assure an adequate supply of enriched uranium" until 1980.

But, put another way, unless additional enrichment capacity is built and "on the line" by 1980, the free world will face the probability of serious power shortages due to an unavailability of enriched nuclear fuel.

WHY 1980?

The 1980 date is a straightforward arithmetic calculation considering the cumulative number of uranium separative work units needed to supply enriched uranium for the predicted number of megawatts of installed electrical capacity at that date based upon our domestic need and foreign commitments.

A change in the pace of nuclear powerplant installation could move the date on which new enrichment capacity becomes vital ahead somewhat or back a little. There are many other variables which can influence it. These include:

The rate of investment in preproduction and stockpiling of enriched uranium pending attainment of full capacity of the diffusion complex.

Any increase in the tails assay of depleted uranium from the complex greater than the 0.2 percent figure now used could increase separative work production but with an increase in the use of uranium feed material.

How rapidly the power industry learns plutonium recycle techniques will determine how soon it can start substituting plutonium it makes in its atomic reactors for enriched uranium as a nuclear fuel.

Major interruptions in production at any of the three plants due to fire, accident, strikes, sabotage, war, or other cause must be regarded as possibilities.

Major perturbations in the cost and availability of competing fuels due to international conditions in the Middle East and elsewhere. Fluctuations in the business climate and cost of money can also affect the demand for enriched uranium.

Political consequences of public alarm over air pollution, thermal discharges, radiation and other environmental concerns may affect all phases of the energy supply problem.

The foregoing and other positive and negative influences tend to cancel out each other when one is projecting the requirements for enriched uranium 10 years in advance. Therefore, until the passage of time brings more certainty into the picture, it would seem imprudent and potentially prohibitively costly to stray from the 1980 date, thereby assuming the risk of a gap in the supply of enriched nuclear fuel. Only if, as, and when future events indicate that it is safe to do so should that deadline be relaxed and other schedules dependent upon it be readjusted.

In fact, most members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy so zealously adhere to the proposition that no gap must be chanced in nuclear fuel supplies that they urge an immediate and irrevocable national financial commitment to the diffusion plant improvement program and to the uprating program as well. The first step would add almost 30 percent to present capacity and the second an additional 25 percent.

These members, including myself, believe that the certainty and timeliness of these programs are basic underpinnings of a sufficient nuclear electric economy. They regard the contumacies of both Johnson and Nixon administrations in refusing to make the commitments to increase production capability as irresponsible budgetary chancetaking, tantamount to little short of playing a deadly game of kilowatt-roulette.

SHIFT TO BREEDER REACTORS

If a fourth unit of separation capacity is to be on the line by 1980 someone must plan, finance, and build it. The question is "who?" Its answer will set a lifetime pattern in the United States and elsewhere for the uranium enriching industry.

This pattern will be unique because the world will have need of large amounts of enriched uranium for only a finite length of time. Ultimately breeder reactors, which produce more nuclear fuel than they consume, will replace today's enriched uranium reactors which manufacture some plutonium as a byproduct, but equivalent less than the enriched product they consume.

Breeders are not yet fully developed. Hopefully by 1985 they will be developed and the start of a phase-over from thermal to breeder reactors will begin. Perhaps by around 2030 the transition will be substantially completed. In terms of requirements for enriched uranium this means a steady increase during the early years, then a flattening out of demand followed by a steady decline in separative work.

During this period nuclear fuels will be supplied most economically if installation of capacity is tailored rather closely to increasing demands during the up cycle and amortization out is similarly adjusted during the down cycle. Whether forces of competition will accomplish this, whether it will come about by intergovernmental decree or, indeed, whether it will be done at all remains to the future form of the industry.

WHO WILL OWN AND OPERATE ENRICHING FACILITIES?

It is almost certain that uranium enriching in the United States ultimately will become partially or wholly a function of private enterprise.

Whether the existing diffusion plants and a fourth, if it is built, will remain under the Government roof is unpredictable. That depends upon the politics of legislation necessary for divestiture as well as on the willingness and ability of private investors to make substantial commitments to what may be a dead-end technology.

Meanwhile, promising new techniques are emerging for separating U–235 including the ultra-centrifuge which is based on an old principle used to separate cream from milk. The American inclination toward private enterprise is strong. It requires little audacity to predict that when centrifuge plants are built in the United States, American industry will plan, finance, build and operate them.

Already in Europe private interests are researching and developing the centrifuge in close cooperation with their governments. In Europe as in America the emerging form of an enrichment industry has strong private characteristics; however, there is closer scrutiny and more visible governmental control apparatus in the developing centrifuge industry than is the case with other industries.

Within a basic structure of private enterprise, standardized rules and regulations governing the enrichment of uranium will no doubt be developed and applied on an international basis. These will mature, however, only after the free world makes its decision on who will build 1980's fourth increment of separation capacity. It can be built cooperatively by the United States and others utilizing advanced U.S. diffusion technology or competitively by the United States and one or more other countries, each utilizing whatever diffusion or centrifuge technology it possesses and believes worthy of exploitation.

Irrespective of who builds the next enriching increment, the United States must make clear to the world that its obligation to supply enrichment services cannot be considered to go on endlessly. Therefore, future users must contract for their separative work requirements for the life of each of their new reactors with whomever is engaging in the enrichment business.

OVERSEAS PLANT USING U.S. TECHNOLOGY

A new diffusion plant financed and built overseas and licensed to use the most advanced U.S. technology would cost over $1 billion and take 5 years to build. Its accompanying electric power supply will cost in excess of $0.5 billion and require 7 years' lead time. In front of this another 2 years will be needed, after commitment to the project and before a spade is turned, just to put together the arrangements, including such items as intergovernmental agreements, plans, specifications, location, financing, bids, awards, contracts, and so forth.

The total time required from commitment to the beginning of additional production outside the United States by the diffusion method is 9 years. The day of the decision for this approach, therefore, falls within the year 1971. The deadline date is fairly rigid.

By comparison, a domestic or an overseas-built centrifuge plant might take 2½ or more years to build and 2½ years in advance of that to put a deal together and for the design and installation of centrifuge component manufacturing facilities. One should realize that present estimates for getting centrifuge plants on line may prove to be optimistically short. Very little is known about centrifuge plant construction, and more importantly, about methods of mass manufacturing of centrifuge on a scale approaching the production rates which would be needed for this system of enrichment. Incremental installation of centrifuge power requirements would obviate a need initially to install a large block of generating capacity as in the case of a diffusion plant. These factors indicate a probable lead time as short as 5 years, permitting a centrifuge commitment date as late as 1975.

DIFFUSION OR CENTRIFUGE?

This means that the 1971 decision on committing to a U.S. licensed overseas uranium enrichment plant will involve a comparison of reasonably hard estimates of what U.S. diffusion economics and technology will be in 1975 with quite soft estimates of whatever the economics and technology of European centrifuges will be in 1975. If overseas interests want to avoid risks, they will be inclined to choose the diffusion plant. But that choice will require disclosure by the United States of enough data to allow the comparison to be made intelligently.

Other countries are aware of their own progress with the centrifuge. They can determine for themselves whether it will be a short or a long time until their centrifuges are likely to become reliable and economic sources of enriched reactor fuels. They also know their own capabilities with diffusion technology. France, for instance, claims that hers is considerable. What they do not know, for comparison purposes, is how good our up-

coming 1975 diffusion technology will be compared to their diffusion and to their projected centrifuge capabilities.

The diffusion data involved at this stage is largely economic data relating to plant cost, performance, capacity, unit costs, reliability and so on. It does not require "giving away the blueprints," and, since the comparison is between U.S. diffusion technology and foreign enriching capabilities, there is no need for a disclosure of anybody else's data to the United States.

Only if a U.S. licensed plant were settled upon would additional U.S. diffusion details be disclosed. Should overseas interests choose the diffusion plant license route, most probably the United States would fabricate the critical process components. Therefore, it would not be until construction is well along or until the plant is finished that complete technical data would necessarily be released.

It is recognized that any potential overseas uranium enricher will consider many matters in addition to the relative merits of competing enrichment technologies and economics in making its decision about a U.S. license. Similarly, U.S. decisions in these matters necessarily involve a wide spectrum of seemingly extraneous political, economic, diplomatic, strategic and other nontechnical factors.

But given the necessary data, the decision by non-U.S. countries to participate or not to participate in the construction of a new diffusion plant can and should be made quickly. Any delay by the participating countries in reaching a decision could indicate bad faith in that possibly they are delaying to obtain more information than is necessary to begin such a program. In any event such delay would prolong the uncertainty as to where the next increment of enrichment capacity is to come from.

CARRYING OUT INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATIONS

Without being oracular about it, the fact should be made crystal clear that the United States does not intend to linger long in negotiations. A prompt decision should be made. If our friends wish to commit themselves to a licensed diffusion plant, they can say so promptly. We simply cannot delay decisions about our own new plants very long. It makes a difference in the United States whether we will have to start sooner or later to augment our enrichment capacity.

Since the decision must be made promptly, we should not resort to routine methods of international negotiations. In lieu of utilizing all echelons and channels normally involved in international negotiations, discussions should be conducted utilizing a task force approach. The task force should be specifically charged with arriving at the diffusion plant decision and arriving at it within a specified time period.

The task force should be composed of personnel with experience in the electric utility field, financing and other large business management ventures. Members should be given the necessary guidance on the schedules to be met, enriching capacity additions needed, licensing provisions and fees, international access to the enrichment services, and the nature and extent of the proposed U.S. cooperation. The parameters in which the United States can and should negotiate ought to be clearly determined in advance, before negotiations with foreign interests are started. It should then be the function of the task force to negotiate a workable arrangement within these parameters acceptable to all parties if that can be done. The package can then be rather quickly blessed or blasted—accepted or rejected—in a formal manner by the governments involved.

ADVANTAGES OF LICENSING

It should be stressed that there are distinct advantages to both the United States and to foreign interests in the concept of a U.S. licensed diffusion plant built overseas to supply the next increment of enrichment plant capacity. Examples of possible advantages are the following:

United States is relieved from financing this increment of enrichment capacity.

United States conserves its irreplaceable energy fuels.

United States stands to receive royalty income.

All parties gain more time for centrifuge R. & D.

Slowdown of centrifuge development postpones its possible contributions toward proliferation.

A cooperative international pattern is established for dovetailing enrichment capacity to enrichment requirements.

Precedent may be created for effective LAEA controls over enriched uranium.

Other countries are relieved from dependence on the United States for uranium enrichment services.

If the deadline for the license decision is missed, these advantages will be lost and the United States and other countries will be forced to make other arrangements for post-1980 enrichment capacity.

In that event, the options open to the United States appear more favorable than those open to others. Supplying separative work units could become a profitable business and a major trade balancing factor, if the United States chooses to market such services on a straight business basis. U.S. opportunities are excellent to continue as the free world's principal supplier of enriched uranium and uranium enriching services.

Moreover, if the present diffusion plants are improved and uprated on schedule, the United States has ample time beyond 1971 to make its internal decision between new centrifuge or diffusion capacity for meeting its domestic growth and foreign sales. It would not need to suffer the 2 years' lag time estimated as required for overseas interest to put together their arrangements for a diffusion plant. Given the will to do so, the United States could make this decision as late as 1973.

And, if the decision is not to build another diffusion plant because progress with the centrifuge is overtaking diffusion technology, then the initial commitment to the first centrifuge increment need not be made until 1975.

In making these estimates on timing, it should be remembered that the United States also has other means available which could relieve a deadline for installing indigenous diffusion or centrifuge capacity. Requirement dates for power supplies can be extended by large-scale pooling arrangements, accommodations to daily and season peaks, and similar devices.

The most attractive U.S. delaying and cost-saving opportunity of all is not to build just a single new diffusion plant, but simply to expand the three existing plants by successively adding small increments of capacity. Before each addition is decided upon, the advisability of switching the investment from diffusion to centrifuge could be reviewed.

DISADVANTAGES OF LICENSING

It can be shown that arguments based on fears of nuclear proliferation allegedly arising from licensing U.S. diffusion technology are spurious.

Another objective is that licensing would deprive the United States of its monopoly position with regard to overseas sales of enrichment work. The answer to that is that we are not making a cent of money on these sales so long as we are making them at cost on the basis of a moral obligation to provide enrichment services in the interests of atoms-for-peace. The sooner this matter is put on a competitive, business basis, the sooner we can start to generate overseas profits in addition to favorable trade balances.

This is true even though the new overseas plant would employ technology in advance of that incorporated in the existing U.S. plants. Both capital costs and power costs of the new plant are anticipated to be such as to maintain parity between United States and overseas costs of enrichment, if not a U.S. advantage. In addition, the United States may receive royalties and otherwise assure itself an equitable return on the overesas arrangement under fair competitive conditions. These are matters which can, and should be handled by a competent U.S. negotiating task force.

MILITARY SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS

It will be necessary to share some knowledge now categorized under "restricted data" in order to provide interested overseas parties with the information needed concerning our diffusion technology. This requires the concurrence of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Argument is heard that sharing such data in this manner will endanger military security and encourage nuclear proliferation.

The answer to these contentions is that no one is going to steal diffusion technology to build a diffusion plant to make enriched uranium atomic bombs. For that purpose, it is much quicker, easier and cheaper to steal the plutonium being made in civilian power reactors all around the world.

In short, over the years, the secrets of diffusion, which were initially of high military significance, have largely become items of commercial and proprietary advantage, that is trade secrets. Large

amounts of highly enriched uranium—above 90 percent—were vital militarily prior to the invention of the H-bomb. That is why the three U.S. diffusion plants were built in the late 1940's and early 1950's. But, the advent of the H-bomb diminished requirements for fully enriched uranium even as these new plants were coming on the line. Since that time, military requirements have stabilized at only a small percentage of our diffusion capacity, thereby releasing this capacity for civilian power uses.

We feel certain that Soviet requirements for highly enriched uranium are being comfortably satisfied by their existing capacity. There is no indication of an incentive on their part to acquire U.S. diffusion technology for weapons purposes. To the contrary, they are offering uranium enriched for nuclear power purposes for sale on the world market.

As to Red China, should that nation have additional military requirements for highly enriched uranium, it is likely that it would be produced in facilities built upon Soviet technology rather than upon U.S. technology. Or, if the Chinese have been using stolen U.S. technology, they probably have been improving it right along and, at this point, would find little worth stealing from the United States.

PROLIFERATION POSSIBILITIES

Insofar as the Europeans or others who might cooperate in a Western-sponsored diffusion plant are concerned, the United States should have no problem in making certain that cascades for the production of highly enriched uranium usable for weapons purposes simply are not built into the plant.

Actually, the likely candidates for nuclear club memberships are smaller countries, hard-pressed to maintain their existence in a hostile environment. These do not have the economic resources to develop large, expensive diffusion facilities needed for making uranium weapons. This is particularly true when it is appreciated that secretly "going nuclear" via the plutonium weapon route is much simpler.

With the foregoing in mind, and realizing the skill which the U.S. Government has acquired in matters pertaining to nuclear secrecy, it should be apparent that partial disclosure of diffusion technology to U.S. foreign friends, so that they may make a decision regarding future enrichment capacity, can be done without impairing our national security or risking nuclear weapons proliferation.

DISCLOSURES TO AMERICAN COMPANIES

A barrier to easy discussion of uranium enrichment is the fact that much of the technology is still considered "restricted data." Thus, it is only assumed here that diffusion plant technology has fully matured since Manhattan district days, that its economics are accurately reflected in the AEC's latest separative work price schedule, and that plant operating data to be found elsewhere in the public realm are reliable.

On July 1, 1965, the United States imposed strict classification on centrifuge technology, and other countries followed suit. So it is also assumed here that 5 years of R. & D. effort by the United States and others, based upon 1965 unclassified technology, ought to achieve centrifuges by 1975 that are workable, although not necessarily very economic.

Disclosure of classified diffusion enriching technology to other countries and their citizens, while continuing to keep this information from American industry, would seem unfair. Equitably, American industry should get it too. Further, since other countries have considerable independent knowledge of centrifuge technology, it would seem that U.S. industries ought to be brought in on the centrifuge at some point in time as well.

Irrespective of whether the Federal Government or private industry eventually makes the investment in new uranium-enrichment capacity in the United States, and irrespective of whether it is a diffusion plant or a centrifuge plant, private industry will have to manufacture some kind and quantity of plant components.

Industry will need to know how to make these things and should have the opportunity to improve them. The logical time to start giving American industry access to both technologies is the time that a move should get underway to talk with other countries. The timing for a decision on new capacity that I have postulated indicates that that time is right now.

These moves are interconnected and the U.S. and foreign recipients must recognize this. Getting the situation in the United States properly lined up is, in fact, a condition precedent to talks with others.

The AEC is considering the possibility of receiving proposals from selected U.S. firms interested in pursuing development work in uranium-enrichment technology. A two-step procedure can be envisioned whereby two dozen or so firms would be given a peek inside the enrichment kimono and, later, a small number of firms would be granted contracts to pursue development work.

OBJECTIONS TO INDUSTRY PARTICIPATION

As is the case with almost any other major decisions, the proposal to bring industry into participation in the enriching process will have its opponents as well as its proponents. I will close this survey of the current enrichment picture by commenting on what may turn out to be the principal objections:

Objection No. 1. Now is the crucial period in developing CIP as well as CUP, and AEC has only a limited number of people available to work on these programs. These people should not be hauled off their jobs at this critical time in order to provide private industry with the data it will need.

This argument is to be respected, but undoubtedly the AEC can work out procedures whereby interference with people working in critical areas will be minimal and tolerable. Only economic items need be considered in the talks with other countries on diffusion technology. As to talks with U.S. firms on the centrifuge, this should not be burdensome and it would seem to involve little more than passing the data among a few more groups than are now working on the centrifuge program.

The magnitude of the effort required to educate industry can be greatly minimized by sharply limiting the industry participants to those who have sufficient competence and resources to actually contribute to the technology and follow through in its R. & D. stages.

Objection No. 2. Involving domestic industry while simultaneously exploring the international area will create confusion as to our purpose and undermine the goal of getting other countries involved in enrichment.

This is true if we blunder about it. But not if, as here outlined, the foreign and domestic aspects of sharing are, from the beginning, understood to be interrelated and interdependent matters. If this is made clear, then getting into these areas simultaneously should boost overseas negotiations rather than impede them.

Objection No. 3. Involvement of American industry in uranium enrichment would present knotty antitrust law problems, primarily in the selection of those who would participate and also in possible conflicts of interest if companies now doing centrifuge and diffusion research for the AEC are among those involved.

This objection is largely removed if the idea is not endorsed at this time that it is being done so that U.S. companies might invest in the construction and operation of complete new enrichment plants. That may come later, but the present concern is simply to involve American industry in developing a capability to manufacture and improve the basic components of diffusion and centrifuge plants.

Further, these problems will be ameliorated if the proposal is based and presented in the context of expanding the existing pattern of AEC arrangements with diffusion and centrifuge contractors.

Objection No. 4. To allow the private participants to obtain patents on inventions they make with their own investment, but based primarily on previous AEC and developments, would amount to a "give away."

All existing AEC patented or patentable knowledge can be protected and preserved. Patents should be permitted only as to inventions resulting solely from private work and private investment. The public should be protected by reserving the AEC's right to fix reasonable royalties and cross licensing should be mandatory. Moreover, the expected thrust of any private patents relating to enrichment matter is in the process area, not in basic invention, that is, in the design of machinery to do component farbricating and similar jobs—an area more usual to private than to Government enterprise.

Objection No. 5. There may not be any takers from private industry since the odds are that any additional U.S. enrichment capacity will be a diffusion plant, in which event there is at least a

50/50 chance that it will not be built by private contract, but by Government contract.

Even if this should prove to be the case, still the matter of getting into the enrichment business should not be prejudged, and the choice to get into or not get into should be left to industry.

CONCLUSION

It is hoped that these remarks will serve to focus attention on a problem before the Nation which is of more than passing significance and will contribute toward the discussion necessary to achieve a wise and timely resolution.

JOINT STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES FOLEY, MEEDS, AND ADAMS ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 1306

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself, Congressmen LLOYD and MEEDS and BROCK ADAMS the following joint statement is submitted for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

H. Res. 1306 directs the Public Printer and the Superintendent of Documents to publish a report by the House Internal Security Committee entitled, "Report of Inquiry Concerning Speakers' Honoraria at Colleges and Universities". The resolution also enjoins all Judge Gerhard A. Gesell, a member of the document in question.

We consider the above report to be devoid of any useful legislative purpose and suggestive of intimidation and coercion against our Constitutional mandate protecting free expression.

Yet we reluctantly support H. Res. 1306. The resolution is intended to overturn a decision rendered on October 28, 1970, by Judge Gerhard A. Gesell, a member of the U.S. District Court here in the District of Columbia. On that day Judge Gesell awarded injunctive relief to plaintiffs seeking to bar publication of the document.

We believe that Judge Gesell exceeded his authority and intruded on the legitimate activities of the Congress. Article 1, Section 5 of the Constitution requires each house to keep a journal of its proceedings and to publish the same. Article 1, Section 6 specifies that ". . . for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place."

The key point to remember is that the report of the Internal Security Committee is protected by the above clauses. A similar case to the present one occurred in 1956 with the lower court verdict on *Methodist Federation for Social Action* v. *Eastland*. In this case the lower court dismissed a challenge that would have barred the printing of a document by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

On the other hand, the Constitution does prohibit activities of Congress which are judged to abridge the Bill of Rights. In regard to investigations and contempt citations, the key decisions have been *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* (1880), *Marshall* v. *Gordon* (1917), and *Watkins* v. *United States* (1957).

In all of these verdicts, the question before the Supreme Court was whether contempt citations exceeded the legislative authority of the Congress.

In *Watkins* the Supreme Court said:

"No inquiry is an end in itself; it must be related to and in furtherance of a legitimate task of the Congress . . . We cannot simply assume, however, that every Congressional investigation is justified by a public need that overbalances any private rights affected. To do so would be to abdicate the responsibility placed by the Constitution upon the judiciary to insure that the Congress does not unjustifiably encroach upon an individual's right to privacy nor abridge his liberty of speech, press, religion, or assembly."

The critical distinction between the above three cases and Judge Gesell's decision is that in neither of the contempt instances was the judiciary asked to grant coercive relief against legislative activities of Congress. The judiciary simply defined individual rights in relation to legislative purpose.

The Gesell decision, if allowed to stand, would encourage an unnecessary and certainly undesirable collision between separate branches of the government. What is said in Congress must not depend on judicial discretion, must not be subject to prior restraint.

We support H. Res. 1306 but affirm our belief that publishing the Committee's document is unwise and unrelated to the legislative process.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR STEPHEN M. YOUNG

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, STEVE YOUNG is now leaving the Senate, after having placed upon it an individual stamp that will be long remembered.

STEPHEN YOUNG has provided this body with pepper. He has spoken his mind with utmost clarity and force. His integrity and devotion to principle have been evident to all and appreciated by all.

Senator YOUNG has been a man to count on, a man who was ready to work tirelessly for social progress and for those policies designed to restore America to its tradition of justice. He has been the conscience of the Senate concerning the tragic events which took place at Kent State University. He has not allowed us to forget that four young people were innocently killed there and that our Government has not yet done them the justice they deserve.

STEVE YOUNG has also had the courage to speak out against the folly of the war in Vietnam. He did not flinch from the recognition that only by setting a fixed timetable for withdrawal from Vietnam, only by learning the lessons of a decade of war, could we insure that our Vietnam dead will not have died in vain. I have been proud and honored to be associated with him in the effort to establish such a timetable.

Most of all, STEVE YOUNG has been a thinking Senator. We say he is independent because we know that he will make up his own mind after careful thought.

It is reassuring to know that his retirement from the Senate does not mean his retirement from active life. I know we shall continue to benefit from the work of STEVE YOUNG in the coming years. I wish him a long and happy life.

UNITED STATES AND EUROPEAN TRADE POLICY IN THE 1970'S

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, a recent address by Ambassador Arthur K. Watson is illuminating with respect to trade policies of the seventies. I think my colleagues might enjoy reading this address:

UNITED STATES AND EUROPEAN TRADE POLICY IN THE 1970's

(Address by Ambassador Arthur K. Watson before the French Diplomatic Press Association, Paris, Dec. 9, 1970)

My distinguished friends of the French Diplomatic Press Association:

I will be dealing with issues familiar to you and more than familiar to me. What I want to talk about is the threat of protectionism in my country—why it exists, and more important, what can be done about it.

In fact, this is the first time in several years that I have not been involved in the battle in Washington over trade legislation. A couple of years ago, when it became clear that protectionism was a real threat, I and a few others formed an organization which we called the Emergency Committee for Trade. That name shows you how naive we were. We viewed the problem as short-term. Well, the "emergency" goes on.

At any rate, the purpose of the Emergency Committee for American Trade was to bring the case for freer trade before the Congress and to the American public, and I think it might interest you to know that our committee members represented corporations producing nearly ten percent of the American gross national product. Freer trade does have a lot of friends in the United States but, as in the case of so many public issues, a minority feeling very strongly about an issue is pitted against the majority that is not always as active or as zealous about its cause. In this case, the active protectionists are threatening the majority for freer trade.

I remember very well in the late sixties travelling all over the world as President of the International Chamber of Commerce. I do not know how many speeches I made in those days warning about this threat of protectionism and trying to say, as politely as I could, that it was going to grow worse unless the American trading position was relieved.

What we have just been witnessing in Washington is, I regret to say, the inevitable result of actions that were not taken a few years ago. America received no real relief, from anyone. We have continued running large balance of payments deficits and some major American industries have been severely impacted by foreign competition.

It appears now, let me add, that the trade bill will probably not pass in this session of Congress. It would be a grave misreading of the record if the world decides that this is the end of the matter. This was much, much too close for comfort. Just because the clock appears to be running out this time does not mean it will run out again. It seems to me a certainty that similar legislation will be resurrected next year and that it will have a good chance of passing.

What we have now is a little time and what I hope is that everyone involved takes this near miss very seriously.

The coverage by the French press of the Trade Bill itself, and the debate in the House and Senate was thorough and for the most part very balanced and accurate. I will not cover that ground again. The point I do want to make is that the threat is going to remain and grow worse as long as the problem remains and grows worse.

Let me remind you of a bit of history. After a disastrous experiment in protectionism in the 1930's, the United States swung around to a free trade position, and every Administration since those days has advocated freer trade and has made progressive steps in the liberal trade direction. President Nixon has been and remains unambiguously in favor of free trade. Never doubt that for a minute. But you must also understand that the American position—economic and political—is different today.

I couldn't help noticing, when some of the European nations first became concerned about the Trade Bill, that they quickly pointed out that they bought a great deal more from the United States than they sold to it. This, of course, is absolutely true. Last year, for instance, the Common Market countries sold 5.8 billion dollars to the United States and purchased 6.9 billion dlolars from it.

When protectionism looked as though it was a real threat a few weeks ago, this was rather forcefully pointed out by many spokesmen from Europe.

There is an old taunt used in the United States: "If you are so smart why ain't you rich?" I will paraphrase it. If the United States is so rich, why does it owe so much money?

In our worst days on the trade front, 1968 and 1969, we had small trade surpluses. American exports, even during the peak of our inflation, continued to grow. The rate was six percent. But, imports during that same inflationary period grew at 14 percent.

The United States, as a world trader, can still pay its way in the world. The real problem is how the United States can support its overseas commitments, principally military and Foreign Aid, without much greater trade surpluses. Look at the figures and you will find that America has only three important ways to make its living in the world: first through exports; second through the repatriated earnings of our investments; and third through royalties and services.

When trade is in balance between the United States and the rest of the world, we are in major difficulty. We must earn a lot more through trade to support, for example, the 285,000 or so men we have in Europe or the Sixth Fleet. These military requirements alone cost us about 1.7 billion dollars a year in foreign exchange.

Therefore, when an American hears that the trade arrangements seem very equitable from a European point of view, and that after all trade balances are in favor of the United States, this is not entirely persuasive. The fact is that my country, whatever the enormous economic potential of its domestic economy, must also pay its way internationally. Our short-term obligations are now nearly 44 billion dollars. Offsetting this, it is true, are long-term American holdings overseas of roughly twice that amount. But it is the short-term obligations we are concerned about now.

I will get into the question of shoes, textiles and sealing wax a little later on. But when you try to understand why there is protectionist sentiment in my country, please view it against this background of an exasperating long-term inability to earn enough through trade and repatriated earnings to pay for our total foreign commitments. These expenditures, largely military and foreign aid, are made by the United States in behalf of everyone else in the free world—Europe—Japan—and all of the rest.

Another development, favoring protectionism, stems directly from our efforts to stabilize the American economy. The Nixon Administration is fully aware of the importance of a stable dollar to the orderly functioning of the world monetary system. My country, right now, is in the throes of a painful effort to brake inflation. A direct result of this is an unemployment level of between five and six percent. This is more than any of the industrialized European countries have known for many years. But more, it means 4,200,000 actual people without jobs, people who are making their voices heard.

We are, I want to point out, trying to cut the inflation rate of the dollar below anything that has been achieved by almost anyone in the world. But let me remind you that the dollar, in its worst days, experienced an erosion no greater than the average currency in Europe during almost any time frame you might choose. There are exceptions—but not many, nor for long.

Organized labor has added its political weight to protectionism. Labor had already deserted the free trade camp in the late sixties, and that was during a period of full employment in my country. Now, with unemployment running at a fairly high rate, the support that labor has given protectionism has become more outspoken.

Still another factor is the competitive environment of today. It has become relatively easy to move modern manufacturing technology to less developed countries. The rapid rate of technological change and this ease of movement has led to a trade environment where rapid and painful adjustments are forced upon certain industries, regions, or countries. In the United States, whole industries have virtually disappeared in the last two decades because of foreign competition, and others feel themselves threatened. Ten years ago, for instance, 2.3 percent of America's shoes were made abroad. Last year 14 percent were. Ten years ago, my country imported 283 million dollars worth of wearing apparel. This increased by last year to 1.2 billion dollars . . . A compound growth rate of 18% annually.

It should not be too surprising that people in these industries feel they are bearing an excessive and unfair burden.

Finally, in trying to understand protectionism in the United States, I think you have to take into account the intangible non-economic factors. The United States has had great success in fulfilling, or coming close to fulfilling, its traditional objective of national prosperity.

Despite this success, or perhaps in some ways because of it, we find ourselves wrestling with a whole set of intensified problems involving youth, drugs, crime, race relations, urban development and the environment. For the first time since the late 1930's, the domestic situation has forced a basic reexamination of national priorities. Domestic priorities are overshadowing international priorities. Some people question the continuation of the role the United States has played in international affairs in the postwar period. And these attitudes spill over into public attitudes toward international trade policy.

In this troubled period, what do Americans see when they look about them? I will tell you that what they see does not encourage them. They see:

One. A strong and aggressive trading partner, Japan, increasing its export surpluses. I think all Americans applaud both the economic recovery of Japan and its astonishing successes. We begrudge them nothing and we understand that Japan, more than any other country, must trade to survive. However, we're also mindful that much of Japan's export growth has been in the American market or in third markets while Japanese exports are heavily restricted by the EEC.

Two. A European community which in its attempts to solve its own social problems has set its internal agricultural prices so high that it stimulates an uneconomic production at the expense of traditional low cost suppliers, and produces unsaleable surpluses which are then disposed of in world markets through massive subsidies.

Three. A series of special preferential deals between the European community and smaller, developing countries have damaged U.S. trade—and the trade of others—and appear to derogate from the basic principles which have governed the expansion of trade in the postwar period.

Four. Non-tariff barriers to U.S. trade in the form of export-oriented tax systems, government procurement systems and—possibly—technical and quality standards. For example, it is difficult to explain to our American businessmen that the 23 percent tax on value added which he must pay in addition to customs duties has a neutral effect on his attempts to sell to France. He is not impressed by the argument that U.S. direct taxes are never shifted forward, while TVA is fully shifted. We have our non-tariff barriers as well—the American Selling Price being the best known example—but many Americans rightly or wrongly think that the United States is running into more barriers than it has itself put up. It is evident to me that much work remains to be done to clarify, classify and reduce these obstacles to trade.

Five. The European community is now discussing enlargement of its membership, an enlargement which my government continues to support. Success of the current negotiations will produce a European Community which will be by far the world's greatest trading power. But many people are disturbed that the enlargement process will be carried out without regard to the problems and interests of the other partners. And there is a general feeling that when we want to discuss what we consider to be urgent common problems, our European friends are so concerned with the internal problems of the Community that they are not always disposed to talk, or even to listen to us.

Now I want to suggest something that may be new. In the past, and according to traditional international political theory, the United States had its own problems and the European countries had their own problems. Each sovereign state was to attend to its own interests. And I can imagine some of my listeners today, after the catalogue of U.S. woes and complaints I have just sketched, saying to themselves, "Very well, but why lecture us? These are, after all, American problems and it is up to the Americans to handle their interests as best they can."

I ask you to consider if this traditional approach is still valid in the world of 1970. Is it realistic, or more important, is it sensible and opportune for Europeans to look at the present situation as essentially an American problem to be solved essentially by Americans?

It is bad manners to quote one's self, but since I have you here, I will indulge myself. Before I became Ambassador to France, I gave as a private citizen the following testimony to the Congress:

"We are not only building a world market but, in my judgment, we are creating the foundations of a free world community. In Western Europe, through the instrument of trade, we have forged physical bonds of interdependence and spiritual bonds of understanding that those nations had never known in all history."

I submit that the ties that bind the U.S. to Europe, and Europe to the U.S., have broadened and deepened through the fifties and sixties to the point where national prob-

lems can no longer be regarded as purely national. They are multi-national. Questions that affect this deepened set of relationships now as never before in history have a transnational character. And in the trade field, the Europe of the Six is already the greatest trading power in the world. A Europe of the Ten would be even more powerful.

I have been philosophical. Now let me be more concrete. For a series of reasons, many of which are unrelated to European actions, protectionist forces in the U.S. are on the upsurge. This is an American problem, but it is also a European problem, and leaving it to the Americans to solve—or worse, taking actions that make it harder for Americans to solve it—may turn out to be a short-sighted and costly policy. This is 1970, not 1950 or even 1960. And the European community is large, powerful and prosperous. In the international trade field, it is already cohesive, speaking with a single voice. And international trade is vital to its economic health and growth.

This is a time when Americans speak increasingly, and rightfully so, of sharing responsibilities. I hope you will recognize that France and the European community not only share the benefits of liberal international trade, but also that they share to an increasing degree—perhaps to a degree which is not yet generally accepted or even recognized—responsibility for leadership in its continuation and development. Put this way, the current threat to liberal trade is not only not wholly a problem for the U.S. to solve. It is also a problem for which Europe and Japan bear responsibility and have a self-interest.

As President Nixon said of U.S. foreign economic policy in his foreign policy statement last February, "As in other areas of foreign policy, our approach is a sharing of international responsibilities. Our foreign economic policy must be designed to serve our purpose of strengthening the ties that make partnership."

The problems will not go away by themselves. Unless we can act together, there is every chance that we will act separately.

Unless we are all ready to pay a reasonable price now for that concerted action, we shall pay hugely later.

Gentlemen, there is no more important single problem in European-American relations today than the future of our trade policies. Errors now, of commission *or* omission, can haunt us for a decade or a generation.

I am at your disposition for questions.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GOODELL

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a famous Gallup poll of some years ago indicated that although mothers may still want their sons to grow up to be President, very few would want them to become politicians in the process. This bias against those who seek and attain elective public office, has long been the source of embarrassment to those who believe that public service can, and should, be the highest calling.

A man whose career belies the accepted wisdom that politicians are rarely worthy men is CHARLES GOODELL. It was clear from the outset of his time in the Senate that GOODELL, like Lincoln, believed that "to sin by silence when they should protest makes cowards of men." CHARLIE GOODELL spoke out clearly and forcibly on those issues which he believed had to be discussed lest this country lose its way entirely from the path of greatness.

CHARLIE GOODELL did not think that the continuing agony of Vietnam could best be stopped by placing all reliance on the wisdom and resourcefulness of the Chief Executive, and so he spoke out. Nor did he believe that the massive and complex problem of crime could best be solved by diluting the protections afforded us all under the Bill of Rights, and so he spoke out. CHARLIE GOODELL believed that there were many important issues which could not be finally determined on the basis of party affiliation and so he spoke out again and again, and many of his protests have now been heeded.

Because he had the courage to lift up his voice in opposition, this country and this Chamber are finer places in which to live and labor. During this last Congress—unfair criticism of its workings aside—the Senate was indeed the world's finest deliberative body. In those 2 years we developed a finer awareness of this body's power and its related potential for good. In no small measure we have this new understanding because of the efforts of men like CHARLIE GOODELL, men who challenged the deafening silence with their courageous voices.

SENATOR GEORGE MURPHY

HON. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, it is both an honor and pleasure to join in tribute to my friend GEORGE MURPHY, who leaves the Senate at the close of the current session. The distinguished senior Senator from California can take pride in the many services he has rendered the American people over the course of his varied career. All of us are, of course, well aware of his contributions in the field of entertainment and we recall with gratitude his activities in maintaining the morale of the Armed Forces during the Second World War. In the years following, his interest in public affairs drew him to politics, culminating in his election to the U.S. Senate in 1964.

His colleagues in this body know him as a courageous, hard working, and able representative of his State. One of his primary interests has been the economy, and his zealous study of budgetary matters inevitably led him to sane and sound economic decisions. Senator MURPHY always took his job seriously and spent an unusual and admirable amount of time on the floor watching over the affairs of his constituents. No recitation of his accomplishments could be complete without mention of his courage and determination in overcoming personal adversity which would have demoralized lesser men. In taking leave of this Chamber, GEORGE MURPHY leaves behind many friends. I count myself fortunate to be numbered among them.

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following.

COMMENTARY ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE 91ST CONGRESS

The 91st Congress, the longest session in nearly two decades, had a difficult time bringing itself to a close. The final weeks of the session were marked by filibusters, foot-dragging and political finagling. In spite of these shortcomings, however, the 91st recorded some solid legislative achievements.

For the long view of history, it may be that the 91st Congress will be noted for its attempts to reassert congressional responsibility in foreign affairs—an area in which previous Congresses had been inactive, accepting passively the leadership of the President.

The debate centered largely on the conflict in Southeastern Asia. Congress repealed the Tonkin Gulf Resolution of 1964, which President Johnson used as authority for a massive build-up of U.S. forces in South Vietnam. The 91st shut off funds to finance the presence of U.S. troops in Cambodia, Laos and Thailand. It also limited U.S. support for allied troops in Cambodia or Laos to actions ". . . required to insure the safety and orderly withdrawal of U.S. forces from Southeast Asia, or to aid in the release of American prisoners of war."

The President was challenged on his proposal to deploy the Safeguard antiballistic missile system, because of its impact on foreign relations—and not incidentally, because of its impact on U.S. economy. The President won a partial victory in this round, as the Congress cut down the number of additional sites requested by the administration.

The 91st Congress generated some of the most serious debate on foreign policy in many years. On the issues, the House generally supported the President, believing that he should have flexibility in making foreign policy decisions. It was in the Senate where most of the opposition occurred.

In the domestic area, an upsurge of public indignation about the state of our environment found expression in stricter anti-pollution laws. The 91st Congress passed legislation to (1.) tighen controls over water pollution from oil spillage, sewage discharges from ships, pollution from mines and thermal pollution from atomic power plants, and (2.) to require auto makers to produce a virtually pollution-free car by 1976.

The 91st Congress had a strong record of anti-crime legislation, another area of keen public interest. An omnibus measure strengthened laws and procedures to deal with illegal gambling and organized crime. A comprehensive anti-crime program for the District of Columbia may provide the basis for future nation-wide legislation. A narcotics control act is aimed at curbing traffic in marihuana, heroin and other dangerous drugs. There was provided, also, increased funding for Federal law enforcement assistance to State and local governments.

Congress spent considerable time in the area of transportation. It approved money

for mass transit and established a public corporation to help operate the Nation's ailing passenger train systems. It also had to step in to prevent a national railroad strike.

In other action, the Congress voted to bring 4.4 million more persons under unemployment insurance laws and to broaden the food stamp program with a tough provision requiring recipients to work at any job available. The Congress also doubled the school lunch program and boosted veterans' education and training benefits by 35 percent.

In the area of agriculture, the most significant development was the imposition of a $55 thousand annual limit on farm subsidies for any one farm. Other major bills which moved through the 91st Congress included:

A postal reform bill which converted the Post Office into an independent government postal service.

An extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act which lowers the voting age to 18 for Federal elections and reduces the state residency requirements to 30 days.

A comprehensive coal mine health and safety act, which also provided compensation for victims of coal miners' diseases such as black lung.

An Occupational Safety and Health Act, covering most of the Nation's 80 million workers, giving the Secretary of Labor authority to set standards, and creating a three-man board to enforce them.

A Legislative Reorganization Act which revises committee procedures, and make public committee votes and teller votes in the House.

TRIBUTE TO HON. ALBERT GORE

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the departure of ALBERT GORE from the Senate represents more than the loss of a great Senator whose four terms set a standard of honor and service to the Senate and the Nation. ALBERT GORE has made a unique contribution to the national life which will become more and more apparent as we confront the social crisis spawned by the great accumulations of wealth and power which threaten the Republic. ALBERT GORE understood, with a depth rarely matched today, that the pluralism of America is a virtue to be defended and protected. Power and privilege of the banks and the rich, which violate the framework of a free economy, the military industrial complex—ALBERT GORE understood that these and other combinations of wealth and power present an ongoing danger from which our democracy must be protected if we are to survive and thrive as a free society. In the challenges he presented to an inequitable tax system, in refusing to bend before the political manipulators and the smart money men, he stood with the original wisdom which gave birth to our freedoms.

He brought the same profound sensitivity to America in the consideration of our foreign policy. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, he understood that America's greatness as a world power rests in leadership, not domination; in concern, not callous indifference; in courage, not arrogance.

For ourselves, the Senate, and the Nation, we should note our debt of gratitude to ALBERT GORE, because the repayment of that debt must lie in our consciousness of the values he so ably represented.

A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GEORGE MURPHY

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, GEORGE MURPHY is leaving the Senate. I join with those who have expressed regret at seeing him leave. The Senate of the United States has often been referred to as the country's most exclusive club. I am not sure that that description is right, but I am sure that the Senate is a great place in which to learn to know those with whom one is associated.

GEORGE MURPHY has been with us for 6 years. To know him is to like him. I have not had the privilege of serving on any committee with him, but I have observed him from day to day here on the Senate floor, and I have admired his attention to the Senate's business and the courage and resolution of the man in participating fully even under the difficulty resulting from his throat operation.

I regard GEORGE MURPHY as a good man, a good friend, and a good Senator. I regret his leaving.

MRS. ROSE McCONNELL LONG

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer tribute to the late Mrs. Rose McConnell Long, a lady of great esteem who was admired by all who knew her in my State.

Mrs. Long, born a Hoosier like myself, as a young girl came to Louisiana where she enjoyed a full and gracious life.

Mrs. Rose McConnell Long will always be remembered by Louisianians as the charming first lady of our State, when her late husband, Huey P. Long was Governor. She enjoyed the unique historical role of having been the wife of U.S. Senator Huey P. Long, the mother of the present U.S. Senator from Louisiana, RUSSELL B. LONG, and she, herself, having served as U.S. Senator to fill the vacancy created by the tragic death of her distinguished husband.

Mrs. Long has passed on to her reward but the heritage and devotion to her people that she so nurtured, lives on with her three surviving children and her grandchildren.

Those of us who ourselves have suffered the loss of our mother can most appreciate the pain and remorse from the void when suddenly she is no longer here.

To her survivors, my deepest sympathy and in remembrance of their mother, Mrs. Rose McConnell Long:

Because she was so dear to all,
Her memory will live on,
Just as the fragrance of a rose
Still lingers when it is gone,
Her kindly and endearing ways,
In thought, are with all still,
And in the hearts that loved her,
She lives, and always will.

PITTSBURGH AND ALLEGHENY COUNTY OFFICIALS DEPLORE ACTIONS OF LENINGRAD COURT AGAINST SOVIET JEWRY

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Government has violated the basic principles of international law and incensed freedom-loving people everywhere by the recent actions of the Leningrad court against nine Jews and two Christians alleged to have plotted the hijacking of a Russian plane to Sweden.

On December 30 I cosponsored a resolution urging the President to convey to the Soviet Government the concern of the people of the United States and the House of Representatives over these injustices, to urge the Soviets to commute the two death sentences, and to urge that fair and equitable justice be provided for Jewish citizens.

The court has since commuted the two death sentences involved; however, I call this statement by public officials of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County to the attention of my colleagues as an indication of the impact this action has had in my congressional district, and as further evidence of my own personal outrage at this display of Soviet anti-Semitism.

STATEMENT CONCERNING RECENT SOVIET TRIAL BY ALLEGHENY COUNTY AND CITY OF PITTSBURGH PUBLIC OFFICIALS

We, the undersigned, wish to express our great dismay and concern over the death sentences and long prison terms recently handed down by the Leningrad Court in the case of eleven people, nine Jews and two Christians, who had allegedly "plotted" to seize a Russian airplane and fly it to Sweden.

As public officials of Allegheny County and the city of Pittsburgh, we want to register our strong protest over this complete disregard of the basic principles of criminal justice and civilized human behavior. It is obvious that this trial and the unduly harsh sentences meted out by the Soviet Judges were designed to further stifle any expression of dissent or disagreement on the part of any individual in Russia. Tragically, the trial also clearly demonstrates the continuing official and overt anti-Semitic policies of the USSR.

We urge the Soviet Government to permit those Jews who wish to emigrate to Israel to be free to do so. There can be no true international justice or worldwide peace until brutal repression of minority groups is ended in all nations, and every person is afforded the right to peacefully express his views and voice his dissent.

It is our fervent hope that the death sentences involving two of the eleven defendants

will be commuted and the excessive sentences of the other nine defendants markedly shortened. Furthermore, we urge the Soviet Government to refrain from further "trials" of this nature, and from all other activities which are blatantly predicated upon anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism.

SIGNATORIES

The Honorable Leonard C. Staisey, Chairman, Allegheny County Board of Commissioners.
The Honorable Thomas J. Foerster, Allegheny County Commissioner.
The Honorable William R. Hunt, M.D., Allegheny County Commissioner.
The Honorable Cyril H. Wecht, M.D., J.D., Coroner of Allegheny County.
The Honorable Rita Wilson Kane, Register of Wills of Allegheny County.
The Honorable James F. Clarke, Prothonotary of Allegheny County.
The Honorable Edward O. Ritenour, Acting Clerk of Courts of Allegheny County.
The Honorable John J. Exler, Recorder of Deeds of Allegheny County.
The Honorable Edward F. Cooke, Treasurer of Allegheny County.
The Honorable Eugene L. Coon, Sheriff of Allegheny County, Chairman, Allegheny County Democratic Committee.
The Honorable Robert B. Friend, Controller of Allegheny County.
The Honorable Michael R. Stabile, Jury Commissioner of Allegheny County.
The Honorable George H. Ross, Public Defender of Allegheny County.
The Honorable Louis Mason, Jr., President of Council, City of Pittsburgh.
The Honorable Edgar W. Michaels, Councilman, City of Pittsburgh.
The Honorable Walter T. Kamyk, Councilman, City of Pittsburgh.
The Honorable Thomas L. Fagan, Councilman, City of Pittsburgh.
The Honorable John P. Lynch, Councilman, City of Pittsburgh.
The Honorable Amy Ballinger, Councilwoman, City of Pittsburgh.
The Honorable John E. McGrady, Controller of City of Pittsburgh.

SENATOR ALBERT GORE

HON. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, today I join in paying homage to an idea and respect to a man. The idea is a simple one, as old as the wisdom of the ancients. It is that man has a duty to be true to himself, to act as he sees right. It is the ultimate moral summons, heedless of the personal consequences of gain or loss. The man we honor today, the retiring senior Senator from Tennessee, took that summons seriously, far more seriously than most men do. He staked his career on it. The returns are in. The race is lost. But the ideal was acted upon and although office is lost, honor and integrity remain. They remain in the character of the man, and they remain as a large part of his legacy to this Chamber and to the Nation. ALBERT GORE'S career has been a long and successful one, filled with accomplishments for Tennessee and the entire country. His integrity has always been informed by the keenest of intelligences and his thoughts always grows out of careful deliberation. The Senate will be the worse for his absence and I shall feel the loss of a wise and noble friend. I join my colleagues in the sincere hope that his future will be happy and that it will provide opportunity for us to continue sharing in his wisdom and hopefully emulating his integrity.

HEW CHARGES ARIZONA WITH NONCOMPLIANCE

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a very distressing situation in my home State of Arizona.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has charged Arizona with noncompliance with departmental regulations. The manner in which the Department has proceeded has left me greatly disturbed.

Doubt has been cast on the validity of the regulations under which the hearings were conducted. These new regulations were put into effect without the 30-day notice demanded by law, 5 U.S.C.A. 553(b)(1)(2)(c)(d)(e). In this case, there was no notice; the new hearing regulations became effective upon notification of their existence. The State was afforded no opportunity to challenge the new regulations without risking the loss of Federal funds.

The requirement of reasonable notice was ignored a second time. The Department at one point informed the State that it had no right of discovery. Then with less than 24 hours remaining before the hearing, the Department provided Arizona with access to its case. With proper discovery so thwarted, Arizona was denied the ability to prepare its case adequately.

Furthermore, the State was not allowed to discuss nor did the examiner consider, the issues of the case. The State of Arizona maintained that its statutes are in accord with the Social Security Act and that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's regulations violated that act.

The hearing examiner declined to rule on the motion. He said that to rule upon the validity of departmental regulations was beyond his power and that, therefore, he must assume them to be valid. Thus, Arizona was denied its right to challenge the departmental regulations; and therefore, was denied a hearing on the issue raised. Improperly delegating the responsibility for conducting such a hearing to one unable to consider these issues is certainly an illegal delegation under the statute.

The hearing was a mismanaged sham. Unrelated third parties were allowed to become parties to the matter. The Department did not meet its burden of proof by presenting any evidence that the alleged noncompliance by the State was in a "substantial number of cases," a standard required by law before payments to a State may be limited or withheld as set forth in Social Security Act, Section 404(a)(1), 42 U.S.C. 604(a)(1); Social Security Act, Section 1404(1), 42 U.S.C. 1204(2)(a).

One of the reasons the Department had charged Arizona with noncompliance was our State's residency requirement for welfare recipients. The residency requirement is not of the type considered in Shapiro against Thompson. Arizona does not require a person to live in Arizona a certain length of time before that person qualifies for welfare. Arizona law does not keep people from qualifying if they reside in the State. Arizona law simply terminates welfare payments to individuals who no longer have any contact with the State. A person continuously absent from the State for 3 months is considered no longer to be a resident and qualified for Arizona welfare.

After 3 months' absence, a person cannot still be considered to have sufficient contact with the State to qualify for welfare, especially since he is eligible for benefits in the State to which he has moved, under the doctrine pronounced in the Shapiro case. If a law such as Arizona's is invalid, there may be no limit as to the number of States in which a person could qualify and receive welfare payments. It is beyond my comprehension that when we refer to our "mobile society" we mean to include welfare recipients who may travel from State to State at public expense. Welfare recipients are not ordinarily prone to tour for months at a time.

The State of Arizona deserves a fair hearing. If a hearing examiner cannot rule on the State's challenge to the validity of HEW regulations, a new hearing should be scheduled before one who can so rule. Justice demands that no penalty be imposed upon the State pending a review or until the validity of the departmental regulations can be tested in a court of law.

A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR EUGENE McCARTHY

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have known GENE MCCARTHY during the time that he has been in the Senate and even during the time that he was in the House of Representatives. Later, I had the privilege of serving with him on the Foreign Relations Committee.

I have always admired GENE MCCARTHY. I found him to be a most congenial person and one with a keen wit and real understanding of mankind and his surroundings. He possesses real ability as has been demonstrated from time to time here in this body from which he now goes out of his own free choice.

GENE will be missed around here but we shall all be wishing for him great happiness in the years ahead. We all know that he will continue his interest in things and that he will be active in trying to get things done to make a better life for the people who inhabit the earth.

THE RELEVANCE OF RELIGION: A COMMITMENT TO NOW

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the recent declaration by the U.S. Supreme Court that 18-years-olds could indeed vote in our Federal elections indicates the importance of that group to the future of our Nation.

The laws that we live by find their roots in the moral law given to man by God. The importance of God to the conduct of our lives is fundamental, and recently a group of young citizens in the new area of my fabulous Fourth Congressional District wrote an original service entitled, "The Relevance of Religion: A Commitment to Now."

Kenneth Garfield and Richard Brust wrote and presented this service on Friday, December 11, 1970, at the Temple Israel in Lawrence, N.Y.

The sentiments and feelings expressed are important to the Members of Congress and our Nation:

THE RELEVANCE OF RELIGION: A COMMITMENT TO NOW

(By Kenneth Garfield and Richard Brust)

LECTURN I

READER. It is indeed a rare occasion that the opinions and philosophies of our generation can be voiced in such a free and open manner to a thoughtful congregation. For this we are thankful.

We come together this Sabbath evening to recollect our thoughts and to reevaluate our lives. We do this by voicing an expression of prayer and of hope, yet too often we leave these evaluations and thoughts behind us as we continue in the main stream of daily life. Our service tonight is one to be inserted into our daily pattern of thinking and living.

Ritual for Sabbath candles

Tonight, we not only light these candles to begin the Sabbath, but to usher in a new era in which honesty and love become the pillars of strength. Let us, tonight, commit ourselves to strive for a united spirit of man.

READER. "In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth, and the Earth was without form, and void—and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let the waters under the Heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so."

Responsive reading

READER. "And God called the dry land Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called He Seas: and God saw that it was good.'

CONG. "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the Earth in the open firmament of Heaven."

READER "And God made the beast of the Earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the Earth after his kind; and God saw that it was good."

CONG. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let him have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the Earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the Earth."

READER. "So God created Man in His own image, in the image of God created He Him; male and female created He them."

LECTERN II

READER. And God created Man to care for the Earth and to nourish it.

Eight major American Corporations have been indicted for dumping mercury into our waters. Poisonous mercury which can eventually produce blurred vision, mental derangement and death. Already contaminated are the Rio Grande and Sacramento Rivers, Lake Erie and Lake Champlain.

Seven hundred million pounds of pesticide are used each year. . . .

Over eight million pounds of carbon monoxide are released by automobiles in New York City each day. . . .

Eighty million tons of soot fall on New York City each year.

Our Earth is dying. Dr. George Wald, Nobel prize winning biologist, says that life on Earth is threatened with extinction in the next fifteen to thirty years.

READER. Man must learn to live with his Earth, not have the Earth live and die for man.

"Blessed of the Lord be his land, for the precious things of heaven, for the dew, and for the deep that coucheth beneath, and for the precious fruits brought forth by the Sun, and for the precious things put forth by the Moon, and for the chief things of the ancient mountains, and for the precious things of the lasting hills, and for the precious things of the Earth and fulness thereof."

Kiddush

This cup contains the fruit of the vine. We rise and praise our God who has created the fruit of a bountiful land. Let us devote ourselves to maintaining an Earth which shall always bring forth a good and plentiful yield.

Boruch Atoh Adonoy, Elohenu Melech Ho-o-lom Borei P'ri Ha-gofen.

[Congregation rises.]

Music of Kiddush.

[Congregation is seated.]

LECTURN I

READER. "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!"

Responsive reading

READER. "In the end of days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the House of the Lord shall be established on the top of the mountains.

CONG. And it shall be exalted above the hills, and people shall flow unto it.

READER. Any many nations shall come and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord.

CONG. And He will teach us of His ways and we will walk in His paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

READER. And He shall judge among many people; and rebuke strong nations afar off.

CONG. And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore.

READER. They shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid.

CONG. For let all the peoples walk each one in the name of his God. We shall walk in the name of the Lord our God forever and ever."

READER. Let us rise together and in spiritual unity proclaim our devotion to the name of the Lord.

[Congregation rises.]

READER and CONG. Shema Yisroel Adonoi Elohenu Adonai Echod. Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one.

Boruch Shem Kevod Malchuso L'olom Voed. Praised be His name Whose glorious kingdom is forever and ever.

Musical response.

[Congregation is seated.]

LECTURN II

READER. Yes, it *is* good for thy brethren to dwell together in unity. Yet how often do we see ourselves abiding by the golden rule of Hillel?

As of September, 1970 the war in Southeast Asia has cost America 43,568 young lives and 288,124 men crippled and mutilated. This does not include those innocent Vietnamese, Cambodians, and Laotians killed and maimed by those at war.

READER. In the turbulent decade of the 1960s, the following nations have been scarred by the ravages of violent conflicts and wars:

Biafra, Nigeria, United States, Congo, Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, Cyprus, Russia, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Turkey, India, Pakistan, North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Cambodia, Indonesia, North Korea,, South Korea, Laos, Dominican Republic and many others.

How many more must there be?

Sermonettes.

Musical selection.

LECTURN I

READER. "Then He answered and spake unto me, saying, This *is* the word of the Lord unto Zerubbabel, saying, Not by might, nor by power, but by My spirit saith the Lord of hosts."

Responsive reading

READER. "For ye shall go out with joy and be led forth with peace."

CONG. "The mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing."

READER. "And all the trees of the fields shall clap their hands."

CONG. "Instead of the thorn shall come up the cyprus."

READER. "And instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle."

CONG. "And it shall be to the Lord a memorial for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off."

LECTURN II

READER. Peace is defined as being a state of quiet, calmness and security. A state of true brotherhood.

This is espoused by man to be the ultimate ideal by which to live. But why a Watts, and why a Detroit, where in 1967 forty people died and thousands were injured in racial conflict. Why Birmingham? Four innocent children murdered in the dynamiting of a church in 1963. And why Newark, why Chicago?

READER. Our country and the entire world is being torn apart by conflicts and wars between the varied and diverse races and beliefs of man.

And *still* we only mouth . . . "They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Let us together, in meaningful silence, pray for the future. May it not be filled with the tragedy and grief of the past.

Silent prayer.

LECTURN I

READER. In memory of those who have gone on before us, serenely and peacefully, and for those who have needlessly and tragically died at the hands of their fellow man, do we now recite the Kaddish, to give strength and comfort to all those throughout the world, black and white, young and old, who have seen the passing of loved ones.

[Congregation rises.]

READER. Yis-gad-dal v'yis-kad-dash sh'meh rabo-bo; b'ol-mo di'v-ro kir'-u-seh v'yam-lich mal-chu-seh, b'cha-ye-chon u-v'yo-me-

chon u-v'cha-yeh d'chol bes yis-ro-el, ba-a-go-lo u-viz-man ko-riv, v'im-ru O-men.

CONG. Y'heh sh'meh rab-bo m'vo-rach, l'o-lam ul'ol'meh ol-ma-yo:

READER. Yis-bo-rach v'yish-tab-bach, v'yis-o-ar, v'yis-ro-mam, v'yis-nas-seh, y'yis-had-dor, v'yis-al-leh, v'lis-hal-ol, sh'-meh d'kud-sho, b'rich hu. L'e-lo min kol bir-cho-so v'shi-ro-so, tush-b'cho-so v'ne-cho-mo-so, da-a-mi-ron b'ol-mo, v'im-ru O'men:

Y'heh sh'lo-mo rab-bo min sh'ma-yo v'cha-yim, o-le-nu v'al kol yis-ro-el, v'imru O-men:

O-seh sho-lom bim'-ro-mov, hu ya-a-seh sho-lom, o-le-nu v'al kol yis-ro-el, v'imru O-men.

[Congregation is seated.]

Musical selection.

LECTURN II

READER. In these troubled times, we often become unsure of ourselves, bewildered by others, and confused about our beliefs concerning God. He has given us values and morals with which to live a humane and meaningful life. The time has come not only to preach these values, but to truly live them, and with this in mind, to seek an honest world. We are His children; there is much of His goodness in each of us. As the late John Kennedy prophetically spoke, "Let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

Benediction.

FARM PARITY EQUALS 1933 DEPRESSION LOW

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the facts contained in the following article which appeared in the Washington Post on Friday, January 1, 1971:

FARM PARITY EQUALS 1933 DEPRESSION LOW

Prices paid to farmers for raw products dropped 2 per cent in December and averaged 7 per cent less than a year ago, the Agriculture Department announced yesterday.

The Crop Reporting Board said lower prices for cattle, hogs, cotton, lettuce and oranges contributed to the decline.

Meantime, farm expenses rose again by one-fourth of 1 per cent during the month ended December 15.

The tighter squeeze between prices farmers get and what they pay out for expenses meant a drop for the third straight month in the parity ratio formula to 67 per cent, compared with 68 per cent in November. At 67 per cent it equaled the 37 year mark set in December, 1933, during the nation's worst economic depression.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MURPHY

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am honored to join in the tribute today to the distinguished Senator from California, GEORGE MURPHY. This good friend will soon leave the Senate, but his grace and dedication will always remain with his colleagues.

Senator MURPHY and I have not always agreed on many important issues. But, even in disagreement, he has been an exemplary gentleman, and a sincere, intelligent member of the opposition.

GEORGE MURPHY came to the Senate with a background in civic, industrial and theatrical work; and thus, he brought rich and varied experiences to bear in his role as a U.S. Senator.

I am sure the Members of the Senate now wait to see in what capacity this man of many talents and many interests will emerge next in American public life.

Mr. President, I am pleased to extend to GEORGE MURPHY my best wishes for an active and successful future.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR EUGENE McCARTHY

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, not often do Members of this body choose voluntarily to leave it while in the prime of life. It is a somewhat extraordinary act. Of course, the senior Senator from Minnesota who has so chosen is an extraordinary man. He has been, too, an excellent public servant. In agreement and in disagreement—and I have experienced both with Senator McCARTHY—he has always been an eminently reasonable man. His leadership has caught the imagination of a significant number of Americans and thus enriched our system of democracy for some time to come.

Mr. President, as one who came to the Senate in 1959 and who has enjoyed being a back-bencher with Senator McCARTHY over those dozen years, I am somewhat saddened by his decision to depart. But GENE McCARTHY has, I know, other enduring gifts to give the people, and with so many others I wish him well.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for all of us in this Congress in saying that we will miss the comradeship and the contributions of the Honorable WILLIAM C. CRAMER of Florida when we meet again. BILL came to this House in the 84th Congress with the unique distinction of being the first Republican elected in Florida since Reconstruction days, and he has been "Mr. Republican" from the Sunshine State ever since.

Although he has served 16 years here, BILL CRAMER is still a young man with a tremendous future ahead of him. But we will sorely miss the energy and expertise which he brought first to the Committee on the Judiciary and more recently as ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works.

In addition BILL was a valued member of our Republican leadership team as vice chairman of the Republican Conference and vice chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee. As Republican National Committeeman from Florida BILL played a key role in the Miami Beach convention of 1968 at which I had the honor of serving as permanent chairman; our President who was nominated there and our party will continue to have BILL'S good counsel on the Republican National Committee and, I am sure, in many other ways.

The Federal highway aid program and the Federal antiriot law are only two of the monuments to BILL CRAMER'S legislative skill. Personally, I will miss more than words can say the day-to-day assistance and support of a fine colleague and friend. I wish BILL and his lovely wife Alice all the best of success in the next chapter of an outstanding career.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ALBERT GORE

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a recent issue of Harper's magazine has an article by David Halberstam in which Senator GORE is called the last Populist. It was a good try at describing the record and character of ALBERT GORE, but it fell short.

ALBERT GORE is more than a Populist. The way of the Populist, if it works, is an easy way, and if it does not work, it still remains largely uncriticized by the people. ALBERT GORE has been concerned not just with quantitative democracy but with its qualitative character as well. He is concerned not only with its individual and personal aspects but also with its formal and institutional character.

The most unfair—almost, I would say, dishonest—charge made against any candidate in the campaign of 1970 was that ALBERT GORE represented special interests—a charge attributed to the Vice President, unless the Vice President meant that the poor and the striving Americans are special interests.

ALBERT GORE was more ready to call an unfair advantage or an inequity, a special interest, than anyone that I have served with during the 12 years of my membership on the Finance Committee. He was not only ready to call such advantages "special interests," but to attempt to eliminate them. His pace was that of the Tennessee Walking Horse: not slow, not fast, not easily distracted or spooked, but tireless, directed, committed.

ALBERT GORE did not change or forget his State nor fail to understand it. I hope that his State has not changed, but rather that in 1970 its electorate was only temporarily distracted and that it will come back to him, to his principles, and to his position on the issues.

PROFITMAKING IN EDUCATION

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in recent years I have spoken of my concern that education is becoming an area exploited by profitmaking corporations. A great deal of Federal money has been wasted in pointless research and in educational gimmicks. If we had provided that same money to our teachers, we would probably be much further along than we are today in the job of educating our young people.

A similar concern has been expressed by Margaret L. Wallen, a valued constituent in my district, in a recent letter to me. For the information of my fellow Members I am pleased to insert that letter in the RECORD:

GRESHAM, OREG., *December 19, 1970.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Representative in Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: The topic of your address title "Profits Gained from Tax Dollars" which was printed in *The Oregonian,* August 7, 1970 was most refreshing.

Profits gained from tax dollars plus the tax funds wasted by school districts have been a source of irritation to me for many years.

It is my firm conviction that many children are being deprived of a good education and proper care due to "big business" tactics by school districts and state departments of education in general. I am sure this is not premeditated or deliberate. It is just a situation which has developed over the years in an honest effort to provide better education but it has gotten completely removed from "the individual child."

Tht public has a right to demand better education when there are so many dropouts and children leaving schools unable to spell, read, write, etc. Not only are there these handicaps; they are unable to cope with life in general. True, much training must come from the home, but why aren't educators helping to produce better parents? Much of this training begins the day the first grader or kindergarten student enters school. This should be common knowledge among educators and the public in general. The child should be prepared for this first big step, then carefully guided and trained until he is well adjusted in the school setting instead of expecting him to complete several textbooks so that he may go on to the first or second grade with the ability to complete another set of textbooks. I believe we are destroying the child's ability to love life and enjoy learning because of the "lock step" grade level of progressing through school. An education is much broader than this.

With the demand for better schools the districts are caught between the public and high pressure salesmen who have many excellent new teaching devices, materials, techniques and ideas produced from years of research. There is always something new to be tried out on our children instead of letting them learn to cope with the simple basic tools primary children have always used to learn—the alphabet and the numbers.

For the past fourteen years it has been my observation as a second grade and Educable Mentally Retarded teacher that it takes several months for most children to be calmed down enough to become reassured of their worth as human beings and to begin to feel the joy and pride of learning.

This is not accomplished with new techniques and sophisticated teaching devices alone. It is done through individual attention, love, encouragement and understanding; through the development of "good" feelings and attitudes toward themselves and others.

Children are basically the same as they always have been. But when young minds are expected to cope with the adjustment to the school routine, as well as the social and emotional adjustment, plus coping with books, pencils, paper and subject matter such as science, math, reading, writing, spelling, physical education, music, art and library, it is no wonder learning problems develop. This alone is enough to completely overwhelm the normal, healthy child to say nothing of what it must do to our underprivileged or handicapped child. It is appalling the number of children who are suffering because of poor physical conditions including malnutrition as well as social and emotional maladjustments.

The interest of the schools does not center around the individual child and his needs. Instead, educators seem to be more interested in curriculum, materials, techniques, devices and the passing of budgets, while all the time the young child is trying to learn, grow and develop but no one ever has the time to listen to him; to help him, guide him into growing to adulthood, proud that he is a unique individual.

For thirteen years I was part of, therefore, observed an elementary district grow. Within a mile and a half radius, six new schools sprang up with a principal and secretary for each new building. The administration building employed additional directors over coordinators who supervised *a few* badly needed specialists such as remedial reading teachers, special education teachers and speech therapists. Teachers' aids were denied the classroom teacher.

At one time the primary teachers had convinced the administration that aides were needed in order to provide more individual attention for the students. Two very fine ladies were assigned to the primary department in one of the schools, and progress was being made. But this situation was short lived.

A teacher who was removed from an intermediate classroom because of poor teaching was assigned as librarian and audio-visual coordinator. It wasn't long until an opportunity presented itself for the same person to build "an empire" with federal funds.

Under the pretense of a program for the underprivileged child, a closed circuit T.V. program was forced upon all of the teachers and students of the district. The aides for the primary teachers became aides for the T.V. program. However, they did not remain long because they were unhappy and felt their assistance in the classrooms was more important. They soon found jobs in other districts. There have been many unhappy persons in the district because they believe it has been, and still is, a total waste of the taxpayers' money.

Needless to say, thirteen years was enough time to convince me that the district did not have the interest of the children at heart and I was miserably unhappy there.

In contrast, last school year was a most happy and productive one. The district in which I am now employed has one primary principal for three schools. He finds the time to fulfill administrative duties; take little sick children home; offer to assist the children and teachers in any way humanly possible and still remain courteous, gracious, diplomatic, yet ready to enjoy a good laugh when the going gets rough. His behavior is indicative of the entire staff of administrators. Money is not wasted. The children come first and everyone on the staff tries to improve the quality of education in the school. Money is not wasted but still there is a need for more individual attention to the students.

The school nurse is over-worked, the county child clinic cannot take all of the physical, emotional and psychological cases; the local dentist cannot care for all of the underprivileged children referrals. Children are not getting their vision and hearing problems cared for early enough in life. First grade teachers do not have time to listen to all of the problems a little person has to talk about and needs to get off his chest because twenty minutes must be devoted to reading, writing, spelling, arithmetic, etc. in order to prepare the child for the second grade textbooks he will be expected to master next year.

I am not surprised that we have a young peoples revolt. Why can't we become more interested in the individual child? Our libraries are full of information dating back into the sixteen hundreds and beyond which inform us of the basic physical and mental needs as well as the basic learning processes of children.

It doesn't seem necessary to continuously experiment with the greatest resource on earth, our youth. The very young will listen to reason and guidance provided someone will take the time to listen to them, guide and teach them.

It isn't that educators in America do not have the knowledge to do an almost perfect job of educating; it is because money can be made exploiting the processes of education which in turn exploits our youth.

Through leadership, valuable research has been achieved but now it seems the cry is for more and more money and the basic care of our children is neglected. How can we as educators dare to place blame on a parent for child neglect, when those very same parents have supposedly had the opportunity to become "educated" in our public or private schools? Or perhaps they have been inadvertently educated too well. The young people are trying to make us see the waste, greed and dishonesty that is actually destroying our great American way of life.

With all of the elaborate methods of communication we have today, the voice of the very young still is not heard or understood, due mainly to the very essence of your topic "Profits Gained From Tax Dollars".

I believe the President was justified in vetoing the Education Appropriation Bill.

It would be interesting to learn what an investigating committee would find if "district" management of local, state and federal funds were investigated nation-wide.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET L. WALLEN.

SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD

HON. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to join in tribute to the retiring senior Senator from Connecticut, THOMAS J. DODD. Senator DODD leaves behind a record of solid achievement in which he can take deserved pride and for which his fellow citizens should express gratitude. An acknowledged expert on communism and a vigilant advocate of internal security, Senator DODD was constantly in the forefront of the guardians of America's safety. His colleagues know him as a concerned patriot, and his friends as a

man of personal courage. Nowhere was his determination better evidenced than in his reelection campaign of the past year when he ran against great odds to vindicate his conduct of office. His countrymen can only admire such tenacity. And certain it is that they have lost an effective defender of American interests abroad and American liberty at home. I join the Members of this Chamber in wishing TOM DODD well in his future endeavors.

JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution of commendation offered by my colleague from Arizona, JOHN J. RHODES.

America has been indeed fortunate to have had the services of JOHN W. McCORMACK in such a position of great leadership for so many years of your public life. Also, we in the House of Representatives have indeed been fortunate to have had the inspiration of so wise a man for so long a period of time. During your tenure in the House of Representatives, you have served eight Presidents, from Coolidge to Nixon, both Democrats and Republicans, and served them well.

Your 44 years of service in this great body have been marked by innumerable legislative accomplishments; many of these memorable achievements have been noted by my colleagues here in their salute to you.

But I, Mr. Speaker, will not only remember you as a great legislator and leader, but as a friend—a friend I could rely on since I first came to Congress 12 years ago.

You have long expressed the wish to be known as a Member's Speaker. A Member's Speaker you definitely were, and a Member's friend and confidant as well. Your door was always open and you were always ready to help, whether the problem was legislative or personal. You have always been as accessible to freshmen Members as you were to the Members of your own leadership. This fairness and concern for all has been greatly appreciated by every Member who ever served under you.

It is often said that many men grow to meet a position of added responsibility—not in this case. For here, the converse was true. The office of Speaker was itself enhanced by the presence of JOHN W. McCORMACK.

I think it was Kipling, Mr. Speaker, who, in talking of men and leadership, best described the years of your stewardship:

"If you can dream and not make dreams your master,
If you can think and not make thoughts your aim,
If you can walk with crowds and keep your virtue
Or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch."

To us, Mr. Speaker, you could do these things and many more. And, because of this, history shall long remember the years of JOHN W. McCORMACK, "the man from Boston."

SALUTE TO SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in saluting JOHN McCORMACK today on his retirement after 42 years of service to this body and the country, it would be easy to lose sight of the man because of the magnitude of his record of achievement. But we who have been privileged over the years to know and love JOHN McCORMACK cannot forget the man. His warmth, goodness, integrity, and sincerity and, when need be, his determination and toughness will be with us forever.

He has led us physically as Speaker, majority leader, and whip; he has led us spiritually as a living example of a great American devoted to God and country. He has comforted us when we were troubled, counseled us when we were perplexed. But JOHN McCORMACK did not just serve this body and its Members. Every American benefited by JOHN McCORMACK's belief in right and justice. He fought for the poor, the aged, the oppressed, the helpless. He fought to keep our country strong and free.

Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon all came to trust and admire our distinguished Speaker, just as we have. But now the time has come to say farewell to JOHN McCORMACK and it is a difficult thing, indeed, to do. We shall all truly miss our beloved Speaker, for there is not a Member of this body who is not a better man for having served with JOHN McCORMACK. May the good Lord grant JOHN McCORMACK and his lovely wife, Harriet, many, many years of peace and happiness.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOSEPH TYDINGS

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Senate owes a debt of gratitude to JOE TYDINGS. JOE TYDINGS provided the kind of concerned and dedicated leadership that bred confidence that we could meet our problems with constructive effort. He helped provide a sense of our past and future, carrying on the tradition with which his father graced the Congress, and acting with the vitality and intelligence required to meet the challenges now before us. His legislative achievements are remarkable testimony to this contribution. His record will serve as a standard for legislative dedication. It will also overwhelm the sordid political strategy which worked his defeat so that the people of Maryland and the Nation will again have the benefit of his leadership.

PEACE THROUGH LAW

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last July, on the occasion of the first official visit to Washington by a United Nations Secretary General, a luncheon was tendered to the Honorable U Thant by the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law. The Secretary-General gave an informal talk at the luncheon and has since approved for release a transcript of his remarks.

While the talk is out of date in some respects, it is a document of permanent value. It reveals clearly U Thant's belief in democracy and the basic freedoms, his view of his role at the U.N. as that of a moderator or harmonizer, and his attitudes toward the problems faced by the U.N.

The transcript follows:

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FOR PEACE THROUGH LAW

(Remarks of His Excellency U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations)

Congressman Brad Morse, distinguished Senators and Congressmen, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: I understand that the Senators have to leave in two minutes in connexion with a very important issue before the United Nations and I am sure we all understand their absence during my brief statement at this very delightful lunch.

First of all I must say that I'm deeply touched by the extraordinarily warm reception accorded to me and my colleagues by the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, and for this I am particularly grateful to its chairman, Congressman Morse, and Senator McGovern and your colleagues, for the very unusual honor done to me and, through me, to the United Nations.

You have very appropriately made references to the review of the activities of the United Nations for the last twenty-five years and projection of activities of the UN for the future. Needless for me to say, the primary purpose of the founding fathers in 1945, when they launched the United Nations in San Francisco, was, in the language of the Charter, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind." That was the primary objective of the founding fathers twenty-five years ago—to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war—which twice in our lifetime, once in 1914 and again in 1939, has brought untold sorrow to mankind.

With this objective in mind, the founding fathers also prescribed certain lines of action. These were stated in the preamble of the Charter of the United Nations. One of the lines of action suggested by the founding fathers in San Francisco was "to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors." This is the actual language of the Charter—"to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors." So from the point of view of the United Nations, from the vantage point of the bridge,

a view from the middle of the bridge—our assessment of international development in many parts of the world can be different from the view from either end of the bridge. The first essential fact of life which we all have to recognize is this: that if we are to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, we have to change our basic approach to problems. Of course, this is very difficult. But if the United Nations is to develop into a really effective instrument for peace and progress, for the fulfillment of the objectives envisaged in the Charter, then it is very necessary to change our approach to problems facing mankind today.

In this respect, I want to project my own thinking, my personal viewpoint. In the political field I believe in democracy. Those who have known me for the last thirty or forty years know very well that I have all along been a believer in democratic processes, democratic institutions, fundamental human rights, like freedom of speech, freedom of expression, freedom of association, freedom of work, freedom of religion, freedom of conscience, and so on. I believe very strongly in the superiority of the democratic system over any other system. But this conviction in democracy, this belief in the superiority of domestic institutions, does not blind me to the knowledge that there are hundreds of millions of people who disagree with me.

I would draw a parallel with my religious conviction. As all of you are no doubt aware, I am a Buddhist. I believe that Buddhism is a very superior religion. Of course I am not sufficiently conversant with other religions to make a comparative assessment. But my conviction in the superiority of the Buddhist religion does not preclude me from the knowledge that there are hundreds of millions of people who believe otherwise. This attitude of tolerance, and I am just trying to elaborate on this concept of tolerance which is one of the guidelines of the Charter, is essential in our approach to the problems we face. Only then can we perform the functions outlined in the Charter of the United Nations.

Another Charter provision relates to the harmonizing function of the United Nations. The founding fathers asked all member states to see to it that the United Nations serve as a center to harmonize the actions of states. In my view, this harmonizing function of the United Nations is one of the most important provisions of the Charter. I am sure many of you will recall that the late President Roosevelt, in 1944, suggested privately that the chief executive of the United Nations should be called "Moderator". There were other suggestions and his suggestion was not accepted. So the post came to be known as "Secretary-General". Personally speaking, I feel that President Roosevelt's suggested term "Moderator" very aptly describes the nature of my office. So long as I function as the Secretary-General of the United Nations, my basic approach to problems will be the search for a common denominator. To find a common denominator, or to harmonize the actions of states, with a view to the achievement of common objectives, shall continue to be my primary guideline. Speaking of the harmonizing function, I must pay tribute to the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law for the courageous and imaginative programs they have drawn up, to fashion the kind of harmonious society which is disciplined, orderly, and which is governed by the rule of law.

On many previous occasions, I have expressed my personal view that if the United Nations is to develop into a really effective instrument for peace and progress, its decisions must be enforceable. This should be one of our primary objectives. The Security Council, for instance, has adopted from time to time, very important resolutions on crisis situations in many parts of the world. Thus, a first step has been accomplished by deciding on a certain line of action. But a second step still remains to be achieved: how to implement these resolutions. I feel very strongly that the unanimous resolutions of the Security Council must be enforceable. In all human organizations, in my view, there must be certain ground rules to observe. In a club, or an association, there are certain sets of ground rules. Even in a bridge club, or a reading society, or a social organization, or a religious association, there are certain ground rules to observe. Only if the members observe these ground rules will this particular human organization function in a disciplined and orderly manner. For the effective functioning of a human organization, the first essential step is for the members to observe the ground rules.

When the United Nations makes a decision through its deliberative organs, like the General Assembly or the Security Council—particularly the Security Council—I feel that it is up to the Member States concerned without exception to observe the ground rules by complying with that decision. Only then will we see the development of the United Nations as a really effective instrument.

To illustrate my point, let us take a club in Washington comprising two hundred members. The rules and regulations say that in order to consider important questions such as the extension of the building or an increase in the subscription of the members, a two-thirds vote is necessary. If there is a provision in the rules and regulations requiring a two-thirds vote for the adoption of such decisions, then if more than two-thirds vote for the adoption of such decisions, then if more than two-thirds of the members agree to take a certain line of action, in my view, the rest, less than one-third of the membership, should go along with that resolution, despite the fact that they don't agree with the decision. That is my basic approach to the consideration of all problems before the United Nations. This is my concept of the orderly and disciplined functioning of the United Nations.

I want to deal with another aspect of the functioning of the United Nations—the principle of universality. I have stressed this point on many previous occasions. Unless the principle of universality of membership is applied, the UN will not be effective in finding solutions to the problems affecting excluded states. You all know that discussions in disarmament committees and commissions have been going on year after year with very little progress. I feel very strongly that for the success of the discussions on disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, the involvement of the Peoples' Republic of China and France is essential. Without the involvement of these two nuclear powers, very little progress can be expected in the disarmament negotiations now going on.

The next point I want to stress is the fact that the world has become smaller and smaller, not only from the viewpoint of the United Nations, but from the viewpoint of every Member State. It is increasingly evident that there can be no national peace, national security or national progress confined within the frontiers of one particular state. This is the assessment of all knowledgeable people. Now we realize that every nation's peace, progress, prosperity and security depend primarily on international peace, international progress, international security, and the development of international resources.

If we are to fashion a new society, the kind of society which is just and peaceful, then we have to recognize that the division of the world into the rich and the poor, the haves and the have-nots, the north and the south, is much more important, much more significant, and, in the long run, much more explosive than the division of the world based in political ideologies. That's why the United Nations system has collectively launched a Second Development Decade. The primary concept in launching the Second Development Decade is based on the global strategy which recognizes the fact that our small planet, in spite of its division on the basis of race, religion or color, is essentially an indivisible whole, that all of us have to sink or swim together. There are only two choices before us. Both the rich countries and the poor countries have to make a choice between two alternatives: one alternative is to march together hand in hand towards a planned and prosperous future; the second alternative is to forget the spirit of togetherness and march haphazardly without any co-operation towards an unplanned and chaotic future. These are the two choices open to the human community. I am sure, if common sense prevails, both the rich and poor countries will choose the first alternative.

Now, coming to the specific issues of war and peace facing the international community today, I want to make some brief observations on the two crisis situations that humanity is facing. First of all, the war in Indo-China. Those who have been in touch with the United Nations know my views, so I don't think I need to elaborate on this subject. Personally speaking, I am much more concerned with the human factor than with the political or military factors involving who is right and who is wrong. To me, as a Buddhist, human life is sacred. Every dead American or dead Vietnamese is a dead brother of mine. I cannot distinguish or differentiate between an American or a Vietnamese or a Cambodian or a Chinese or a Jew or an Arab. So I have regarded the war in Southeast Asia as most tragic, as a colossal horror story.

Of course people speak about atrocities in this village and that village, and in this town and that town, but in my view, these atrocities constitute just a very small part of this total horror. That's why I've been saying for the last six years that the war must be stopped. I've even suggested some means of bringing about the termination of this very tragic conflict, but so far peace is not in sight. I want to take this opportunity to assure this very distinguished gathering that I shall continue to exert my utmost to contribute to a peaceful and just solution of this tragic problem.

Regarding the war in the Middle East, my position is also well known at the United Nations. To retrace some of the basic points of my attitude, first of all I must say that the United Nations has a responsibility to contribute to a just and lasting peace in the area. The Security Council which, in the context of the Charter, has a primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, has a definite role to play in contributing to a just and lasting peace in the area. In order to enable the Security Council to function effectively, the permanent members of the Security Council have a special responsibility because of their special status under the Charter. The principles for a just and lasting peace in the area are outlined in the Security Council Resolution 242. The big powers, the permanent members of the Security Council, should and must exert their utmost to come to an agreement on basic guidelines for an early solution of the problem. Such an agreement will enable the Secretary-General's special representative, Ambassador Jarring, to reactivate his mission. Last week, I was in contact with Ambassador Jarring on the telephone. Both he and I agree that there is no real basis for him, at least for the moment, to reactivate his mission. Both he and I will be very happy if there is a real basis for the reactivation of his mission.

I just want to conclude with a brief observation. For the effective functioning of the United Nations, which has been under

examination for many weeks and many months in this anniversary year, the basic attitudes of the peoples of the United Nations is very important. I think it is worth recalling the difference between the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Charter of the United Nations. The Covenant of the League of Nations starts with the words, "We, the high contracting parties, will undertake to" do this and that. It used the words—"We the high contracting parties". The Charter of the United Nations uses the words, "We, the peoples of the United Nations". The stress is on the peoples more than on the governments. So, if the United Nations is to function in the manner it was meant to function, it is up to the peoples. In other words, if the United Nations has failed, it is the failure of the peoples of the United Nations. If the United Nations has succeeded, it is the success of the peoples of the United Nations. The failure of the United Nations will be the failure of the human community. The success of the United Nations will be the success of the human community.

If we are to see to it that the United Nations succeeds in the fulfillment of the objectives set down by the founding fathers twenty-five years ago, then we need to change our concepts; we need to adjust our attitude towards the burning issues of the day. As I have said on one or two previous occasions, it is understandable that the first allegiance of an American should be to America; the first allegiance of a Russian understandably should be to Russia; the first allegiance of a Burmese should be to Burma; the first allegiance of an Englishman should be to England. It is natural, understandable, and, in many ways, desirable. But in order that the international organization may function in the way it was meant to function, this single allegiance is not enough. We need to develop—the people of the United Nations need to develop—a second allegiance. That is the allegiance to the international community. I think that this double allegiance, in this twenty-fifth anniversary year of the United Nations, in these very tense times, in the shadow of the hydrogen bomb, is very necessary and even essential for all of us. All the peoples of the United Nations, irrespective of race or religion, must try to develop this double allegiance—allegiance to our own state and allegiance to the human community, represented by the United Nations. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

TRIBUTE TO HON. SAMUEL FRIEDEL

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, SAM FRIEDEL leaves this body with the affection and esteem of all its Members. As chairman of the House Administration Committee, he has well served all Members of this House, and the House functions more smoothly because of his hard work and dedication. To me personally he has been a friend, one always willing to render assistance. Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for SAM FRIEDEL good health, good fortune, and success in whatever field of endeavor he enters. I predict that SAM FRIEDEL has many more accomplishments to record in public life, and I hope he will visit with us in the years to come.

REPRESENTATIVE E. ROSS ADAIR

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, on the retirement from this body of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR) one of the ablest and most effective Members of the House of Representatives is completing a long career of service.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the business of the Foreign Affairs Committee upon which Congressman Ross ADAIR served as the ranking minority Member, I have been privileged to participate with Mr. ADAIR as a fellow delegate to a number of Interparliamentary Union conferences.

Mr. Speaker, as a representative of our Nation at these international meetings, Mr. ADAIR spoke with a great background of knowledge and experience and with the conviction which comes from a full understanding of the position of our Nation in the world and the policies which guide our Nation in the various aspects of our international relations.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to his legislative talents, I have come to know and appreciate the great spiritual dedication which has been one of Ross ADAIR's characteristic attributes. In this area and in related ventures, both Congressman ADAIR and his lovely wife, Marian, have provided leadership and direction in our Nation's Capital and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that Congressman ADAIR's service to the Nation will be continued and that he will find an appropriate outlet for his talents and his great industry. Both Mrs. McClory and I wish him and his wife well in whatever they undertake in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE PAID TO SENATOR GORE

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a valued Member of our body who is departing—ALBERT GORE of Tennessee.

Senator GORE has a long and distinguished history in the annals of Federal Government. First elected a Congressman in 1938, he served from the 76th through the 82d Congresses—a period of turbulent history for our country. In 1952 ALBERT GORE was elected to the U.S. Senate, and has served here ever since, contributing much to the Committee of Finance and Foreign Relations.

This year as we fill out our income tax forms, we can thank ALBERT GORE for his work on the Tax Reform Law of 1969. Among other things, this law contains legislation by the Senator from Tennessee that will eventually raise personal deductions to $750 per person.

ALBERT GORE was a man of peace, but he never flinched from fighting for the civil rights of our disadvantaged blacks, browns, and American Indians. His work and speeches in this field show a deep-felt concern for our minorities, tempered by a persuasive quiet dignity.

We shall all miss Senator GORE's strength and wisdom on Capitol Hill. I know, however, that our country will be better for the high level of achievement that ALBERT GORE will continue to exert as he enters private life. We all wish him well in his new endeavors.

FAREWELL TO MEMBERS OF THE NEW YORK DELEGATION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I acknowledge the departure from this body of several distinguished Members from New York. They will be missed when the 92d Congress convenes and they deserve to be remembered for the excellent service they gave to their constituents, their State and their country.

One colleague who will be sorely missed in the new Congress is my good friend JACOB H. GILBERT. He has always been a source of inspiration and wisdom. As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Majority Committee on Committees he has always shown good judgment and a high sense of responsibility. His departure from this body will be a loss for all of us.

Another Member whose departure will be felt by all of us is ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN. While only a freshman, Congressman LOWENSTEIN has shown a special kind of inspiration and deep devotion to public service. He is an exciting, able individual who has shown a remarkable ability to channel the productive energies of young people into the political system.

We will also miss LEONARD FARBSTEIN a long-time friend whom I have come to know even better since my assignment to the Foreign Affairs Committee 2 years ago. Congressman FARBSTEIN has shown on the committee the insight, concern, and creative thinking that has made him so fine a Member of this body.

Another long-term New York Congressman who will not be back in the 92d Congress is ADAM C. POWELL. Congressman POWELL leaves a fine legacy of important legislation passed under his chairmanship of the Education and Labor Committee. For many years he was an important community leader in New York City, in addition to his role as Congressman, and he should not leave without some recognition of the services he has performed.

There are two Congressmen who are leaving this week who came into Congress when I did 6 years ago. I speak of RICHARD OTTINGER and RICHARD MCCARTHY, both of whom gave up their secure seats in this body to seek other office.

These are two bright, energetic, young Members whose careers, I trust, are only being interrupted and not ended.

To all of these men I want to say what a special pleasure it has been for me to work with you. And I want to add perhaps the most important point of all—the service you rendered while you were here will not be forgotten. Thank you, good luck and Godspeed.

AMERICA AS A GUN CULTURE

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of House passage of legislation, which I opposed, weakening the reporting provisions of the 1968 Gun Control Act, a most comprehensive and interesting article in American Heritage caught my attention. It is entitled "America as a Gun Culture," and was authored by the distinguished American historian, Richard Hofstadter. It reviews the history of America's fascination with firearms, and speculates with, I think, great insight about the sources of that fascination.

I certainly concur with Mr. Hofstadter's concluding observation that "the purchase and possession of guns in the United States is controlled by a chaotic jungle of 20,000 State and local laws that collectively are wholly inadequate to the protection of the people and that operate in such a way that areas with poor controls undermine those with better ones." He also concludes, however, that "a nation that could not devise a system of gun control after its experiences of the 1960's, and at a moment of profound popular revulsion against guns, is not likely to get such a system in the calculable future," and that, I hope, will not prove to be true.

I recommend this piece from the October 1970 issue of American Heritage most enthusiastically, and am pleased to provide it for the RECORD:

AMERICA AS A GUN CULTURE

(By Richard Hofstadter)

Senator Joseph Tydings of Maryland, appealing in the summer of 1968 for an effective gun-control law, lamented: "It is just tragic that in all of Western civilization the United States is the one country with an insane gun policy." In one respect this was an understatement: Western or otherwise, the United States is the only modern industrial urban nation that persists in maintaining a gun culture. It is the only industrial nation in which the possession of rifles, shotguns, and handguns is lawfully prevalent among large numbers of its population. It is the only such nation that has been impelled in recent years to agonize at length about its own disposition toward violence and to set up a commission to examine it, the only nation so attached to the supposed "right" to bear arms that its laws abet assassins. professional criminals, berserk murderers, and political terrorists at the expense of the orderly population—and yet it remains, and is apparently determined to remain, the most passive of all the major countries in the matter of gun control. Many otherwise intelligent Americans cling with pathetic stubbornness to the notion that the people's right to bear arms is the greatest protection of their individual rights and a firm safeguard of democracy—without being in the slightest perturbed by the fact that no other democracy in the world observes any such "right" and that in some democracies in which citizens' rights are rather better protected than in ours, such as England and the Scandinavian countries, our arms control policies would be considered laughable.

Laughable, however, they are not, when one begins to contemplate the costs. Since strict gun controls clearly could not entirely prevent homocides, suicides, armed robberies, or gun accidents, there is no simple way of estimating the direct human cost, much less the important indirect political costs, of having lax gun laws. But a somewhat incomplete total of firearms fatalities in the United States as of 1964 shows that in the twentieth century alone we have suffered more than 740,000 deaths from firearms, embracing over 265,000 homicides, over 330,000 suicides, and over 139,000 gun accidents. This figure is considerably higher than all the battle deaths (that is, deaths sustained under arms but excluding those from disease) suffered by American forces in all the wars in our history. It can, of course, be argued that such fatalities have been brought about less by the prevalence of guns than by some intangible factor, such as the wildness and carelessness of the American national temperament, or by particular social problems, such as the intensity of our ethnic and racial mixture. But such arguments cut both ways, since it can be held that a nation with such a temperament or such social problems needs stricter, not looser, gun controls.

One can only make a rough guess at the price Americans pay for their inability to arrive at satisfactory controls for guns. But it can be suggested in this way: there are several American cities that annually have more gun murders than all of England and Wales. In Britain, where no one may carry a firearm at night, where anyone who wants a long gun for hunting must get a certificate from the local police chief before he can buy it, and where gun dealers must verify a buyer's certificate, register all transactions in guns and ammunition, and take the serial number of each weapon and report it to the police, there are annually about .05 gun homicides per 100,000 population. In the United States there are 2.7. What this means in actual casualties may be suggested by the figures for 1963, when there were 5,126 gun murders in the United States, twenty-four in England and Wales, and three in Scotland. This country shows up about as badly in comparative gun accidents and, to a lesser degree, in suicides. There is not a single major country in the world that approaches our record in this respect.

Americans nowadays complain bitterly about the rising rate of violent crime. The gun is, of course, a major accessory of serious premeditated crime. Appealing for stronger gun controls in 1968, President Johnson pointed out that in the previous year there had been committed, with the use of guns, 7,700 murders, 55,000 aggravated assaults, and more than 71,000 robberies. Plainly, stronger gun controls could not end crime, but they would greatly enhance enforcement of the law (as New York's Sullivan Law does) and would reduce fatalities. Out of every one hundred assaults with guns, twenty-one led to death, as compared with only three out of every one hundred assaults committed by other means. In five states with relatively strong gun laws the total homicide rate per 100,000 population—that is, homicides from all causes—runs between 2.4 and 4.8. In the five states with the weakest gun laws this rate varies from 6.1 to 10.6.

In 1969, after the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr., there was an almost touching national revulsion against our own gun culture, and for once the protesting correspondence on the subject reaching senators and representatives outweighed letters stirred up by the extraordinarily efficient lobby of the National Rifle Association. And yet all that came out of this moment of acute concern was a feeble measure, immensely disappointing to advocates of serious gun control, restricting the mail-order sales of guns. It seems clear now that the strategic moment for gun controls has passed and that the United States will continue to endure an armed populace, at least until there is a major political disaster involving the use of guns.

Today the *urban* population of the nation is probably more heavily armed than at any time in history, largely because the close of World War II left the participating countries with a huge surplus of militarily obsolescent but still quite usable guns. These could be sold nowhere in the world but in the United States, since no other country large enough and wealthy enough to provide a good market would have them. More weapons became available again in the 1950's, when NATO forces switched to a uniform cartridge and abandoned a stock of outmoded rifles. These again flooded the United States, including about 100,000 Italian Carcanos of the type with which John F. Kennedy was killed. Imported very cheaply, sometimes at less than a dollar apiece, these weapons could be sold at enormous profit but still inexpensively—the one that killed Kennedy cost $12.78.

It has been estimated that between five and seven million foreign weapons were imported into the United States between 1959 and 1963. Between 1965 and 1968 handgun imports rose from 346,000 to 1,155,000. Domestic industries that make cheap handguns are approaching an annual production of 500,000 pistols a year. Thus a nation in the midst of a serious political crisis, which has frequently provoked violence, is afloat with weapons—perhaps as many as fifty million of them—in civilian hands. An Opinion Research poll of September, 1968, showed that 34 per cent of a national sample of white families and 24 per cent of blacks admitted to having guns. With groups like the Black Panthers and right-wing cranks like the Minute Men, not to speak of numerous white vigilante groups, well armed for trouble, the United States finds itself in a situation faced by no other Western nation. One must ask: What are the historical forces that have led a supposedly well-governed nation into such a dangerous position?

It is very easy, in interpreting American history, to give the credit and the blame for almost everything to the frontier, and certainly this temptation is particularly strong where guns are concerned. After all, for the first 250 years of their history Americans were an agricultural people with a continuing history of frontier expansion. At the very beginning the wild continent abounded with edible game, and a colonizing people still struggling to control the wilderness and still living very close to the subsistence level found wild game an important supplement to their diet. Moreover, there were no enforceable feudal inhibitions against poaching by the common man, who was free to roam where he could and shoot what he could and who ate better when he shot better. Furthermore, all farmers, but especially farmers in a lightly settled agricultural country, need guns for the control of wild vermin and predators. The wolf, as we still say, has to be kept from the door.

Finally, and no less imperatively, there were the Indians, who were all too often regarded by American frontiersmen as another breed of wild animal. The situation of the Indians, constantly under new pressures from white encroachments, naturally commands

modern sympathy. But they were in fact, partly from the very desperation of their case, often formidable, especially in the early days when they were an important force in the international rivalries of England, France, and Spain in North America. Like the white man they had guns, and like him they committed massacres. Modern critics of our culture who, like Susan Sontag, seem to know nothing of American history, who regard the white race as a "cancer" and assert that the United States was "founded on a genocide," may fantasize that the Indians fought according to the rules of the Geneva Convention. But in the tragic conflict of which they were to be the chief victims, they were capable of striking terrible blows. In King Philip's War (1675–76) they damaged half the towns of New England, destroyed a dozen, and killed an estimated one out of every sixteen males of military age among the settlers. Later the Deerfield and other frontier massacres left powerful scars on the frontier memory, and in the formative days of the colonial period wariness of sudden Indian raids and semimilitary preparations to combat them were common on the western borders of settlement. Men and women, young and old, were all safer if they could command a rifle. "A well grown boy," remembered the Reverend Joseph Doddridge of his years on the Virginia frontier, "at the age of twelve or thirteen years, was furnished with a small rifle and shot-pouch. He then became a fort soldier, and had his port-hole assigned him. Hunting squirrels, turkeys and raccoons, soon made him expert in the use of his gun."

That familiarity with the rifle, which was so generally inculcated on the frontier, had a good deal to do with such successes as Americans had in the battles of the Revolution. The Pennsylvania rifle, developed by German immigrants, was far superior to Brown Bess, the regulation military musket used by British troops. This blunt musket, an inaccurate weapon at any considerable distance, was used chiefly to gain the effect of mass firepower in open field maneuvers at relatively close range. The long, slender Pennsylvania rifle, which had a bored barrel that gave the bullet a spin, had a flatter and more direct trajectory, and in skilled hands it became a precision instrument. More quickly loaded and effective at a considerable distance, it was singularly well adapted not only to the shooting of squirrels but to the woodsman's shoot-and-hide warfare. It struck such terror into the hearts of British regulars as to cause George Washington to ask that as many of his troops as possible be dressed in the frontiersman's hunting shirt, since the British thought "every such person a complete Marksman." The rifle went a long way to make up for the military inconsistencies and indifferent discipline of American militiamen, and its successes helped to instill in the American mind a conviction of the complete superiority of the armed yeoman to the military professionals of Europe.

What began as a necessity of agriculture and the frontier took hold as a sport and as an ingredient in the American imagination. Before the days of spectator sports, when competitive athletics became a basic part of popular culture, hunting and fishing probably were the chief American sports, sometimes wantonly pursued, as in the decimation of the bison. But for millions of American boys, learning to shoot and above all graduating from toy guns and receiving the first real rifle of their own were milestones of life, veritable rites of passage that certified their arrival at manhood. (It is still argued by some defenders of our gun culture, and indeed conceded by some of its critics, that the gun cannot and will not be given up because it is a basic symbol of masculinity. But the trouble with all such glib Freudian generalities is that they do not explain cultural variations: they do not tell us why men elsewhere have *not* found the gun essential to their masculinity.)

What was so decisive in the winning of the West and the conquest of the Indian became a standard ingredient in popular entertainment. In the penny-dreadful Western and then in films and on television, the western man, quick on the draw, was soon an acceptable hero of violence. He found his successors in the private eye, the F.B.I. agent, and in the gangster himself, who so often provides a semilegitimate object of hero worship, a man with loyalties, courage, and a code of his own—even in films purporting to show that crime does not pay. All mass cultures have their stereotyped heroes, and none are quite free of violence; but the United States has shown an unusual penchant for the isolated, wholly individualistic detective, sheriff, or villain, and its entertainment portrays the solution of melodramatic conflicts much more commonly than, say, the English, as arising not out of ratiocination or some scheme of moral order but out of ready and ingenious violence. Every Walter Mitty has had his moment when he is Gary Cooper, stalking the streets in *High Noon* with his gun at the ready. D. H. Lawrence may have had something, after all, when he made his characteristically bold, impressionistic, and unflattering judgment that "the essential American soul is hard, isolate, stoic, and a killer." It was the notion cherished also by Hemingway in his long romance with war and hunting and with the other sports that end in death.

However, when the frontier and its ramifications are given their due, they fall far short of explaining the persistence of the American gun culture. Why is the gun still so prevalent in a culture in which only about 4 per cent of the country's workers now make their living from farming, a culture that for the last century and a half has had only a tiny fragment of its population actually in contact with a frontier, that, in fact, has not known a true frontier for three generations? Why did the United States alone among industrial societies cling to the idea that a substantially unregulated supply of guns among its city populations is a safe and acceptable thing? This is, after all, not the only nation with a frontier history. Canada and Australia have had their's, and yet their gun control measures are far more satisfactory than ours. Their own gun homicide rates, as compared with our 2.7, range around .56, and their gun suicide and accident rates are also much lower. Again, Japan, with no frontier but with an ancient tradition of feudal and military violence, has adopted, along with its modernization, such rigorous gun laws that its gun homicide rate at .04 is one of the world's lowest. (The land of hara-kiri also has one of the lowest gun suicide rates—about one fiftieth of ours.) In sum, other societies, in the course of industrial and urban development, have succeeded in modifying their old gun habits, and we have not.

One factor that could not be left out of any adequate explanation of the tenacity of our gun culture is the existence of an early American political creed that has had a surprisingly long life, albeit much of it now is in an underground popular form. It has to do with the antimilitaristic traditions of radical English Whiggery, which were taken over and intensified in colonial America, especially during the generation preceding the American Revolution, and which became an integral part of the American political tradition. The popular possession of the gun was a central point in a political doctrine that became all but sacrosanct in the Revolution: a doctrine that rested upon faith in the civic virtue and military prowess of the yeoman; belief in the degeneration of England and in the sharp decline of "the liberties of Englishmen" on their original home soil; and a great fear of a standing army as one of the key dangers to this body of ancient liberties. The American answer to civic and military decadence, real or imagined, was the armed yeoman.

By the same reasoning the answer to militarism and standing armies was the militia system. It had long been the contention of those radical Whig writers whose works did so much to set the background of American thought, that liberty and standing armies were incompatible. Caesar and Cromwell were commonly cited as the prime historical examples of the destructive effects of political generals on the liberties of the people. The Americans became confident that their alternative device, an armed people, was the only possible solution to the perennial conflict between militarism and freedom. Their concern over the evils of repeated wars and institutionalized armies was heightened by the eighteenth-century European wars in which they were inevitably involved. Blaming the decay that they imagined to be sweeping over England in good part on the increasing role of the military in the mother country, they found their worst fears confirmed by the quartering of troops before the Revolution. John Adams saw in the Boston Massacre "the strongest proof of the danger of standing armies." The Virginian George Mason, surveying the history of the nations of the world, remarked: "What havoc, desolation and destruction have been perpetrated by standing armies!" The only remedy, he thought, reverting to one of the genial fictions of this school of thought, was the ancient Saxon militia, "the natural strength and only stable security of a free government." Jefferson reverted to the idea of a popular Saxon militia by providing in his first draft of the Virginia Constitution of 1776 that "no freeman shall ever be debarred the use of arms."

Washington, who had to command militiamen, had no illusions about them. He had seen not a single instance, he once wrote, that would justify "an opinion of Militia or raw Troops being fit for the real business of fighting. I have found them useful as light Parties to skirmish in the woods, but incapable of making or sustaining a serious attack." Despite the poor record of militia troops in the Revolution, as compared with the courage and persistence of Washington's small and fluctuating Continental Army, the myth persisted that the freedom of America had been won by the armed yeoman and the militia system, and the old fear of a standing army was in no way diminished now that it was not to be under the command of an English aristocracy but of native American generals. In the mid-1970's, when the Americans had won their independence and were living under the Articles of Confederation, Secretary of War Henry Knox found himself the administrator of an army of about seven hundred men. In the 1790's, when it was proposed under the Constitution to add only about five hundred more, Pennsylvania Democrat Senator William Maclay anxiously observed that the government seemed to be "laying the foundation of a standing army"! Only the disastrous performance of militiamen in the War of 1812 persuaded many American leaders that the militia was a slender reed upon which to rest the security of the nation.

In the meantime the passion for a popular militia as against a professional army had found its permanent embodiment in the Second Amendment to the Constitution: "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." By its inclusion in the Bill of Rights, the right to bear arms thus gained permanent sanction in the nation, but it came to be regarded as an item on the basic list of guarantees of *individual* liberties.

Plainly it was not meant as such. The right to bear arms was a *collective*, not an individual, right, closely linked to the civic need (especially keen in the absence of a sufficient national army) for "a well regulated Militia." It was, in effect, a promise that Congress would not be able to bar the states from doing whatever was necessary to maintain well-regulated militias.

The Supreme Court has more than once decided that the Second Amendment does not bar certain state or federal gun controls. In 1886 it upheld an Illinois statute forbidding bodies of men to associate in military organizations or to drill or parade with arms in cities or towns. When Congress passed the National Firearms Act of 1934 forbidding the transportation in interstate commerce of unregistered shotguns, an attempt to invoke the Second Amendment against the law was rejected by the Court in what is now the leading case on the subject, *United States v. Miller* (1939). In this case the Court, ruling on the prosecution of two men who had been convicted of violating the National Firearms Act by taking an unregistered sawed-off shotgun across state lines, concluded that the sawed-off shotgun had no "reasonable relationship to the prevention, preservation, or efficiency of a well-regulated militia." The Court ruled that since the gun in question was not part of ordinary military equipment, its use was unrelated to the common defense. The Court further found that the clear purpose of the Second Amendment was to implement the constitutional provision for "calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions" and declared that the Second Amendment "must be interpreted and applied with that end in view."

While the notion that "the right to bear arms" is inconsistent with state or federal gun regulation is largely confined to the obstinate lobbyists of the National Rifle Association, another belief of American gun enthusiasts enjoys a very wide currency in the United States, extending to a good many liberals, civil libertarians, and even radicals. It is the idea that popular access to arms is an important counterpoise to tyranny. A historian, recently remonstrating against our gun policies, was asked by a sympathetic liberal listener whether it was not true, for example, that one of the first acts of the Nazis had been to make it impossible for the nonparty, nonmilitary citizen to have a gun—the assumption being that the German people had thus lost their last barrier to tyranny. In fact Nazi gun policies were of no basic consequence: the democratic game had been lost long before, when legitimate authorities under the Weimar Republic would not or could not stop uniformed groups of Nazi terrorists from intimidating other citizens on the streets and in their meetings and when the courts and the Reich Ministry of Justice did not act firmly and consistently to punish the makers of any Nazi *Putsch* according to law. It is not strong and firm governments but weak ones, incapable of exerting their regulatory and punitive powers, that are overthrown by tyrannies. Nonetheless, the American historical mythology about the protective value of guns has survived the modern technological era in all the glory of its naiveté, and it has been taken over from the whites by some young blacks, notably the Panthers, whose accumulations of arms have thus far proved more lethal to themselves than to anyone else. In all societies the presence of small groups of uncontrolled and unauthorized men in unregulated possession of arms is recognized to be dangerous. A query therefore must ring in our heads: Why is it that in all other modern democratic societies those endangered ask to have such men disarmed, while in the United States alone they insist on arming themselves?

A further point is of more than symptomatic interest: the most gun-addicted sections of the United States are the South and the Southwest. In 1968, when the House voted for a mild bill to restrict the mail-order sale of rifles, shotguns, and ammunition, all but a few of the 118 votes against it came from these regions. This no doubt has something to do with the rural character of these regions, but it also stems from another consideration: in the historic system of the South, having a gun was a white prerogative. From the days of colonial slavery, when white indentured servants were permitted, and under some circumstances encouraged, to have guns, blacks, whether slave or free, were denied the right. The gun, though it had a natural place in the South's outdoor culture, as well as a necessary place in the work of slave patrols, was also an important symbol of white male status. Students in the Old South took guns to college as a matter of course. In 1840 an undergraduate at the University of Virginia killed a professor during a night of revelry that was frequently punctuated by gunfire. Thomas Hart Benton, later to be a distinguished Missouri senator, became involved, during his freshman year at the University of North Carolina, in a brawl in which he drew a pistol on another student and was spared serious trouble only when a professor disarmed him. He was sixteen years old at the time. In the light of the long white effort to maintain a gun monopoly, it is hardly surprising, though it may be discouraging, to see militant young blacks borrowing the white man's mystique and accepting the gun as their instrument. "A gun is status—that's why they call it an equalizer," said a young Chicago black a few years ago. "What's happening today is that everybody's getting more and more equal because everybody's got one."

But perhaps more than anything else the state of American gun controls is evidence of one of the failures of federalism: the purchase and possession of guns in the United States is controlled by a chaotic jumble of twenty thousand state and local laws that collectively are wholly inadequate to the protection of the people and that operate in such a way that areas with poor controls undermine those with better ones. No such chaos would be tolerated, say, in the field of automobile registration. The automobile, like the gun, is a lethal instrument, and the states have recognized it as such by requiring that each driver as well as each car must be registered and that each driver must meet certain specified qualifications. It is mildly inconvenient to conform, but no one seriously objects to the general principle, as gun lobbyists do to gun registration. However, as the United States became industrial and urban, the personnel of its national and state legislatures remained to a very considerable degree small town and rural, and under the seniority system that prevails in Congress, key posts on committees have long been staffed by aging members from small-town districts—worse still, from small-town districts in regions where there is little or no party competition and hence little turnover in personnel. Many social reforms have been held back long after their time was ripe by this rural-seniority political culture. Gun control is another such reform: American legislators have been inordinately responsive to the tremendous lobby maintained by the National Rifle Association, in tandem with gunmakers and importers, military sympathizers, and far-right organizations. A nation that could not devise a system of gun control after its experiences of the 1960's, and at a moment of profound popular revulsion against guns, is not likely to get such a system in the calculable future. One must wonder how grave a domestic gun catastrophe would have to be in order to persuade us. How far must things go?

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 91ST CONGRESS: REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE FOURTH DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today we are ending what has been one of the longest and hardest working Congresses in the history of this country. It has also been one of the most productive and socially responsible Congresses in the 22 years during which it has been my pleasure to represent the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin.

The intense effort exerted by the 91st Congress to meet the serious domestic and international problems facing our country was reflected in hours and hours of debate on the House and Senate floors and in a record number of rollcall votes on proposals to combat these problems.

Presidential vetoes of important bills and obstructionist tactics such as filibusters in the Senate unfortunately reduced the accomplishments of the 91st Congress. Nonetheless, a number of landmark achievements were realized, including major tax reforms, stringent air and water pollution control measures, postal reform, legislative reorganization and occupational health and safety standards.

Significant improvements were also made in Federal programs to improve the health and upgrade the education of Americans, to improve passenger train service, and to combat crime, drug abuse, and the problems of our cities.

PROGRESS IN OTHER AREAS

Regrettably, action was not completed on such important measures as a further increase in social security benefits, creation of an independent consumer protection agency, welfare reforms, a supplemental national health insurance plan, electoral college reform, and measures to aid workers and industries hurt by sharp increases in imports. However, further action on these issues is expected early in the 92d Congress.

A comprehensive manpower program designed to combat our unemployment problems and keep able-bodied persons off the welfare rolls was approved by an overwhelming majority in Congress, but was vetoed by the President. Unfortunately, the 48 to 35 Senate vote to override the President's veto of the bill was short of the two-thirds majority which was needed.

The President's action in vetoing this bill came as a particular disappointment in view of its potential value in easing unemployment, improving job training programs and providing manpower which could be used effectively in the future. The 92d Congress will undoubtedly take this matter up early in the session.

Another vetoed bill which had strong support in Congress and will also receive further action would limit political spending by candidates for public office.

Approval of comprehensive campaign spending limitations is absolutely necessary in order to prevent only the rich from entering politics.

THE ECONOMY

Congress has given the President temporary authority to impose wage, price, rent and interest controls in order to combat inflation. The President has refused to use this authority, or even to issue any kind of wage-price guidelines. However, there have been some recent indications that the President is now realizing that his reliance on a tight money policy has not been effective in combating inflation, but has increased unemployment to a distressingly high level and has been instrumental in generating an actual decline in our national production this year.

Hopefully, the President will now take steps to use the great influence of his office to improve our economic well-being and certainly Congress will continue to consider and act on effective measures in this area.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES

Among other bills vetoed by the President was one providing needed funds for Federal education programs. The reason given for this veto was the "inflationary effect" the bill would supposedly have on the economy. I was pleased that Congress overrode this veto, thereby asserting that although unneeded Federal spending was undesirable and could be inflationary, Federal funds can and must continue to be provided to accomplish those goals at the top of our list of national priorities.

In spite of pressing national needs for more funding in certain problem areas, Congress was able to cut $1.7 billion from the President's fiscal 1971 request for funds. Actually, a total of $2.1 billion was cut from the defense budget and from less important areas of Federal spending. However, $453 million was added by Congress for such vital programs as education, housing and health.

PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT

Particularly outstanding among the achievements of the 91st Congress was its action to protect and improve the quality of our environment.

The Clean Air Act amendments are designed to take strong steps against air pollution by requiring complete reduction of automobile exhaust emissions which cause much of our air pollution. These provisions require that car manufacturers produce virtually pollution-free automobile engines by 1975. Further, they authorize new funds for research and for enforcement of air quality standards, as well as new antipollution regulations for automobile fuels and for aircraft engines and fuels.

As a sponsor of legislation designed to curb aircraft noise I was particularly pleased that the Clean Air Act amendments will establish an Office of Noise Abatement and Control within the Environmental Protection Agency. This office will investigate noise pollution, including sonic booms, and will make recommendations to Congress and the President next year.

Continued Federal assistance for the development of a supersonic transport plane—SST—was severely challenged in the 91st Congress, both because of uncertainty about whether the SST would add to our already serious air and noise pollution problems and because other programs of a higher priority appeared to be more worthy of the limited Federal funds available.

I supported and voted for a discontinuance of further funding for the SST at this time. As a compromise measure, funding for the SST has been extended only until March.

Congress approved legislation to strengthen Federal water pollution control programs and to combat pollution from oil spills. This legislation also provides for a Great Lakes water pollution control demonstration.

Other measures enacted will promote education in environmental quality, provide for research in the area of solid waste disposal and recycling of materials, establish a Youth Conservation Corps and extend the land and water conservation fund. In addition, the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, authorized by a bill which I cosponsored, brings overdue recognition to this beautiful area of Wisconsin.

VETERANS

Our Nation's veterans received particular attention in the 91st Congress. Measures approved in recognition of the services rendered by members of our Armed Forces represent a special tribute to the dedication of these men and women.

Our progressive withdrawal from direct military involvement in Southeast Asia is of course a welcome development. However, many of the problems of veterans of this war remain with us and have brought about a greater understanding of the needs of veterans of past wars.

In fiscal 1971 Congress approved an additional $105 million in Federal funds to increase the quality and availability of medical care for veterans. Steps were also taken to insure that all possible employment and other readjustment aid was provided to returning Vietnam veterans. In addition, legislation was approved which increases pension payments and income limitations for veterans and their dependents or survivors.

Disability compensation payments for veterans were increased an average of 11 percent by a bill which also affords former prisoners of war compensation for disabilities related to their imprisonment.

In a further effort to aid the dependents of those servicemen who are still prisoners of war or missing in action, Congress authorized educational benefits and home loan assistance to these persons. Liberalized educational assistance for servicemen was also authorized.

THE CONTINUING TASK

These and other actions represent significant accomplishments by the 91st Congress—politically motivated charges to the contrary notwithstanding. Nonetheless, much work remains for the 92d Congress.

It is my sincere hope that a continued realization of the seriousness and urgency of the problems which face us in the 1970's and a strong commitment to find effective solutions for these problems will characterize the 92d Congress as it undertakes this work.

A listing of some of the major actions of the 91st Congress follows:

VOTING RECORD OF CONGRESSMAN CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, 91ST CONGRESS

Position	Issue	Status
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Voted for	$1,700,000,000 reduction in nonessential Federal spending to curb inflation and reduce the tax burden	Became law.
Do	Measures to combat inflation and unemployment, including broad authority for President to impose wage, price, rent, and credit restrictions if necessary.	Do.
Cosponsored	Tax reform legislation to close tax loopholes and reduce the tax burden by more than $9,000,000,000	Do.
Sponsored	An increase in the personal and dependency income tax exemptions	Do.
Voted against	Extension of surtax at reduced rate of 5 percent until June 1970	Do.
Voted for	Increased funds to bring decent housing within the reach of more Americans and to help solve urban problems	Do.
Do	Making more money available in the home mortgage market to promote homeownership and bring down interest rates	Do.
Do	Increased funds for Federal loans to small businesses	Do.
Do	Measures to help American workers and industries hurt by sharp increases in foreign imports	Passed House, failed action in Senate.
Cosponsored	Legislation to promote Great Lakes shipping	Became law.
Voted for	Safeguards to protect investors from brokerage firm bankruptcies	Do.
Do	Earlier collection of estate and gift taxes, continuation of telephone and automobile excise taxes	Do.
Do	Continuation of Federal-aid highway program	Do.
Do	Additional relief for victims of major natural disasters	Do.

VOTING RECORD OF CONGRESSMAN CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, 91ST CONGRESS—Continued

Position	Issue	Status
	CONSUMER PROTECTION AND CRIME CONTROL	
Cosponsored	Creation of an independent Consumer Protection Agency	Passed Senate, failed action in House.
Sponsored	Legislation to protect consumers against false or malicious credit reports	Became law.
Do	Measures to curb the flow of mail-order pornography	Do.
Voted for	Extension of National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act	Do.
Do	Toy Safety Act to keep hazardous toys off the market	Do.
Do	Strengthened Meat Inspection Act	Do.
Do	Comprehensive program to increase the capacity and safety of the Nation's airports and airways	Do.
Do	Improved safeguards against airline hijacking	Do.
Do	Measures to improve passenger train service and railroad safety	Do.
Do	Increased aid to States and cities for law enforcement and crime prevention efforts	Do.
Do	Strong Federal measures to combat organized crime	Do.
Consponsored	Creation of a House Select Committee on Crime to study all aspects of crime in the United States	Approved and operating.
Voted for	Additional Federal judges and circuit court administrators to handle the criminal caseload	Became law.
Do	Repeal of provisions of the Gun Control Act requiring records of sales of shotgun and rifle ammunition used by hunters	Do
	POLLUTION CONTROL, CONSERVATION, AND AGRICULTURE	
Voted for	Strong measures to combat air pollution, including regulations on automobile and aircraft engine exhaust emissions	Became law.
Do	Improved water quality standards and authorization of a Great Lakes pollution control demonstration project	Do.
Do	Increased funds to aid communities in building sewage treatment facilities	Do.
Do	Establishment of an Environmental Quality Council to study and make recommendations in the area of environmental pollution	Do.
Cosponsored	Creation of an Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in Wisconsin	Do.
Do	Additional funds for the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in Wisconsin	Do.
Voted for	Creation of a Youth Conservation Corps	Do.
Do	Prohibition against the importation of endangered species of fish and wildlife	Do.
Do	Limitations on the amount of Federal crop payments that may be received by an individual farmer	Do.
	EDUCATION AND LABOR	
Voted for	Increases in Federal aid to education funds	Became law despite President's veto.
Do	Extension of aid to public and private nonprofit schools	Became law.
Do	Action to make more guaranteed student loans available to college and vocational school students	Became law.
Cosponsored	Legislation to improve educational programs in public and private nonprofit child day care centers	Hearings in House.
Voted for	Revision of the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts to help more disadvantaged children	Became law.
Do	Extension of special program to encourage the consumption of milk by children in schools and day care centers	Do.
Do	Comprehensive program to promote the health and safety of American workers	Do.
Do	Strengthened coal mine health and safety regulations	Do.
Do	Extension of unemployment insurance benefits during periods of high unemployment; extension of coverage to an additional 4,800,000 workers.	Do.
Supported	Additional Federal laws to protect those who contribute to private pension plans	Hearings in House.
Cosponsored	Manpower Act to help provide the opportunity for appropriate training and employment to every American and to help provide needed public services.	Vetoed by President.
	SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE	
Voted for	15 percent across-the-board increase in social security benefits effective Jan. 1. 1970	Became law.
Do	Further increases in social security benefits and improvements in the social security and medicare programs	Died in Conference.
Sponsored	Reduced social security benefits for retirees at age 60	Pending in House.
Voted for	Expanded Older Americans Act programs to aid senior citizens	Became law.
Supported	Supplemental national health insurance program	Hearings in Senate.
Voted for	3-year program of drug abuse prevention and control, including funds for rehabilitation of drug users	Became law.
Do	3-year program to help relieve a shortage of doctors in general practice	Vetoed by President.
Do	An additional $210,000,000 to help improve the quality of health care available	Became law.
Do	Continuation of grant and loan programs to build or modernize hospitals and emergency rooms	Became law despite President's veto.
Do	Comprehensive program to prevent and treat alcoholism	Became law.
Voted against	Legislation expanding the family planning and population research activities of the Federal Government	Do.
Cosponsored	Requirement that abortions in military hospitals could be performed only in accord with the laws of the State in which the hospital was located.	Pending in House.
Voted for	Stronger health warning on cigarette packages, prohibition of cigarette advertising on radio and television	Became law.
Cosponsored	National minimum standards and eligibility requirements to help curb welfare abuses	Passed by House, failed action in Senate.
Voted for	2-year extension of the antipoverty program	Became law.
Do	Expansion and reform of food stamp program	Do.
Do	Strengthened law to prevent inhumane treatment of animals	Do.
Do	Welfare reforms to make the program more adequate to those in real need and less costly in relation to benefits received	Passed by House, failed action in Senate.
	GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION	
Voted for	Replacement of the electoral college with a direct popular election of the President and Vice President	Passed by House, failed action in Senate.
Do	More efficient congressional procedures, as recommended by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress	Became law.
Do	An extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965	Do.
Do	Legislation lowering the voting age to 18 years	Do.
Sponsored	Establishment of a residence hall for congressional pages	Do.
Voted for	Creation of a U.S. Postal Service to improve postal operations	Do.
Do	Census reform bill including further protections against illegal disclosure of information	Passed by House, failed action in Senate.
	SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS, NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SPACE	
Sponsored	Prohibition of assignment to a combat area for a serviceman when another member of his immediate family has been killed, captured, or disabled in a combat area.	Implemented by Defense Department.
Cosponsored	Continuation of health benefits for survivors of a serviceman killed in a hostile fire area such as Vietnam	Passed by House and Senate in different versions.
Voted for	Liberalized educational assistance for veterans	Became law.
Do	Additional $105,000,000 to increase the quality and availability of medical care for veterans	Do.
Do	Pension increases and additional income exclusions for veterans and their dependents or survivors	Do.

Position	Issue	Status
	SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS, NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SPACE—Continued	
Voted for	11-percent increase in disability compensation, liberalization of program for former prisoners of war	Became law.
Do	Extension of educational benefits and home loan assistance to dependents of those who are prisoners of war or missing in action	Do.
Do	Creation of a lottery system for the draft and reduction of draft vulnerability to 1 year	Do.
Supported	Further reforms in the selective service system	Pending in House and Senate.
Voted for	Approval of initial deployment of a modified ABM system	Became law.
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Sponsored	Resolution requiring the President to report to Congress whenever he committed U.S. forces abroad without prior congressional approval and reaffirming the constitutional power of Congress to declare war	Passed by House.
Cosponsored	Resolution indicating House support for the President's efforts to negotiate a just peace in Vietnam	Do.
Sponsored	Resolution calling for the humane treatment and early release of American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front.	Passed by House and Senate.
Voted for	Resolution commending American servicemen for their efforts and sacrifices, especially veterans of Vietnam action	Passed by House.
Sponsored	Resolution urging U.S. ratification of Geneva Protocol regarding chemical and biological warfare	Hearings in House.
Do	High priority in strategic arms limitations talks with Soviet Union for a moratorium on the testing of multiple warhead missiles (MIRV's)	Favorably reported in House.
Voted for	Extension and revision of U.S. economic and military aid programs to developing countries	Became law.
Do	Increased U.S. participation in the International Development Association	Do.
Sponsored	Authority to open U.S. Information Agency materials distributed abroad to public inspection	Pending in House.
Do	Inquiry into U.S. military assistance training programs	Hearings in House.

ROLLCALL RECORD OF CONGRESSMAN CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, 91ST CONGRESS

Session	Total roll and quorum calls	Rollcalls	Not voting [1]	Quorum calls	Absent on Quorum [2]
1st	353	177	1	176	6
2d	459	266	15	193	13

[1] Paired on rollcall votes when possible; excused when on official business.

[2] Absence on quorum call does not necessarily mean an entire legislative day's absence.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE ROSE McCONNELL LONG

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I never had the pleasure of knowing Mrs. Rose McConnell Long personally, but one of my most vivid memories of her was the courageous manner in which she departed for Washington to fill the unexpired term of her husband, the late Senator Huey B. Long. Mrs. Long's service in the U.S. Senate is well documenetd, but what is not so well documented is the fact that she was the source of much inspiration to the people of Shreveport where she and the Senator had made their home.

Those who knew her better than I can attest to her quiet charm and dignity. Over th years many news media have made exhaustive efforts to bring her back into the public eye by having her reminisce, but it was to her credit that despite her enormous knowledge of the remarkable era in which she played such a significant role, it was never her mission to capture any of the spotlight for herself.

Louisiana has lost ont only an important personage of a tremendous era, but all of us have lost an example of what true character combined with public service is all about. I join those who knew her and those who did not, in extending my heartfelt sympathy to her distinguished son, the junior Senator from Louisiana, as well as the other members of this family which has long been in the forefront with those who have made it their business to make Louisiana a better place in which to live.

TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the departure from Washington of Speaker McCormack removes one of the commanding figures in the political history of this century. Not many men serve continuously in one legislative body for 42 years; only one man has exceeded his time of service as Speaker. No one has been so single-minded in his devotion to his two constituencies; the Members of the House and the people of Boston.

It is impossible to study the history of our times without detecting repeatedly the tenacity and skill of JOHN McCORMACK. Those of us who are Democrats are particularly conscious of his abilities. He came to Congress in the year that Al Smith ran for President. He became majority leader in 1940 and served, with but two brief interruptions, until 1962. When the voters had their brief lapses of affection for the Democrats in 1946 and 1952, JOHN McCORMACK showed equal skill as a leader of the opposition within Congress. All of us in both parties know how large an influence he has carried in most of the landmark legislation since 1933; he has known how to blend his strong political convictions with the art of effective compromise and practical achievement. There is no one among us who has shared so long and so significantly in such a large segment of our national destiny. He has never sought to escape the responsibilities of the offices he has held and he has never failed in moments of crisis and decision.

Above all, JOHN McCORMACK has never lost the capacity to feel and to express the moods and hopes of the people. As his career has progressed and his position in public life heightened, he has always kept his mind and heart attuned to the realities of our common existence and national purpose. Though the roster of his achievements and the obligations of his office have never ceased to grow, his sympathies and understanding have never lost their moorings in a life of sturdy service and faith in his fellow men.

We all wish to him and his beloved wife, many more years of happiness in the private life they now enter together.

HON. JOHN McCORMACK

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was the Speaker's final wish, as he so eloquently expressed it, to be remembered as "the Member's Speaker." It is not mere coincidence that his wish coincides with what was, and is, in the minds of all Members who have been fortunate enough to have served with him and to call him their Speaker.

As one who has known JOHN McCORMACK for almost 40 years, and who has known him most intimately during his speakership, I can attest to his unfaltering dedication to the prerogatives, requests, and problems of the individual Members of this House. As the Speaker himself stated:

He has protected the rights and dignities of every Member "under the rules of the House—and a little bit beyond the rules of the House, if necessary."

JOHN MCCORMACK's concern for Members transcended his official relationship with them, and became a personal commitment to each of the countless Members who sought him out. The door of his office, his mind, and his heart have always been open to me, and for that I shall be forever grateful.

The Speaker has totally served the Members of this House and, through them, the people of this Nation and of the world.

NATIONWIDE PAPERS LAND RUSSIAN TOUR

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the belligerence of the Soviet Government is evident in its anti-American foreign affairs, persecution of Jews and Christians within the Soviet Union, and direction of Communist aggression in the Middle East and Southeast Asia, an objective attitude must be maintained concerning U.S.-Soviet relations.

The Homewood-Flossmoor Viking Chorus from my Illinois district toured the Soviet Union last spring and has been lauded as one of the most effective ambassadors of our country in recent years.

This point was dramatized in an article appearing in the Homewood-Flossmoor Star reporting on the favorable impression the Homewood-Flossmoor Viking Choir received on their tour of the Soviet Union:

NATIONWIDE PAPERS LAUD RUSSIAN TOUR

Newspapers in 32 states have carried comment to date about the Russian tour of the Viking choir of Homewood-Flossmoor high school last spring.

A syndicated article has appeared in Alabama, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia and Wisconsin.

Heads put on the article by newspapers included "There's Nothing Wrong with America," "Choir Credit to the Nation," "Promises a Punch in Nose," "Good Little Ambassador," "Well Done Teenagers," "Give Credit Where Due," "They Won By Singing," "Well Done Viking Choir," "Music, Universal Voice," "Great Ambassadors," "Young Americans in Russia," "Other Side of the Coin," and "Well Done."

Distributed to some 10,000 newspapers by Industrial News Review, the article stated:

"While rioters were stealing the headlines in the United States, a group of high school students from Flossmoor, Ill., stole the hearts of Russians during a singing tour that included not only the USSR but the Netherlands and Austria."

"Frank Starr, chief of the Moscow bureau of the Chicago Tribune, said of the 108 members of the Viking choir, "They came to Russia to sing, and sing they did . . . with gusto, spirit, and sensitivity, the choir sang spirituals, pop songs, gypsy songs, and songs from the musical show, 'Hair.'

"According to Starr, the group sang Russian songs to the Russians in Russian.

"The Vikings made their trip to the USSR during Easter vacation at their own expense and are believed to be the first American high school choir to tour the Soviet Union. The tour was termed a great success, and an official of the Institute for Soviet-American Relations called the young singers 'great little ambassadors of your great and proud country.'

"The students themselves came home with a new appreciation of their own country. One young member of the singing group seemed to express the general feeling when he said, 'Anybody that says anything's wrong with America in the next six months gets a punch in the nose.'

"The Vikings were welcomed home with expressions of praise for a job well done. Although they may not be fully aware of it, they won the gratitude of Americans for the manner on which they presented their country in what must have been a difficult undertaking."

SPEECH ON CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SPEECH ON CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

I. THE CONGRESS

A. Its importance

The United States Congress is one of the most successful political institutions in the world today.

That may sound like an odd statement to make in January 1971—right after the U.S. Congress has been the subject of intense criticism. One newspaper article, typical of many, headlined an article on the Congress this way: "What ails it, and is it fatal?" Another screamed: "Is the Congress obsolete?"

Or, as a constituent wrote to me the other day, "Just what in the world have you clowns been doing down there in Washington?"

The U.S. Congress is accustomed to such remarks.

Mark Twain spoke of the U.S. Congress with a happy and malicious gleam in his eye. He would begin his lectures by saying, "Now suppose you were an imbecile, and suppose you were a Congressman, but I repeat myself."

Will Rogers, of course, had his time at bat, too. He would grumble that comedians could hardly make a living any more because their audiences were so busy laughing themselves to death over the antics of Congress. Someone asked him one time if he had any competition as a comedian and his response was, "Only when Congress is in session."

And, of course, a favorite of just about everybody is the idea that after a Congressman has served one term he should return home and try making a living under the laws he helped pass.

In the course of my remarks I'll be making some criticisms of the U.S. Congress.

It is important for you to remember that—in spite of the criticisms and the humor—the Congress has helped create a Nation more free than any other.

It is the most powerful and most respected representative assembly in the world.

It has met the great tests of American history—wars, depressions, internal strife, and even Civil War.

It is the depository of the people's power, and the image of their wisdom.

In the words of Alexander Hamilton, It is in the Congress that "the people govern".

The Congress stands as a great creation of free men. Its historic mission is—not efficiency in government, as some would insist—but the maintenance of freedom, and measured against that test, the Congress has performed its mission satisfactorily.

B. Its function

The work, the responsibility, of the Congress is enormous, and it is expanding at an accelerating rate.

In the first Congress there were 144 bills introduced. In the 91st Congress just completed, there were 25,215 bills introduced, about 175 times as many as the first Congress.

Back in 1789 to 1791 the Congress worked with a budget of $4.3 million. The expenditures for the 91st Congress will be $210.3 billion or 49,000 times more than in the first Congress.

A Congressman in 1790 represented 30,000 people. Today he represents about 470,000, or 16 times the 1790 figure.

In the early days of the republic, and well into the last century, a well informed Congressman need only acquaint himself with a half dozen major issues at most. Today it is virtually impossible for any Congressman to be expert in more than a fraction of the legislation of a typical Congress.

1. Lawmaking

The first function of the Congress is to make laws.

Lawmaking is really the reconciliation of disparate views and the management of conflict in our country.

In a democratic society the purpose of government is to soften tension and strife and to enable groups and individuals to more nearly obtain the kind of life they wish to live.

This is an exceedingly difficult role but absolutely essential. The tension and strife within a country of 210 million have to be adjusted, harmonized, accommodated. Large groups of people and individuals cannot be allowed to be disaffected from their government. There must be some procedure for wrongs to be righted and grievances redressed. There are already too many examples in today's world of people reacting violently to a government which has become an instrument of oppression.

The Congress plays an indispensable role in working out accommodation on particuar issues. There are 435 Congressman and 100 Senators. Congressman represent districts as diverse as Manhattan Island (with its four square miles) and the state of Alaska (with its 570,000 square miles).

Every Congressional district has a unique background, different needs, interests, prejudices. Each is entitled to be represented in the Congress and to have its views and grievances aired. The Congress must satisfy a nation, not just a fraction of a nation.

Let me give you an illustration of this role of the Congress in managing conflict.

There are 25 million Negroes and many white people in this country who want equality of treatment today for all Americans.

But at the same time, there are other millions of Americans who want a slowdown in the process of applying the greater equality promised by our Declaration of Independence. These people believe we have gone too fast in trying to achieve equality of opportunity. They believe that the drive for equal opportunity has been too vigorously pursued and that there is real danger to the stability and order of the Nation.

These conflicting views clash head on. Government and society have to reconcile and accommodate them, and it's not an easy thing to do.

The lawmaking function of the Congress in this context is the management of conflict. It must soften tension and strife.

Or another example. How do we divide the resources of this nation between young people and elderly people? There are almost 25 million people in this country over 65 years of age. They want adequate self-respecting systems of social insurance (social security).

On the other hand, there are almost 70 million people who are under the age of 20 and they want access to higher education. More than 100,000 of our brightest high school students in this nation every year are not able to go to college.

This nation's resources, as vast as they may be, are limited. We can't provide everything that both groups want with available resources.

The Congress, through its lawmaking function, tries to reconcile the differences.

Sometimes the Congress avoids conflict, sometimes it postpones conflict, sometimes it evades conflict. But in each of these steps the Congress furnishes a catharsis for the American people.

2. Education

Congress fulfills other roles, too. In the process of lawmaking the Congress:

Educates.

It reflects public opinion.

It helps create public opinion.

It focuses public attention on the pros and the cons of a given proposal.

It helps people to understand the need for action.

It helps people to understand the alternative proposals to resolve a particular problem.

3. Oversight

Another major function of the Congress is oversight. Making certain that legislative programs are properly administered by the Executive Branch. Many people believe that this is becoming the chief function of the modern Congress.

There are roughly 70 departments and agencies in the Federal government. In the interest of efficiency, economy, responsiveness, these departments and agencies need a continuing critical review by the Congress. The Congress exercises its oversight function through:

Its lawmaking power;

By the power of the purse; and

By investigation.

4. Representative

Another role of the Congress is to serve constituents and to communicate with them. This function is not even hinted at in the Constitution and yet it has become increasingly significant in recent years.

The Congress serves as a vital link between a vast government in Washington and the people of the nation. Nothing is more important than that an individual believe that he has ready access to his government and that he can get a speedy reply when he needs it.

Probably the most pressing day to day demands for the time of a Congressman are not directly linked to the lawmaking function. They come from constituent requests.

C. Its Character

The Congress is really a microcosm of the people of the United States. It has their virtues and their faults—humor, tragedy, high endeavor, horse-trading, industrious, tired.

At times it is strong and able; at other times, confused and timid.

The Congress is not a museum, or a monument—although the crowds that stream to it might make you think so.

It is a very human institution.

Often it acts with wisdom.

Sometimes it acts foolishly.

In 1842, Samuel F. B. Morse asked Congress for an appropriation of $30,000 to finance an experiment with his electric telegraph. Some members of the Congress hooted at the proposal. In a facetious manner, one wanted to approve it only if the money could be used to build a railroad to the moon.

D. Its members

Great men have come and gone in the United States Congress and some very small men, too.

Through the Congress have walked some of the giants of American history:

James Madison, who wrote the Bill of Rights.

Albert Gallatin. the fiscal wizard.

Fisher Ames, one of the most eloquent men in the history of the nation.

John C. Calhoun.

Daniel Webster.

Henry Clay, giants of the 19th century.

The Congress has had some colorful figures, too:

Davey Crockett of Tennessee, the frontiersman.

John Morrisey of New York, the heavyweight boxing champion of the world.

Jeremiah "Sockless Jerry" Simpson of Kansas who refused to wear socks.

James Watson of Indiana who clattered about his Congressional district in wooden shoes to impress his Dutch constituents.

"Big Tim" Sullivan, Tammany's strong-armed boss of the bowery.

But by and large the Congress is made up of men who work diligently and selflessly for the Nation, and who do not forget the solemn obligations imposed on the Congress by the Constitution.

II. CRITICISMS OF THE CONGRESS

Criticism of the Congress comes easy, and the list of criticisms is long:

Its workload is too heavy.

Its scheduling is inefficient.

Its committee chairmen are too old.

It has insufficient staff and obsolete procedures.

It spends too much time on non-policy business.

It does not use modern business equipment to facilitate its work.

It does not adequately inform the Nation of its performance and accomplishments.

It does not have a code of ethics for its Members.

Of course, criticism of the Congress is not new.

At the close of George Washington's administration Fisher Ames of Massachusetts said, "The proceedings (of the Congress) smell of anarchy".

Teddy Roosevelt, in a confidential letter to the Secretary of State, once said about the Senate that—

"More than two-thirds of the members will be found on the blackguard of the question every time."

President Wilson used to observe tartly that—

"The nation breathes easier when the Congress adjourns."

The Congress is probably the most criticized public institution in America.

If it is slow to act, it is called a do-nothing Congress. One critic defined Congress as a body of men brought together to slow down the government.

If it moves swiftly it is criticized for not giving sufficient consideration to legislation.

If it passes a lot of legislation, it is criticized for taking this country in a head-long rush toward bureaucracy, governmental control and socialism.

If it passes very little legislation, it is criticized for not meeting the urgent needs of the nation.

When this country was founded the idea was that Congress would make the laws, the President would execute them, and the Supreme Court would interpret them. Three separate but equal branches of government.

Today critics say that Congress is not even the second most influential branch of the government—it is the third.

Over the decades we have seen a profound revision of our constitutional system. It came upon us gradually. So far as I know, it was not deliberately planned. It follows the history of governments. Whoever has power and does not use it, loses it.

The Congress has been unable to use its power effectively. The President, on the other hand, has used his power with great effectiveness, and the most significant development in American governments in recent decades has been the increasing power of the Presidency.

If that trend continues, the risk is that the Congress will become impotent. My argument today is that unless major changes are made, the Congress will become ineffective.

And that would not be good for the Congress for the nation, or for you.

III. WHAT SHOULD WE DO ABOUT IT?

A. General

One evening in Washington during the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln left his stovepipe hat on a chair in Secretary of War Stanton's reception room. When he returned to reclaim it, a very fat woman rose from the chair to bow to the President. Lincoln returned the bow and then walking behind her, picked up the remains of his hat and said to the lady, "Madame, I could have told you that my hat wouldn't fit before you tried it on".

That's precisely the problem of Congress today. The Congress has tried to fit its institutional form as it has existed for many years, to the nation's massive size, diversity, and complexity in the 1970's. And it won't fit.

The Congressional apparatus today was designed for a simpler, more leisurely world.

Because the Congress has been a successful institution in dealing with the problems of that kind of world, many persons feel it can continue without change.

I am not among them. The Congress needs help. Any institution:

That is unable to approve its own budget until 6 or 7 months after the fiscal year has already begun.

That cannot, because of complex procedures, even manage a vote on the major issues of the day (Vietnam, SST, ABM) is in need of radical surgery.

The critical question, then, is: "How do we make the Congress work? How can we make the Congress become a co-equal branch of government?"

The aim must be—

To make the Congress more responsive to the majority of its Members.

To insure better deliberation.

To favor the elected leadership of the Congress and not the leadership automatically achieved by length of service.

B. Obsolete procedures

The failure of the Congress to play its full role centers on three problems:

(1) Obsolete procedures.

(2) Weak leadership.

(3) Its public conduct.

The procedures of the House are time consuming, and antiquated. They encourage delay and discourage deliberation.

(1) Filibuster

The filibuster—or unlimited debate—allows a minority of Senators to prevent action on a bill and to talk it to death. The only way to end a filibuster is for two-thirds of the Senate to vote a time limit on debate. This is called cloture.

The change that is needed is to permit a simple majority vote of the Senate to stop the filibuster.

At issue is whether the principle of majority rule will be allowed to operate in the Senate. As of today, it doesn't.

(2) Committee System

The Congress operates by the committee system. Committees are absolutely essential for the Congress to function. By the use of committees the Congress divides its enormous workloads into manageable components.

(a) Jurisdiction

Each committee has specific areas or subject matter jurisdictions which continue from year to year. But there is no review of the divisions of work so that the jurisdictions correspond with the actual problems facing the Congress.

For example, today at least ten committees work on the environment. Over 17 committees work on Foreign Affairs.

There are 268 Congressional subcommittees and over one-half claim some share of urban policy issues. And nowhere among them is there a central focal point where urban problems are considered in their entirety.

Likewise, there is no place in the Congress for consideration of a comprehensive national policy for the improvement of life in rural America.

Sharp jurisdictional lines often hinder proper consideration of urgent national problems. The Congress does not consider diplomatic and military aspects of foreign policy in a single context. The Armed Services Committee considers the military aspects and the Foreign Affairs Committee considers the diplomatic aspects.

Some of the major internal battles in the Congress occur over the question of which committee has jurisdiction. Committees are very jealous of their responsibilities and they will stand for no intrusion.

Some committees, like the Ways and Means Committee, have jurisdictions so broad, so complex, that they cannot give adequate consideration to many parts of their subject

This one committee handles all taxes, trade, unemployment compensation, social security, medicare, welfare—to name a few items on its agenda. The result is that critical problems, e.g., tax reforms—go for years without serious examination.

The Congress should restudy and revise its committee structure at least every ten years to assure that committee jurisdiction is based on functional lines and the work load is more evently distributed among committees.

There must be a regular and continuing effort to rationalize and clarify committee jurisdictions. A reduction in the number of present committees (26 in House, 21 in Senate) is probably desirable with broadened jurisdictions in each committee.

(b) Loss of perspective encouraged

Committees become advocates of their program. They develop, as one commentator put it, tunnel vision. The space committee member becomes enthralled with the space program, and tends to lose his perspective and balance as to where the space program fits among the national priorities.

It becomes a matter of pride for the chairman of the committee and members of the committee to get their program through the Congress. The committee system tends to make members become strong proponents of narrow programs and, lost in the process, is a concentrated effort to achieve the most difficult job of government—the setting of national priorities.

(c) Secrecy

Today much committee business is carried out in secrecy. This practice stifles the fundamental tenets of democracy.

Committee hearings, except possibly when final revisions ("mark ups") are being made. should be open to the maximum extent practicable, and roll call votes should be made public.

It is simply incredible to me that all House Appropriations Committee and subcommittee meetings are secret. As a member of Congress, I cannot attend an Appropriations Committee meeting. The public's business is not conducted in public under present rules.

3. Committee Staffing

Although some committees in the Congress are well staffed, often committee members find the committee staff lacking, with the result that they must rely on information from outsiders or from the Executive Branch.

Too many staff members are patronage employees—A friend of the committee chairman or ranking minority member.

The inadequacy of committee staffs gives the advantage to the Executive with its legions of employees and computers.

The solution is more and better staff to match the Executive Branch, the abandonment of political patronage on committee staffs, and equipping the staffs with modern computer capability in the gathering, storing, and retrieving of facts. If these things were achieved, committee staffs could identify and evaluate alternatives to the programs proposed by the President.

In addition, the Library of Congress needs to be expanded.

4. Financial Affairs

The weakness of Congressional procedures becomes most obvious in the way the Congress deals with the budget.

There is no organized procedure for the Congress to review the President's entire fiscal program. No committee of the Congress reviews the President's complete income and expense proposals. Expenditures are examined in detail by subcommittees but there isn't any organized overview.

The Congress fragments its decisions on the budget, and does not consider its impact on the economy, on credit markets or on the balance of payment position.

Today, the members of Congress on the appropriate committees become knowledgeable specialists on segments of the budget, but the very specialization, without the means of overview, has placed effective policy control in the hands of the Executive.

A number of changes in the handling of the budget are needed:

The Congress should get five to ten year forecasts of financial commitments it undertakes when supporting a new financial program. It should establish the ability to test in advance the relative effectiveness of alternative courses of action. Cost effectiveness is a standard management tool, but the Congress does not use it.

The awesome size and complexity of the federal budget requires major changes in the way the Congress handles it. A single forum must be given the task of an annual, comprehensive review of the entire range of fiscal and monetary issues presented by the President's budget. There are difficulties in this proposal in deciding what the forum will be, whether a joint committee, a combination of the present committees, or a new committee. Nonetheless, it is urgent that the difficulties be resolved, and the committee established.

I would prefer to see the consolidation of all fiscal affairs in a single committee in each chamber. Obviously this would concentrate enormous power in two new committees, but it is just such concentration of spending and taxing that is needed to assure the overview presently lacking and so critically needed.

The adoption of a calendar fiscal year would help improve the handling of the federal budget. For decades the Congress has fallen farther and farther behind the fiscal calendar. Today it is rather rare for appropriations to be completed when the fiscal year begins, the Congress simply cannot act on the federal budget in 6 months time. It must allow itself sufficient time for deliberation without bringing the Executive Branch to a halt.

The Congress should establish a Congressional budget each year with its own target for total spending, total lending, its own explanation and defense of national priorities.

Only if these steps are taken can the Congress become an effective counterbalance to the Executive.

5. Scheduling

The Congress works on a schedule that wastes time and causes conflict, inconvenience, and delay.

Although some improvements have been made recently, members do not have more than a few hours notice of the finish of the week's business. They cannot plan meetings with constituents in their districts with certainty. They cannot be sure how late the session will go each evening.

There is no regular provision for Congressional members to get home and see their constituents, to travel on government business, or to take family vacations. There is no certitude in scheduling floor and committee business.

Too much of the business is scheduled to suit the personal convenience of committee chairmen and those who attend their duties only in the middle of the week. Committee meetings are not scheduled to minimize conflicts for individual members. Members are given insufficient notice of scheduling.

Not long ago I was presiding over a bill in the House Chamber and, as we were finishing the bill, I learned to my amazement that the leadership had not decided what bill to consider next. I have seen occasions when we were actually voting on a bill, and even then the leadership did not know what the next item of business would be.

Congress has a full time job, and it needs a year round schedule. The schedule should provide for regular campaign and election recesses, periodic trips home, trips for government business, as well as family vacations. It should be announced early in the Congressional year.

Committee schedules should be laid out by computers to minimize time conflicts of Members, and flexibility in scheduling between floor and committee activities should be provided to reflect changing workloads during the year.

It is written in the stars somewhere that the Congress must always begin at noon?

The Congress always begins at noon, no matter how much or how little business is on the agenda.

At the beginning of the year when committee work is heavy and consideration of legislation on the floor light, the schedule should permit more time for committee business. At the end of the year, when committee work is light and there is much legislation to consider on the floor, the schedule should allow more time for consideration of legislation on the floor.

This flexibility would increase the time for deliberation and the quality of legislation.

6. Office Management

The Congress needs an office management service to help its members. Members spend far too much time on administrative and office management problems.

They need expert advice on staffing requirements, office procedures, filing systems, and equipment.

A Congressional office manager with central office services could provide automatic typewriting and machines for duplicating and mass mailings.

Office management today is a highly spe-

cialized field and few legislators are trained in it. Today the Congressman has no place to turn for advice on office management.

7. Recording floor proceedings and voting electronically

Congress does not take advantage of modern electronic equipment to facilitate its work. Every visitor is astounded to observe manual note-taking to record debates instead of electronic recording and transcribing equipment.

Voting by the call of the names of members takes a half hour, but should take a few minutes by the push of a button.

8. Nonpolicy business

The Congress spends long hours on the detail management of the District of Columbia, postmaster selection and military service academy appointments. All military academy appointments and, until recently, 21,000 postmaster appointments clear through Congressional offices. The political rewards from this custom are not commensurate with the time it consumes.

The Congress should divest itself of being a city council for the District of Columbia and grant the District home rule.

C. Leadership

Congress also needs to strengthen its leadership.

(1) Anonymous power

Part of the leadership problems is that power in the House is anonymous. It rests in the hands of a very few men, who so far as the public is concerned, are not known.

Who in this assembly can name the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee? He is one of the several most important men in the United States government. He could walk in here this afternoon and none would know him.

If we are to have open decisions, openly arrived at, then, at the very least, men with vast power must be open to public view and accountability.

Congressional authority is widely scattered, and central leadership is too weak. I do not believe the Congress will be able to meet its challenges unless the internal leadership is strengthened.

This leadership issue also includes the key problem of seniority.

(2) Seniority

Seniority is the method by which positions of power in the Congress are determined. The member with the longest continuous service becomes the chairman of the committee. The system rewards survival, it ignores merit. A Congressman moves up the ladder on the committee simply by being reelected.

In January 1970 the medium age of House Committee chairmen was 68 and 66 for Senate chairmen. The seniority system has a number of drawbacks:

Advanced age of men in positions of enormous responsibility.

They are often insensitive to public opinion.

Able, young members, whose abilities are under utilized, feel frustration.

It is essential, then, that House and Senate adopt new methods for selection of committee chairmen, based on merit rather than a rigid and automatic reliance on seniority.

To improve the system the chairman of each committee should be elected by party colleagues with consideration for merit instead of automatically for length of service.

The leaders of each party in the House could nominate the person they consider most qualified for the top job, and then all members of each party would vote on their party's nominee. If the nomination were rejected, another person would be nominated and voted on.

This procedure would give leverage to the party and its leaders in dealing with committee chairmen. Today they can safely ignore their party leaders, party platforms, and public opinion.

The Democrats have controlled Congress for most of the past 40 years. Half the major House committees and ⅔rds of the major Senate committees are chaired by veteran Southern congressmen who are often out of step with the national party.

The goal should be to make the chairmen responsible to the members of his party and to the House.

Today, the chairman of the most powerful committee in the House of Representatives is not even a member of the recognized Democratic party in his state. Yet, he occupies that position of power as a Democrat.

The majority of a political party can reasonably demand that its legislative proposals be discussed, debated, and voted on by the full House. But, many of these chairmen deal and obstruct even the opportunity to discuss and vote on the issues.

The point here is that you will never go down the road to comprehensive Congressional reform without fundamental reform within the House of political parties.

In my own party, so many of the committee chairmen are Democrats in name only, a convenient affiliation they wear at election time only. Once elected they do not support the Democratic Party.

(3) Incumbancy

Congressional leadership today is made up chiefly of men who have been in the House three and four decades. As a result, Congress is denied vitality that comes from a steady flow of new blood, energy, and ideas. Long incumbancy has several disadvantages.

It increases the incumbents ties to lobbyists.

It overrepresents special interests from the one party states and Congressional districts.

And it means less vigorous leadership as physical ability diminishes.

I support a mandatory retirement age for elected representatives. Private industry has determined that age to be 65. Certainly it should not be more than seventy.

D. Public conduct

To improve its public image the Congress should adopt standards of public conduct. Action is needed in several areas.

(1) Campaign financing

The two dominant facts of political campaigns today is that they are shockingly expensive, and most of the expenditures go unreported.

We do not know from the public record where the money comes from or how it is spent.

The system has reached the point where the public interest is endangered.

The problem a candidate faces is how to finance campaigns without becoming obligated to the rich. Although present law limits contributions from any one person to a candidate, the law is easily evaded by giving the maximum contribution to many separate committees.

Present law does not require campaign committees to report the source of their funds, so the public never knows where the money is coming from.

This country needs a more open and honest system.

We are entitled to know how much was spent for what and where the money came from.

We should have strict Federal campaign finance reporting standards, covering all committees regardless of where they operate.

Campaign costs should be limited. Elected office should not be available only to the wealthy, or to those who are willing to be obligated to the wealthy.

A candidate should be required to report anything of value he has received or which has been spent on his behalf in the campaign.

Full public disclosure of all campaign contributions and expenditures is the best available means of making campaigns honest and fair.

(2) Lobby Control

The financial stakes that develop in Federal legislation, as in the trade bill, are enormous. A sentence or two can mean millions of dollars to an industry.

The current laws simply do not adequately regulate lobbying by special interests. We are entitled to know who is spending how much money and for what. But under present law we cannot find out.

Present law is so inadequate that many groups seeking to influence legislation avoid registering.

Complete information about a lobbyist's pay and purpose should be public record.

They should be required to register and to report financial information.

The government should be given the power to investigate lobby registrations and reports to assure that lobbyists are giving the public all the information the law requires.

(3) Code of Ethics

To improve its public image, the Congress should adopt a simple, clear code of ethics.

It should cover such difficult areas of conduct as conflict of interest, financial disclosure, travel, nepotism.

(a) Conflict of interest

Congressmen are frequently criticized, sometimes with justification for maintaining private business relationships. This is the so-called "conflict of interest" problem.

Conflicts of interest should be clearly defined, and members who indulge in them should be subject to censure.

(b) Financial disclosure

I support complete financial disclosure as the most adequate solution of the problem of conflicts of interest. Perhaps the code of ethics should provide the "Jefferson rule" under which a member is obliged to step aside at the time of voting if he holds a substantial interest in the pending legislation.

(c) Travel

Although Congressmen have to travel extensively to perform their jobs with understanding, there are some who use their jobs as an excuse for the junket.

The conditions under which travel at public expense are authorized should be carefully spelled out.

(d) Nepotism

Congressmen occasionally hire qualified relatives and this presents an opportunity for public misunderstanding.

Qualifications for staff should be so rigid as to permit nepotism only when it is clearly professionally justified. The burden should be on the Member of Congress who does the hiring.

IV. SOME RECENT IMPROVEMENTS

We have made a start on Congressional reform. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 makes several worthwhile reforms, but it also shows that Congressional reform comes slow and comes hard.

The Reform Act will provide better information for Congressmen and the public, and will open to the public more of the operations of the Congress.

Congressmen will get more complete data on the Federal budget, with the help of data processing systems and an improved legislative reference service. Members will receive committee reports in advance of debate on a bill.

The public will know how each member voted in committee and how representatives voted on teller votes during floor debate. (On a teller vote, under existing procedures, Con-

gressmen file up the center aisle and are counted but not recorded by name.)

Recorded teller votes is the key achievement in the reform bill. It will prevent the present practice of voting anonymously when both parties prefer not to go on record. The result of that practice has been we have no meaningful roll call vote on Vietnam, ABM, or the Supersonic Transport plane in five years.

Major areas of reform were not covered at all by the bill, especially seniority and the filibuster rule in the Senate, scheduling of legislation and regulation of lobbying.

Both parties in the House have special committees studying seniority and minor changes can be anticipated before the next Congress convenes.

None of the top House leaders were really enthusiastic for this reform bill. The coolness was all too apparent in the snail's pace of the legislative scheduling of the bill. A $20 billion military procurement bill can be brought to the floor and passed with stringent limitation on debate in one afternoon. It took three months to get the Legislative Reorganization Bill through the House, with eleven days of debate.

CONCLUSION

I am persuaded that the winds of change are blowing in the Congress. I predict the next several years will see major reform in the U.S. Congress. My voice and vote will help it along.

Major reform is needed. But it will only come about if pressure to reform is kept on the Congress from the outside. Reform means the redistribution of power. The senior members who now hold power are reluctant to give it away. You cannot reasonably expect them to. Gouverneur Morris told the Constitutional Convention in 1787 that "the mind of man is fond of power". It was then, and it still is.

That is why pressure for reform from the outside must be unrelenting.

Let me conclude with this summary. The U.S. Congress is one of the most successful political institutions in the world today.

But it has not kept pace with the demands upon it, and unless major changes are made in the way the Congress operates, the Congress will become ineffective.

The aim must be:

To make it responsive to the majority of its members.

To make it efficient by abolishing obsolete procedures.

To insure better deliberation by strengthening the democratic process.

Only then will the Congress become a co-equal branch of government.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DODD

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is an honor to add my voice to those of many other Senators in paying tribute to a close friend and valued colleague, Senator THOMAS J. DODD. His departure from the Senate marks a close to 16 years of distinguished service to his State and Nation in the Congress of the United States. They were 16 years of achievement, a record in which Senator DODD can take great pride.

His was a record containing many singular accomplishments, but I think TOM DODD will best be remembered for his brilliant, untiring work in the critical area of crime, juvenile delinquency and drug abuse control legislation. TOM DODD managed to forge laws that were both strong and enlightened, and the Nation owes him a debt of gratitude that could never be paid in full.

TOM DODD served his State and Nation during difficult times of extremism and violence. Yet he approached the volatile problems of crime and lawlessness with wisdom. He was able to look beyond the anger and passion of the moment and discern that basic liberties as well as life and property were being endangered. And he fought to protect them all.

TOM DODD is leaving the Senate, but I hope he is not leaving public service. His ability and leadership are too important to be stifled by an election reversal. My sincere best wishes for success and happiness to TOM DODD and his wonderful wife, Grace.

THE UNITED STATES ASSAULTS THE ILO

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, during this session, the Congress, for the first time in the history of the United States, made a conscious decision to go into default on legally binding payments to an international organization by refusing to pay our dues to the International Labor Organization. I strongly opposed that decision on the floor of the House, and tried to suggest the dire implications of such action. The events leading up to it are complicated and span a number of years. Since the debate in both Houses of the Congress on the issue was very short, that background was only superficially covered.

Mr. Speaker, the January issue of the American Journal of International Law will contain an excellent editorial on this issue which reviews its background and recent developments. The author, Mr. Stephen Schwebel, is a distinguished and widely experienced international legal expert. I share Mr. Schwebel's conclusion that the cure for violation of international obligations by nondemocratic states "is not for democratic states to join in subverting international law and organization." He said further:

> Rather . . . it is for democratic states to adhere to their international obligations and to strengthen the international organizations which are so important to the implementation of those obligations.

A great many Members will, I am sure, find the facts and opinions presented by Mr. Schwebel useful, as I did. His article, "The United States Assaults the I.L.O.," follows:

THE UNITED STATES ASSAULTS THE I.L.O.

David A. Morse, after twenty-two years of distinguished service as Director General of the International Labor Office, was succeeded in May, 1970, by C. Wilfred Jenks. The election of Dr. Jenks, then Principal Deputy Director General and an official of the I.L.O. for almost forty years, although closely contested, was widely welcomed, not least by international lawyers, among whom Dr. Jenks had long been so eminent. The United States supported Dr. Jenks' election.

On July 31, 1970, Congressman John J. Rooney of New York, submitting that "this bird Jenks thinks he has inherited the ILO lock, stock and barrel . . .,"[1] concluded that "Mr. Jenks needs to be rocked. I know of only one way to rock him, cut off his water."[2] Congressman Rooney suggested that the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs telephone the Chief of the United States Mission in Geneva, "Ambassador Rimestad and tell him to hotfoot it over to Mr. Jenks and tell him before nightfall that there will be no money for the ILO . . . ."[3] Congressman Rooney did not wish the purposes of this threat to be concealed. On the contrary, he declared that ". . . Mr. Jenks should have a copy of this record air mailed to him as soon as it is printed. . . . Maybe it will help him[4] . . . . He might change his mind. I will lay odds that he eventually will."[5]

The subject of the change so to be induced in the mind of the I.L.O.'s Director General was the appointment of an Assistant Director General of Soviet nationality (who ranks eighth in the I.L.O. hierarchy, and who heads a department concerned with social security and maritime and certain other affairs). In June, in the course of a conversation with the Deputy Under Secretary for International Affairs of the U.S. Department of Labor, George H. Hildebrand, about the appointment of a U.S. national to the senior directorate of the I.L.O. (there being none with the departure of Mr. Morse), Dr. Jenks informed him of his intention also to appoint a Soviet Assistant Director General.[6] That in turn led to consultations among U.S. labor, employer and governmental representatives in the I.L.O. and to the calling of extraordinary Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on July 31, at which Congressman Rooney made the remarks quoted above.

His remarks, in turn, appear to have been stimulated by the testimony of George Meany, President of the AFL–CIO, Edwin P. Neilan, U.S. Employer Delegate to the I.L.O., and Mr. Hildebrand, who substantially supported suggestions by Congressman Rooney[7] that payment of I.L.O. assessments by the United States be cut off.[8] The purpose of withholding funds was candidly stated to be the exertion of pressure upon the Director General so as to lead him not to appoint, or to vacate the appointment, of a Soviet Assistant Director General. Mr. Neilan suggested that ". . . the delinquency [of the United States in withholding its payment] is not going to accomplish the purpose unless it is accompanied by a clear statement of the reason for it . . .";[9] whereupon Congressman Rooney remarked that the record of the Subcommittee's hearings would be airmailed to the Director General. That record manifests not only opposition to the appointment of a Soviet Assistant Director General but disapproval of what was alleged to be disproportionate Soviet influence in the International Labor Organization and in the International Labor Office. It was claimed that the Soviet Union gets what it wants in the I.L.O. by threatening to withhold its ten percent contribution to the budget; and the Subcommittee appeared to take up the suggestion that the United States would exert even more influence if those directing the I.L.O. could be brought to appreciate that the United States could withhold its twenty-five percent contribution.[10] The appointment of a Soviet representative was, in Mr.

Footnotes at end of article.

Meany's view, "the last straw." [11] Not only was the Organization inordinately influenced by the Soviet Union, in Mr. Meany's view, "It is quite obvious that the [International Labor] office is and has been for some time, in the Russian's corner." [12]

By the time of the Subcommittee's Hearings, the House of Representatives had already adopted a bill containing, among other appropriations, the remaining half of the I.L.O. assessment for 1970. Nevertheless the Subcommittee decided to invite the Senate Appropriations Committee, which had not yet acted, to strike that sum of $3,758,875 from the bill. This the Committee, led by Senator John L. McClellan, agreed to do, coupling this action with the recommendation that "the proper legislative committee review the continued participation of the United States in this organization." [13]

When these recommendations came before the Senate, Senator Javits moved vigorously to restore the I.L.O. appropriation. He noted that the United States "is bound as a matter of law to pay the assessments for the I.L.O. duly made upon it." [14] He cited a number of reasons (among them, the thrust of the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice in the case of *Certain Expenses of the United Nations*) why failure to pay would detract from the interests of the United States and the United Nations community.

In reply, it was maintained that the I.L.O. was deluged with Communist propaganda; [15] that some other Members were in arrears, and that the United States would lose its vote in I.L.O. organs only after the amount of its arrears were to equal or exceed the amount of contributions due from it for the preceding two full years, and that, accordingly, failure to pay would not be a treaty violation; [16] that Soviet nationals are appointed to international secretariats upon the nomination of a single candidate for the post in question, while the United States is "discriminated against" since it has to submit a number of candidates; [17] and that representation of Soviet workers' and employers' representatives in the I.L.O., as well as the manner of choice of Soviet members of the Secretariat, represents a "double standard." [18]

At the conclusion of the debate, and before the vote, Senator McClellan asked unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from William B. Macomber, Jr., Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, which, however, Senator McClellan refrained from reading out. Nor apparently did the Senator give his colleagues indication of the letter's contents. Mr. Macomber wrote that, if the cut in the I.L.O. appropriation were adopted, "Serious legal consequences will follow . . . the United States has undertaken an international legal duty to pay the share of the budget that has been voted by the I.L.O. General Conference and . . . we would be in violation of that obligation if we did not pay our full assessment." [19]

After referring to the *U.N. Expenses Case*, Mr. Macomber noted that "nonpayment of our dues to the I.L.O. could, of course, lead to the question being raised again in the International Court of Justice." And, he concluded, non-payment "would seriously weaken the ability of the United States to exert influence within the organization." [20] The vote to sustain the deletion of funds for the I.L.O. was 49 to 22, 29 Senators not voting. [21] The Senate-House Conference Committee and the House of Representatives subsequently upheld the deletion (some three weeks after the Soviet Assistant Director General took office in September, 1970). [22]

In the light of these actions, it is clear that the United States has violated international law on two counts.

First, it has violated its explicit obligation to respect the international character of the responsibilities of the Director General of the I.L.O. As do the comparable provisions of the United Nations Charter, the I.L.O. Constitution provides that the "responsibilities of the Director-General and the staff shall be exclusively international in character" and that:

"In the performance of their duties, the Director-General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization. . . .

"Each Member of the Organization undertakes to respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Director-General and the staff and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their responsibilities." [23]

Among those responsibilities is the appointment of staff by the Director General under regulations approved by the Governing Body (regulations followed to the letter in this case). Thus, insofar as it seeks by the threat or use of non-payment to induce the Director General to vacate his appointment of a Soviet Assistant Director General or otherwise to adjust his policies to the will of the United States, the latter thereby endeavors to influence, and indeed instruct, the Director General contrary to this important international legal obligation. As the record of the House Hearings and Senate and House debate makes clear, this is precisely what the Congress had in mind. While the Department of State did not favor the course of action initially threatened and then implemented by the Congress, it has officially communicated that action to the Director General; and failure to pay an assessment in any event must be a matter of public and official record.

Representations by states to the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Directors General of the Specialized Agencies about secretariat appointments are a commonplace. That, however, is not sufficient to legalize the pressures exerted by the United States in this instance. It is one thing for a state to express preferences to an international official about aspects of his official functions, including staff appointments (almost invariably about appointments of its own nationals); it is quite another for a state to inform an international official that, unless he takes or refrains from taking a specific action, that state will commit against the Organization a specific, grave, and, in this case, patently illegal injury. A clearer case of a state endeavoring to influence and instruct an international civil servant contrary to its international obligations would be hard to conceive.

Second, the United States has failed to meet its obligation under the Constitution of the I.L.O. to pay assessments upon it. Article 13 of the Constitution provides that the expenses of the I.L.O. "shall be borne by the Members." That this provision imports what the I.L.O. Constitution elsewhere describes as "financial obligations" [24] is the plainer in view of the interpretation of precisely that provision of the United Nations Charter by the International Court of Justice in its advisory opinion on *Certain Expenses of the United Nations*. [25]

This willful failure of the United States to pay an I.L.O. assessment, whose validity and legally binding character is not open to serious challenge, in a sense surpasses the violation of international law committed by the U.S.S.R. and allied states and France in failing to pay certain peacekeeping expenses of the United Nations. Those countries alleged (however unjustifiably) that the assessments in question were unlawful, a contention which the International Court of Justice did not sustain. But the United States can allege no illegal act to give a color of legality to its own. It does not challenge the validity of any I.L.O. assessments. The policy which the Congress has so far embraced is simply to withhold all unpaid contributions until I.L.O. policies are reshaped to suit it.

At the time when the United States ceased to press for the application of Article 19 of the U.N. Charter to the U.N. delinquents, it declared that it reserved the right not to pay future U.N. assessments if strong and compelling reasons existed for non-payment. [26] Whatever the legal force of that declaration—a question of considerable complexity and interest—the continuing delinquency of certain states in their United Nations payments cannot justify a default of the United States in the I.L.O. Moreover, in the I.L.O. there are no exceptions to collective financial responsibility to which U.S. non-payment may reasonably be claimed to be responsive. Indeed, the very rationale of the United States declaration in the United Nations is lacking in the I.L.O., for, unlike the United Nations, the International Labor Organization has consistently and automatically deprived Members in the requisite arrears of their votes in I.L.O. bodies. [27] It has not maintained a double financial standard. The deplorable double standard which the United Nations itself has maintained in respect of the payment of financial obligations due it and in the application of Article 19 has contributed to the broader undermining of the principle of collective financial responsibility in the world of international organization. But that hardly justifies the United States in making this singular contribution of its own in an I.L.O. context.

It remains to comment upon the arguments advanced in the Congress in support of cutting off payments to the I.L.O. The contention that the I.L.O. suffers a surfeit of Communist propaganda has no legal force; politically, the sensible course it to answer such propaganda rather than facilitate it by a process of United States retreat. The suggestion that because some Members are in arrears, the United States may lawfully be, rebuts itself, the more so in an organization where delinquents in the requisite arrears suffer the prescribed suspension of vote. Nor is there substance to the contention that, since two years' worth of delinquency must accrue before an I.L.O. Member loses its vote, non-payment of lesser sums is lawful; this confuses violation of the law with imposition of a sanction responsive to the violation.

The other arguments are more consequential. The United States has reason to complain that the Soviet Union is permitted to submit the name of but one candidate for a position in an international secretariat; this process in fact tends to enable the U.S.S.R. to select those of its nationals who are to be employed by international organizations, contrary to Article 101 of the United Nations Charter and comparable clauses of the constituent instruments of the Specialized Agencies. However, the situation would not be materially different if the U.S.S.R. were to submit several names for a post; the fact is that, in any totalitarian society, an international organization will have grave difficulty in freely recruiting and holding Secretariat members.

It is of course also true that Soviet workers' and employers' organizations are not free and representative in the sense in which they are in democratic countries; they hardly comport with the tripartite plan of the I.L.O. [28] But again the fact is that, in too much of the world, realities are not consonant with the structure of the I.L.O. or the ideals of the Unted Nations. If the Soviet Union and other non-democratic (including non-Communist) states are to be Members of the I.L.O. and the United Nations, if universality is to be put above purity, then it is plain that, up to a point, a "double standard" will have to be accepted; a standard in

Footnotes at end of article.

which many non-democratic states are prone to violate their international obligations more pervasively and importantly than democratic states characteristically do. The cure for this is not for democratic states to join in subverting international law and organization. Rather, it is for democratic states to fight the double standard by every lawful means; it is for democratic states to adhere to their international obligations and to strengthen the international organizations which are so important to the implementation of those obligations.

Universality is not of course the paramount goal. An international organization is meant to promote its purposes, not diffuse them. There is and will be a tension between universality and effectiveness which generalizations cannot resolve. There may come a point in a given international organization where violation by some members of their obligations will require others reciprocally to withhold performance of theirs.

What is clear in this case of assault by the United States Congress on the I.L.O. is that a sense of proportion, of intelligent and practical purpose, of legality, has been lamentably lacking. It is to be hoped that this gross display of international insensitivity and illegality will have been reversed by the time these comments appear in print; the longer it is prolonged, the greater will be the damage to the I.L.O., to international law and organization, and to the interests of the United States. (Stephen M. Schwebel).

FOOTNOTES

[1] Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 91st Cong., 2nd Sess., "Additional Testimony on the International Labor Organization," p. 79.

[2] *Ibid.* 69.

[3] *Ibid.* 76.

[4] *Ibid.* 70.

[5] *Ibid.* 77.

[6] *Ibid.* 71.

[7] *Ibid.* 59, 68–69. Mr. Hildebrand preferred the threat of withholding payment of U.S. assessments to actual withholding (*ibid.* 76). The representative of the Department of State, Samuel De Palma, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, opposed deletion of appropriations for the I.L.O. (at pp. 74–75, 78).

[8] *Ibid.* 5, 59.

[9] *Ibid.* 70.

[10] *Ibid.* 59, 66.

[11] *Ibid.*

[12] *Ibid.* 75.

[13] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 116, pt. 22, p. 29876.

[14] *Ibid.* at 29867.

[15] *Ibid.* at 29870.

[16] *Ibid.* at 29871.

[17] *Ibid.* at 29876.

[18] *Ibid.* at 29878.

[19] *Ibid.* at 29879.

[20] *Ibid.*

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] Congressional Record, House, Oct. 6, 1970, at 35165–35176. Congressman Rooney then stated "that we belonged to an organization that has become dominated by Communists. It is now nothing but a stage for Communist propaganda, and there is no reason why our taxpayers should be paying 25 percent of every dollar of cost of keeping that organization alive." (At 35166.) In response to Congressman Frelinghuysen's statement that the reduction in the appropriation would cause "a default by the United States on an assessment which has already been levied against it," Congressman Rooney replied: "There is not any question about that. That is exactly what we want to do, is it not?" (at 35174).

[23] Art. 9, pars. 4 and 5.

[24] Art. 2, par. 5.

[25] [1962] I.C.J. Rep. 158, 164; 56 A.J.I.L. 1053 (1962).

[26] ". . . [We] must make it crystal clear that if any member can insist on making an exception to the principle of collective financial responsibility with respect to certain activities of the Organization, the United States reserves the same option to make exceptions if, in our view, strong and compelling reasons exist for doing so. There can be no double standard among the members of the Organization." Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, in an address to the United Nations Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, Aug. 16, 1965, U.N. Doc. A/AC.121/PV.15, pp. 3–15; reprinted in 53 Dept. of State Bulletin 454, 456 (Sept. 13, 1965); excerpted in 60 A.J.I.L. 104 at 106 (1966).

[27] See "Article 19 of the Charter of the United Nations: Memorandum of Law," by the Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State, in 58 A.J.I.L. 752, 772–776 (1964).

[28] Nevertheless, the International Labor Organization in 1946 extended a warm invitation to the U.S.S.R. to rejoin the I.L.O. The employers' representatives noted that the existing I.L.O. Constitution had permitted the appointment of a representative "of socialized management when the U.S.S.R. was a Member of the Organization. . . . If the U.S.S.R. resumed membership of the Organization, and the Employers' representatives shared the general desire that it should do so, it would naturally appoint as Employers' delegate a representative of the socialized management of the U.S.S.R." The Conference Delegation on Constitutional Questions unanimously concluded that "appropriate provision for the representation of socialized management and of different sections of the labour movements of Member States can be made within the framework of the present system of representation . . ." Report II (1), pp. 91–94, quoted in International Labor Organization, Record of Proceedings of the 29th International Labor Conference, 1946, pp. 358–359.

AN ARROGANT DEMAND

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues, an editorial which appeared in the National Observer. Entitled "An Arrogant Demand," the editorial very appropriately questions the "no politicking" demands which were made of Frank Carlucci as the price for confirmation on his nomination as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The editorial follows:

AN ARROGANT DEMAND

Speaking of Congress, a good example of small-minded partisanship was acted out recently during a Senate Labor subcommittee hearing on the nomination of Frank Carlucci as director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Carlucci, a career Foreign Service officer, has eschewed political activity in the past. Sen. Edward M. Kennedy and Sen. Harold E. Hughes think that in his new job he might hit the hustings for the Administration and that that would be terrible. The senators actually asked Mr. Carlucci to promise he would not appear in political campaigns against incumbent Democratic senators.

As David S. Broder, the even-handed political analyst of the Washington Post noted last week, such a demand comes in poor grace from the Democrats—and especially from Mr. Kennedy—inasmuch as Sargent Shriver, Mr. Kennedy's brother-in-law, was a vigorously partisan political activist when he was bossing the antipoverty program. Beyond that, it is difficult to see how the OEO director can remain innocent of politics when antipoverty techniques themselves are proper subjects for political debate.

The no-politicking demand, which is just part of the capitulation sought by Senators Kennedy, Hughes, and Alan Cranston, suggests that those Democrats will support no one for the OEO post who isn't prepared to be their lap dog.

Mr. Carlucci was right in refusing to knuckle under to such arrogance—arrogance that can only make Administration-Congress relations even more difficult.

REQUIREMENTS FOR DEMOCRATIC PARTY SENIORITY

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the questions raised by the leaders of the Mississippi Democratic Party concerning the claim of certain Members of the House from Mississippi to sit in the Democratic caucus in the House and enjoy the benefits of Democratic seniority have important implications for our entire two-party system. Some of those implications were reviewed in a Washington Post editorial entitled "Is There a National Democratic Party." It urges that "a clearly stated set of standards to determine who may claim the party label for purposes of seniority" be looked into. I think a great many Members of the House will find this editorial from the December 17 issue of the Post, thought provoking. The text follows:

IS THERE A NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY?

The chairman of the Mississippi Democratic Party, Aaron Henry, has presented a most impressive challenge to the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives. That challenge is reproduced, in part, on this page today under the heading "For the Record." In brief, it demands that the Mississippi congressional delegation be excluded from the Democratic Caucus and be denied the committee assignments and rankings which they claim through seniority as Democrats. It will be very hard, in terms of logic or of mortality, or even of elementary common sense, to answer Mr. Henry's rhetorical question: "How long will the House Democratic Caucus give seniority to one whose major function has been to thwart the will of the majority of Democrats, especially when he is not even a Democrat in the first place?"

The assertion that the members of the Mississippi congressional delegation are not Democrats is supported by the simple fact that they refused to file with the organization recognized by the Democratic National Committee as the regular Democratic Party of Mississippi. Instead, they filed with the segregationist organization headed by Gov. John Bell Williams, whose Secretary of State has refused to register as the Democratic Party of Mississippi the organizations certified as such by the Democratic National Committee.

There is involved in all this something much more than the conflicting ambitions of rival politicians. The essence of what is at stake is the right of Mississippi Negroes to full participation in the political process. That right will be devoid of content so long as John Bell Williams and his friends can make it so. The Democratic Party as a national organization has committed itself to fulfillment of that right. Thus, at the 1968 Democratic National Convention it seated a biracial group of Mississippi Democrats under the chairmanship of Mr. Henry and rejected the credentials of the segregationist Mississippi regulars.

The 1968 Democratic Convention also set up a Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection under the chairmanship of Sen. George McGovern to frame rules which would "guarantee every American who claims a stake in the Democratic Party the opportunity to make his judgment felt in the presidential nominating process." The report of that committee established wide-reaching and salutary reforms. Perhaps its example points the way toward resolution of the issue now raised so cogently by Aaron Henry.

It isn't likely, with its eyes fixed on the 1972 election, that the Democratic Caucus in the House will precipitate a Donnybrook in the party by refusing to seat the Mississippi congressmen. They ought to be put on warning, however, that their spurious tactics will no longer be countenanced. A clearly stated set of standards to determine who may claim the party label for purposes of seniority would promote confidence in the party as a responsible institution. These standards should not, of course, be so rigid ideologically as to exclude wide differences of political opinion from the party. One of the healthiest and most fruitful aspects of the American two-party system lies in the fact that the two major parties have always embraced a wide range of aims and interests.

But the Democrats need to establish procedures which will guarantee members of their party, as the McGovern Commission guaranteed in the presidential nominating process, the opportunity to make their judgment felt in the congressional nominating process. With fair notice, it should be in order to enforce those standards when the 93d Congress convenes. The fundamental question at stake here, as Mr. Henry has said, comes down to this: Is there a National Democratic Party?

THE HIGH PRICE OF BEEF

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following story which recently appeared from United Press International gives another example of how the coat and pants do the work and the vest gets all the gravy. At least insofar as farmers and present American society are concerned.

The story follows:

THE HIGH PRICE OF BEEF

A top government economist has charged that the cost of beef at the supermarket is higher than necessary partially because of inflexible pricing policies of the food industry.

Don Paarlberg, director of economics in the Agriculture Department, said that because of those policies, current low prices for cattle were not being passed on to the housewife by the meat packers and grocery chains.

Paarlberg called for lower retail beef prices, an appeal similar to one he issued earlier last month on pork.

The official said some of the blame for high beef prices must lie with a traditional pricing policy of shrinking the profit margin on beef when wholesale meat prices rise and widening the margin when the wholesale price drops again. The effect is stable retail prices but doesn't give the housewife the savings from lower cattle prices.

This practice, Paarlberg said, is "more inept than illegal" and not the result of collusion. But, he said, the industry "could give both farmers and consumers a better break" by holding margins steady.

Paarlberg said marketing margins for beef leaped from 32 cents a pound in 1968–69 to 37 cents during the first 11 months of 1970, and to 41 cents in December. Most of the jump of 7.3 cents came in retail stores margins, he said.

NEW YORK CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION'S DEPARTING MEMBERS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the 91st Congress, several of our colleagues from New York will be departing from our midst. I would like to take this opportunity to join with my other colleagues from the Empire State in wishing these six gentlemen well in their future endeavors.

JACK GILBERT, who was well-liked and well-respected by his colleagues and constituents alike, has contributed much to this body and to its Committee on Ways and Means. With his return to Private Law practice in New York and Washington, I am sure he will continue to make contributions of his talents and insight for the betterment of our society.

With the departure of LEONARD FARBSTEIN this body is losing the able opinions of a man well versed in the field of foreign affairs. His outstanding record of service to this body and to his constituency will be well remembered.

A little bit of color will certainly depart with ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN. He came to this body 2 years ago in a fit of controversy and left in the same way. His time in between was no less hectic. But AL would not have it any other way. He earned the respect of all Members because of his integrity and conviction. Although I did not always agree with his stands, I could be sure of what his position was and know he would be fighting hard for it. Certainly, a constituency could ask for little more from their Representative.

RICHARD D. MCCARTHY is leaving behind him an invisible monument. His outstanding and successful efforts to remove from the U.S. arsenal the highly questionable germ warfare weapons will be long remembered. He has made a fine contribution to the entire country which is no less matched by his outstanding service to his constituency.

The politics of pollution is practiced by everyone these days, but DICK OTTINGER helped write the ground rules when he first came to this body. His successful efforts in his freshman term to save the Hudson River from becoming a dead body of water will be one of his many benchmarks in his yet to be completed career.

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, although quite controversial, was a master of the legislative process. His successes as chairman of the Education and Labor Committee in winning many battles for the little man will long be the high point of his career. During his many years of service he showed himself to be a valuable colleague and a leader.

The New York congressional delegation is by any standard a greatly representative group. All aspects of the political spectrum are represented among our number as is evidenced by those departing. These six may no longer be active Members of this body, but their past efforts will certainly be with us. They were all good friends and will be long remembered. I join with my colleagues in extending my very best wishes for their every success and good health in the coming years.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the voluntary retirement of the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK brings to a close one of the most distinguished records of public service ever etched in the annals of the U.S. Congress.

He has devoted his adult life to the Nation, his State, and his constituency, and has given selflessly of his time, his energy, and his outstanding talents. All America is in his debt.

The end of the 91st Congress will mark the completion of his 42 years of uninterrupted and illustrious service as a statesman. For some 25 of those years, JOHN was entrusted by his colleagues with leadership roles in the House, first as whip, then majority leader, and ultimately as Speaker. All who were fortunate to serve with him know that he wore the mantle of leadership with great dignity and grace, and a profound sense of responsibility.

When I first came to Congress in 1944, JOHN MCCORMACK was widely recognized as an accomplished legislator and a proven congressional leader. It was my pleasure to meet him on the opening day of the 79th Congress and during the ensuing years I have been honored to have him as my close personal friend. His office was always open, not only to me, but to all Members, and to the humble and great from all walks of life. I shall sorely miss his companionship, his wisdom, and his counsel.

The exceptional abilities of Speaker

McCORMACK were tested and proven time and time again during some of this Nation's most awesome crises: The depression of the 1930's, World War II, the cold war, the Korean conflict, the space race, the civil rights movement, the tragic death of President Kennedy, and the crisis of the cities. Seven Presidents looked to him for advice and counsel, and he participated in many of the major decisions made by our Government during those critical years.

In the hallowed Hall of the House, JOHN McCORMACK regularly demonstrated his unique gifts in the art of debate. Although a vigorous advocate and proponent of his own views, he was always tolerant and considerate of the views of others. He was a leader in the fight for progressive legislation, and an ardent believer that a strong national defense is our best assurance for a long-term peace.

JOHN McCORMACK has been an inspiration to countless Members over the years. He was completely dedicated, and served the public with a profound understanding of human nature. His faith in God, his devotion to his wife, and his love for this House were known to all of us. He was a man's man, and a Member's Member.

I pray that God's choicest blessings will be bestowed on our great Speaker and his gracious wife in the years to come, and that he will return often to share his wisdom with us.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE APPROVES RESOLUTION COMMENDING SENATOR RALPH YARBOROUGH

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, prior to the adjournment of Congress, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare approved a resolution "expressing profound admiration for and best wishes" to our departing chairman, Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH. As ranking majority member of the Committee, I speak for all members in stating that we will miss the loyal devotion and dedication with which he guided and influenced legislation.

His impact, especially in the field of health and education legislation, is felt by millions of Americans. A compassionate man and one of wisdom, RALPH YARBOROUGH provided strong leadership in pursuit of those goals which are right and just. Always courageous, energetic, and sincere, he was truly a champion of the people.

Although RALPH YARBOROUGH will no longer be in the Senate, I am confident that his endeavors on behalf of all citizens will be continued.

Mr. President, I am privileged to ask unanimous consent that this resolution expressing tribute to a distinguished public servant, RALPH YARBOROUGH, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[In the 91st Congress, Second session]

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE OF THE U.S. SENATE EXPRESSING PROFOUND ADMIRATION FOR AND BEST WISHES TO THEIR BELOVED CHAIRMAN, THE SENIOR SENATOR FROM TEXAS, THE HONORABLE RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

Whereas, our beloved colleague and distinguished Chairman, Senator Ralph W. Yarborough of Texas, is leaving us at the height of his career; and

Whereas, during his over thirteen years in the Senate of the United States he has with courage and dedication committed his heart, his intelligence, and his vision and leadership to unceasing efforts to advance the health, education, prosperity and well-being of all our people; and

Whereas, his passion for human excellence, his thirst for ever-expanding knowledge, his command of the legislator's art, and his vast experience in the councils of government have benefitted and inspired all who have had the honor to serve under him; and

Whereas, as Chairman of this Committee he has been our wise counsellor, our valiant leader, our generous benefactor and our kind friend:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That we, the Members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, express in the official minutes of the Committee our profound admiration for his matchless record of contributions to our Nation, and our best wishes to him for a long, happy, and always fruitful life.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia; HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey; CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island; EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts; GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin; WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota; THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri; ALAN CRANSTON, California; JACOB K. JAVITS, New York; WINSTON L. PROUTY, Vermont; PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado; GEORGE MURPHY, California; RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania; WILLIAM B. SAXBE, Ohio; RALPH TYLER SMITH, Illinois; HAROLD E. HUGHES, Iowa; and ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, Illinois.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ALBERT GORE

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Tennessee has amassed a truly remarkable record of public service which encompasses a generation of lawmaking here on Capitol Hill dating back to those days prior to World War II when he came to Washington as a Member of the 76th Congress. Sixteen Congresses have met since then and have grappled with perhaps the greatest variety of problems man and his society have ever faced. But these problems have been faced and often solved. That this can be said is a tribute to the quality of men who have served. In the front ranks over the years there has always been the imposing presence of ALBERT GORE—for 18 years in this body and for 14 years in the House of Representatives. ALBERT GORE has pursued peace, progress and prosperity. He has done his best, and his best always has been good indeed. He will be missed by many here, myself included.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it would never be possible for me to describe all that JOHN McCORMACK has meant to me, to this body and to this Nation; nor do I possess the eloquence to adequately relate such a record of achievement. I am honored, however, to have these few moments to tell my colleagues of my profound regard for the man who has been "Mr. Speaker" to us for the past 9 years.

I have known JOHN McCORMACK as Speaker of the House, and I have respected his leadership. I have known him as a colleague, and I have admired his record of public service. I have known him as a friend, and I have loved him for his many kindnesses.

JOHN McCORMACK has given the people of his congressional district representation without equal. By leading the fight for every major piece of social legislation passed by the Congress in the last 42 years, he has also become a representative of all Americans.

Although a great and dedicated Democrat, JOHN McCORMACK has extended his support to every President of the United States since 1928 in times of peril and on measures of importance and concern to the people of this Nation. The respect and admiration felt for Speaker McCORMACK knows neither political nor geographical boundaries.

JOHN McCORMACK's contributions to our country have made him a truly outstanding and beloved American. Through his position as the third most powerful figure in American political life, he has become, in fact, an outstanding citizen of the world.

Many men have achieved greatness in their time, yet few have found it possible, in their greatness, to hold fast to the Christian principles and goodness and compassion which are within JOHN McCORMACK. Indeed, one is reminded of the words of John Wesley when he wrote:

Do all the good you can,
By all the means you can,
In all the ways you can,
In all the places you can,
At all the times you can,
To all the people you can,
As long as ever you can.

Truly, these words describe the career of JOHN McCORMACK—a good representative, a good friend, a good man.

I have heard him say that he wishes to be remembered as a "Member's Speaker." I believe that I speak for all of us in the House when I say, "You will be so remembered, Mr. Speaker, you will be."

May God grant JOHN MCCORMACK and his lovely family every happiness in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RALPH YARBOROUGH

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am honored to join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the hardest working and most constructive Members of this body—the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, RALPH YARBOROUGH.

When RALPH YARBOROUGH retires from the Senate this year, he will leave behind him a most impressive record of accomplishments in the fields of health, education, veterans benefits, and welfare. His accomplishments are well known to all of us. He has been a fighter for the rights of all Americans. Millions and millions of Americans enjoy fuller, more fruitful lives today because of the work RALPH YARBOROUGH did in the Senate.

I do not want to list his many accomplishments, but only to speak briefly of the philosophy and personality which have inspired his brilliant record.

I think the philosophy which RALPH YARBOROUGH has lived by for more than 12 years in the Senate has been to bring about a better and happier life for the average man and to open up the joys and opportunities of American life to the underprivileged and the poor.

His vigorous and courageous work on behalf of migrant workers and his active chairmanship of the Labor and Public Works Committee testify to that philosophy.

At a time when many people were willing to turn their backs on our needs at home, RALPH YARBOROUGH worked to make the Government serve the people and to attain adequate funding for programs which are vital to the health and well being of millions of Americans.

His actions always reflected the belief that our system of government could cope with the immense problems of our time and that it was possible to offer hope and opportunity to all Americans. He acted to help people because he believed that it was possible for the American Government to dry up the sources of bitterness and hopelessness in our society and offer better lives to the poor and underprivileged.

The depth and extent of RALPH YARBOROUGH'S convictions were demonstrated time and time again by his firm allegiance to principle. As a man of deep conviction, he always had the courage to do what was right, even when it was unpopular.

While every Member of this body must deeply regret that RALPH YARBOROUGH has been taken from the Senate, I am sure we are also heartened by the example of courage and dedication which he set here in the last 12 years. No tribute could be too great for this man who has served the people and the Nation so well. It is a privilege to join in wishing him good fortune in the future.

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of my longtime friend, Congressman BILL MURPHY, from the House of Representatives is an occasion for deep personal reflection on my part. BILL MURPHY and I are friends in the truest sense of the word. Our friendship extends over a period longer than my service in public office—and far longer than his service in the Congress of the United States. Indeed, our personal relationship involves the greater part of a lifetime as lawyers practicing in the courts of Cook County, Ill., and as friends who enjoyed much leisure time together in activities unrelated to the law and to public service.

While we were as yet unmarried, we vacationed together along the remote and beautiful shores of Georgian Bay in Canada. We were friends together then and have shared this friendship with many other persons whom we have known in common throughout the intervening years.

In the later period, when Alderman MURPHY—and later, Congressman MURPHY—and I had our own homes and families and our respective public careers, we shared many experiences together. I followed Congressman MURPHY'S rise in the U.S. House of Representatives as a prominent member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and his steadfast application to the great national issues facing our Nation, as well as his faithful attention to his duties as a Representative of the people from the Third District of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman MURPHY'S perspective in his public service has always been enriched by his life's experiences, including his service in World War I, his family and home experience—which has been an example to be envied and emulated—and his deep concern for people, as evidenced by the intimate relationships which he developed as a ward committeeman and as a member of the Chicago City Council, as well as in his practice as a lawyer.

It is, Mr. Speaker, as I said, a moment for deep reflection on my part as I contemplate the departure from the House of Representatives of my longtime friend and colleague, Congressman BILL MURPHY. I am confident that he will not be inactive in his retirement, and I am certain that he and his lovely wife, Rose, will find many opportunities for useful service to the community and to the Nation, as well as increased time for each other and for their wonderful family.

I congratulate BILL MURPHY on his life of public service and, particularly, on his career since 1959 as a Member of this House of Representatives. I take this occasion to express to BILL MURPHY and his wife, Rose, my affection and my best wishes for happiness and satisfaction in the years to come.

WASHINGTON, D.C., STADIUM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has before it the plan of the owner of the Washington Senators to shift to the taxpayers the responsibility that they should share with the Senators the rental of the Washington, D.C., Stadium.

Interestingly enough Chicago may soon face this same question of whether or not the taxpayers or teams which have use of the facilities should share the cost of its operation.

An editorial broadcast December 28 by WMAQ–TV, Chicago, discussing the Chicago question deserves to be analyzed in the light of the pressure that the Washington Senators owner is bringing to bear:

NEW SPORTS STADIUM

It appears that sometime during the 70's Chicago will have a new sports stadium. Mayor Daley has assembled a high-powered commission of 17 men who are supposed to be figuring out the details for the new sports palace, which will be, in Daley's words, "the world's finest."

Now we are not opposed to a new stadium. This place here, Soldier Field, is obsolete, and Wrigley Field and White Sox Park are pretty well along in age.

So we encourage the Mayor and his committee to move onward, with one provision. We feel that it would be a disgrace if the city spent any of the people's tax money on the sports stadium.

The Daley administration has been responsible for a lot of physical improvements in this city. The loop certainly does have a modern skyline. But we feel that this city has failed to provide for the needs of the people.

The children of Chicago are not receiving the quality of education that they deserve. We didn't make this up, it's well documented. There is a serious shortage of housing in this city for people with low incomes and large families. And many people in Chicago are without adequate medical facilities. But it costs money to build schools and houses and clinics. And it would be a disgrace to use any of this money for a new sports palace.

Mayor Daley has promised that the new stadium would be available to the public for recreation use. That sounds good, but wouldn't it serve the people better to have improved recreational facilities spread out all over the city?

We have said before that this city is in trouble. There is a restlessness among the people who are getting the short end of it. And that restlessness is not going to be cured by an occasional visit to watch a ball game at a glorious new stadium.

This city is in debt to its people. It is not in debt to George Halas and Philip Wrigley and John Allyn. If these sportsmen want a new place of business, they should be willing to pay for it, or find someone who is willing. It is unthinkable to ask the people of Chicago to pick up any of the tab for a new stadium.

SENATOR CHARLES E. GOODELL

HON. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate I had the privilege of meeting with the leaders of the economic and financial community in New York at several luncheons. I learned to know and respect Representative CHARLIE GOODELL. He showed keen insight and judgment and, most assuredly, represented the views of his community.

On becoming Senator for the entire State, he necessarily broadened his views which were sometimes characterized as a switch in philosophy. To me his philosophy was constant and sound and unchanged—and that was to represent the best interest of all of his people.

But politics knows no gratitude and often denies what it demands. Unfortunately, he was never given the opportunity to fully represent. He was a conscientious Senator, and I enjoyed working with him.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHN J. WILLIAMS

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I rise today to praise Senator JOHN WILLIAMS and his distinguished 24 years service to our country. It would seem simple to praise Delaware's senior Senator, for he is a simple man, of simple habits, and of simple manner. But in this simplicity lies greatness. Although only a high school graduate, he has taught economists economics and accountants accounting. He is a silent man, a man who rarely speaks above a whisper. But when he spoke the spoilers and plunderers of this Nation trembled. In 24 years the entire Nation has learned that his simplicity is a mask for rare and great qualities.

A Supreme Court Justice was once asked what was a distinctive feature of the Supreme Court and he replied.

Unlike almost everything else in Washington, it does its own work.

JOHN WILLIAMS shares with the Supreme Court this rare talent of doing his own work. JOHN WILLIAMS in doing his own work, or, as it might be phrased today, doing his own thing, has made a lasting contribution to this country. His contribution was more than exposing wrongdoers for he also restored the people's faith in the integrity of our Government. He demonstrated time and time again that our Government through its process of checks and balances could correct itself.

In the Senate and on the Senate Finance Committee, on which I had the pleasure to work with him, he was a forceful and conservative spokesman. We differed greatly on the role the U.S. Government and the possibilities of man, but while we differed, I never questioned his worth. It was this rock-ribbed consistency and pursuit of principle that have led many to call him "Mr. Integrity" or the "conscience of the Senate." While these are good and apt phrases, I prefer to think of him as the last Roman Senator—a Senator adhering to the principles of Republican Rome before the Caesars and especially to the principle that the private citizen should give himself to public service, without thought of gain, without concern of the sacrifices, performing his duties quietly and effectively and then returning with humility to private life. Mr. President, I an honored to praise the last great "Roman" Senator.

WORDS ON THE RECORD OF SENATOR DODD

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, it was my privilege to be closely associated with the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) perhaps more so than were many of my colleagues.

Only a short time after he came to the Senate Senator DODD shouldered the duties of vice chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman. From that time forward through all of his Senate service Senator DODD gave lavishly of his time and his talents to further the work of the Internal Security Subcommittee.

I remember that for the first 6 months of 1 year—I believe it was the year 1962—I had a compilation made of the time spent by each of the subcommittee's members in attendance at its hearings. The total time so spent by Senator DODD was the highest recorded by any member of the subcommittee and amounted to more than 33 hours of which he presided more than 21 hours. This is not by any means a measure of the total time spent by Senator DODD on the work of the subcommittee because, of course, attendance at hearings is only one of the many time-consuming tasks imposed upon a committee chairman and Senator DODD shared a great deal of the work of the chairmanship of the Internal Security Subcommittee.

Senator DODD was especially meticulous in the care and attention he gave to subcommittee publications. Some of the committee's publications were special studies or reports initiated by Senator DODD or at his request; and I doubt if there was a study or report of the subcommittee during the entire period of his membership which was not the better, in its final form, for the attention given to it by the Senator from Connecticut.

During his service as a member of this body, Senator DODD made many valuable contributions to the work of the Senate. One of the most important of these was his long series of periodic reports to the Senate in which he documented developments connected with the world Communist conspiracy. Senator DODD was highly knowledgeable in this field, and was always able to make sensible explanations of the twists and turns of the Communist line, to expose the advances and retreats of Communist policy and Communist diplomacy, to point out the important impacts upon the security of the United States, and to make appropriate recommendations for action by this country looking toward the preservation of our legitimate interests.

Quite obviously, Senator DODD felt it to be one of his major duties to keep himself fully informed with respect to all of the ramifications of the cold war, in every part of the world, and to make his expertise in this regard available to his colleagues.

Another major effort was put forward by Senator DODD in connection with his chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency. In this field, also, he worked very hard and made major contributions. The reports and hearings of both the Internal Security Subcommittee and the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee will stand for a long, long time as impressive monuments to the work of TOM DODD as a Senator of the United States.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING SPEAKER

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in these final remarks addressed in behalf of the retiring Speaker of the House of Representatives, I must recall that throughout my 8 years of service in this body the words "Mr. Speaker" have applied only to one person—the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN MCCORMACK.

As a member of the minority party throughout these 8 years, I must aver initially that, as Speaker of the House, you have been eminently fair and considerate to me and my other Republican colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the chronology of your life as lawyer and lawmaker has been reviewed fully in this Chamber. In addition, your personal attributes of fidelity to your district and your Nation, your vigor, and persuasiveness in debate, and your gentle nature and steadfast affection as displayed to your friends—are qualities which each of us will recall long after you have left these Halls.

Mr. Speaker, I know somewhat of the devotion which you have always shown to your beloved wife. I know also that many citizens of your State and of the Nation will continue to look to you for guidance and sage advice. In all that you do and undertake I wish you well.

In addition, I want to express personal appreciation for your many favors and courtesies shown me throughout my service as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. In turn, both Mrs. McClory and I extend to you and Mrs. McCormack our affection and warm personal wishes.

SEVENTH WORLD WINTER GAMES FOR THE DEAF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, later on this month, January 25 to 30, there will be held at Adelboden, Switberland, the seventh world winter games for the deaf, an exciting event which has grown in recent years to a sports attraction holding worldwide interest and participation.

I am very proud and honored to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House that among the participants in this seventh world winter games for the deaf is the outstanding slalom titlist, Miss Tamar Petre Marcinuk, 402 Kimball Street, Fitchburg, Mass., a constituent of mine who is a student at Fitchburg State College.

Tamara or Tammy, as she is known to her friends and associates, will defend her two slalom titles at Adelboden. Four years ago at Berchtesgaden, she won two gold medals in slalom and giant slalom and her friends and admirers are looking forward to her new achievements this year. In addition, at the Berchtesgaden competition, she earned fifth place in the downhill.

World competition is nothing new for Miss Marcinuk. In fact, she was the only girl skier from the United States in the European Alpine races for the deaf at Westendorf, Austria, in 1968 when she won all three races.

Tammy is only 20 and there is no question that new honors and laurels will be hers as she develops her skills and techniques in this highly competitive sport. She is now determined to take all three Alpine crowns at Adelboden and for this, she has been practicing since she was 11. She has worked hard for this objective, running 3 to 5 miles daily, spring and winter, bicycling and swimming, summer and fall.

Miss Marcinuk was selected for the winter games upon recommendation of the competition committee of the U.S. Deaf Skiers Association. Other competitors from Massachusetts will be Jarlath Crowe, of Northampton; George Balsley II, of Amherst; and Ronald Borne, of Hanover. Jarlath and Ronald are students at the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, which is a division of the noted Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, N.Y.

The competition committee was guided by the results of the following meets in which deaf skiers participated:

USDA championship races at Aspen, Colo., and Park City, Utah; eastern deaf skiers championship races; New Jersey Ski Council invitational giant slalom and downhill races for the top deaf skiers in the East, and other USSA-sanctioned races, based upon FIS-point rating, and NASTAR races, based upon handicap-point rating.

The U.S.A. contingent to the Adelboden games departs from New York on Sunday, January 17, and will return on February 7. Among the nations participating are Belgium, West Germany, East Germany, Canada, Poland, Finland, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Austria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Spain, Japan, and the U.S.S.R. The Russians will have nine women and 12 men competing in the cross-country and relay events.

Mr. Speaker, the cost for each American participant in the winter games this year is approximately $1,200 for each skier. Fortunately, many public-spirited citizens throughout the United States, largely through local fundraising activities, are helping to pay the costs involved, though many of these young people are using part of their own funds to pay their way to Adelboden.

After the games, the American team will enjoy short holidays of 3 days in Berlin and London.

To Tammy and her fellow American contestants, I extend my heartiest congratulations and best wishes for success in the seventh winter games for the deaf. Win or lose, they will make new friends, have wonderful memories of their experiences abroad, and bring new prestige to this great land of ours.

I salute them and wish them well in the days ahead all through their lives.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM T. MURPHY

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, it is a special pleasure to join the tributes being paid to our retiring colleague, BILL MURPHY of Illinois. In the 6 years that I have been a Member of the House, I have come to know him well as a friend and as a coworker on the Foreign Affairs Committee. We have both been active together on the Africa subcommittee.

In all that he undertakes, BILL MURPHY shows qualities of judgment and experience. He is always accessible, always ready to offer counsel, and invariably he adds to every occasion or meeting a special spark of good sense and good will. He is a seasoned politician having served not only 6 terms in this body, but many terms more on the Chicago city council and in a variety of important posts in the city. Chicago has had few Representatives in Washington with so deep and sure an understanding of the political and social fabric of that great city.

Though politics has been his life, partisanship that is narrow or vengeful has never been his trademark. Instead, politics has given to him a sense of calling, an appreciation of the people, for whom and with whom he lives, and an instinct for what the public interest requires. He has brought with him a zest for life and for the work of Congress, and a special capacity for friendship which all of us shall value as much in the years of his retirement as in his long years of active service.

TRIBUTE TO A GOOD AND GREAT MAN, THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE, THE HONORABLE JOHN WILLIAM McCORMACK

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I note with profound regret that the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN WILLIAM MCCORMACK, is retiring at the end of this session of Congress. Our skillful and beloved Speaker has earned a special place in the hearts of his colleagues, constituents, and countrymen for his devoted service, his true friendship, and his undying patriotism and dedication to the House, to his district, and to the United States of America.

A Boston constituent has said of him:

> Knowing what it is to be poor, John has never moved away from his people. . . . He's always helping some guy who's down on his luck, and he's never taken a dime. There'll never be another like him.

A former congressional chaplain has been quoted as saying that if all men lived a life like JOHN MCCORMACK's, there would be no need for chaplains. His personal life as well as his career is an inspiration to all those privileged to know him and serve with him.

The son of a Boston bricklayer and grandson of an immigrant who had fled the Irish potato famine, JOHN lost his father on the eve of his graduation from grammar school. In order to support his mother and two younger brothers, he left school to work for $3 a week as a messenger for Western Union, and earned additional wages on Sundays, delivering newspapers. Lured by the salary of $4 a week, he later went to work for the law firm of William T. Way, and that barrister encouraged the boy to read law. By the time he was 21 years old, never having attended high school or college, JOHN successfully passed the Massachusetts bar examination.

For 6 months after he began to practice law, he continued to deliver Sunday newspapers, to make ends meet. He served his country in World War I and was honorably discharged at the termination of the conflict with the rank of sergeant major. His legal practice flourished after his return to Boston, and he made a reputation as an adroit trial lawyer and built up his practice into a successful enterprise that grossed $30,000 in 1928.

The Speaker has said that politics was a natural interest to all who lived in South Boston, and it certainly appealed to him. At the age of 25, he successfully sought the office of delegate to the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention. He served in the State House of Representatives from 1920 to 1922, and in the State Senate from 1923 to 1926, the last 2 years as Democratic leader. First elected to the U.S. Congress in 1928, he has been reelected in every succeeding election. Throughout the New Deal, the

Fair Deal, the New Frontier, and the Great Society, he has worked tirelessly to secure the enactment of the programs of Democratic administrations in Congress. Before election as Speaker in 1962, JOHN was an adept majority leader and Democratic whip.

Most of us will remember him from those days as a slam-bang fighting Irishman from Boston. In the vitally powerful and important office of Speaker, he has performed in a different manner, but he is still a witty debater who has always remained true to his principles, and who has influenced, through positive action the course of Government.

Speaker MCCORMACK has been the champion of the working man, the underprivileged, and the elderly. He has put his mark on extensive legislation in the areas of health, education, welfare, civil rights, and labor. He helped write both the Wagner Act and the Social Security Act, the first minimum-wage bill was one of his special projects, and he was influential in the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. He has continued to be ruled by a high personal moral code, by his understanding of the problems of other people, and by his concern for the well-being of all the people of America.

Speaker MCCORMACK is rarely seen on the Washington social circuit. He owns no property, and donates much of his salary to charity. He spends most of his nonworking hours in the company of his beloved wife of many years, the former Harriet Joyce. He is not a drinking man. He is, in short, a deeply religious man, a superior leader, an outstanding Democrat, a patriotic American, a fine and true friend. He has never failed to help a colleague, to counsel when counsel was sought, to show loyalty to his ideals and to his friends, and to give of himself to the district whose every street he knows and loves. His humanity, his friendship, and his unfailing consideration are matched only by his skillful and aggressive leadership, his ability to compromise, and his knowledge of the workings of the House of Representatives. JOHN WILLIAM MCCORMACK has said that if he had to choose, he would far prefer to be a good man than a great man. In his many years of service to this Nation, he has proved to be both.

We will miss him very much in this body and, as he leaves us, I heartily congratulate him upon his fine and dedicated service and wish for him and his devoted family all choicest blessings of continued good health, happiness, and peace for many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CHARLES GOODELL

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, CHARLES GOODELL has made an outstanding contribution to the work of this House during his term here and he will be sorely missed.

Appointed to fill the seat of the late Robert F. Kennedy, CHARLIE GOODELL was given a heavy responsibility. To his great credit, he worked hard to fulfill the promise of humane leadership that had been made by Senator Kennedy.

CHARLIE GOODELL has shown himself to be a man of courage, sensitivity and brilliance. He laid before the Senate a proposal for setting a fixed timetable for the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam that was the forerunner of the amendment to end the war.

It has been a source of comfort and pleasure to work side by side with him in an attempt to return to the Congress its constitutional powers over the war-making authority. He has shown imagination and good will.

Through all the debates, sometimes stormy, on the legislation with which he has been associated, he has always shown himself to be a gentleman. I believe that he has been highly regarded by all Members of this body whatever their political affiliation or political philosophy. No matter the slings and arrows of the recent political campaign, his reputation has emerged enhanced by his personal dignity and his public service.

I am sure that CHARLIE GOODELL will remain actively involved in American political life in the coming years and we shall all be the beneficiaries.

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM C. CRAMER

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 31, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, when the 92d Congress convenes in January, some of our valued colleagues will be missing from this Chamber. One of them is our esteemed colleague and my close personal friend, Congressman WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida, who has served in the Congress with distinction for the past 16 years.

BILL CRAMER and I sit on opposite sides of the aisle in Congress. He is loyal to his party just as I am to mine. But there has been no involvement of party in our work together. We have worked closely on many matters of importance to our State and Nation. So I am very glad to attest to the devoted, patriotic, and able representation which BILL CRAMER has rendered in Washington. His record here, since he first came to serve in these historic halls, has been one of impressive achievement and of fidelity to duty.

He has served his constituency, the State of Florida, and our beloved Nation with ability and a fine spirit of dedication, patriotism, and loyalty. He has been a strong leader and an effective legislator, keenly aware of contemporary problems and ever zealous in pursuing viable solutions for them in the interests of the American people. For this he has earned the respect of all Members on both sides of the aisle.

As he leaves us, I am happy and proud to note, to recognize, and to laud the record of accomplishment that he has made while a Member of the House. As a leading and a high-ranking member of the important Public Works Committee of the House, he has fought for approval of important civil works projects not only for the State of Florida but for the entire Nation. He is at present the ranking Republican on that committee, and his services will be greatly missed. He coauthored the Interstate Highway Act which makes possible the great Inter-State Highway System all over America. Before the word ecology was woven into the daily vocabulary of the American people, BILL CRAMER was sponsoring laws to clean up the environment. Sixteen years ago, he sponsored the Nation's first Water Pollution Control Act and he has been a leader in the fight for clean water throughout his service here. It is important to note that he also cosponsored the antiriot law and the antibusing amendment. These are major congressional accomplishments and they are but a few of his accomplishments.

Mrs. Sikes and I heartily congratulate him upon his fine service and join with his many friends everywhere in wishing for him and his lovely wife, Alice, and their family success and happiness in all their future endeavors.

SENATOR EUGENE McCARTHY

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, nothing which I can say will add or detract from the record and the recognition which has been achieved by GENE MCCARTHY. He has established a unique position in the annals of the Senate and indeed in the history of our Nation. His departure leaves a great void.

GENE MCCARTHY is a man of charm, of great wit, of real intellect, and of deep concern for people. For this alone he has been recognized as a leader among men. However, GENE MCCARTHY shall be remembered primarily for his vision and for his courage.

I have not always agreed with the positions taken by the Senator from Minnesota nor do I find myself in total agreement with him today. I find however, that he has had real foresight, that he recognized long before many of us were willing to admit, even to ourselves, what was happening, where we were going, and the tragedy which was in store for our Nation if we pursued an unchanged course.

He not only recognized it but he was willing to act on that recognition in an effective way without regard for the political cost to his future here in the Senate and without concern for the position and prestige of the forces which were arrayed against him. This was a mark of true courage and true leadership.

In particular I wish to commend him for providing for so many—particularly the young—a voice and a leader who thereby permitted them to express their concern and their discontent within the

political system. No one will ever know what the course of events would have been had GENE MCCARTHY stood back. We can only speculate.

Yes, GENE MCCARTHY will be long remembered for his unique leadership. He has been a leader in the true democratic spirit. He has belonged to no one and yet—or perhaps therefore—he has belonged to everyone. I wish him well.

DEAFNESS NO BAR TO INTERNATIONAL SKI COMPETITION

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative in Congress of one of the major winter sport areas in the Nation, which in 1960 hosted the International Olympic games at Squaw Valley. I was extremely pleased to learn of a special event which will take place in Adelboden, Switzerland, later this month. This is the VII World Winter Games for the Deaf. Thirteen young Americans, who have refused to let a physical handicap restrict them in their desire to ski and participate in other activities, will represent the United States in this international competition. I think we all should be mighty proud of the determination which these young people have shown in order to become outstanding skiers.

I am particularly proud of the fact that this group of athletes is being coached by a young man who has achieved an outstanding record in the Olympic games, Jimmie Heuga, a 1964 Olympic medal winner and also a competitor in the 1968 Winter Olympic games. A native of Squaw Valley, Jimmie has achieved national and international fame for his skiing and those of us from California are proud of him. I am especially proud of the contributions which he has made and is making to the success of the U.S. deaf team.

I want to take this opportunity on behalf of the people of California to wish the team well in their competitions against the best deaf skiers from Belgium, West and East Germany, Canada, Poland, Finland, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Austria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Spain, Japan, and the Soviet Union.

Members of the team making the trip are: Tamara Petre Marcinuk, Fitchburg, Mass.; Barbara Ann Hayes, Seattle, Wash.; Diane Marie Sigota, Bronx, N.Y.; Susan Jean Stokes, Logan, Utah; Susan Mozzer, Manchester, Conn.; Jarlath William Crowe, Northhampton, Mass.; George Hoak Balsley II, West Chatham, Mass.; Robert Lee Holmes, Spokane, Wash.; Eugene Scott Sigoda, Bronx, N.Y.; Larry James Ottem, Minneapolis, Minn.; Richard John Roberts, Gloversville, N.Y.; Dan Farrell Miller, New York, N.Y.; and Ronald Gray Borne, Hanover, Mass.

In addition to Jimmie Heuga as coach, whose home now is Bear Valley, Calif., also a famous ski resort in the second district, the following officials will be making the trip: Art Kruger, USA–WGD Committee chairman, Hollywood, Calif.; James A. Barrack, tour director, Towson, Md.; Simon J. Carmel, team director, Rockville, Md.; and Gary A. Mortenson, team manager, Twin Falls, Idaho.

Mr. Kruger has written a report of the forthcoming trip for the magazine, "The Deaf American," which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

SPORTING AROUND

(By Art Kruger)

Switzerland is a country which doesn't like to get its hair mussed. It doesn't perspire, shiver, shout. In the world chorus, it's the whisper.

You wipe your feet before you enter Switzerland. It's as high as it is wide. Someone said if you could flatten it out it would be one of the world's biggest countries. Its biggest commodity is dirt. It has more of it packed in a smaller area than any other place, save Tibet.

You have the feeling it is holding in a belch. It's a cameo country. You have the feeling the whole country is just one of those little figurines where you wind it up and it snows and plays a little nursery tune.

Its architecture is early fairy tale. You are in Switzerland a week and you can believe in Hansel and Gretel or Heidi.

Everybody in Switzerland can make or fix a watch. Most people have one eye smaller than the other from squinting into eye pieces. They don't even make any noise walking, we were told. They're friendly but their faces don't show it. Their countenances are as wintry as their climate. They are as correct as English butlers and just as unobtrusive.

They have such a reverence for money that when you deposit some, you don't even need proof of existence. You are a number known but to God and the Bank of Suisse. They can count in four languages.

They abhor violence but they did have their riot. That was back in 1489 when they cut the head off the mayor of Zurich for spending too much money, then they built a monument to him. You can see it there today.

There hasn't been a shot fired in Switzerland since William Tell. Wars have raged around them for centuries but they sit there making watches and eating oranges. They have their Chocolate Soldier army but you have the feeling it's just another Christmas toy turned out by Swiss Craftsmen.

This will be our third trip to Switzerland when we attend the forthcoming VII World Winter Games for the Deaf, which will take place at Adelboden, Switzerland, January 25–30, 1971.

Ratified by the AAAD Administrative Board, a new World Games for the Deaf Committee of the United States has been formed to assist Chairman Art Kruger. Two members of the committee are newcomers. They are F. A. Caligiuri of La Mirada, California, and Herry M. Jacobs of Oakland, California. Mr. Caligiuri serves as the publicity director while Mr. Jacobs is the team director. Two other members are holdovers, James A. Barrack of Towson, Maryland, and Leroy L. Duning of Henrietta, New York. Mr. Duning, who teaches architectural drawing at NTID, remains as treasurer, while Mr. Barrack is the tour director.

"Cal," as F. A. Caligiuri is popularly known, formerly taught in schools for the deaf, sold insurance and has a fairly large income tax clientele. He works for the Los Angeles Times Mirror Press as a proofreader and pager. Jacobs, with a reputation of being precise and meticulous in any undertaking, is a commercial printer.

At present the committee is extremely busy with a myriad of details for the coming Winter Games for the Deaf. The committee has approved the recommendation of the Competition Committee of the United States Deaf Skiers Association and the following skiers be selected for the United States squad for the Adelboden Games:

WOMEN

Tamara Marcinuk, Fitchburg, Massachusetts.
Barbara Ann Hayes, Seattle, Washington.
Diane Sigoda, Bronx, New York.
Susan Stokes, Logan, Utah.
Susan Mozzer, Manchester, Connecticut.

MEN

Jarlath Crowe, Northampton, Massachusetts.
George Balsley II, Amherst, Massachusetts.
Robert Holmes, Spokane, Washington.
Eugene Scott Sigoda, Bronx, New York.
Larry Ottem, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Richard Roberts, Gloversville, New York.
Ronald Borne, Hanover, Massachusetts.
Dan Miller, Erwin, Tennessee.

The criteria used to select the best deaf skiers were the following race results: (1) USDA Championship Races at Aspen, Colorado, and Park City, Utah; (2) Eastern Deaf Skiers Championship Races; (3) New Jersey Ski Council Invitational Giant Slalom and Downhill Races for the top deaf skiers in the East; (4) Other USSA sanctioned races (based upon FIS-point rating) and NASTAR Races (based upon handicap-point rating).

The USDSA Competition Committee is composed of Thomas Hassard, who competed for Uncle Sam at the Berchtesgaden Winter Games in 1967, of Union, New Jersey, chairman; Simon J. Carmel of Rockville, Maryland, Gary Mortensen of Boise, Idaho, James Liese of Denver, Colorado, and Joe Cohen of Hyattsville, Maryland, ex officio.

All except two of those selected skiers will compete in the Alpine events, which consist of slalom, giant slalom and downhill, while Alan Gifford and Susan Mozzer will participate in the cross-country races. They all will go to Adelboden—that's if we are able to raise $1,200 for each skier to make the Swiss trip.

It may interest you to know that all except three of these skiers were born deaf. One became deaf from an ear infection when she was 1½ years old. One was stricken with chicken pox when he was six months old and became deaf. And hay fever caused one to become deaf when he was one year old.

Four women and three men are college students . . . one is a high school student . . . one is a senior at the Austine School for the Deaf in Brattleboro, Vermont . . . two just graduated from the New York School for the Deaf in White Plains . . . two are daily newspaper printers . . . one is a 3M Company clerk and one is a welder.

Simon Carmel has been selected as the team director of the USA Deaf Ski Team, while Jim Heuga, a 1964 Olympic medal winner and also a member of the 1968 Olympic Ski Team, was recently appointed as coach. A 5-6, 145-pound native of Squaw Valley, California, Jim was a student at the University of Colorado, and is now a product manager of the well-known international ski company—THE LANGE CO.—in Broomfield, Colorado. He is also the technical director and coach of the Lange International Racing Camp in Mammoth, California, which nine of our selected skiers attended last July.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GEORGE MURPHY

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to add a few words of

my own to the expressions of my colleagues and the tributes honoring the senior Senator from California, GEORGE MURPHY.

I have known Senator MURPHY since our times together at Yale University. I was a senior; he was a sophomore, and we played football together. Among his Senate duties, I recall especially his term on the Senate Committe on Public Works, on which I serve, and his particular efforts there on air pollution control and for disaster relief.

GEORGE MURPHY has served his State well. He has been a fearless and outspoken Member of the Senate—one who speaks with firm conviction and believes in the United States and its destiny. We know that GEORGE MURPHY will continue to show forth that belief and that conviction always.

TRIBUTE TO HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, can anyone really imagine a U.S. Congress without JOHN MCCORMACK? This body will never seem the same without him. I know personally that those rumors that JOHN MCCORMACK began his career in the Continental Congress in my constituency in Philadelphia are completely without foundation. The Congressional Directory tells us that our revered Speaker was a member of only 22 Congresses—spanning almost a half century. But it does seem as if he was always with us.

Whenever I or a fellow Congressman—either a youngster or a veteran—needed advice, or guidance or help, the Speaker—and I find it difficult to think of him as anyone but the "Speaker"—always had an open door, a ready ear, and a sympathetic heart.

The Speaker would more than listen; he acted. He acted regardless of party lines and philosophies, whether the problem was House business or political, or personal.

Of course, this is a body of varied political philosophies, and the Speaker could be termed a "Yankee liberal." But perhaps a man of his stature should not be measured by his personal philosophies so much as his attitude toward the beliefs of others. Never have I heard even a hint that he ever prevented anyone from fully expressing his thoughts, no matter how diametrically opposed they may have been from the Speaker's own.

There are many fine men who sit in this body, and I have no doubt that as the years, the Congresses, and generations pass, many other great men will occupy seats in the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, I likewise have no doubt that few if any will ever reach the stature of a JOHN MCCORMACK. With no disrespect intended to those who will follow him to that exalted position, I must confess that the "Speaker" to me will always be the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

And if he will forgive the familiarity due to an old friendship, may I say, "Goodbye, JOHN, I wish you peace of mind and peace of soul in your retirement. I will miss you deeply; we all will. You have left your mark on the House and the Nation. We are better men, a better House of Representatives and a better Nation for that."

SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as today we mark the retirement of our beloved Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, as we bid you this fond farewell, as we are infused with rich and wonderful thoughts and memories of what the Speaker has meant to each of us, and as the book is closed on his 42 years of distinguished and dedicated service through this great Congress of the United States to the entire people of our great Nation, I join proudly in paying highest tribute to this noble son of Massachusetts and this most impressive American. I say, Godspeed and good fortune to you always, Mr. Speaker.

As a Nation we are collectively proud of JOHN W. MCCORMACK. We owe him a debt of gratitude, and our appreciation is easily rendered. However, as we individually seek the right words to describe the many attributes of our Speaker, I find that one particular line from the writing of Stephen Vincent Benet best expresses my view of JOHN MCCORMACK—the essential man—and it reads: "Kindness as large and plain as a prairie wind."

I have not been privileged to serve long with JOHN MCCORMACK, yet I shall always cherish that experience. And I think my colleagues will agree that JOHN MCCORMACK will be remembered best for his big heart.

He was born in Boston on December 21, 1891, the son of Joseph and Mary McCormack. I have no doubt that JOHN MCCORMACK's background, his own experience with a life of both hardship and challenge, contributed significantly to the growth of his great humanitarian spirit. His Irish background became his hallmark. When he came to Congress in 1928, he soon acquired the name of "the fighting Irishman from South Boston."

His legislative skills were honed earlier as a member between 1920 and 1926 of the Massachusetts House and Senate, He was elected to the 70th Congress to represent the Ninth Congressional District of my State. It did not take long for JOHN MCCORMACK's remarkable leadership talents to be recognized on Capitol Hill. He was majority leader or whip in the 79th through 87th Congresses. He was elected Speaker of the House during the second session of the 87th Congress.

As events took shape so JOHN MCCORMACK responded to these challenges, indicating enormous skills and deep compassion, as a confidant of Presidents and the mighty throughout the world, as a magnificent contributor to the growth and welfare of our Nation and its people. Yet, he remained a simple man, a gentle man, a kind man—and this, too, will be remembered about him. He has led us with calm restraint and dignity. He is respected, perhaps mostly highly, for those latter qualities. He has endured as Speaker despite the fearsome challenges of that office because JOHN MCCORMACK's leadership is achieved through calm restraint and dignity. I think that a quotation from William Makepeace Thackeray may be applicable to his career:

> To endure is greater than to dare; to tire out hostile fortune; to be daunted by no difficulty; to keep heart when all have lost it; to go through intrigue spotless; to forego even ambition when the end is gained—who can say this is not greatness?

Mr. Speaker, I wish you and your beloved wife, Harriet, the greatest of possible happiness in your retirement and in the years to come. We shall miss you.

SALUTE TO SENATOR JOSEPH TYDINGS

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, a man's contribution as a U.S. Senator is not measured in terms of the time that he has spent in these Halls but by the impact that he has had. With all the stress which we have observed on the evils of the seniority system, and on the resulting concentration of power and influence in the hands of those who have great longevity, I want today to pay tribute to one of our more junior colleagues who has amply demonstrated the ability to surmount the obstacles of little seniority and to get things done. I speak of JOE TYDINGS.

During his 6 years here he has had more influence than many who have been here far longer. And I want you to know that this influence has been a positive influence—an influence for good. He has been both a progressive and a productive legislator with a sincere and intelligent concern for a variety of problems which increasingly affect our Nation and our people.

While JOE TYDINGS represented Maryland he nevertheless exhibited a real and abiding concern for the people of the District of Columbia in his work as chairman of the District Committee. The same can be said for his other work here in the Senate. He has been a forward-looking voice and provided strong leadership in the area of population control, in reform of the judicial system, in drug abuse legislation, in environmental quality efforts, civil rights, and many more.

He has built an enviable record and his voice will indeed be missed as the 92d Congress convenes.

I join with his many friends here in wishing for him and for his wife all the best that life has to offer. He is most deserving.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McCARTHY

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, the U.S. Senate is losing one of its most unique and scholarly Members as the senior Senator from Minnesota leaves this body. GENE MCCARTHY has been more than a U.S. Senator from Minnesota. To many of the young and disenchanted citizens of our country he is a national symbol of hope that our system can be responsive to new ideas and attitudes and can develop new answers to old problems.

GENE MCCARTHY'S announcement in December of 1967 that he would challenge an incumbent President of his own party because he disagreed with that President on the vital issue of the war in Vietnam was a courageous decision which continues to affect the political life of our Nation.

His candidacy brought the students of America back into politics and taught them that working within the system could indeed effect change.

And his candidacy was the national catalyst for the movement against the war in Vietnam which I hope will lead to final military disengagement in Indochina and to better prospects for continuing world peace once American troops have come home.

To those of us who had known GENE MCCARTHY, his decision in that winter of 1967 was unexpected but no surprise. His whole political career has been distinguished by his integrity, his insight, and his willingness to stand up for what is right.

I and many of my fellow Democrats will never forget the moving eloquence of his nomination of Adlai Stevenson before the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles.

In the Senate his independent approach to legislation has been a refreshing departure from the prosaic and programmatic attitudes which sometimes entrap all of us.

In the Senate he voted as an individual and his individuality exuded from his statements, his votes and his actions. He represented much of what our country and its founding was and is all about.

I am certain that GENE MCCARTHY'S retirement from the U.S. Senate is not his retirement from American political life.

I look forward to watching GENE MCCARTHY in the future as he changes his role from Senator to citizen. His past record augers well for his continuing contribution to the health and vitality of the American spirit.

LET'S LOOK AT THE THEORY OF DOMINANT USE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD a copy of an article entitled "Let's Look at the Theory of Dominant Use" by A. J. Christiansen.

LET'S LOOK AT THE THEORY OF DOMINANT USE

(By A. J. Christiansen)

The Public Land Law Review Commission in its report at page 116 on "Grazing as a Dominant Use on Retained Lands" states:

"Few statutory guidelines exist for allocating public land resources between domestic livestock and other uses. Without such guidelines the range manager is hindered in fixing the limits of competing use. The result is that pressures, unrelated to the true capabilities of the land, may be the determining factors in allocation of the land.

"This situation will be corrected, in our view, by classifying for grazing as the dominant use those lands retained in Federal ownership and identified as being chiefly valuable for grazing of domestic livestock."

However, the real sticker here is how do you establish what is the dominant use? Wildlife prevails on most of the Public Lands where domestic livestock grazing is permitted and wildlife, and especially big game, competes with domestic livestock, to some degree, for forage and browse on Public Lands suitable for grazing.

Should the amount of money collected from the livestock industry for grazing purposes on public lands be the guideline as to whether domestic livestock grazing is the dominant use, and if so, then should the fees collected from hunting license buyers be used as a comparison to ascertain whether livestock or wildlife is the dominant use?

Lets take a look at the figures for the State of Colorado:

In 1969 the Colorado Game Fish and Parks Division collected hunting license fees from 247,086 big game hunters in the amount of $5,976,000, mostly from Elks and Deer hunters. No actual figures are available as to the amount of game harvested on Public versus Private Lands but from data collected on game kills over the years by the Game Fish and Parks Division an estimate indicates that 80% of the elk and 50% of the deer are harvested on Public Lands. A good average to use would be 65%, 65% of the license fee money collected in 1969 would credit $3,884,400 to the use of Public Lands to hunting or wildlife (65% of $5,976,000 equals $3,884,400). True this goes into the coffers of a Division of the State and not the Federal Government, yet it is created by a use of public lands, namely hunting and wildlife.

Let's contrast this with the grazing fees collected for domestic livestock grazing by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service for the year 1969. The Bureau of Land Management collected $313,490 and the Forest Service collected $613,791, a total of $927,281.

Certainly dollars and cents should be an important factor in ascertaining dominant use. Therefore, the dominant use of these Public Lands should be designated as Wildlife because the hunter pays in license fees more than four times as much money into the Government coffers as does the domestic livestock industry for grazing fees for the use of these Public Lands.

Habitat and its ability to provide food and cover for wildlife is the most important factor necessary to increase our deer and elk herds. Grazing of domestic lifestock does cut down on the available food for our wildlife, especially on the winter range, which is most important if our game herds are to survive severe winters.

Domestic Livestock Operators are now complaining that the increase in grazing fees as proposed for 1971 and for the future years until the fee reaches $1.23, will put them out of business. Inasmuch as livestock grazing is NOT the dominant use of these lands it might be a good idea if they were reserved for wildlife. In this way more forage, browse and cover should be available for our big game herds and other wildlife and we could expect a substantial increase in the sport of hunting. If all big game license fees were increased $5.00 each it would produce to the Game Fish and Parks Division (247,086 x $5.00) $1,234,430 some $300,000 more than now collected for livestock grazing fees by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service. These agencies would also save considerable money in the administration and policing of the grazing services. The Game Fish and Parks Division could pay to the BLM and Forest Service the money collected by this $5.00 increase in hunting license fees and they would be $300,000 better off than they are now in collecting grazing fees. This would be much better than having a Federal hunting fee to be paid by the hunter for hunting on Federal lands as suggested in the Public Land Law Review report. Most hunters would gladly pay an additional $5.00 license fee if it could result in providing more foodstuffs for our wildlife and improve the habitat which could increase our game herds.

This of course would not mean that grazing of domestic livestock should be eliminated but more consideration should be given to wildlife and its place in competition for the forage on these Public Lands, because wildlife is the dominant use.

With Wildlife as the dominant ues of these grazing lands the Federal Agencies and the Game Fish and Parks Division should take a careful look into the use of these lands. Maybe the time is here when the Sportsman's dollar should compete for the use of these grazing rights for the benefit of wildlife.

TRIBUTE TO HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, BYRON ROGERS came to this body in January 1951, at the same time that I was returning to this body. Since that time I, as my colleagues of both parties, have developed an admiration for his diligent and effective service to the Nation. His colleagues on the great Judiciary Committee have commented on his distinguished service, and on his tireless work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization. I have known him to be a nationally minded legislator who could take a broad, nonparochial view of whatever legislation came before him. BYRON ROGERS has ably and effectively represented one of our great Western Mountain States, but he has never lost sight of national priorities. I frankly find it strange to think of a Congress without BYRON ROGERS, but the

legislative history of the past 20 years, especially in areas that fall under the jurisdiction of the great House Judiciary Committee, will be a living record of his service here.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for BYRON ROGERS good fortune and success as he leaves this body. We will miss him, but hope that he will come to visit with us often.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD OF CONNECTICUT

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I say goodby today to Senator TOM DODD, a man who has served in the Senate since his election to this great deliberative body in 1958.

In my estimation, Senator DODD's foremost achievements have been in the area of controlling drug abuse. He submitted the first bill ever introduced in Congress to control the sale and misuse of amphetamines and barbiturates. I was the only person available to hold the necessary hearings on this crucial piece of legislation when it was referred to the Commerce Committee of which I was a member at that time. The bill passed and became law.

In recent years as a member of the Judiciary Committee, he has continued to carry on investigations, hold hearings, and pass legislation which seeks to establish laws and enforcement procedures to combat the menace that narcotics pose to the very lives of our young people. I am proud that through the combined efforts of the Judiciary Committee and the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of which I am chairman, we were able to get the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (Public Law 91–513) enacted into law this year. It is my hope that this measure, along with others, will provide not only for the swift prosecution of drug offenders, but also for the treatment and preventive programs that are so vital if we are ever to overcome the problem of drug abuse in this country.

The Senator from Connecticut will also be remembered by future generations for his unstinting, and often unpopular, efforts in the area of gun control, and domestic security. I have disagreed, sometimes quite strongly, with some of the positions, viewpoints, and causes which TOM DODD has championed during his 12-year tenure as a U.S. Senator, but I have never questioned his loyalty, sincerity, or tenacity. I respect these characteristics in any man, and I respect them in THOMAS DODD. He is a fighter for the causes in which he believes.

TOM DODD has established a record of service in the Senate. I hope that his future years will be even more productive. I wish him well in whatever endeavor he may choose.

REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS IN THE 91ST CONGRESS

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works I report herein on its activities during the 91st Congress.

On February 4, 1969, the committee was formally organized into a structure consisting of five standing subcommittees, as follows: Rivers and Harbors, Flood Control, Roads, Public Buildings and Grounds, and Watershed Development; and the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program—investigating—the ad hoc Subcommittee on Appalachian Regional Development, and the Special Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs.

The committee had 660 bills for consideration during the first and second sessions of the 91st Congress, which were introduced or cosponsored by 394 individual Members. They deal with such subjects as navigation improvements, flood control, water pollution, environmental control, beach erosion control, hurricane protection, disaster relief, highways and highway safety, public buildings, land conveyances, watershed development, water supply, public works and economic development, Appalachian regional development, and uniform relocation and land acquisition policies.

Reported by the committee were 38 bills, 33 of which have been enacted into law. In addition, the committee adopted 62 river and harbor survey resolutions, 12 beach erosion survey resolutions, and 57 flood control survey resolutions. These resolutions authorized survey studies by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, that will ultimately result in the submission of project reports to Congress.

The committee approved 36 projects pursuant to the provisions of section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 which permits the Committees on Public Works to authorize, without additional congressional action, water resource development projects under $10 million. Fourteen flood control projects, 18 navigation projects, and four beach erosion projects were authorized by this procedure.

The major bills reported by the committee are:

The Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970 and the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970: This legislation contains such features as control of pollution by oil. It establishes for the first time in this category a cleanup authority; it also places strict features of liability on those who would ship oil. In the matter of vessels it establishes a category of $100 per gross ton or $14 million liability whichever is the lesser and in the field of onshore and offshore installations the figure is $8 million.

It moves into the area of operation of the small boatowners who move across our Nation's waterways in ever-increasing thousands. It provides the basis for a meaningful control of pollution discharge from these vessels under the rules and regulations to be worked out jointly by the U.S. Coast Guard and the Secretary of the Interior.

For the first time it establishes a requirement that when those who seek a license or permit from a Federal agency for the use of our Nation's waters whether it be to build nuclear powerplants, steam powerplants, or any other uses of our navigable waters they must give reasonable assurances that the operation of whatever they seek to require a permit for, will not lower the water pollution standards of the waters of a particular State. It goes into the field of acid mine drainage research, pollution control in the Great Lakes, land acquisition for field laboratories for the studying of various forms of pollution; oil pollution removal research; extension of the basic research authorization program now in existing law; a clean lakes research section; language to require development of scientific knowledge on the effects of pesticides in the environment, a pilot training program and an additional program to give those who would operate our Nation's sanitary facilities the best background and experience to carry out the job for staffing for our all important Council on Environmental Quality.

Disaster Relief Act of 1969: This act provides additional assistance for the reconstruction of areas damaged by major disasters occurring after June 30, 1967, and on or before December 31, 1970.

Disaster Relief Act of 1970: This legislation establishes an entirely new basic Federal disaster relief law and repeals all of the major substantive provisions dealing with this subject which were on the statute books. This legislation takes into consideration the experiences which have been gained over the years in helping the States and local communities reestablish themselves after major disasters. Included in the legislation are provisions for State disaster plans, use and coordination of relief organizations and Federal agencies, debris removal, temporary housing assistance, small business disaster loans, Farmers Home Administration Agency loans, assistance to communities for loss of tax revenues, repair and replacement of State and local government facilities, and other additional Federal assistance.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970: This legislation, among other things, authorizes an extension of the Interstate System construction through 1976 and authorizes the ABC highway program and other related programs for fiscal years 1972 and 1973. It establishes an urban system for metropolitan areas, the first major system addition since the creation of the Interstate System. It provides for exclusive bus lane construction to facilitate urban transit systems by more effectively using the Nation's highways. It funds the highway beautification program for a 3-year period and creates a commission to report back firm

recommendations within 1 year on some of the thorny problems involved in the beautification program. In addition, it funds highway safety activities two-thirds from the trust funds and one-third from the general fund.

River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of 1970: This legislation authorized the Army Corps of Engineers to construct, modify, or otherwise participate in the provision of 31 flood control, navigation, beach erosion, and other water resource development projects.

Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970: This legislation is the accumulation of lengthy and extensive efforts to develop legislation establishing a uniform policy for the fair and equitable treatment of persons who are displaced, or have their real property taken for Federal and federally assisted programs. This legislation recognizes that the Federal Government has a primary responsibility to provide uniform treatment for those forced to relocate by Federal and federally assisted programs and to ease the impact of such forced moves, and establishes the appropriate financial and other assistance for those displaced.

River Basin Monetary Authorization and Miscellaneous Civil Works Amendments Act of 1970: This legislation authorizes an increase in the monetary authorization for 13 comprehensive river basin plans previously approved by Congress, authorizes the completion of the Chesapeake Bay Basin comprehensive study and modifies the flood control projects on the Scioto River, Ohio, and the multiple purpose project at Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir, Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

John F. Kennedy Center: This legislation amended section 8 of the John F. Kennedy Center Act by increasing the authority for direct appropriations from $15,500,000 to $23 million, an increase of $7.5 million provided, as in the basic act, that this increase is matched by an equal amount of money, securities, and other property from other sources. In addition, Public Law 91–90, amended section 9 of the John F. Kennedy Center Act by authorizing an increase in the amount of bonds authorized to be issued to pay for the cost of the underground parking facilities by $5 million from the original $15,400,000 to $20,400,000.

Among other bills reported by the committee which became public law are the following:

Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1969; Regional Action Planning Commission Amendments of 1969; amendments to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965;

Amended the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for titles I through IV through fiscal year 1971;

Amended the act of August 12, 1969, to insure that certain facilities constructed under authority of Federal law are designed and constructed to be accessible to the physical handicapped;

Authorized additional funds for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building.

Authorized an adequate force for the protection of the Executive Mansion and foreign embassies;

Named the Federal Office Building and U.S. courthouse in Chicago, Ill., the "Everett McKinley Dirksen Building";

Granted the consent of Congress to the States of Maryland and West Virginia and the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia, as signatory bodies, for certain amendments to the compact creating the Potomac Valley Conservancy District and establishing the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin;

Amended section 15d of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to increase the amount of bonds which may be issued by the Tennessee Valley Authority;

Changed the name of certain projects for navigation and other purposes on the Arkansas River and names the Arkansas River navigation and comprehensive development project as the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System;

Changed the name of the West Branch Dam and Reservoir, Mahoning River, Ohio, to the Michael J. Kirwan Dam and Reservoir; and

Named a U.S. post office and courthouse in Boston, Mass., as the "John W. McCormack Post Office and Courthouse"; a Federal office building in Baltimore, Md., as the "George H. Fallon Federal Office Building"; and a Federal office building in St. Petersburg, Fla., as the "William C. Cramer Federal Office Building."

FURTHER COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The committee approved 53 watershed protection and flood prevention projects transmitted to Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture through the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended.

During the 91st Congress the committee approved 77 projects which includes construction, alterations, and purchases under the Public Buildings Act of 1959. These are public building projects to house Government agencies and facilities, including post offices, courthouses, customhouses, immigration quarters, warehouses, Federal office buildings, and so forth.

The committee held hearings and executive sessions almost continuously from the beginning of the Congress. In addition the subcommittees made special inspection trips to investigate flood, storm, and oil pollution damage in California; tornado and flood damage in northern Ohio; and Hurricane Camille damages in Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Subcommittees also held hearings in Texas on the Sabine River Basin, in Oklahoma and Arkansas on projects in the Arkansas River Basin; in Montana and Alaska on water resource projects in those States and on the proposed future development and use of the Alaska highway; inspected the Savannah River Basin and held hearings on its future development; as well as conducting a survey of the Tennessee Valley Authority installations in North Alabama and Tennessee; and inspected and held hearings at Sandy Hook, N.J., for an on-the-spot investigation of the waste disposal areas involved in the New York Bight area.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program during the 91st Congress continued to monitor the practices, policies and procedures involved in the administration of the highway program. Special attention was directed to those areas which previous inquiries and hearings identified as containing deficiencies and weaknesses. Corrective measures have been taken by the responsible Federal agencies and individual States, but the need for continuous oversight is apparent.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

Concerned with the tragic accident toll that continues to mount on the Nation's highways each year, the subcommittee carried forward its broad inquiry into the subject of highway safety, design, and operations. Opening phases of this study had analyzed roadside hazards and freeway signing and resulted in significant changes in design and construction practices.

Public hearings in 1969 opened the third phase of the overall safety study, taking a look at the nationwide lack of uniformity of traffic control devices and their effectiveness. Witnesses who enjoy national reputations in the highway safety field testified that traffic control devices, which include signs, signals, and pavement markings, have failed to do the necessary job. Supposed to have been standardized a long time ago, they are not standard. As a result, drivers operate under a confusing network of nonuniform, often contradictory, and sometimes even illegal direction that can lead them into danger.

Highway users must depend upon such devices for information, warning, and guidance to such an extent that uniform, high quality devices are necessary to the productive use and public acceptance of any highway regardless of its excellence in design. Consequently, the subcommittee considers this a subject of extreme importance and is pursuing the matter.

WET WEATHER PERFORMANCE

Attention has also been devoted to the subject of wet weather performance which includes the vitally important relationship between pavement surfaces and the steady growth of highway casualty statistics. During 1969, 15.5 million highway crashes in this country killed 56,400 Americans, while some 2 million others suffered disabling injuries, an intolerable new high. The importance of wet weather accidents is demonstrated by the fact that 9,000 persons were killed in 7,600 accidents while the roads were wet, and 376,000 suffered disabling injuries in 244,000 accidents under similar wet conditions. These facts and figures, representing what appears to be a wholly disproportionate segment of the whole accident record, clearly merit special and expeditious attention in the judgment of the subcommittee. Preliminary study has already indicated that real improvement can be had in this critical area.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

During the second session the subcommittee staff, at the direction of the Chair, undertook an examination of the administration of the Economic Development Act and the impact of EDA and related economic development programs which have been established under the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee. Following several days of public hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs during the second session the investigative study was expanded and continued through the end of the Congress. An account of the hearings is set forth under another portion of these remarks.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The Special Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs during the 91st Congress, first session, was directed by Chairman FALLON to begin a full-scale indepth study of the economic programs that have been enacted into law through legislation developed by the full committee in recent years. These programs include such acts as the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Area Redevelopment Act, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 including the regional commissions that have been established under title V of this act.

The findings of this evaluation and review were presented to the subcommittee at hearings on September 10, 21, and 30, 1970, and can be found in committee print No. 91–47.

It is expected that the subcommittee will present the report on its evaluation early in the new Congress.

My sincere appreciation for their splendid cooperation goes to the committee members, particularly the subcommittee chairmen. Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors and the Federal-Aid Highway Program Subcommittee; Congressman ROBERT E. JONES, chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, and the Ad Hoc Sucommittee on Appalachia; Congressman JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads; Congressman KENNETH J. GRAY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds; Congressman JIM WRIGHT, chairman of the Subcommittee on Watershed Development; and Congressman ED EDMONDSON, chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs.

To Congressman WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida, the ranking minority member of the committee, as well as the other able Members of the minority side who have done much to further the work of the committee, I wish to extend my deep and sincere appreciation also.

To all the staff of the committee and subcommittees may I thank you sincerely for a job well done.

In closing, may I point out that this is but a biref summary of the extentive activities of the Committee on Public Works during the 91st Congress, and a complete and detailed history of the committee's activities can be found in committee print No. 91–52, published by the committee.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOE TYDINGS

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, JOE TYDINGS' campaign slogan was, "He never ducks the tough ones," and unlike most campaign slogans it was an understatement of the truth. For JOE TYDINGS took the lead in many of the tough fights in the Senate: in gun control, in making the District of Columbia liveable, and in civil rights.

I am sorry to see him leave the Senate. He was not one of those who hid when a tough issue came up. He had the intelligence and courage to consider each issue objectively and decide, on its merits, if it would benefit the people of Maryland and of the Nation. He did not follow any crowds; he led them.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, Senator TYDINGS' contributions to our judicial system will stand for years as monuments to his Senate record. The Congress enacted his legislation creating a Federal Judicial Center, replacing the old, part-time U.S. Commissioners, and his legislation improved our jury selection procedures.

As chairman of the Senate District Committee, JOE shattered precedents in moving legislation through his committee. The election to be held in a few weeks of a District of Columbia delegate to Congress owes much to his awareness and sensitivity to the needs of this struggling city. He achieved and overhauled and restructured District of Columbia court system as well as the first citywide drug program in the Nation providing treatment for all addicts.

On Sunday, the President used the term "landmark" when he signed JOE TYDINGS' bill creating an Office of Population and Family Planning in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Three years before conservationists convinced America it might be murdered by its own technology, JOE drafted the National Estuarine Pollution Study to save our estuaries from extinction. He has been a strong supporter of antipollution legislation. His persistent efforts to outlaw soring of the hooves of Tennessee walking horses in their training resulted in a law ending that barbarous practice.

He worked for the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and its extension 5 years later. He led the floor fight for the Open Housing Act of 1968.

JOE has all the ingredients of a fine Senator, as well as a lovely wife and family, a dedicated staff, and a proud family heritage of public service. We will miss him in the Senate. Every American will be poorer for his absence, and I hope he keeps that in mind.

Even though you leave us in the Senate, JOE, I hope you keep fighting. I know you will not start ducking tough ones now.

CREDITORS EASE WAY FOR SHORT

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the Washington Post should be of interest to my colleagues particularly those on the District of Columbia Committee as apparently we will be ask to transfer the Robert Francis Kennedy Stadium from the District of Columbia to the Department of Interior and to grant a more favorable rental agreement. Since the 1970 rent has not been paid and the Armory Board is owed $110,000, it should be interesting to learn what might be considered a "more favorable" rental agreement.

The article follows:

CREDITORS EASE WAY FOR SHORT

(By Shirley Povich)

The critical financial squeeze of the Washington Senators, admitted by owner Robert E. Short, has been eased for him by the American Security and Trust Co. and other major creditors.

The Washington Post has learned that the bank, which holds a first trust of $2 million on the Senators' franchise, has agreed to defer, or "roll over," a $1 million payment due Tuesday, Jan. 12, plus interest of $180,000 also due on that date.

The Senators' largest creditor, the estate of James H. Johnston, also will "agree to go along" with the decision of the American Security and Trust Co., The Post was informed.

An interest payment of $154,000 on a $2.2 million loan to Short by the trustees of the Johnston estate has been overdue since Dec. 31.

LEMON DEFERS PAYMENT

James E. Lemon, former partner of the late Mr. Johnston before sale of the team to Short in early 1969, has agreed to postpone payment of overdue interest of $77,000 on the $1.1 million note he holds against the team. Lemon now is a 10 per cent partner of Short.

The Senators' owner who, in several conferences with his creditors, has asked relief from a threat of bankruptcy, pointed out that he expected other financial help in the form of advance payments of nearly $500,000 on the television and radio contracts.

Short said he also is hopeful of an early act by Congress at its next session that would transfer jurisdiction of Robert F. Kennedy Stadium from the District of Columbia to the Interior Department and lead to a more favorable rental and concessions agreement.

Meanwhile, the baseball team has not paid its stadium rent for the 1970 season, and owes the Armory Board $110,000. Hotels and airlines also are standing in line for payment of overdue bills against the Senators.

"HE PAID TOO MUCH"

Short has attributed his money squeeze to the financial crunch of his other holdings,

trucking and hotel investments, during the soft economy of the past year. "We also had anticipated a home attendance of a million fans in 1970," he said, "but the team's last-half slump cut that down." The Senators drew 824,780.

One Washington banking figure put Short's difficulty in other terms: "He simply paid too much for the team ($9.4 million) at those high interest rates prevailing in 1969."

For the money-pinched Senators, the anomaly is that in signing pitcher Denny McLain and outfielder Curtis Flood in recent months, they became the only team in major league history with three players in the $100,000 salary bracket. Frank Howard is the third.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RALPH YARBOROUGH

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the work and accomplishments of the senior Senator from Texas, RALPH YARBOROUGH, have already been recognized by my colleagues in their tributes and expressions of affection for him.

I served with RALPH YARBOROUGH on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and know well his initiative, his charm, and his perseverance and tenacity. During his long service in Congress, Senator YARBOROUGH has been an effective advocate of health measures, of fair working conditions, and of occupational health and safety legislation. He has been a great worker for his State of Texas.

Above all, RALPH YARBOROUGH is a man of, and for, the people. The Senate will not be quite the same without him.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GORE

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is with particular sadness that I watch the departure of the senior Senator from Tennessee, ALBERT GORE.

My association with the Senator from Tennessee has spanned my entire 18 years in the Senate. Both of us came to the Senate in the class of 52. Since that time my colleague has compiled a distinguished record in the work of the Senate, frequently being compared with such previous great members as Webster, Clay, and Calhoun.

ALBERT GORE has put his imprint upon the State of Tennessee, the Nation, and the U.S. Senate. His singular accomplishments have changed the course of our Nation. Early in his career he sponsored the historic 1956 Highway Act, which started the interstate highway system. He has diligently worked on the Foreign Relations Committee and for the betterment of East-West relations. It was my privilege to be associated with the Senator from Tennessee on the Senate Public Works Committee as a member of the Highways Subcommittee, of which he was chairman, at the time the 1956 Highway Act was passed and, more recently, to work with him on the Foreign Relations Committee.

In domestic legislation, particularly as a member of the Finance Committee, ALBERT GORE has rendered outstanding service in getting tax reform and social security amendments of particular benefit to the less affluent of our Nation. His leadership in these areas have earned him the respect and admiration of his fellow Senators.

In these difficult times, we will miss the abilities, the integrity, and the friendship of ALBERT GORE in the 92d Congress, but know full well that he will continue to work and influence our Nation.

URGES CONTINUED INDEPENDENCE OF SBA

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, ordinarily, it has not been my practice to attach credibility to rumors in this Capital City where these are almost an inherent stock in trade. However, there are disconcerting rumbles and reports circulating both in the Halls of Congress and in the executive departments downtown and in the press that plans may be in the formative stage to merge the Small Business Administration into a new agency whose major thrust would be the development of minority enterprise.

As chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee and one who believes that America's small businessmen deserve the best their Government can help to provide them, I believe I can assure those who may be thinking about accomplishing any such goal or goals that they are in for a fight on Capitol Hill.

The role of the Congress in discouraging plans to end the independence of the Small Business Administration is well known. During the Kennedy-Johnson administration, one merger effort was shot down before it became fully airborne. Almost 2 years ago Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans, in a statement at the National Press Club, declared that:

> The Small Business Administration by definition belongs in the Department of Commerce.

At that time, congressional reaction came swiftly. There was a strong resolution submitted to the President from the Senate Small Business Committee opposing any such plan. There were strong statements made before the Senate by five or six Senate committee chairmen and other Senators protesting any effort to cut away the independence of SBA.

So there will be no doubt about that position, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Small Business Committee's resolution of March 18, 1969, together with a letter of the same date transmitting such to the President be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I do not believe any minds have been changed in the past 2 years wherein there would be any meaningful support in the Congress for advocating the merger of SBA into the Commerce Department, irrespective of how it was sugar-coated with other functions being combined into its activities.

We are hearing much talk these days about various reorganization plans that may be coming along to the Congress. The highly respected Washington publication, the National Journal, on December 26, 1970, carried an indepth article entitled "Minorities Report: Panel Seeks Broader Federal Program To Help Non-White Business Ventures," and written by Jonathan Cottin. This article dealt at length with some of the problems of the Nixon administration in its efforts to put together a meaningful minority enterprise program and some of the pluses but mostly the minuses of the Commerce Department's Office of Minority Business Enterprise over the past year and one-half.

Briefly, a staff report of the President's Council on Minority Enterprise, according to the National Journal, is slated to be considered by that Council on January 15, which recommends:

First. Creation of an independent Agency for Expanded Ownership, to include the Small Business Administration, the Economic Development Administration, and the Office of Minority Business Enterprise, with assigned programs from the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Agriculture Department.

Second. Organization of an Agency for Expanded Ownership within the Department of Commerce.

Third. Creation of a quasi-public corporation to handle the same programs proposed for the Agency for Expanded Ownership, with money and staff provided by private sources.

During 1969, the Senate Small Business Committee focused its attention for 6 days of public hearings on the administration's key effort, the Commerce Department's Office of Minority Business Enterprise, to bring together a forceful and realistic program to help minorities enter and survive as business proprietors. Our committee concluded, after 10 months of OMBE's operation that:

> A defined and/or ongoing program for developing minority enterprise on a national scale would seem very much in doubt.

The Small Business Committee concluded at that time in a formal report that:

> A meaningful minority business program should be developed by the Nixon administration with defined goals, but that any such development should be carried out without detriment to regular loan and assistance programs operated by the Small Business Administration for all small businessmen generally.

Therefore, Mr. President, we are most hopeful that those in the executive branch with reorganization ideas keep in mind with proper perspective that the

Congress established SBA during the Eisenhower-Nixon administration in 1953 to help all small businessmen and in so doing it set down a national policy in favor of smaller business in this country as follows:

It is the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel, assist and protect, insofar as is possible, the interests of small-business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise . . . and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation.

Today, this country's small businessman needs help because he faces high interest rates, a tight policy in the private money market, continued inflationary pressures, a heavy tax load, and the absence of direct loans from the Small Business Administration because of White House budget-cutting, presumably to ease inflationary pressures generally.

We are hopeful that President Nixon will restore the Small Business Administration's direct loan program to the 1971–72 budget to a level to permit realistic needs of all small businesses nationwide to be met.

There is no question that a broadly based minority enterprise endeavor should be fashioned with defined goals. This would provide direction for the development of minority business enterprise efforts on a more acceptable basis, as the Senate Small Business Committee set out in its 20th annual report. But that report also pointed out such should be accomplished without detriment to regular loan assistance programs operated by the Small Business Administration for small businessmen generally.

Therefore. I would hope that any formulators of possible reorganization proposals will bear in mind some of these considerations so that in their sincere desire to be helpful in one area that a larger segment not be short-changed.

The Small Business Administration, under its broad legislative enactment, has the authority to help those 5½ million small businessmen who provide almost 50 percent of all the jobs in this land and contribute between 33 to 40 percent of the gross national product.

Personally, I believe it is absolutely necessary that the Small Business Administration continue as an independent agency so it can speak out with its own single voice for American small business.

Mr. President, in closing, I ask unanimous consent that the National Journal article of December 26, 1970, on this subject be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 20, 1969]

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON
SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1969.

RESOLUTION

Whereas in 1953 the Congress established the Small Business Administration as an independent agency "under the general direction and supervision of the President," and provided specifically that the Small Business Administration "shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government"; and

Whereas a new Administration has assumed control of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, and a new Administrator of the Small Business Administration has been appointed; and

Whereas printed and other reports persist that the future of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency may be in doubt; and

Whereas any departure from absolute independence for the Small Business Administration as a government agency would be contrary to the stated intent of Congress, and would patently abrogate the legislation creating the Small Business Administration as an independent agency of the Federal Government, and would lessen considerably the effective voice at the Federal level of the Nation's five and one-half million small businessmen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate strongly favors the continuation of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency and strongly recommends that its function not be transferred to, or assumed by, any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

ALAN BIBLE, Nevada, chairman; JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama; RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana; JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia; HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey; GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin; JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, New Mexico; FRED R. HARRIS, Oklahoma; THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, New Hampshire; MIKE GRAVEL, Alaska; JACOB K. JAVITS, New York; MARK O. HATFIELD, Oregon; ROBERT DOLE, Kansas, MARLOW W. COOK, Kentucky.

U.S. SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON
SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: May I call your attention to the enclosed resolution adopted this week by the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Small Business strongly favoring continuation of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency and opposing any proposal to merge it with or subordinate it to any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

The Committee's affirmative action stems from persistent and recurring reports, published and otherwise, that such an Executive reorganization proposal is under consideration. Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans has been quoted as stating at the National Press Club on March 5 that the Small Business Administration "by definition . . . belongs to the Department of Commerce."

It is my judgment that this country's almost 5½ million small businessmen view the Small Business Act of 1953 and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 as two of the outstanding legislative achievements of the Eisenhower-Nixon Administration. The former specifically provided that SBA "shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government."

Certainly, Congress and the Administration must have felt at that time that such language clearly represented a strong mandate that the small businessman was entitled to a strong clear, independent voice in his Government—a voice free from the pressure and influences of big business special interest groups not dedicated to serving the small business community.

It was important for SBA to speak independently for the small businessman during the Eisenhower-Nixon years of the 1950's. It was equally important for SBA to remain independent during both succeeding Democratic Administrations during which at least one merger effort was discouraged. Today, it is even more urgent that SBA remain an independent agency during a difficult economic cycle marked by high interest rates, shortage of capital, fiscal uncertainties and the march of corporate giantism, mergers of small businesses into big business and the advent of conglomerates. These have provided real threats to the small businessman as a viable force in protecting himself.

The Nation's nearly 5½ million small businessmen must retain their spokesman—SBA—at the national level if they are to continue to provide employment for 40 million people contributing approximately 40 percent of the country's gross national product of $808 billion annually.

As the son of a small businessman yourself, you must be appreciative of the concern of the country's small business community about any proposed merger of the Small Business Administration with the Executive Department charged primarily with assisting and supervising big business—the Department of Commerce.

I sincerely hope you share this Committee's concern, and, as Chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, I respectfully urge your support for the continued independence of the Small Business Administration.

Cordially,

ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman.

[From the National Journal, Dec. 26, 1970]

MINORITIES REPORT/PANEL SEEKS BROADER FEDERAL PROGRAM TO HELP NONWHITE BUSINESS VENTURES

(By Jonathan Cottin)

Leaders of an advisory council created by President Nixon have urged the Administration to undertake a more aggressive program to aid nonwhite businessmen.

A draft report prepared by the staff of the Advisory Council on Minority Enterprise told the White House that the Commerce Department lacks "the resources to get the job done."

The report, which has been reviewed by the advisory council's executive committee, was submitted to Mr. Nixon's Domestic Council No. 17.

In submitting the report, advisory council leaders were bypassing the man whom the council was appointed to advise—Commerce Secretary Maurice H. Stans.

One suggestion made in the report was that a new independent agency be established to handle the minority enterprise program.

The proposed agency would encompass two units now in the Commerce Department: the Economic Development Administration, a prime funding source for minority business projects, and the controversial Office of Minority Business Enterprise, the agency for the Administration's "black capitalism" program.

Stans has not commented publicly on the proposal, although he privately has opposed moving EDA and OMBE out of Commerce. Under Secretary Rocco C. Siciliano told *National Journal* that Stans ordered topranking officials at OMBE Nov. 30 to keep silent on the proposed changes.

Although the advisory council was directed by President Nixon to work with Stans, the Council chairman, Sam Wyly, and his staff have dealt directly with the White House since they began operations in 1969.

OMBE's director, Abraham S. Venable, whose programs have been under fire for several months, said in an interview Dec. 4 that he had asked Stans for a transfer. Venable said he told Stans, "I'm a tired warrior."

RECOMMENDATIONS

The advisory council staff proposals now pending before the Domestic Council call for a commitment to minority enterprise programs far beyond the present OMBE thrust.

The confidential draft report, a copy of which was obtained by *National Journal*, maintains that reorganization of the present structure is essential to carry out such a commitment.

The Commerce Department, as now constituted, "is in the position of having apparent responsibility for minority enterprise, but not having the resources to get the job done," the report states.

Reorganization: These three organizational alternatives to "more effectively utilize federal resources" are among its chief recommendations:

Creation of an independent Agency for Expanded Ownership, to be formed by the fusion of the Small Business Administration, EDA and OMBE, with assigned programs from the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Agriculture Department;

Creation of an AEO within the Commerce Department;

Establishment of a quasi-public corporation to handle the same programs envisioned for AEO, with money and staff provided by private sources.

Since the draft report was submitted to the White House, two other alternatives it suggested have been discarded by the advisory council's 15-member executive committee. They called for strengthening OMBE within the Commerce Department or moving it to the Executive Office of the President.

Broader concept: The report strongly suggests that "the concept of 'minority enterprise' (which grew from an earlier concept of 'black capitalism') be further broadened to embrace a concept of 'expanded ownership.'"

Its recommendations are based on the premise that "substantially increased ownership of economic resources in urban and rural areas should be made a major national priority for the decade of the seventies."

The report calls for a program that helps both minority and nonminority small businessmen, since they have 'much in common and . . . much is to be gained by a strategy and structure of private and public effort designed to assist in the solution of their common problems."

Financial aid: Other proposals contained in the report require no governmental restructuring. They include:

A $930-million, three-year federal commitment for minority enterprise development;

Federally funded research on costs and benefits of minority business programs;

Special student scholarship programs to encourage more members of minority groups to take management training courses;

Tax breaks for companies assisting minority business ventures;

Less federal control of local minority business assistance programs.

Status: The recommendations are now on the desk of John F. Evans, a Presidential staff assistant assigned to the Domestic Council. (*For background on Domestic Council, see p. 620.*) Bradley H. Patterson Jr., an aide to Leonard Garment, special consultant to the President on minority problems, said Evans has "got all the pieces," including a lengthy memorandum from Stans detailing progress in the minority enterprise program.

RELATIONSHIPS

The 150-page advisory council staff report would not have gone directly to the White House if the intention of the directive (Exec Order 11458) creating the body had been observed. But the White House is where the council found the help and cooperation it needed to operate.

Original intent: Mr. Nixon created the advisory council on March 5, 1969. His executive order specified that "the council shall meet at the call of the (Commerce) Secretary . . . be advisory to the Secretary . . . keep abreast of plans, programs and activities in the public and private sector which relate to minority enterprise, and advise the Secretary on any measures to better achieve the objectives of this order . . . and consider and advise the Secretary and such officials as he may designate, on problems and matters referred to the council."

(The first 63 members of the council were not appointed by the President until Sept. 17, 1969.)

Stans followed with a letter to Chairman Wyly on Nov. 25, 1969, saying he wanted the group to examine "the principles on which the program of the Office of Minority Enterprises is based"; evaluate OMBE programs under way and in the planning stage; "suggest ideas, give critiques and propose alternative programs and methods to OMBE"; and provide "continuing advice."

"When council members have reached the point where they can finalize their ideas and proposals," Stans wrote Wyly, "they will put them forward as legislative, administrative or budgetary recommendations to the Secretary of Commerce."

Wyly's explanation: Wyly, a Dallas, Tex., computer firm president, gave this explanation of how a working relationship developed between his staff and the White House, rather than the Commerce Department:

"The council's role was very broadly defined in the executive order. We didn't have any clear direction from the White House or the Secretary."

Thus, he said, there was not even a provision for a staff.

Wyly, who is a friend of the President and raised money for his 1968 campaign, said many of the minority members of the council were suspicious that Mr. Nixon meant the council to do nothing.

"I went to my friends in the White House and asked if the council was meant to be an ornament and said if it was, they should get someone else," Wyly continued.

"They said, 'We don't want a decoration. We know the minority people think we don't want to do anything, but the President is genuinely interested in doing what can be done.'"

When he asked the White House for a staff, the request was granted, Wyly said.

Wyly said he prevailed upon the President to increase the council membership from 63 to 84 so minorities would be better represented. He also set up an executive committee, with half the membership from racial minorities.

Although a report to the White House was not prescribed, Wyly said the council decided it would be "the best way to focus" on the problems. "It was the appropriate way of giving our advice."

Staff operation: The advisory council staff began dealing with the White House shortly after its executive director, Alan W. Steelman, started work in Washington in late September 1969.

While there was no attempt initially to bypass Stans, the council staff and officials met frequently with White House assistants, including John D. Ehrlichman, assistant to the President for domestic affairs, and Garment.

Steelman said it was "our assumption" that since the group was named by the President, its mission was to report to him.

One council source, who declined to be identified, was more blunt: "We were called upon to produce a major product and that meant a separate staff, money of our own and a blueprint. There was disagreement on that at the Department of Commerce, but we went our own way."

The White House was not reluctant to deal directly with the council staff, Steelman said. "The White House was very cooperative. They helped us get money. Our relations with Ehrlichman and Garment have been superb. . . . Not in any way did they tamper with the size of the effort or anything else."

Steelman said he obtained a pledge Nov. 30 from Kenneth R. Cole Jr., deputy assistant to the President for domestic affairs, that $150,000 would be provided for completion of the staff's work and publication of the report. He mentioned the promise as evidence of White House backing.

(The council has spent most of the $450,000 allocated—a $250,000 Commerce Department appropriation and a $200,000 OEO grant. Siciliano said Commerce had no funds that it could make available to the council.)

CRITICISM

While the council staff report avoids direct criticism of OMBE programs and methods, some council members do not. Siciliano said, "The relationship between OMBE and the council is not a warm one."

EDA grants: Darwin W. Bolden, a council member, has repeatedly criticized OMBE tactics. Bolden is national executive director of the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity, an independent organization which has offices in eight major cities.

His complaint concerns the method used to encourage minority business development organizations in various cities to become OMBE affiliates.

One of the tangible ways OMBE can show results is through development of a nationwide network of affiliated local organizations, and it strongly urges affiliation. In return, it provides local affiliates with background information on every federal program designed to involve minority group members in business ownership and management.

More important, affiliation with OMBE—which has no funding authority of its own—brings money from the Economic Development Administration, OMBE's sister agency within the Commerce Department.

Many of the minority business development groups already receive EDA grants, but they come up for renewal each year.

A survey of local organizations affiliated with the Office of Minority Business Enterprise shows that all but one of them obtained an increase in EDA funding after signing on with OMBE.

The one exception was a San Francisco organization which was to be phased out of all EDA financing. Then the group, Plan of Action for Challenging Times, agreed to affiliate with OMBE and its approval for EDA funding was restored with a fresh $180,000 grant that was only $4,000 less than it's expiring grant.

Bolden's complaint—Bolden maintains that OMBE uses the EDA grant money as a club. During an interview in his New York office, he described a meeting held last July 15 at which Venable, the program's director, explained the OMBE affiliate idea to more than 20 representatives of minority development groups from throughout the country.

"At the meeting," Bolden said, "it was clearly stated by Abe Venable that either you became an OMBE affiliate or your EDA funding would probably not be renewed and you certainly would not get more EDA funding. Those were his words."

Bolden rejected OMBE affiliation in order to maintain his organization's independence. He said he has a high regard for Venable but not for the OMBE program.

Venable's version—Venable recalled the July meeting somewhat differently. He said he told the business leaders that OMBE was the Administration's vehicle for building minority capitalism. "I said, 'If you are going to stay in the ball game, it's being played with OMBE.' The guys who are part of the program certainly will benefit from that and the funds."

Venable remembers discussing the EDA

cash reward for OMBE affiliation this way: "I said, 'You won't get cut off but I can't see you will be refunded either.' "

OMBE has no authority to cut off money spent by EDA, Venable said, but he conceded his agency consults with EDA about affiliate prospects.

Delivery system: There also have been objections lodged against the "delivery system" OMBE has devised to help minority group members get the capital and technical advice they need to become businessmen.

Local affiliates are supposed to "serve as the focal point for information, business and technical assistance and follow-up services," says *OMBE Outlook*, an official publication of the agency.

Council critique.—By implication, the council staff issued a negative verdict on the delivery scheme when it suggested a much broader concept: establishment of "one-stop packaging centers" where federal officials and designees from the private sector of the economy would have on-the-spot power to commit money and management manpower for a new minority business venture.

This goes considerably beyond the information center idea embraced by the Commerce Department leadership. In Washington, Michael D. Wallach, director of the Business Assistance Center of the Mayor's Economic Development Committee, an OMBE affiliate, said: "They're delivering information. They're not delivering any dollars."

Bolden—Describing OMBE as "one of the poorest-managed federal agencies I know," Bolden said the agency's local delivery system offers nothing to the would-be minority entrepreneur that was not available before. "All of these organizations (designated as affiliates) existed before OMBE came into the field. They have been enlarged slightly. But if OMBE were to go out of business tomorrow, there would be no void."

Bolden called OMBE a "tragic failure" and said "it cannot be saved."

Chamber of Commerce—The Chamber of Commerce of the U.S. leveled another criticism against the local delivery system. Chamber officials have told the council the present system will not work.

Owen Kugle, coordinator for urban affairs at the chamber's Washington headquarters, said that in large cities with many minority economic development groups, an OMBE designation of one, with the accompanying EDA cash, "turns the others off."

"Without cooperation from the other groups, it becomes harder to locate would-be businessmen," Kugle said. "Without community support, the whole delivery system is not going to work," he added.

Senate committee—On Nov. 10, the Senate Select Committee on Small Business issued a critical analysis of OMBE (SRept 91-1343) that said: "If the full extent of minority enterprise development is to be achieved, it seems imperative that a more comprehensive, defined program be instituted."

The panel declared that "only with a comprehensive, defined national effort can there be real hope to surmount the problems of the minority businessman. A piecemeal approach will result only in unkept promises and ineffective programs.

The committee, which held oversight hearings on OMBE in June, July and October 1969, suggested that the agency's lack of power to commit money was a major reason for its inability to perform adequately.

"With no substantive statutory power other than the executive order, and no plan of federal requirements, it seems difficult to understand how real and effective coordination can be achieved without the guidelines of a defined, broad effort," the committee said.

FUTURE

The continuing criticism, from a wide range of interests and institutions, may bring about some changes and more aggressive programs in the field of minority capitalism.

Steelman thinks the election results have caused the White House to look more closely into the minority enterprise problem. "Since Nov. 3, this has been a higher priority item," he said.

Wyly agrees. "We're coming to the end of the report at a time when the Domestic Council is getting really serious about proposing more positive programs if it makes sense," he said during a telephone interview from Dallas.

"I don't believe the Domestic Council wants to bury the report now," Wyly added. "There will be some positive recommendations—both on the administrative and legislative fronts in the first half of next year."

White House: At the White House, Robert J. Brown, the only black Presidential special assistant, defends OMBE but hints that the agency may be changed structurally.

"It may be that they need more clout than they have," he said. Six months ago, in another interview, Brown said of OMBE: "They have White House influence and power. I don't think you can get any bigger clout than that."

As for the council proposals, Brown said Nov. 30, "we will be guided strongly by whatever the chairman recommends along with what Secretary Stans and the rest advise."

Brown said he doubts that there are "any differences between Secretary Stans and Sam Wyly. . . . I am sure any problems that they have will be resolved without any difficulty."

Brown maintained that OMBE has performed well "under the circumstances." But, he added, "maybe we need to make the circumstances better to do the job better."

Another White House source, who declined to be identified, said it would be logical to conclude that President Nixon would be receptive to a proposal for a change in OMBE's status. He said he expects the President to deal with the issue in his State of the Union address next month.

Commerce: Now that the White House appears more receptive toward a change in OMBE's structure, Under Secretary Siciliano says Commerce is not against it. He said Stans is "completely wedded to this program." But, he added, "we're not looking at it from a jurisdictional point of view."

Siciliano described OMBE as an experiment, a pilot project.

"I don't think OMBE organizationally is a static thing. It's not frozen in concrete," he said. Six month's ago, in an interview, he said there were no plans to revise the structure of the office.

Council: Final action on the draft report is scheduled for a Jan. 15 meeting of the full council.

Shortly thereafter, Wyly and other top council officials plan to present the report formally to Mr. Nixon and the report formally to Mr. Nixon and Secretary Stans at a White House ceremony.

The report will then be printed and made available to all government agencies. Minority organizations and private sector trade associations will also be sent copies of the report free on request, Steelman said.

Venable: Meanwhile, OMBE Director Venable is casting about for new job opportunities. "I want a fresh assignment," he said Dec. 14.

An affable, optimistic man, Venable was planning a vacation during the Christmas holidays. He said his departure was not imminent, because there is "too much unfinished work."

As for moving on to a new job in either Commerce or private business, he said he has "looked at things but I haven't made any firm decisions."

Whatever the fate of OMBE or Venable, its embattled director, the larger issue of Administration commitment to America's racial minorities, who comprise 11.3 per cent of the population, continues to trouble men like Bolden.

"If no new substantive effort is taken," he said, "OMBE must be regarded as a Nixon copout."

ADVISORY COUNCIL OFFICES, STAFF

Offices for the Advisory Council on Minority Enterprise are located at 923 15th Street, NW, Washington, D.C., in the same building as Council Chairman Sam Wyly's University Computing Co. Wyly donated the office space. The council has 14 professional staff members, who have conducted interviews, compiled data on minority ownership problems and written draft recommendations now pending at the White House. The total staff, including clerical personnel, numbers about 30. Professional staff members are:

Alan W. Steelman, 28, executive director, on paid leave as executive director of the Sam Wyly Foundation, Dallas, an organization promoting better opportunities for minorities. Steelman was executive director of the Dallas County, Tex., Republican Party from 1966–69. He is a trustee and director of KERA–TV in Dallas; a director of the American Federation of Radio and Television Artists Local 740 in Dallas, and a director of the LQC Lamar Society, an organization of Southerners of both parties which states its belief that "the fulfillment (of the South's potential) has been delayed by the preoccupation of regional energies with the question of racial integration, rather than with other pressing problems." Steelman is the only staff member not on the council payroll.

Iverson O. Mitchell, 48, deputy director. Formerly senior commercial loan specialist, Economic Development Administration.

Dr. Samuel I. Doctors, 36, acting director, task force on national strategies and goals. Chief report writer. Associate professor of management, Northwestern University Graduate School of Management.

Carlene G. Harrell, 32, administrative assistant. Former secretary, Office of Policy Development, office of Commerce Secretary.

Sharon Lockwood, 28, research associate. Former financial economist, Small Business Administration.

Freddie H. Lucas, 34, consultant, public relations. Former program specialist, Women's Job Corps.

Josephine Rita Mangiapane, 25, research associate. Former consultant, Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs.

Joyce A. Gates Mitchell, 26, research associate. Former supervisor, Work Incentive Program, YMCA, Washington, D.C.

Charles Smith, 35, associate director for expanded participation. Former economic development specialist, Office of Economic Opportunity.

Anthony Rodney Stadeker, 41, associate director for business opportunity. Former economic development program consultant, Chicago Community Renewal Society.

Sim Stokes, 26, associate director for management and technical assistance. Former executive trainee in operation, National Bank of Commerce, Dallas.

John Topping, 27, research associate. Former defense counsel, Judge Advocate General Corps, U.S. Army.

John E. Troutman, 52, consultant. Former assistant to the president, Education Systems Inc., a subsidiary of LTV Aerospace Corp.

Israel Valdez Sr., 49, associate director for finance. Former special assistant to the Administrator of SBA.

Source: Advisory Council on Minority Enterprise.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The 13 members of the executive committee of the Advisory Council on Minority Enterprise are:

Sam Wyly, chairman, board chairman, University Computing Co., Dallas, Tex.

Berkeley G. Burrell, vice chairman; presi-

dent, National Business League, Washington, D.C.

John Belindo, director, National Indian Leadership Training Institute, Albuquerque, N.M.

Darwin W. Bolden, national executive director, Interracial Council for Business Opportunity, New York, N.Y.

Ben Fernandez, president and general manager, Research Inc., Chatsworth, Calif.

David B. Hertz, director, McKinsey & Co., New York, N.Y.

Joe W. Kirven, president, ABCO Building Maintenance Co., Dallas, Tex.

Robert Bruce McKersie, professor of industrial relations, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Alex Mercure, executive director, Home Education Livelihood Program, Albuquerque, N.M.

Albert C. Meyer, senior vice president, Bank of America, Los Angeles, Calif.

Donald E. Sneed Jr., president and board chairman, Unity Bank & Trust Co., Roxbury, Mass.

The Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, pastor, Zion Baptist Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

Arthur M. Wood, president, Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chicago, Ill.

GRANTS TO OMBE AFFILIATES

Using federal cash as an inducement, the Office of Minority Business Enterprises encourages local minority development organizations to affiliate with the federal agency. Every organization that signs up to distribute data from OMBE on federal programs to help minority businessmen receives a grant from the Economic Development Administration. OMBE approves the EDA grants. In some cases, it is the affiliate's first EDA money; in others, the funds supplement previous EDA grants.

This table lists financial benefits received by organizations that affiliated with OMBE between July 15 and Dec. 1 this year. The first column lists each organization's fiscal 1971 EDA grant before affiliation; the second column lists additional funding received after affiliation.

Organization	Before	After	Total
United Inner City Development Foundation, Seattle	$81,700	$50,000	$131,700
South Central Improvement Council Inc., Los Angeles	90,000	60,000	150,000
East Los Angeles Community Union, Los Angeles	99,700	60,000	159,700
Minority Economic Development and Industrialization Corp., Newark, N.J.	75,000	67,295	132,295
Brooklyn Local Economic Development Corp., New York	87,030	54,970	142,000
Zion Non-Profit Charitable Trust Entrepreneurial Development Training Center, Philadelphia	0	161,000	161,000
Mayor's Economic Development Committee, Washington	0	140,507	140,507
Howard University, Washington	125,000	50,000	175,000
Plan of Action for Challenging Times, San Francisco	0	180,000	180,000

Source: Economic Development Administration.

TRIBUTE TO HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, as ROSS ADAIR leaves the Congress I could not let the occasion pass without expressing to him my highest respect and affection. Ross ADAIR has compiled a record of achievement that has won the esteem of his colleagues from both sides of aisle. As a fellow member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have observed his tireless work for the benefit of our veterans and their dependents. The GI bill, pension increases, and other important legislation are part of the permanent legislative record that Ross ADAIR leaves with us. He leaves with the respect and affection of Members on both sides of the aisle. Mrs. Dorn joins me in extending to him my very best wishes and my hope that he will enjoy good health and good fortune.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN O. MARSH

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, when the 92d Congress convenes on January 21, some of our colleagues will be missing from this Chamber. One of them is the statesman from Virginia, JOHN O. MARSH, JR. The gentleman has spent 8 years representing the people of the Seventh District of Virginia. There is abundant record that he has represented it ably and well and with complete dedication to not only his State but the Nation as well. Congressman Marsh has been an exemplary public servant. He has been a foremost patriot. He has demonstrated many times not only political courage but a high order of selflessness in service to our Nation. He has been faithful to friends, a hard-hitting but fair partisan, a dynamic and effective leader. He has made valuable contributions to the Appropriations Committee and, it has been my good fortune to know and serve with him in both the Appropriations Committee and the House of Representatives. He has demonstrated time and time again his able and forceful manner as a legislator and a leader.

We will miss him very much in this body and, as he leaves us, I heartily congratulate him upon his fine service and wish for him and his family all choicest blessings of continued good health, happiness, and peace for many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO ALLARD LOWENSTEIN

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my regret that ALLARD LOWENSTEIN's congressional service is at least temporarily coming to an end. He was the calculated victim of a redistricting pen, not a Congressman who lost the confidence of the voters who originally sent him to the House 2 years ago.

Yet those of us who are acquainted with AL LOWENSTEIN know that he is impatient with an excess of sympathy or lament. He has in his still young life known many victories, and not a few defeats. He is resilient, unwavering in his confidence for the future, and never at a loss for new quests and for new battles. AL LOWENSTEIN was known to many of us before he came to the House, and he will be known for many years to come. His unflagging energy, his exceptional capacity for enlarging the public vision, the loyalties he inspires, and the causes which he infuses with fresh purpose and meaning, are guarantors of a public career far into the future. Even those in this House who have not shared all his views have been impressed by his powers of persuasion, his ability to talk with and across all generations, his imaginative mind, and his generous nature. He always expands his mind and energies to the very limits, and his dedication is legendary.

I expect that AL LOWENSTEIN will always be among us—as a Member, or witness, or as a political mentor when times are difficult. We do not say farewell to him; instead we await another chapter in an immensely productive and vigorous career.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE RICHARD OTTINGER

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of the 91st Congress, I wish to take note with great regret that our able colleague from New York, RICHARD OTTINGER, will not be with us in the next Congress. He will be sorely missed.

DICK OTTINGER and I came to the House at the same time, and I have had the privilege of working with him on many matters of common interest.

In particular, we worked together for the creation of the Hudson River Valley Commission, the preservation of the ecology and the beauties of this great river valley being of especial interest to our constituents.

DICK showed great independence of mind in taking positions on important issues and was quite willing to cast votes that might be politically unpopular in his district when he felt deeply.

Congressman OTTINGER took the lead on many important projects involving joint action or statements by Members. His energy was extraordinary, and he showed great imagination in his approach to many public problems.

I hope that Congressman OTTINGER will be back in the Congress before long. In any case, whether or not he seeks public office again, he will surely be fighting for good causes. We all wish for him and his charming wife and family the best of good fortune in whatever they undertake.

FRANKLIN'S ELECTRIC MOTOR

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Americans have long held Benjamin Franklin as one of our greatest forefathers. a legend within his own time. His deeds are known to almost every schoolchild, for Franklin excelled as a statesman, diplomat, inventor, and as a leader of men.

As an inventor he is credited with designing lightning rods, bifocal glasses, the Franklin stove, and other inventions, many of which still titillate the imagination.

For a few years, Franklin occupied himself with electricity, particularly its positive and negative properties.

But Franklin's achievements were far greater than recognized either by his contemporaries, or later by historians. While Michael Faraday is generally given the credit for inventing, during the early 1830's, the first electric motor, the fact is that Franklin designed an electric motor in the 1740's.

Okey M. Cogar, a research associate in the department of physics at West Virginia University and a longtime admirer of Franklin, recently verified that Franklin's design of an electric motor was functional. Following the instructions found in a letter authored by Franklin in 1748, Mr. Cogar successfully constructed, operated, and tested the motor with a load of 100 silver dollars.

Mr. President, Mr. Cogar's findings are significant, as the electric motor is one of the great inventions of history. Our modern technological society would be almost helpless without it; mass transportation in our urban areas would be at a standstill. Credit for the design of the elecrtic motor should be given where due, particularly if the recognition goes to Ben Franklin.

Mr. Cogar's report entitled "Franklin's Electric Motor" and a newspaper article which appeared in the Times-West Virginian of January 11, 1970, follow:

FRANKLIN'S ELECTRIC MOTOR

(By Okey M. Cogar)

In Letter IV [1] from Benj. Franklin, Esq; in Philadelphia to Peter Collinson, Esq; F.R.S. London, bearing the date 1748, there is described what is probably the first electric motor, its mode of operation, and some practical examples of how it might be used. That part of the letter dealing with the motor, which was used to produce the replica, follows below.

"On the principle, . . . that hooks(1) [The prime conductor of a Leyden Jar—generally a sphere] of bottles,(2) differently charged will attract and repel differently, is made an electrical wheel, that turns with considerable strength. A small upright shaft of wood(3) passes at right angles through a thin round board,(4) of about 12" diameter, and turns on a sharp point of iron,(5) fixed in the lower end, while a strong wire in the upper end,(6) passing through a small hole in a thin brass plate,(7) keeps the shaft truly vertical. About thirty radii of equal length, made of sash glass,(8) cut in narrow strips, issue horizontally from the circumference of the board, the ends most distant from the center [thimble tips], being about four inches apart. On the end of every one, a brass thimble(9) is fixed. If now the wire of a bottle electrified in the common way [negative polarity], be brought near the circumference of this wheel, it will attract the nearest thimble, and so put the wheel in motion; that thimble, in passing by, receives a spark, and thereby being electrified is repelled and so driven forwards; while a second being attracted, approaches the wire, receives a spark, and is driven after the first, and so on until the wheel has gone one round, when the thimbles before electrified approaching the wire, instead of being attracted as they were at first, are repelled, and the motion presently ceases. But if another bottle, which had been charged through the coating [positive polarity], be placed near the same wheel, its wire will attract the thimble repelled by the first, and thereby double the force that carries the wheel round; and not only taking out the fire [electrical charge on thimble] that had been communicated to the thimbles by the first bottle, but even robbing them for their natural quantity, instead of being repelled when they come again towards the first bottle, they are more strongly attracted, so that the wheel mends its pace, till it goes with great rapidity twelve or fifteen rounds in a minute, and with such strength, as the weight of one hundred Spanish dollars with which we once loaded it, did not seem in the least to retard its motion."

Having constructed the wheel according to Franklin's instructions, the problem remained of mounting it in a suitable device that would fit into the same time period. To distract as little as possible from the wheel is was decided to use a single board for a table (10) with a turned wooden upright (11), holding the top bearing support (12), which is simply a round wooden rod of ½" diameter. This rod is cemented into a yoke (13), that clamps to the upright with a wooden set-screw (14). The table was then mounted on four turned wooden legs (15). A rectangular piece of glass is used as an insulator for the Leyden jars. (16). The wheel is made as Franklin described it; hopefully the mounting, or table, is somewhat similar to that used by him in the early period of his electrical investigations.

Franklin's motor was not a mere "philosophical toy" as some have suggested. The system of bearings, that support the wheel in such a graceful manner, would be hard to improve upon. There is so little friction that a breath will start the wheel rotating. The most startling first impression is the size of the device. Its diameter is 37" and it is about 35" high. Our wheel was reduced in diameter to slightly more than 24" for easier handling. It will do work; as evidenced by the ease with which it turned when loaded with one-hundred silver dollars.

After the wheel was constructed it was powered by two charged Leyden jars and it performed in the manner described in Franklin's letter to Collinson. For safety, comfort, and ease of operation a small static generator was constructed. Voltage was delivered to the thimbles through four electrodes, one mounted in plexiglass on each corner of the table. The generator was at first hand-cranked but later a small motor and "O" ring belt drive were substituted for the crank. With this generator the wheel turns hour after hour at a speed of 30 to 40 revolutions per minute depending upon conditions of humidity. It can be noted that the electrodes are cross-connected; lower left corner to upper right corner, and lower right corner to upper left corner. This arrangement provides a negative-positive-negative-positive polarization and Franklin's principle of attraction and repulsion is used. The generator produces 40,000 to 50,000 volts and the wheel operates with a few microamperes of current.

The only real remaining evidence that Franklin's motor was displayed to the general public during his lifetime is a broadside printed in St. John's, Antigua, in the West Indies, bearing the date April 25, 1753. The motor display was advertised as part of a public lecture given by Franklin's friend and neighbor, Ebenezer Kinnersley. It read, in part, "A Wheel of a curious Machine turned round by lightning and playing Variety of Tunes on eight musical Bells".

COGAR FOLLOWS FRANKLIN'S DIRECTIONS TO MAKE MOTOR

MORGANTOWN.—The Russians may have invented fire, but good old Ben Franklin invented the first electric rotisserie. And in doing that he also invented the first electric motor.

Those inventions aren't generally attributed to Franklin, who was born on Jan. 17, 1706, in Boston, Mass.

But Okey M. Cogar, research associate in the Department of Physics at West Virginia University, recently proved that Franklin's instructions for constructing an electric motor really work.

Out of the sheer delight of doing things, Cogar (with the help of Dr. Oleg Jefimenko, WVU professor of physics) decided to build an electric motor according to Franklin's instructions.

"It didn't surprise me that the motor worked, but it is surprising that it took over 100 years before anyone found any practical use for an electric motor—and of course the fellow built his motor on an entirely different principle than that used by Franklin," Cogar said.

Franklin's motor, which he called an electric jack, is based on the principles of static electricity and was described by him in a letter written in 1748. Michael Faraday, who is generally given credit for inventing the first electric motor, is reported to have studied Franklin's book, "Experiments and Observations on Electricity."

Faraday's motor, which is based on the principles of electro-magnetism and is the type that is commonly used today, was built in the early 1830's. His discovery, which may sound simple but has changed man's way of life, was that a copper disk would rotate when placed between two magnets.

DAVENPORT MOTOR

The first practical electro-magnetic motor was developed on Faraday's model by Thomas Davenport, a New England blacksmith who used it to drive a drill press. Davenport's motor, was patented in 1837, was powered by three chemical cells (batteries).

Franklin's motor consisted of a horizontal wooden disk 12 inches in diameter fitted with 30 narrow strips of glass with brass thimbles on the end. This "electric wheel" rotated on a vertical wooden shaft that had an iron point at its lower end and a wire extending from the upper end. The wire was passed through a small hole in a thin brass plate to keep the shaft vertical.

The motor was powered by condensers (Leyden jars). Leyden jars of Franklin's time were wide-mouth bottles full of water and coated on the outside with metal foil. A metal hook was passed through the cork and submerged in the water. The jars were charged by mechanically turning a glass globe and rubbing it with a piece of buckskin. The charges were picked up from the globe and transferred by a wire to the hook or the metal foil of the jar.

---

[1] Benj. Franklin, *Experiments and Observations on Electricity—1774*, edited by I. Bernard Cohen (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1941), pp. 194–95.

The simplest form of the motor consisted of the electric wheel and two oppositely charged Leyden jars placed 180 degrees apart.

SPARKED THIMBLES

As each thimble approached the hook of the first jar, it would receive a spark (like charges of electricity repel each other and unlike charges attract). Now that the thimble and the hook had the same charge, the thimble was repelled and caused the wheel to turn.

As that thimble approached the second jar, it was attracted and added this force to turning the wheel. But because the charge on the second jar was much greater than that on the thimble, a spark opposite in charge to the first spark would pass from the thimble to the second hook and thus give the thimble and the second hook the same charge. This would cause the thimble to be repelled from the second jar and attracted by the first jar.

According to Franklin, he was able to make such a wheel turn at from 12 to 15 rpm and placing 100 Spanish dollars (about the size of our silver dollar) on it didn't slow it down. Except for unimportant changes in the materials used and the use of modern Leyden jars, the motor made by Cogar is an exact replica of Franklin's motor.

Franklin was always a practical man. In one of his letters to a friend in England, he described a proposed party—"a turkey is to be killed for . . . dinner by the electrical shock, and roasted by the electrical jack, before a fire kindled by the electrified bottle: then the healths of all the famous electricians . . . are to be drank in electrified bumpers, under the discharge of the guns of the electrical battery. (Electrified bumpers were glasses that were coated with metal foil and filled with liquor and charged. The drinker, thus, received two jolts).

In a late letter, Franklin added. "I conceit that the Birds kill'd in this Manner eat uncommonly tender."

Because of Franklin's numerous accomplishments in diplomacy and other fields, many people don't realize that he was also a first rate scientist, Cogar said.

MANY INVENTIONS

"He not only invented the Franklin stove and the lightning rod, but made several important contributions to electrical theory. He proved that the positive and negative charges on a condenser are equal and was one of the foremost advocates of the theory that there are two kinds (positive and negative) of electricity. He also coined the terms positive and negative as applied to electricity and was the first to use the plus and negative signs.

"He also showed that static electricity is attracted to and discharged from pointed bodies more readily than curved bodies. The lightning rod was one of the applications to this principle" Cogar explained.

The "points-versus-balls" argument over lightning rods is a good example of what happens when politicians dabble in scientific matters. Franklin, who was the first non-Englishman to be elected to the Royal Society in England, had a long standing argument with certain English scientists over whether a lightning rod should be topped with a point or a ball. He had been able to convince most scientists that points were the best, but a few English scientists were not swayed.

Before the American Revolution many public buildings in England, including some powder magazines, had been equipped with pointed lightning rods. When the Revolution started and Franklin was considered a traitor, some English politicians thought that the points were a foul American plot. The points were replaced with balls, and sure enough, one of the powder magazines was struck by lightning and destroyed, Cogar said.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a great and dedicated American, has retired from Congress, after serving ably for 43 years. Nine of these years he served as Speaker of the House of Representatives in a distinguished manner.

Speaker MCCORMACK has earned the respect and admiration of not only his colleagues in Congress but of people throughout this Nation.

He is the symbol of the American dream. Though forced to quit school at age 13 to support his family, he nonetheless had the desire to learn and to achieve. He taught himself law while working in a law office and was subsequently admitted to the bar—this the young man who missed a high school and college education.

Elected to Congress 43 years ago, he served his country as a loyal and accomplished public servant, during peace and war, and in good times and bad. During this time he attained the third highest office in the United States.

Speaker MCCORMACK'S commitment to high ideals, loyalty to the principles in which he believed, and love for his country have earned for him a place in history as one of our greatest Speakers.

We extend best wishes to Speaker and Mrs. John W. McCormack.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GORE

HON. BIRCH BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, with the departure of ALBERT GORE the Senate of the United States is losing one of its most able, outspoken Members. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee is a man who has devoted half his lif to public service for the people of his State and Nation in both Houses of the U.S. Congress; a record which includes 14 years in the House of Representatives and 18 years in the Senate.

In paying tribute to ALBERT GORE the press has coined many apt phrases with which we all agree: "chronic independent," "Senator with a cause," "old-fashioned liberal," "strong will in the Senate." All of these and more have been used to describe our distinguished colleague's career in the House and Senate. But in the final analysis, the Senator from Tennessee has been far too many-sided to be summed up in such neat phrases.

A man of conviction, yes; a man who cares about the average American to the point of denouncing any and all special privileges, yes; a skilled debater and parliamentary leader, yes. But, more than this, and perhaps more than anything else, a man whose basic impetus is founded in what he knows to be right, rather than what he believes to be politic. This very quality—his insistence on voting his conscience—may have contributed to his recent defeat. But as one who has worked with him on a cordial basis in the Senate for 8 years, I know that ALBERT GORE would never do otherwise. Let me only note that his actions have served as an admirable example to many in this body in the past, and I would hope they will be recalled whenever the Senate in the future is required to choose between what is right and what is politic.

FAREWELL TO HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, each new Congress is a milestone for the Nation and for each of us individually. And when the 92d Congress is seated, numbers of familiar faces will be missing. Some of these Members have gone to their final rewards. Some were victims of the political wars which dictate that in each election contest there is a winner and a loser. And some have decided to hang up the political shillelagh and reap their well-deserved rest.

My dear personal friend, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, WILLIAM T. MURPHY, is one of those who has retired gracefully and honorably after a lifetime of service to his city, his congressional constituency and his Nation.

I believe that his retirement is a loss to the Nation as well as a personal loss to his many friends, among whom I number myself proudly. But who can argue with his decision? After all those years—25 years in the Chicago city council and a dozen in the House of Representatives—he has earned the right to a rest, with time to spend with his marvelous family.

Many men pass through the doors of this body. Some pass in and out with little notice. But some, such as BILL MURPHY, make a lasting impression which will remain in the hearts and minds of his colleagues.

Some find a special interest when they serve in this body. BILL MURPHY was one such man. Who would have guesssed that a city councilman from the south side of Chicago would become such an expert on Asia and Africa that his knowledge would amaze the so-called experts of the State Department. Yet, this is what he became.

His sage advice will be missed in the House Foreign Affairs Committee and on the floor of this body.

His many contributions cannot be measured in years but in accomplishments and in the friendship and admiration he has engendered in the hearts of his colleagues. This friendship transcends party lines and philosophies. He has been a beloved Member of this body.

USING NATURE'S FILTERS TO CONTROL POLLUTION

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, pollution control is one of the major technological challenges facing our Nation. It is my pleasure to direct to my colleagues' attention the following outstanding address by Hon. F. Evans Farwell, who is associated with the American Sugar Cane League. Mr. Farwell delivered this address before the Federal Reserve Board in Atlanta, Ga., June 7, 1970.

The address follows:

USING NATURE'S FILTERS TO CONTROL POLLUTION

(Address by F. Evans Farwell)

We hear a great deal today about BOD—Biochemical Oxygen Demand. Simply put, BOD represents the amount of oxygen needed to decompose an organic object, e.g., a dead plant or animal. If the volume of material decomposing is too great for the amount of oxygen available, a vicious cycle starts: Free oxygen in the water is depleted and hydrogen sulphide—that smelly stuff—is produced which in turn uses up more oxygen. The lack of oxygen kills fish, aquatic plants, etc. and their decomposition in turn requires even more oxygen.

Industrial or chemical pollution is caused by the discharge of toxic substances and/or organic materials that use up oxygen in decomposing. Such discharges into the air and streams need to be treated on an individual basis—by recovery, changing form, etc. Different solution for each problem.

In the case of water pollution, *the main offender is sewage,* both treated and untreated. On entering the water it over-fertilizes with nitrogen and phosphate such aquatic plants as algae and slimes. They grow profusely and at their death require large amounts of oxygen to decompose—the vicious cycle. If this problem is to be solved, coordinated efforts throughout our nation will be necessary.

To cite an example. A creek that flows all year had three families living along its banks and they dumped all sewage and wash water into it. No serious problems developed because the water volume was sufficient to so dilute the waste that there was plenty of oxygen available to break it down (decompose-degrade) into elementary and harmless parts. Later, there were five hundred families dumping their wastes into the same creek—disaster!

Properly treated sewage results in solid matter rich in plant food and an effluent (run-off water) that has been chlorinated and so contains no live or harmful bacteria, but is over-rich in nitrogen and phosphate. We need to get rid of these, but how? We cannot economically change these materials into their harmless components, but Mother Nature can. She is doing so continuously. If we are careful not to over-load her, she can be a great help in solving our pollution problems.

Soil complete with all needed elements dug-up from, say, 8' down is sterile and will not properly grow plants until it has "seasoned"—become alive with microorganisms. They function to "disperse" and "reassemble"—a continuous process. Our top soil, where plants grow, is alive with these microorganisms (soil bacteria) and they are the ones that can and do break-down dead plants, fertilizers, etc. into basic forms that can be utilized by growing plants and trees.

Sewage from homes in widely scattered rural areas can be safely handled by septic tanks with overflows into properly constructed soil beds, but where people crowd together in villages, towns, or cities, the sewage is going to have to be *properly treated.* The solid matter can be hauled away to be used as fertilizer. The problem is, what to do with the nitrogen-phosphate rich effluent.

Eventually, if we are to solve this problem, each populated area should be surrounded (or as nearly so as possible) by farm lands growing plants and trees—a green belt. These lands should be contracted for, or owned by, the town or city. The solid sewage waste would be hauled to the farms by truck and the liquid effluent would go through underground pipelines to temporary storage ponds or directly to overhead sprays located in the fields.

Crops for animal and poultry feed such as hay, oats, alfalfa, corn, sorghum, soya beans, and rye would be grown together with, say, cotton, flax, etc. Trees, including evergreens, like pines, that grow all year would be included.

The amount of farm land needed for each populated area would depend on the number of growing days per year, the rainfall patterns, soil types, and other things. Where land is frozen for several months a year, a larger area would be needed as well as more storage ponds, and because of the short growing season, there would be a tendency to have a larger acreage devoted to evergreen trees.

In all cases harvested crops do a more effective job of "hauling away" the nutrients than trees, because the dropping tree leaves actually re-deposit part of the nutrients. A combination of harvested crops and trees does an effective job.

The liquid effluent from sewage, as it passes through the soil with its microorganisms and vegetative cover, would go through a living filter and be purified and renovated by the time it reached the water table or ground reservoir. In the U.S. the average use of water per citizen, counting both industrial and personal use, is now estimated at 1,300 gallons per day. Our supply of fresh water is limited and it must be used and reused over and over again.

The salient objective must be to avoid over-loading Nature's natural living filtration system, giving it the time and capacity to do a good job.

In a Penn State project it was found that 129 acres were needed to dispose of 1 million gallons of waste water per day. This represented the effluent output of a sewage plant serving 10,000 persons. The application rate was two inches weekly on the 129 acres. The application rate could vary from ¼" to 2" per week as would the size of the land area depending on circumstances involved, but the system is feasible and adaptable. One inch of water on an acre amounts to 27,154 gallons. Standard rail tank cars hold 8 or 10 thousand gallons.

Well aerated, microbe-rich top soil destroys complicated organic molecules (such as are found in detergents) within 10 days when the applications are properly controlled. It must also be remembered that organic and inorganic colloids in the soil have vast capacity to "fix" (lock-up) phosphorus.

Waste products, under law, would have to go through Nature's converter-filter located in a GREEN BELT around the populated area. Buried pipe lines could radiate-out from populated areas for 5–30 miles, or for whatever distance was required. Pumping through such lines would be mechanically feasible at reasonable cost.

Using Nature's filters is neither new nor untried. This system is presently being used by plant operators in many parts of our country. Waste products are converted by Nature into useful ones as a part of their conservation effort.

The populated areas would gain an additional advantage with a GREEN BELT of growing crops and trees, as these would also act as natural air filters helping to purify the air. The air man breathes is about 80% nitrogen and 20% oxygen. Growing leaves "scrub" the air of many pollutants, returning oxygen as a by-product of the leaf's protosynthesis—conversion of sunlight to plant-food energy. A sedentary person consumes about 460 liters of oxygen per day; a very active person 2,030 liters. An acre of growing rye grass will evolve over 100,000 liters of oxygen per day and an acre of sugarcane in Louisiana in September will produce about 196,800 liters of oxygen per day.

One large problem in trying to keep a green belt around populated areas is related to taxes. A farmer with 400 acres in various crops has his land valued at $400.00 per acre. His farm neighbor has only one acre which is also valued at $400.00. Someone comes along and buys the one acre for $1,000.00 and divides it into two house lots. The assessor (who is always being pressed to find more tax revenues) re-values the 400 acres at $1,000.00 per acre and immediately puts the owner into an uneconomic position. This step often results in a premature conversion of land from non-urban to urban use, frequently resulting in unsightly and haphazard development.

Some states have recognized the need to maintain some open and agricultural lands near population centers. Maryland pioneered the idea fourteen years ago: Lands that are actively devoted to farm or agricultural use are assessed on the basis of such use and not as if sub-divided. In 1963 New Jersey endorsed by a 2 to 1 margin a constitutional amendment allowing preferential assessment of farm land. It was the urban vote that put it over based on recommendation of a "Citizens committee to save open space in New Jersey." Other states having similar legislation are Indiana, California, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, and Oregon. There are possibly others.

How is such a tax structure protected from speculators—the so-called "psuedo farmers"? Under "preferential assessment", the land owner who actively farms 5 acres or more and has done so for 2 years prior to the tax year, may elect to have his farm assessed at farm-use value. If, in the future, he decides to sell, for non-farm use, he will pay 2 years back taxes at the higher use value.

Some day in the future, there should be legal standards requiring that population concentrations over a certain density must be served by a *complete* sewage treatment plant, and quite probably it would be a legal requirement that the solid waste and effluent from such a plant be utilized by nearby farms for growing animal and poultry feeds, as well as trees. Such steps would go a long way toward uniformally solving our worst pollution problem, and at the same time would preserve open areas for recreation, beauty, and the production of oxygen.

This land of ours can be beautiful again!

ALLEGATIONS OF SPYING BY THE MILITARY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, a number of my constituents have expressed grave concern over recent allegations of spying by the military on various civilians in Illinois, including the alleged surveillance of several prominent elected officials.

I have discussed this matter with officials of the Department of Defense who have supplied me with a copy of the Secretary of Defense's Memorandum to the Secretaries of the Military Departments, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Directors of the Defense Agencies.

The following is a quotation from the policy objectives of that memorandum:

I want to be certain that Department of Defense intelligence and counterintelligence activities are completely consistent with constitutional rights, all other legal provisions, and national security needs. These activities must be conducted in a manner which recognized and preserves individual human rights. Policy determinations governing such activities must be retained under civilian cognizance and control.

I believe that this statement accurately reflects the concern with which Secretary Laird views the situation, and I look forward to Assistant Secretary of Defense Robert Froehlke's report on reforms in this area.

In addition, my colleagues from Illinois, the Honorable JOHN N. ERLENBORN and the Honorable PAUL FINDLEY, have called for a congressional hearing by the House Government Operations Subcommittee. I fully support their request for such an investigation.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ALBERT GORE

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I consider it an honor to have had the opportunity to serve in the Senate with one of its most distinguished and respected Members—Senator ALBERT ARNOLD GORE of Tennessee.

In his hometown of Carthage, Tenn., public service is held in the highest regard. The town, which has a population of only 2,000, has produced the district's Congressmen for the last 75 years, as well as a Governor, two Senators, an ambassador, and a Secretary of State. The "Gray Fox of Carthage," as Senator GORE is affectionately referred to by his friends, has carried on the tradition of Carthage with honor and integrity.

ALBERT GORE has spent over half of his life serving Tennessee and the Nation in the Halls of Congress, spending 14 years in the House and 18 years in the Senate.

He is admired by friend and foe alike as a great orator, a tough and skilled debater, and as one of the most courageous men to ever sit in the U.S. Senate.

Senator GORE is best known for fighting the people's battles. Whether it meant standing up to the President of the United States or a fellow Senator, he would not hesitate if he believed that the cause was just. His vote was always governed by what he thought was right, rather than by what might be politically expedient.

Senator GORE stood for tolerance at a time when intolerance was the safe stand. For instance, he was one of three Senators from the South who refused to sign the southern manifesto protesting the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision in 1954. The other two Senators were his fellow Tennessean Estes Kefauver and the majority leader Lyndon B. Johnson.

Senator GORE will be remembered along with his boyhood idol from Carthage, Cordell Hull, as one of the great statesmen and progressive leaders of our time.

Senator GORE will be missed in the Senate; however his departure from the Senate does not mean that his voice will no longer be heard. I am sure that Tennessee and the Nation will hear a great deal more from the "Gray Fox of Carthage."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RALPH YARBOROUGH

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to the many which are being raised in honor of RALPH YARBOROUGH as he leaves the U.S. Senate. I know of no Senator more deserving of our tributes nor any whose presence here will be more missed. His whole career here has been a "profile in courage."

RALPH YARBOROUGH is no longer a young man. He is at an age when many are either retired or thinking of the easy life. But not RALPH YARBOROUGH. He is a young man in outlook, in spirit, in vigor, and in his ability to work hard. I am confident that we have not heard the last from him.

RALPH YARBOROUGH has never been known as a man to take things easy. As chairman of one of our most important committees he has demonstrated superb mastery of the legislative techniques and been most productive of legislation which is designed to serve the public good. He has been a real populist in the true sense of that word, and a most effective one, I might add. We will miss him here in the Senate but I fear that the people, in a broad sense, will miss him even more. And this is particularly true of the so-called little people.

It is not surprising that he has had the strong support of the minority-group people in his own State over the years. His whole career has demonstrated his deep and constant concern for their welfare. He is one man who never forgot his responsibility to help those most in need of help. His legislative solutions on their behalf have been most constructive preserving the full dignity of the individual participant in governmental programs.

RALPH YARBOROUGH'S vision has, like everything about this man, been a Texas style vision—big and broad with real sweep and substance. He shall be missed and long remembered.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN RICHARD D. McCARTHY

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 30, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the departure of MAX MCCARTHY is a genuine loss to the House of Representatives. He has, in only three terms here, exemplified the qualities of effective service in the House.

Like all good Members of Congress, he knew his district intimately, and never ceased to serve it well. His margin of victory increased in each election, and his voice was a powerful one in the Buffalo area. Equally, he won stalwart respect in the House, for he has been a man who has shown a mastery of difficult areas of public policy, and a capacity to find legislative solutions to them. On a variety of subjects including germ and chemical warfare and environmental pollution, he has become a voice commanding attention and respect. He does not speak from simple impulse or for an easy headline; rather his words are based on an informed understanding, on careful investigation, and on the conclusions of a probing mind. All of us have benefited from the illuminating contributions he has made both in committee and on the floor.

Those of us who came to the House with MAX in January, 1965, have a special affection for him and have enjoyed the qualities of mind and work which he possesses. He is a man of extraordinary ability and he inspires the greatest trust. For my part I express the fullest confidence that his public career is, at worst, at a moment of brief interruption or punctuation. We need more MAX MCCARTHYS among us, and I trust that his return is not far distant.

GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF OEO

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, on December 30, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held hearings on the confirmation of Frank C. Carlucci III, as the new director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Unfortunately, the committee did not act on this nomination before the close of the 91st Congress, and it will be pending business before the committee in the new Congress.

In his opening statement to the committee, Mr. Carlucci discussed the goals of OEO as he sees them and reviewed some of the accomplishments and policies of OEO over the last 2 years. Mr. Carlucci, for the past 18 months, has been assistant director for operations at OEO. I request unanimous consent that Mr. Carlucci's statement be inserted at this point in the RECORD, followed by an article which appeared January 4, 1971,

in the Baltimore News American, by Ned Young, civil service editor of the newspaper, commenting on Mr. Carlucci's statement.

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

STATEMENT OF FRANK CHARLES CARLUCCI III, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

During the 18 months it has been my privilege to serve as OEO's Assistant Director for Operations, with responsibility for supervising regional offices, state and local government relations, community action, and Indian and migrant programs. In this role I have attempted to pursue a course which would strengthen the effectiveness of Federal, state and local efforts to fight poverty, while through responsible management enhancing broad citizen support for those efforts.

Throughout much of its brief history, OEO has been a subject of controversy and speculation. Criticism and praise can be found at virtually all points on the political spectrum. Dollar for dollar OEO's programs are perhaps more widely debated. This is as it should be. An agency on the cutting edge of social change is bound to be controversial. If we ever accede to the normality and relative calm of a traditional bureaucratic unit, it might well be that we are no longer serving our purpose.

Simply stated, our mission is to work on behalf of those whose voice has gone unheeded for too long in our society. A key element in this task is to make the institutions of our society—federal, state, local and private—more responsive to the needs of the poor.

There are widely disparate views on how OEO should strive to fulfill this mission. Fortunately, most parties to that discussion disagree on techniques rather than on objectives. Hopefully such differences can be argued in a manner that does not impede progress on common objectives. I believe that OEO is doing an increasingly effective job. Allow me to cite some examples which support this view.

OEO's Legal Services Program, expanded and strengthened in the past two years, is giving millions of poor Americans their rightful access to our system of justice. And it is doing more than that. Legal Services is showing all Americans that our system is strong enough and flexible enough to be changed where necessary through peaceful, legal means.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, the concept underlying Legal Services—access to justice for all Americans—is one that I personally treasure, and one I will defend.

OEO's Comprehensive Health Centers have charted new paths for delivering first-rate health care to poverty populations. Recently, as you know, 16 of the health centers were spun off to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, freeing OEO money for use in establishing still newer, and hopefully, even better means of delivering health care to the poor.

OEO's Senior Opportunities and Services, or SOS Program, funded through Community Action Agencies, is providing desperately needed help to the aged poor—proportionately the fastest growing segment of the nation's poverty population. SOS has enjoyed great success in generating private and public support; for every Federal dollar spent on the program, nearly forty cents in public-private money or in-kind services has been contributed.

OEO's programs for American Indians have been expanded. Funds for Indian economic development projects have been doubled. More than 60 of OEO's Community Action Agencies are now operated for and by Indians, while other agency funds have gone toward opening Indian-operated schools and a college, and Indian urban centers in seven cities.

OEO's programs for migrants, whose problems are as serious and difficult to address as those of any poverty group in America, including offering high school equivalency training for youngsters, an absolute necessity in breaking the poverty cycle; adult education and vocational retraining classes for adults; self-help housing programs, as well as day care, emergency food and medical aid, and mobile credit unions and health insurance plans.

OEO's Volunteers in Service to America, the VISTA Program, has been a forerunner in efforts to promote organized voluntary action and involve more individual Americans in facing the poverty-related problems of our communities and our fellow citizens.

OEO is tesing exciting new methods for linking our least fortunate citizens—the poor who are also unskilled, or alcoholic, or addicted to drugs—with the rehabilitation and training they need to hold decent jobs.

OEO experiments with performance contracting in education should tell us whether or not the nation's education establishment can and should refocus its success criteria on achievement rather than on teacher-pupil ratios and numbers of new classrooms.

The institution of tough new regulations and processes has tightened the agency's control over grants and contracts, is minimizing the potential for conflicts of interest, and has resulted in more competitive bidding while helping to end indefensible cost overruns.

OEO's nearly 1,000 Community Action Agencies, with which I am especially familiar, continue to constitute the agency's operational heart—and that heart, in my judgment, is beating more strongly, and more productively than ever.

The past two years have seen these local agencies strengthened from the standpoint of management, evaluation of their effectiveness, and newly won community support. The CAAS remain the unique institutions they were at the inception. They represent today an even more vital means of mobilizing all segments of the community into a partnership effort with the poor.

As you are well aware, the CAA approach has not always been universally accepted. In some cases needed support has been withheld by segments of the community that viewed the CAA as a threat to their own hegemony. In others, protest-style tactics used by the CAAs, or on their behalf, have served only to widen the gap between the poor and the nonpoor.

During the past two years OEO's leadership has repeatedly stressed the need for CAAs to serve as a catalyst for stimulating the broader community to action aimed at eliminating poverty. Again, it has been a case of facing up to the reality that all Americans must work together if poverty for some is to be overcome. By and large, the CAAs have responded well.

Along the same lines, OEO's leadership has insisted that the CAAs be more effective and responsible—action required to guarantee their acceptance by all Americans whose tax dollars support them, and to inspire trust in them by their poverty constituencies.

Some Community Action Agencies have been closed when careful evaluation proved conclusively they were not serving the poor. Others have been helped to put their houses in order. But the majority have proven themselves effective and efficient in doing what they were intended to do: provide a workable mechanism for focusing the nation's attention and resources on enabling the poor to lift themselves out of poverty.

While improving its own internal structure, OEO has mounted a major effort to strengthen its relations with other Departments of the Federal Government, and with state and local governments. That effort is in keeping with OEO's role, as mandated by Congress and reemphasized by the President, as an intra-governmental spokesman for the poor. It also recognizes the reality that if this nation is to address the problem of poverty, the effort must involve every institution, and not simply the OEO.

I am personally confident that OEO's present posture puts it in a position to be an increasingly effective part of the nation's overall attempt to combat poverty and its devastating, unacceptable effect on human lives. And I am personally committed to doing whatever I can to help OEO serve the poor and thereby serve the nation.

CARLUCCI SEEN AIDING OEO LINKS

(By Ned Young)

Liaison between the federal government and the states will strengthen, it appears, if Frank Carlucci becomes the permanent director of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO).

Such liaison included in the theme of his testimony before the subcommittee on employment, manpower and poverty of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

The originator of such a policy for the agency was Donald Rumsfeld, who was director prior to his appointment as a White House adviser.

Carlucci, who is yet to be approved as Rumsfeld's successor, had been the assistant and acting director of the agency for 18 months.

"It is counter productive to have the states as our enemies," Rumsfeld is reported to have stated when inaugurating the program.

"Simply stated, our mission is to work on behalf of those whose voice has gone unheeded too long in our society.

"A key element in this task is to make the institutions of our society—federal, state, local and private—more responsive to the needs of the poor," said Carlucci in his testimony before the Subcommittee.

Consequently, the OEO has issued guidelines to strengthen the role of the states in the poverty program.

Among the provisions are:

That the OEO consult with the state offices on training and technical assistance grants and contracts.

That regional offices work out joint agreements with state officials for more efficient use of their respective field personnel.

That State Economic Opportunity Offices (SEOOs) shall function as advocates for the poor by working for their representation state committees, seeking to make existing programs more responsive to the poor, and other efforts.

That state offices will be helped to hire more specialized personnel and to provide training for them.

That state offices will be encouraged to develop and conduct innovative programs that could bring about institutional changes to benefit the poor.

SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, as we move through the corridors and halls of the Capitol we observe the many tourists who come to visit our legislative halls. We hear them talking to each other as they recognize various members of the

body. Some of us go unnoticed and unrecognized but I have noted that one Member who will be leaving this body always attracts their attention and recognition. I refer to TOM DODD. When near him you hear their hurried comments, "There goes a Senator."

Yes, TOM DODD looks every inch the Senator he has been these many years.

I wish to pay tribute to TOM DODD, however, not primarily because of his senatorial demeanor but because of his demonstrated courage. They say you can take the measure of a man by watching how he operates under pressure and under adversity. I want to pay my respects to TOM DODD for the courage and conviction which he has so nobly demonstrated under very difficult circumstances. He has proven himself a real fighter and a real leader and he will be much missed. May good fortune be his and may his future be bright.

TRIBUTE TO HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Chairman GEORGE H. FALLON, of Maryland, has served his Nation with distinction and dedication. He leaves this body with the highest respect and affection of Members on both sides of the aisle and of the millions of Americans who daily benefit from the great developmental projects that he has championed. As Chairman of the great House Committee on Public Works, Chairman FALLON was one of the foresighted men responsible for the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, the legislation which established the vast Interstate System. Later, he sponsored the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, the Highway Safety Act of 1966, and many other programs dealing with pollution control.

Mr. Speaker, GEORGE FALLON was fighting for environmental protection long before this topic came into vogue. He has always been able to see that sensible development of our vast natural resources can go hand in hand with wise and prudent protection of the environment. On November 25, 1970, the House of Representatives overwhelming passed the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970, which among other things provides for the completion of the great Interstate System.

This overwhelming approval was a tribute to GEORGE FALLON'S leadership and his ability to offer legislation that almost all Members could support. On that day I joined many of my colleagues in paying tribute to Chairman FALLON, both for his leading role in writing this landmark legislation, and for his great overall leadership in the development and protection of the resources of this Nation. At that time Mr. Speaker, I said that the career of GEORGE FALLON has brought to reality the words of Daniel Webster which are emblazoned in this Chamber above the Speaker's chair. I wish again to place this quotation in the RECORD, because it is so especially appropriate to GEORGE FALLON. Webster said:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day may not perform something worth to be remembered.

GEORGE FALLON has lived up to this challenge.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it has been a personal pleasure to serve on the Public Works Committee under the leadership of Chairman FALLON. He has been a fair and skillful chairman who has always reported from his committee legislation of which we could be proud.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for the chairman continued health and happiness. We will miss him here in the Congress, but hope that he will come to visit with us often.

DAVID ROCKEFELLER CALLS ON "SPIRIT OF PITTSBURGH" IN ADDRESS BEFORE PITTSBURGH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh business community was privileged to hear an address by David Rockefeller, chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Corp., recently concerning "Public Responsibilities of Private Business in the 1970's."

Mr. Rockefeller said some very nice things about our city and its business sector, indeed he called upon them to take the lead in showing the country how to influence the social legislation so badly needed in our cities, States, and Nation today.

I am pleased to include his remarks for the attention of my colleagues at this point in the RECORD:

PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITIES OF PRIVATE BUSINESS IN THE 1970'S

(Address by David Rockefeller)

I have looked forward to this occasion with particular pleasure because, frankly, I have long admired the forthright manner in which the Pittsburgh business community has dealt with urban and environmental problems.

As even the occasional visitor knows, you were among the first to recognize and respond to the many complex and interrelated issues of ecology and urban renewal. You did so with imaginative approaches that, in many cases, have since been adopted by other major cities.

During the 1950's and '60's, urbanologists and early environmentalists were still unable to get a serious hearing in many parts of the country. Yet here in Pittsburgh, you already had a functioning alliance of concerned business and civic leaders headed by Dick Mellon whose memory should be revered by all. Under this kind of capable leadership, you moved forward with a broad base of community support to reverse the tide of urban deterioration and environmental pollution.

In view of your record of accomplishment, you have better reasons than most to resent the current wave of attacks charging business with an utter lack of social concern. It is no exaggeration to say that American business today is facing its most severe public disfavor since the Depression era of the 1930's.

We are told in the most forceful terms by a wide range of critics that we are doing both too much and too little, that we are once profligate and miserly, evangelistic and hypocritical. Indeed, there seems to be a fixed belief, in some quarters at least that businessmen are constitutionally incapable of performing a selfless act. When one occurs, the critics are sure it must have been done for the wrong motives. And if no questionable motives can be assigned, then it is assumed to have been an accident!

We cannot escape evidence of this public disfavor even in the toy departments where we do our Christmas shopping. Where once the game of "Monopoly" dominated the scene, we now find a proliferation of new ones with such topical names as "Smog: The Game of Environmental Awareness," and "Extinction: The Game of Ecology."

Ours is the dubious honor of having gone from "Monopoly" to "Extinction" in one generation!

The net effect of this shifting public sentiment toward businessmen was summarized amusingly in a recent article in Finance Magazine. It ticked off the typical headaches of today's average executive in these words:

"Two citizens' groups have brought suit (against his company) . . . the press keeps making outrageous claims . . . consumers are trying to organize a boycott . . . a Federal agency is making a study . . . some fellow in Washington, acting independently with some law students, is about to slip a report to a Congressman . . . a nearby college has 150 scraggly potsmokers who are talking about bombing his office . . . and his children call him an imperialist pig!"

In such a climate of confrontation, it should come as no surprise that socially concerned businessmen are caught in a devastating cross-fire of criticism from both ends of the ideological spectrum.

At one pole, Professor Charles Reich has pronounced America's businessmen guilty of social "crime" of creating an anti-human "Corporate State." In his current best-seller, "The Greening of America," Professor Reich views this supposed monolithic machine as a destroyer of individual dignity and holds it responsible for a catalogue of social ills ranging from depersonalization to pollution. In his view, business—as an oppressor of the human spirit—cannot make a positive social contribution.

Professor Reich's goals are admirable. Surely no one will contest a creed that places individual dignity and self-realization at the center of our social and economic efforts. But his analysis fails, I believe, when it attempts to make business the scapegoat for the inevitable dislocations produced by rapid progress. His view of business as a rigid, machine-like structure bears little resemblance to today's flexible, responsive, consumer-conscious corporation.

Material prosperity and automation have immeasurably improved the lives of millions and greatly shortened the work week, freeing people for the aesthetic, intellectual and recreational pursuits that Reich himself espouses. Business now is making substantial inroads against the by-products of technological advance through anti-pollution efforts, urban programs and a host of other activities. Further, business has moved

away from arbitrary authority toward participative management and individual initiative in many of its operations.

In short, business concern for the individual and the community has moved us toward Professor Reich's most worthy goals. To use one of his own terms, his revolution has been "co-opted" by American business.

Attacking from an opposite point of view, Professor Milton Friedman contends that business has only one responsibility—to maximize profits for its shareholders. Beyond this, he insists, corporate social efforts are only "hypocritical window-dressing" and "unadulterated socialism." This is surely too narrow a perspective.

Even Professor Friedman recognizes that the donations made by businesses to various community service organizations on an annual appeal basis are appropriate under customary and conventional ethical standards of good citizenship. But what he fails to appreciate, in my view, are the many innovative social contributions of business which are perfectly consistent with the profit incentive. The construction of "turnkey" public housing, for example, in which private industry works with government to create much-needed housing for low-income families, has proven both profitable and socially beneficial.

Profits are, indeed, the lifeblood of business. But our own consciences as well as rising public expectations make it increasingly clear that modern managers must come up with more new and imaginative approaches like "turnkey" housing, to reconcile their expanding responsibility to society with the investment interest of their shareholders.

Responding to critics is tempting and I think businessmen should give in to the impulse more often—not to apologize but to set the record straight. I would hope, however, that we would not spend so much time and energy in answering critics that we have none left for reexamining our own performance to spot new areas for improvement.

This is a time of profound reassessment throughout our society, a time for reordering values and priorities at all levels.

Business must participate fully in this reassessment by redefining its own relationship to society.

The last time we went through such a national reappraisal—in the 1930's business tended to stand aside and leave the initiative to government. In retrospect, I think all of us would acknowledge that this was a mistake. The result was a serious erosion of our economic freedom. This time, unless business rolls up its sleeves and gets into the fray, there is likely to be not only a further erosion of economic freedom but of individual freedom as well.

The amount of freedom business retains will depend decisively on the quality of management's response to changing public expectations and on the degree of its involvement in public responsibilities.

Certainly, I recognize the temptation to cut back on programs for social progress during a period of diminished profits, especially when we are being roundly criticized for these very commitments from certain enclaves of tradition. But I would argue that it is precisely at this time, when social expectations and needs are greatest, that we must weigh our options calmly and employ our most farsighted business judgment.

Far from cutting back, it seems to me highly desirable that we step up our social involvement, at this critical juncture, in at least three distinct areas.

The first, of course, is within our own companies. Many businessmen have been doing a good deal, individually, to make their corporations more socially responsive to the changing environment. But, for the most part, they have done this as a kind of "add-on" to their regular business—programing a response to each challenge as it appears. For example, they have stepped up financial contributions to deserving urban projects, developed more playgrounds in the ghettos, and provided more counseling services for the disadvantaged. In other words, they have responded with good intentions but usually with the self-limiting presumption that social improvement programs must be carried on the loss side of the company's ledger. They presumed that business and social responsibilities would not mix. I believe it is now time to question that presumption.

The immediate task, as I view it, is to learn how to discharge our social responsibilities as an integral part of our overall corporate planning and performance. We should think not so much in terms of how to hold down the cost of these programs, but rather how to make them more efficient and more effective so that they contribute to long-range profitability. Briefly stated, the essential job is to reconcile what happens in the marketplace with what has already happened in society. This may mean liberalizing our hiring practices to include more from the minorities or broadening our services to extend into disadvantaged neighborhoods.

This may also mean taking a longer range view of profits. It may mean lowering our profit sights in a particular year, in the interest of helping to shape an environment in which business can continue to prosper ten or twenty years into the future. In a sense, this is a kind of capital investment in community well-being which will produce future dividends in the form of a more viable business and living environment.

The latest surveys by the Opinion Research Corporation reveal that a solid majority of the American people now considers corporate responsibility for maintaining a pollution-free environment equal in importance with supplying customer needs at reasonable prices. So, besides being a matter of good conscience and good citizenship, it is also a matter of good business judgment to structure ourselves, within a sound application of free-market principles, to respond to the will of the majority of our potential customers. To narrow our individual corporate objectives solely to the pursuit of profits would place us almost at once in direct conflict with the many publics on whom those profits depend.

A second area in which businessmen can and should be involved in a socially responsive way is at the industry and even the multi-industry level.

The "pilot projects" of individual companies have been very much worthwhile, and have taught us valuable lessons about what can and can't be done with limited resources. But the need now, as I see it, is for more massive collaboration by groups of several corporations in diverse fields to tackle those truly major problems that surpass the resources of a single company.

One of the most promising avenues for expansion would be to select, from among the many trial-and-error experiences of separate companies, those ongoing projects which show the greatest potential for multi-industry application.

For instance, in my own industry, I think the "Key Cities Program" of the American Bankers Association, which is committing one billion dollars by 1975 in minority business financing across the country, is an important program. It will focus initially on 50 critical urban areas. In these, coordinating committees of local bank executives will see to it that his financing is responsive to unique local needs and problems. Supporting this funding program will be teams of visiting specialists who will bring their proven experience to bear through a series of Urban Development Seminars. The "Key Cities Program" is particularly attractive for multi-industry involvement because it offers wide-ranging opportunities for almost every kind of industry to supply its own particular technical, managerial and product support in local areas under local supervision.

The various manpower development programs of the National Alliance of Businessmen have proven themselves capable of far wider applicability, given the inter-industry base that has already been established. The lessons learned in these programs could be applied more extensively to the development of training capacities for moving workers up from entry-level competence toward managerial positions.

Although still in development stages, the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships and HUD's "Operation Breakthrough" are both promising prototypes for a total business-sector initiative. With its recent development grant from HUD, Westinghouse is already exploring the feasibility of modular and prefabricated housing on a broad scale.

In the underlying and, in many ways, most critical problem of educational deficiencies, the various "partnership projects" between corporations and schools have nationwide and industry-wide potential.

In the past several weeks, two major educational studies have been released—one by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the other by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Both studies concluded that the present educational system in this country is too rigidly degree-oriented and lacks the flexibility needed to guide young people with a wide range of talents and ambitions into suitable professions and occupations. They proposed that big cities create new models of secondary schools adopted to their own community needs rather than remain firmly anchored in the past and the present.

The validity of this proposal is supported by recent statistics revealing that almost one-quarter of all high school students drop out before graduation. And roughly half of those who enter college quit before taking the bachelor's degree.

Until now, the business sector has tackled this enormous problem largely on a company-by-company basis, setting up separate programs for the industrial and basic skills training of "drop-outs." These individual programs are often costly and inefficient, and the new educational techniques learned by one company are not transmitted quickly to others.

How much better it would be if we had a nationwide system of industry-supported vocational schools of sufficient scope to exert a real impact. Ideally, these institutions would not close off the possibility of subsequent academic training, but would provide a viable alternative route toward higher learning. Those who, for personal or family reasons, felt the need for early employment could have the opportunity and the flexibility to complete their high school education in these industry-sponsored vocational schools and then continue on to college if and when they desired.

By breaking down the rigid correlation between age and formal schooling, an approach such as this might go a long way toward making education a lifelong process with men and women entering college from the ranks of labor, commerce and industry—perhaps under employee or trade union scholarship programs. Nowhere is it written that education in America must be a hectic scramble by everyone, regardless of incentives and qualifications, to accumulate the maximum number of degrees in the minimum amount of time.

The major industries could establish a loosely-tied national chain—steel, transportation, utilities, communication and banking—building the buildings, defraying salaries and other operating costs and offering employment options to the graduates.

The schools that I propose would not be

in competition with other public schools. They would be supplemental and would be fully certified and accredited by local educational authorities—differing not in educational standards but in educational emphasis and in the fact that they were financed in part by the private sector.

To work out the details of such a project in full cooperation with the present secondary school system and to ascertain what tax incentives might apply, this proposal would clearly require the concurrence of educators, leaders of business and labor and various governmental authorities. But I have outlined the proposal here in order to illustrate the dimensions of future commitment that I believe business must undertake at the multi-industry level.

The third major area in which this sense of commitment must be manifested is in the national debate over policies, programs and priorities.

Businessmen have been generally reluctant to enter into public debate on issues other than those of direct company concern. They will talk volubly about why they need higher tariffs or lower taxes. But they tend to become reticent when the discussion turns to the need for an improved welfare program, broad-gauged trade legislation, or more realistic safety standards. The supposed risks of alienating other businessmen or consumers are often regarded as unacceptably high. As a result, we too often end up with uninformed, catch-all legislation.

By restricting the range of topics to those directly related to their livelihood, businessmen have seldom achieved wide public recognition. It is precisely by avoiding social debate, that they have given currency to the notion that they are concerned solely with profits and have little of substance to contribute to the developing dialogue of democracy.

The great need here, as I see it, is to coordinate the business community's efforts, talents and influence in a way that will give it genuine impact not only at local and state levels, but at the national level as well.

Some coordination in the social realm already exists in activities of the National Alliance of Businessmen, the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships, the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Conference Board, the Committee for Economic Development and others.

But what is needed additionally, in my view, is an all-out determination to mobilize the opinions and resources of the business community behind workable large-scale approaches to urban problems. With a guiding consensus of our own, we would then be in a better position to enlist the support of the Administration and Congress to do the job that must be done. The influence and ideas of businessmen are needed now as never before to speak out more forcefully and more frequently on social and urban legislation.

Because of this very urgency and because of your own enviable past record in setting examples for the larger business community, I am taking the liberty now of urging upon you—the business leadership of Pittsburgh—this additional task. I know of no body of businessmen anywhere that is better equipped, by experience and achievement, to show us how the country's business section can bring its influence to bear on forward-looking social legislation in city hall, state house and in Washington.

I do not mean to suggest that such a leadership role can or should be played in isolation. Its effective implementation will require the same kind of close cooperation with the academic and intellectual communities that you have achieved in the past. And it will require the same cordial working alliance with labor to impact effectively on Government at all levels.

But I believe that the first driving thrust could well come from the concerned and committed business sector of Pittsburgh. I would add only that the time is short and present problems across the nation are rapidly outrunning their solutions.

For those across the country who boggle at the immense urban tasks still before them, there would be great encouragement in the realization that "the spirit of Pittsburgh" was on the move once again.

In a larger sense, there is reassurance for the nation's businessmen, too, in recalling that since the days of Karl Marx, critics have been predicting the downfall of the American industrial system and the demise of the corporation. Yet through the years that system has proven remarkably durable and resilient. It has been highly resourceful in adapting to change involving employees, customers and society in general.

I personally am confident that it can and will demonstrate equal adaptability in the decade of the Seventies. I think it is more than capable of rising to the challenges posed by Professors Reich and Friedman by coming up with fresh solutions to many problems within the context of the free-market system.

Tradition holds that the first draft of the Declaration of Independence dedicated this new nation to "life, liberty and the pursuit of property." It was only at the urging of those who insisted on greater concern for the *quality of life* in America, that Thomas Jefferson struck out "property" and placed "the pursuit of happiness" in a position of high prominence.

Now, nearly two centuries later, we are witnessing a strong resurgence of this national goal. Those of us in business are being asked to contribute more to the quality of life than mere quantities of goods and services. I believe that "the spirit of Pittsburgh" could well supply us with the precedent and vision necessary to achieve this goal.

TRIBUTE TO ALBERT GORE

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, election night 1970 was of special interest to me. There were no returns in which I was more interested than in the returns from the State of Tennessee and there was none I received with greater sorrow than the word that my good friend and courageous colleague, ALBERT GORE, would no longer be with us after this Congress.

We will miss his fiery oratory and his strong and effective voice on behalf of the people. He has been a real stalwart and an inspiration to me. His has been a voice of reason and intellect as well as a voice of some passion.

His leaving seems to mark the end of an era. I only hope that we may find within those who join this body the same spirit and will, for the U.S. Senate will be a lesser place without him. It is probably a truism that none of us are irreplaceable but it is also true that ALBERT GORE will leave a huge void that will not soon be filled.

His accomplishments have been many but I think he deserves our particular thanks for his work in behalf of the average American taxpayer through his work on the Finance Committee. Although not privileged to serve with him on that committee I have always found his advice on fiscal and tax matters most helpful and sound and I have appreciated his guidance. I know he has been of help to many.

We will miss ALBERT GORE. May he have a long and happy future.

WHOSE COUNTRY IS AMERICA?

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a very interesting article appeared in the New York Times magazine on November 22, 1970. The article, titled "Whose Country Is America?", was written by Eric Hoffer and reads as follows:

WHOSE COUNTRY IS AMERICA?

(By Eric Hoffer)

THE YOUNG AND THE MIDDLE-AGED

The conspicuous role played by the young in our society at present has prompted a widely held assumption that the young constitute a higher percentage of the population than they did in the past. Actually, in this country, the percentage of the under-25 age group has remained fairly constant through several decades—hovers around 47 per cent. The high-school and college age group—14 to 24—has remained close to 15 per cent. The nation as a whole has not been getting younger. The median age of all Americans in 1910 was 24. Today it is 27, and it is likely to go up since the birth rate now is very low.

The conspicuousness of the young is due to their greater visibility and audibility. They have become more flamboyant, more demanding, more violent, more knowledgeable and more experienced. The general impression is that nowadays the young act like the spoiled children of the rich. We are discovering that there is such a thing as an "ordeal of affluence," that diffused affluence subjects the social order to greater strain and threatens social stability more than does diffused poverty. Order and discipline have up to now been attributes generated in the battle against want. Society itself originated in the vital need for a joint effort to wrest a livelihood from grudging nature. Not only our material but our moral and spiritual values are predicated on the immemorial curse: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." Thus diffused affluence unavoidably creates a climate of disintegrating values with its fallout of anarchy.

In the past, breakdowns of value affected mainly the older segment of the population. This was true of the breakdown of the Graeco-Roman civilization, of the crisis that gave birth to the Reformation, and of the periods of social disintegration that preceded the French, the Russian and the Nazi revolutions. That our present crisis particularly affects the young is due partly to the fact that widespread affluence is robbing a modern society of whatever it has left of puberty rites to routinize the attainment of manhood. Never before has the passage from boyhood to manhood been so difficult and explosive. Both the children of the well-to-do and of families on welfare are prevented from having a share in the world's work and of proving their manhood by doing a man's work and getting a man's pay. Crime in the streets and insolence on the campus are sick forms of adolescent self-assertion. The young account for an ever-increasing percentage of crimes against persons and property. The peak years for crimes of violence are 18 to 20, followed by the 21 to 24 age group.

Even under ideal conditions the integration of the young into the adult world is beset with strains and difficulties. We feel ill at ease when we have to adjust ourselves to fit in. The impulse is to change the world to fit us rather than the other way around. Only where there are, as in primitive societies, long-established rites of passage, or where the opportunities for individual self-assertion are fabulous, does growing up proceed without excessive growing pains.

Can a modern affluent society institute some form of puberty rites to ease the passage from boyhood to manhood? It is of interest in this connection that among the Bantu tribes in South Africa work is replacing the ritual related to puberty. It used to be that a young man had to kill a lion or an enemy to prove his manhood. Today many young natives do not feel they have become full-fledged adults until they have put in a stint in the mines. Could not a ritual of work be introduced in this country? Every boy and girl on reaching 17 or on graduating from high school, would be given an opportunity to spend two years earning a living at good pay. There is an enormous backlog of work to be done both inside and outside the cities. Federal, state and city governments, and also business and labor would pool their resources to supply the necessary jobs and training.

The routinization of the passage from boyhood to manhood would contribute to the solution of many of our pressing problems. I cannot think of any other undertaking that would dovetail so many of our present difficulties into opportunities for growth.

Though the percentage of the young, as pointed out, has remained constant through several decades there has been a spectacular increase in the percentage of adolescents. At present, adolescence comprises a wider age range than it did in the past. Affluence is keeping persons in their late 20's in a state of delayed manhood, while television has lowered the threshold of adolescence. Nowadays, 10-year-olds have the style of life and the bearing of adolescents. Even children under 10 have an astounding familiarity with the intricacies and the mechanics of the adult world. By the time a child enters kindergarten, he has spent more hours learning about his world from television than the hours he will spend later in classrooms earning a college degree. It is a paradox that at a time when youth rioting in Chicago are called "mere kids," there are actually few genuine kids any more.

The contemporary blurring of childhood is not unprecedented. During the Middle Ages, children were viewed and treated as miniature adults. Nothing in medieval dress distinguished the child from the adult. The moment children could walk and talk they entered the adult world, and took part in the world's work. In subsequent centuries, the concept of childhood became more clearly defined. Yet even as late as 1835 schoolbooks in this country made no concession to childhood in vocabulary or sophistication. Child labor, so widely practiced in the first half of the 19th century, and which we find abhorrent, was not totally anomalous in a society that did not have a vivid view of childhood as a sheltered, privileged age.

To counteract an old man's tendency to snort at the self-important young, I keep reminding myself that until the middle of the 19th century the young acted effectively as members of political parties, creators of business enterprises, advocates of new philosophical doctrines and leaders of armies. Most of the wars that figure in our history books were fought by teen-agers. There were 14-year-old lieutenants in Louis XIV's armies. In one of his armies the oldest soldier was under 18. The middleaged came to the fore with the Industrial Revolution. The experience and capital necessary to make an industrialist required a long apprenticeship. One might say that from the middle of the 19th to the middle of the 20th century the world was run by and for the middle-aged. The post-industrial age seems to be groping its way back to an immemorial situation interrupted by the Industrial Revolution.

The middle-aged came to the fore with the Industrial Revolution. Another way of putting it is that the middle-aged came into their own with the full entrance of the middle class onto the stage of history. The present discomfiture of the middle-aged is a symptom of a downturn in the fortunes of the middle class.

Adolescence as a clearly marked phase in the life of the individual, and the practice of keeping physically mature males in a state of delayed manhood are middle-class phenomena. The young of the working class and of the aristocracy come early in touch with the realities of life, and are not kept waiting in the wings. In neither the working class nor the aristocracy does age have the vital meaning it has in the middle class.

Industrialization was the creation of the middle class. It is questionable whether the spectacular "mastery of things," the taming of nature on a global scale, could have been achieved by other human types. No other ruling class succeeded so well in energizing the masses, and infusing them with an automatic readiness to work. Aristocrats and intellectuals know how to generate in a population a readiness to fight and die, but they cannot induce an uncoerced, wholehearted participation of the masses in the world's work.

Indeed, it is doubtful whether a non-middle-class society can be modern. Domination by aristocrats, intellectuals, workers or soldiers results in a return to the past—to feudalism, the Middle Ages, or even the ancient river-valley civilizations. It is not as yet certain whether it is possible to have a free-wheeling science, literature and art, or even a genuine machine age, without a middle class.

Yet, despite its unprecedented achievements, the middle class is just now on the defensive, unsure of its footing. With the consummation of the Industrial Revolution and the approach of affluence the middle class seems to have nowhere to go. It no longer feels itself in possession of the true and only view possible for sensible people. One begins to wonder whether the unglamorous, hard-working middle class, so essential to the process of production in a climate of scarcity, is becoming anachronistic in an age of plenty where distribution is the chief problem. Middle-class society is being strained to the breaking point not, as Marx predicted, by ever-increasing misery but by ever-increasing affluence. The coming of affluence has found the middle class unequipped and unprepared for a return to Eden.

Early in the 19th century, Saint-Simon characterized the coming of the industrial age as the passage "from the management of men to the administration of things." He did not foresee that once the industrial revolution had run its course there would have to come a reversion from the administration of things to the management of men. Up to quite recently, the middle class did not have to bother overmuch with the management of men since scarcity (unfulfilled needs), the factory, long working hours, etc., tamed and disciplined people automatically. Now, with affluence and leisure, people are no longer kept in line by circumstances. Discipline has to be implanted and order enforced from without. It is at this point that "men of words" and charismatic leaders—people who deal with magic—come into their own. The middle class, lacking magic, is bungling the job.

Thus, as the postindustrial age unfolds, we begin to suspect that what is waiting for us around the corner is not a novel future but an immemorial past. It begins to look as if the fabulous century of the middle class and the middle-aged has been a detour, a wild loop that turns upon itself, and ends where it began. We are returning to the rutted highway of history, which we left 100 years ago in a mad rush to tame a savage continent and turn it into a cornucopia of plenty. We see all around us the lineaments of a preindustrial pattern emerging in the postindustrial age. We are rejoining the ancient caravan, a caravan dominated by the myths and magic of élites, and powered by the young.

In this country, the coming of the post-industrial age may mean the loss of all that made America new—the only new thing in the world. America will no longer be the common man's continent. The common people of Europe eloped with history to America and have lived in common-law marriage with it, unhallowed by the incantations of "men of words." But the élites are finally catching up with us. We can hear the swish of leather as saddles are heaved on our backs. The intellectuals and the young, booted and spurred, feel themselves born to ride us.

The phenomenal increase of the student population is shaping the attitudes and aspirations of the young. There are now more students in America than farmers. For the first time in America, there is a chance that alienated intellectuals, who see our way of life as an instrument of debasement and dehumanization, might shape a new generation in their own image. The young's sympathy for the Negro and the poor goes hand in hand with an elitist conceit that pits them against the egalitarian masses. They will fight for the Negro and the poor, but they have no use for common folk who work and moonlight to take care of their own. They see a free-wheeling democracy as a society stupefied by "the narcotic of mass culture." They reserve their wrath for the institutions in which common people are most represented: unions, Congress, the police and the Army. Professor Edgar Z. Friedenberg thinks that "elitism is the great and distinctive contribution students are making to American society." Democracy is for the dropouts; for the elite, an aristocratic brotherhood.

Yet one cannot help but wonder how inevitable is the future that seemingly is waiting for us around the corner. Might not the common people, so cowed and silent at this moment, eventually kick up their heels, and trample would-be elitists in the dirt? There is no earthly reason why the common people who for more than a century have been doing things here that in other countries are reserved for elites, should not be capable of overcoming the present crisis.

WHOSE COUNTRY?

No where at present is there such a measureless loathing of educated people for their country as in America. An excellent historian thinks Americans are "the most frightening people in the world," and our foremost philologist sees America as "the most aggressive power in the world, the greatest threat to peace and to international cooperation." Others call America a "pig heaven," "a monster with 200 million heads," "a cancer on the body of mankind."

Novelists, playwrights, poets, essayists and philosophers depict America as the land of the dead—a country where sensitive souls are starved and flayed, where nothing nourishes and everything hurts. Nowhere, they say, is there such a boring monotony: monotony of talk, monotony of ideas, monotony of aim, monotony of outlook on the world. One American writer says: "America is no place for an artist. A corn-fed hog enjoys a better life than a creative artist." One she-intellectual maintains that "the quality of American life is an insult to the possibilities of human growth."

It is hard to believe that this savage revulsion derives from specific experiences with persons and places. What is there in America that prevents an educated person from shaping his life, from making the most of his inborn endowments? With all its faults and blemishes, this country gives a man elbowroom to do what is nearest to his heart. It is incredible how easy it is here to cut oneself off from vulgarity, conformity, speciousness, and other corrupting influences and infections. For those who want to be left alone to realize their capacities and talents, this is an ideal country.

The trouble is, of course, that the alienated intellectual does not want to be left alone. He wants to be listened to and be taken seriously. He wants to influence affairs, have a hand in making history, and feel important. He is free to speak and write as he pleases, and can probably make himself heard and read more easily than one who would defend America. But he can neither sway elections nor shape policy. Even when his excellence as a writer, artist, scholar, scientist or educator is generally recognized and rewarded he does not feel himself part of the power structure. In no other country has there been so little liaison between men of words and the men of action who exercise power. The body of intellectuals in America has never been integrated with or congenial to the politicians and businessmen who make things happen. Indeed, the uniqueness of modern America derives in no small part from the fact that America has kept intellectuals away from power and paid little attention to their political views.

The nineteen-sixties have made it patent that much of the intellectual's dissent is fueled by a hunger for power. The appearance of potent allies—militant blacks and students—has emboldened the intellectual to come out into the open. He still feels homeless in America, but the spectacle of proud authority, in cities and on campuses, always surrendering before threats of violence, is to him a clear indication that middle-class society is about to fall apart, and he is all set to pick up the pieces.

There is no doubt that in our permissive society the intellectual has far more liberty than he can use; and the more his liberty and the less his capacity to make use of it, the louder his clamor for power—power to deprive other people of liberty.

The intellectual's allergy to America shows itself with particular clarity in what has happened to many foreign intellectuals who found asylum here during the Hitler decade. It is legitimate to assume that they had no anti-American preconceptions when they arrived. They were, on the contrary, predisposed to see what was best in their host country. Though no one has recorded what Herbert Marcuse said when he landed in New York in 1934, it is safe to assume that he did not see Americans as one-dimensional men, and did not equate our tolerance with oppression, our freedom with slavery, and our good nature with simple-mindedness.

We have a record of what some other foreign intellectuals said when they arrived in the nineteen-thirties. It is worth quoting in full the words of Olga Schnitzler, the widow of Arthur Schnitzler: "So much is here to learn and to see. Everyone has been given an opportunity. Everyone who has not been completely worn out experiences here a kind of rebirth. Everyone feels what a grandiose, complex and broad-minded country America is, how well and free one can live among these people without perfidy and malice. Yes, we have lost a homeland, but we have found a world."

Once they had settled down and found their place, many of these intellectuals began to feel constrained and stifled by the forwardness and the mores of the plebeian masses. They missed the aristocratic climate of the Old World. Inevitably, too, they became disdainful of our lowbrow, practical intelligence. They began to doubt whether Americans had the high-caliber intelligence to solve the problems of a complex, difficult age. Hardly one of them bethought himself that in Europe, when intellectuals of their kind had a hand in shaping and managing affairs, things had not gone too well. There was something that prevented them from sensing the unprecedented nature of the American experiment; that the rejected of Europe have come here together, tamed a savage continent in an incredibly short time and, unguided by intellectuals, fashioned the finest society on a large scale the world has so far seen.

Scratch an intellectual and you find a would-be aristocrat who loathes the sight, the sound and the smell of common folk. Professor Marcuse has lived among us for more than 30 years and now, in old age, his disenchantment with this country is spilling over into book after book. He is offended by the intrusion of the vulgar, by the failure of egalitarian America to keep common people in their place. He is frightened by "the degree to which the population is allowed to break the peace where there is still peace and silence, to be ugly and uglify things, to ooze familiarity and to offend against good form." The vulgar invade "the small reserved sphere of existence" and compel exquisite Marcusian souls to partake of their sounds, sights and smells.

To a shabby would-be aristocrat like Professor Marcuse there is something fundamentally wrong with a society in which the master and the worker, the typist and the boss's daughter do not live totally disparate lives. Everything good in America seems to him a sham and a fraud.

An interesting peculiarity of present-day dissenting intellectuals is their lack of animus toward the rich. They are against the Government, the Congress, the Army and the police, and against corporations and unions, but hardly anything is being said or written against "the money changers in the temple," "the economic royalists," "the malefactors of great wealth" and "the maniacs wild for gold" who were the butt of vituperation in the past. Indeed, there is nowadays a certain rapport between the rich and the would-be revolutionaries. The outlandish role the rich are playing in the affluent society is one of the surprises of our time. Though the logic of it seems no fairly evident, I doubt whether anyone had foreseen that affluence would radicalize the upper rich and the lowest poor and nudge them toward an alliance against those in the middle. Whatever we have of revolution just now is financed largely by the rich.

In order to feel rich, you have to have poor people around you. In an affluent society, riches lose their uniqueness—people no longer find fulfillment in being rich. And when the rich cannot feel rich they begin to have misgivings about success—not enough to give up the fruits of success, but enough to feel guilty, and emote soulfully about the grievances of the disadvantaged, and the sins of the status quo. It seems that every time a millionaire open his mouth nowadays he confesses the sins of our society in public.

Now, it so happens that the rich do indeed have a lot to feel guilty about. They live in exclusive neighborhoods, send their children to private schools, and use every loophole to avoid paying taxes. But what they confess in public are not their private sins, but the sins of society, the sins of the rest of us, and it is our breasts they are beating in to a pulp. They feel guilty and ashamed, they say, because the mass of people, who do most of the work and pay much of the taxes, are against integrated schools and housing, and do not tax themselves to the utmost to fight the evils that beset our cities. We are discovering that in an affluent society the rich have a monopoly of righteousness.

Moreover, the radicalized rich have radical children. There is no generation gap here. The most violent cliques of the New Left are made up of the children of the rich. The Weathermen, to whom workingmen are "honky bastards," have not a member with a workingman's background. The behavior of the extremist young makes sense when seen as the behavior of spoiled brats used to instant fulfillment who expect the solutions to life's problems to be there on demand. And just as in former days aristocratic sprigs horse-whipped peasants, so at present the children of the rich are riding roughshod over community sensibilities. The rich parents applaud and subsidize their revolutionary children, and probably brag about them at dinner parties.

As I said, the alienated rich are one of the surprises of our time It is not surprising to be told that America is a country where intellectuals are least at home. But it is startling to realize that the rich are not, and probably never have been, wholly at ease in this country. The fact that it is easy to get rich in America has not made it a rich man's country. The rich have always had it better elsewhere—better service, more deference, and more leisure and fun. In America, the rich have not known how to savior their riches, and many of them have not known how to behave and have come to a bad end.

There is a story about a British intellectual who traveled through this country toward the end of the last century. He was appalled by the monotony and unimaginativeness of the names of the towns he saw through the train window: Thomasville, Richardsville. Harrysville, Marysville and so on. He had not an inkling of the import of what he was seeing namely, that for the first time in history common people—any Tom, Dick and Harry—could build a town and name it after his own or his wife's name. At one station, an old Irishwoman got on the train and sat next to him. When she heard his muttering and hissing she said: "This is a blessed country, sir. I think God made it for the poor." Crèvecœur, in the 18th century, saw America as an asylum where "the poor of Europe have by some means met together." The poor everywhere have looked on America as their El Dorado. They voted for it with their legs by coming over in their millions.

Yet during the nineteen-sixties, poverty became one of the chief problems that plague this country: one of several nagging problems—like race relations, violence, drugs, inflation—which defy solution. From being a land of opportunity for the poor, America has become a dead-end street for some 15 million unemployables—80 per cent of them white, and most of them trapped in the cores of big cities. Money, better housing, and special schooling have little effect. Our society is showing itself unduly awkward in the attempt to turn the chronically poor into productive, useful citizens. Whereas, in the not too distant past, it was axiomatic that society lived at the expense of the poor, the present-day poor, like the Roman proletariat, live at the expense of society.

We have been transferred by affluence to a psychological age. Impersonal factors, including money, no longer play a decisive role in human affairs. It seems that, by mastering things, we have drained things of their potency to shape men's lives. It is remarkable that common people are aware of this fact. They know that at present money cannot cure crime, poverty, etc., whereas the social doctors go on prescribing an injection of so many billions for every social ailment.

In the earliest cities, suburbs made their appearance as a refuge for dropouts who could not make the grade in the city. When eventually the cities decayed, the suburbs

continued as the earliest villages. In our cities, the process has been reversed. The dropouts are stagnating in the cores of the cities, while people who are ideally suited for city life seek refuge in the suburbs. The indications are that we shall not have viable cities until we lure the chronically poor out of the cities and induce the exiled urbanites to return.

The diffusion of affluence has accelerated the absorption of the majority of workingmen into the middle class. The unemployable poor, left behind, feel isolated and exposed, and it is becoming evident that a middle-class society, which hugs the conviction that everyone can take care of himself, is singularly inept in helping those who cannot help themselves. If the rich cannot feel rich in an affluent society, the poor have never felt poorer.

Whose country, then, is America? It is the country of the common—the common men and women, a good 70 per cent of the population—who do most of the work, pay much of the taxes, crave neither power nor importance, and want to be left alone to live pleasurable humdrum lives. "The founders of the United States," said Lord Charnwood, "did deliberately aspire to found a commonwealth in which common men and women should count for more than elsewhere."

Again and again, you come up against the mystery of what happens to common folk when they land on our shores. It is like a homecoming. They find here their natural habitat, their ideal milieu that brings their energies and capacities into full play.

Tasks that in other countries are reserved for a select minority, for a specially trained élite, are in this country performed by every Tom, Dick and Harry. Not only did common Americans build and name towns, but they also founded states, propagated new faiths, commanded armies, wrote books, and ran for the highest office. It is this that has made America unprecedentedly new.

It tickled me no end that the astronauts who landed on the moon were not élite-conscious intellectuals but lowbrow ordinary Americans. It has been the genius of common Americans to achieve the momentous in an unmomentous matter-of-fact way. If space exploration remains in their keeping, they will soon make of it an everyday routine accessible to all.

The intellectuals call this giving access to the vulgar—vulgarization. The intellectuals' inclination is to complicate things, to make them so abstruse and difficult that they are accessible only to the initiated few. Where the intellectuals are in power, prosaic tasks become Promethean undertakings. I have yet to meet an intellectual who truly believes that common people can govern themselves and run things without outstanding leaders. In the longshoremen's union the intellectuals have a nervous breakdown anytime a common, barely literate longshoreman runs for office and gets elected.

To me it seems axiomatic that the common people everywhere are our natural allies, and that our chief contribution to the advancement of mankind should be the energizing and activation of common folk. We must learn how to impart to common people everywhere the technological, political and social skills that would enable them to dispense with the tutorship of the upper classes and the intellectuals. We must deflate the pretensions of self-appointed élites. These élites will hate us no matter what we do, and it is legitimate for us to help dump them into the dustbin of history.

Our foreign aid to backward countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America should be tailored to the needs of common people rather than of the élites. The élites hanker for the trappings of the 20th century. They want steel mills, airlines, skyscrapers, etc. Let them get these trappings from élitist Russia. Our gift to the people in backward countries should be the capacity for self-help. We must show them how to get bread, human dignity and strength by their own efforts. We must know how to stiffen their back so that they will insist on getting their full share of the good life and not allow themselves to be sacrificed to the Moloch of a mythical future.

There is an America hidden in the soil of every country and in the soul of every people. It is our task to help common people everywhere discover their America at home.

RYAN PROVISION AIDS MITCHELL-LAMA

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the President signed into law on December 31, 1970, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970. Thereby, my bill applying to Mitchell-Lama projects—H.R. 49—has become a part of the public law, since it is incorporated in the 1970 act as section 118.

Section 118 makes pre-1968 State and locally financed limited profit housing projects eligible for Federal rental assistance subsidies under the section 236 program, and for rent supplements. This change in the previous law is particularly important to New York City, where the State and city Mitchell-Lama programs, allied with the Federal section 236 program, are so vitally integral in ameliorating the housing crisis afflicting us.

I should like to briefly explain the State and city Mitchell-Lama programs, the Federal section 236 program, and my legislation which has been adopted to enable their effective meshing and to thereby avoid increased rentals and carrying charges in Mitchell-Lama projects.

The Mitchell-Lama programs make available long-term, low-interest mortgages to regulated companies which agree to limit their profit. The regulations are enforced either by the State commissioner of housing and community renewal or by the supervising municipal agency, depending upon whether the source of financing is the State or the city. The funds for financing are obtained from the sale, by the city or the State, of notes and bonds. The money paid for these is loaned to the sponsors of the Mitchell-Lama projects.

The section 236 rental assistance program was created by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 to provide assistance for rental and cooperative housing for lower income families. This assistance takes the form of periodic payments by the Federal Government to the entity financing the housing.

These payments reduce the mortgagor's interest costs. And this reduction in costs enables the setting of lower rentals and carrying charges to be paid by the occupants of the housing, since they are in effect relieved of absorbing otherwise high interest expenses.

Because of my previous amendment, adopted in the Housing Act passed 2 years ago, Mitchell-Lama projects constructed after 1968 have been eligible for the benefits of the section 236 program, as well as for rent supplements: The Federal subsidies are used by the financing entity—that is, the city or the State—to pay off the principal and interest on the bonds which it sold to raise the funds which were then loaned to the sponsor of the Mitchell-Lama project. Thereby, the Mitchell-Lama sponsor is relieved of having to pay off the high financing expenses, and in turn the Mitchell-Lama occupants do not have to bear these expenses, which would otherwise be passed on to them in the form of higher rentals and carrying charges.

Now, because of my bill embodied in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, pre-1968 Mitchell-Lamas will similarly be eligible for section 236 rental assistance subsidies, and for rent supplements.

The section 236 programs, as I said on December 2, 1970, when I discussed the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 which was then being considered by the House, "is absolutely vital for the bringing of decent rental housing to lower income families in urban areas. Its use in tandem with State and locally financed limited profit programs—such as that in New York—has been particularly beneficial."

Some idea of how vital this program is can be derived from these figures: if sufficient section 236 funds were available—and, parenthetically, I should note here that we succeeded in obtaining, in accordance with another bill of mine, an additional $35 million for the program last fiscal year, and we will be undertaking in the next Congress to obtain additional funds for this fiscal year—New York City alone could use approximately $35,000,000 for projected city and State Mitchell-Lama projects containing approximately 18,000 apartment units. But for my 1968 amendment, these projected Mitchell-Lamas would be ineligible for the federal subsidies.

My new provision will be directed at those already existing Mitchell-Lama projects still under temporary financing which face having to go into permanent financing, and the large rental and carrying charge increases which would then ensue. Let me demonstrate briefly how this works.

Since the financing of construction of Mitchell-Lama projects is achieved by the sale, by the city or the State, of temporary bond anticipation notes, a tight-money, high-interest market is necessarily reflected in what the seller—that is, the city or State—has to "pay" to sell the bonds. In today's market the seller has to "pay" a high rate of return to make the bonds attractive. And, because of this, higher costs are in turn passed on to the renter and cooperator in the form of higher rentals and carrying charges.

When the project has to go into permanent financing, the situation becomes even more extreme, because an even higher rate of return may have to be paid by the city and State than for temporary notes. Thus, it may be possible to

sell temporary notes by "paying" the buyer a 5.75-percent rate of return. To sell permanent bonds, the city may have to "pay" the buyer 7.75-percent interest. The ultimate victim, of course, is the Mitchell-Lama occupant, who sees his rental or carrying charge increased.

As I said when I appeared before the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Banking and Currency Committee on June 3, 1970, to present testimony regarding this year's housing legislation:

The generally accepted rule of thumb, proven out by numerous analyses, is that for every percentage point of interest, there is an increase in rents-carrying charges of $4.50 per room per month. Now, 4, and 5 and 6 years ago, Mitchell-Lama projects were coming in at 3.5 and 4 percent interest rates. To this would be added 0.5 percent for service charges. Today, the totoal is up to 7.7-percent—that means, 7.2-percent interest and 0.5-percent service charge. So, this represents an increase from 3.2 to 3.7 points. Figuring that each point of interest raises rents by $4.50 per room per month, this means rent-carrying charge increases of from $14.40 to $16.65 per room per month. A family of two living in a four-room, one-bedroom apartment would therefore face, when its building goes into permanent financing, an increase ranging from $57.60 up to $66.60 per month.

I don't think I have to make any comment. The figures speak for themselves—shocking!

In addition to the push of spiraling interest rates, which convert into skyrocketing rental and carrying charge increases, construction costs have similarly soared, as well as maintenance expenses. And again, these rising costs are translated into increased rentals and carrying charges.

Obviously, relief is mandatory. The section 236 rental assistance subsidy program, combined with the Mitchell-Lama program, offers that relief. But section 236 had to be fashioned to enhance its utility. Thus, in 1968, when the section 236 program was being drafted, I worked to insure that Mitchell-Lama projects would be eligible for its benefits. In the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act, I succeeded in having adopted the so-called Ryan amendment, which made Mitchell-Lamas constructed subsequent to passage of the 1968 act eligible for section 236, rent subsidies, and for rent supplements.

That was the first step. This year I sought to effect a change in section 236's language to make pre-1968 Mitchell-Lamas eligible. And by the incorporation of my bill, H.R. 49, as section 118 of the just-signed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, we successfully achieved that goal.

I can readily attest to the efforts required to bring this to fruition. One adverse factor we confronted was the bias of some nonurban Members to legislation which appears to particularly aid the cities. Added to this barrier was that erected by the minority members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, from which emanated the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970. These members, in their minority report on the act, specifically attacked my provision aiding Mitchell-Lamas, and they in fact sought to strike the provision by an amendment on the floor during debate. Fortunately, we succeeded in defeating that attempt.

Finally, the administration opposed my bill. Following is its formal statement, issued on December 10 in an attempt to convince the House and Senate conferees—who were meeting to iron out the differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970—to drop my provision:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

ASSISTANCE UNDER SECTION 236 AND RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAMS FOR EXISTING PROJECTS FINANCED UNDER CERTAIN STATE OR LOCAL PROGRAMS

Section [118] of the House bill would authorize section 236 and rent supplement assistance for *existing* rental and cooperative housing projects which are financed with State or local aid. There is no similar provision in the Senate bill.

THE ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDS AGAINST ENACTMENT OF THE HOUSE PROVISION

This provision runs counter to the purpose of the 236 and rent supplement programs, which is to generate new rental units to fill an as yet unmet demand for such units. This proposal would divert limited subsidy funds available to these programs to support one particular group of existing projects. We believe this would be an inefficient use of the scarce subsidy funds.

Despite the opposition arrayed against section 118, we were successful in bringing it to the point where it has now become public law. Much credit must be paid to the many New Yorkers who wired and wrote the House and Senate conferees urging retention of the Ryan provision in the bill which was ultimately sent to the President's desk. In good measure, also, we succeeded because of the compelling case made by the panel of New Yorkers who came to Washington last June to testify in support of my bill before the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

This panel included State Senator Manfred Ohernstein—to whom our distinguished colleague from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY), one of the most informed leaders in the Congress on housing legislation, referred thusly:

I might say, too, Senator, that the work you have been doing in the New York State Senate has not escaped notice.

Also included in the panel were the Honorable Charles J. Urstadt, New York State Commissioner of Housing and Community Renewal; the Honorable Avrum Hyman, New York State Assistant Commissioner of Housing and Community Renewal; Miss Shirley Sanderson, vice president, board of directors, RNA House, and chairman, joint action committee, West Side Mitchell-Lamas; Warren Holder, Westgate Tenants' Association; Mrs. Edna Luftig, chairman, Mitchell-Lama Action Committee, Metropolitan Council on Housing, and vice president, board of directors, Franklin Plaza; Harold Ostroff, executive vice president, United Housing Foundation, Inc.; Jack Braunstein, legislative director, Council of Limited Profit Mutual Housing Companies, Inc.; Murray Raphael, president, Council of Limited Profit Mutual Housing Companies, Inc.; and Joseph Cox, vice president, Council of Limited Profit Mutual Housing Companies, Inc.

The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing (Mr. BARRETT), who has been so vitally important in the passage of progressive Federal housing legislation, made clear the impact of this panel, when he said at the hearing:

Mr. Ryan, I want to say seriously and forthrightly that you have brought down here one of the most intelligent panels that I have experienced in the 20 years that I have been on this committee.

I wish that I could say that now, after enactment of my 1968 amendment making post-1968 Mitchell-Lamas eligible for section 236 assistance and for rent supplements, and after enactment of my 1970 legislation making pre-1968 Mitchell-Lamas similarly eligible, the rest would be clear sailing. Unfortunately, this is not the case. Our achievements make a difference. But more work still remains.

In particular, two other aspects of section 236 must be changed. One of these concerns the requirement that tenants receiving the benefit of section 236 must pay at least 25 percent of their income as rental or carrying charge. Obviously, this constitutes an enormous burden—one which I have constantly sought to have ameliorated. In 1969, I offered an amendment on the floor during the debates on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969 to lower this requirement to 20 percent. I succeeded in having this amendment adopted, but in the House-Senate conference, my amendment was deleted—the victim of too-powerful opposition.

This year, I testified before the Subcommittee on Housing in support of my bill—which I introduced as soon as my amendment was deleted in 1969—to lower the rent-income ratio to 20 percent. In the course of my testimony before the Subcommittee on Housing this June, I noted:

The present 25 percent rental requirement reflects the thinking of a day when an ideal budget construct allocated one-fourth of a person's income to shelter. This allocation is no longer realistic, particularly since the tenant is not building up any equity, as a mortgagor is. The expenses of living, particularly in metropolitan areas where transportation, food, and services account for so much of a person's income, simply make unrealistic the expenditurer of one-fourth of income in rent.

I am hopeful that action will soon be forthcoming on my proposal, because the Subcommittee on Housing has set up a special study panel to examine the question of rent-income ratio requirements.

Another change which must be effected in order to enhance the utility of the section 236 program is a modification of the income eligibility requirements. As I said on December 2, when I discussed the need for legislation:

The simple fact of the matter is that these eligibility limitations are too stringent. There are many families for whom section 236 subsidization is necessary, yet whose incomes exceed the present statutory limits. (My bill,) H.R. 17885 (,) rectifies this problem by abol-

ishing the percentage limits now in the law, and substituting in their stead the administrative discretion of the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to set income limits taking into account the housing costs of the area in which the project receiving subsidization is located.

As with my other legislation, I testified for this change when I appeared before the Subcommittee on Housing. And, as with my bill to change the rent-income ratio under section 236 down to 20 percent, I am hopeful of action in the near future, since one of the special panels established by the subcommittee is to consider this issue.

Finally, provision must be made for allowing an increase in the construction cost limits for section 236 subsidized projects. This is the only way section 236 can be utilized really effectively in high-cost areas, such as New York City. Unfortunately, a provision to this end was deleted by the House-Senate conferees on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, but we will continue to work in the coming Congress to achieve this goal.

The housing crisis is not going to be overcome overnight by virtue of the enactment of my legislation embodied in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970. But progress—essential progress—is being made. We have succeeded in making the Mitchell-Lama program and the Federal section 236 program a workable combination—first, by passage of the 1968 amendment, and now, by passage of the 1970 provision. And we have succeeded in sensitizing the Congress to New York City's needs.

This is not to say that I, therefore, counsel patience. Patience for the thousands of families being afflicted by inadequate housing and by exorbitant costs is a commodity whose currency is by now largely valueless. But I do counsel continued demand for change. Our demands succeeded this year, and they succeeded 2 years ago. We will succeed again, in the future.

SENATOR STEPHEN M. YOUNG

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I wish to pay my respects to one of our departing Members, STEVE YOUNG. I know that I shall miss him very much as will my colleagues.

STEVE YOUNG has been a unique Member of this body. His voice has always been direct and to the point. His has been a most refreshing and spirited voice and a voice of great candor and little pretense. It has also been a voice of courage and of wisdom.

STEVE YOUNG, despite his years, has been as youthful a Member as this 91st Congress has seen. He has been youthful in terms of vigor but also in terms of his spirit and his outlook. There has been no generation gap separating STEVE YOUNG and the concerned youth of today. He operates on their wavelength and he can and does communicate with them. "YOUNG" he is, and young he remains.

Yes, we are going to miss STEVE YOUNG. We will miss his pungent and well chosen words and his manner of direct communication with constituents and others. I have relished his sharp response to many an abusive letter writer. I wonder if we would not all communicate more effectively if we would but adopt such directness and candor.

I also wish to pay tribute to a man who, having made the decision to step down and not to seek reelection, used every hour, and every minute of every hour, available to him to try to maximize his influence on the Senate and on public policy here in Washington. He has never worked harder than he has these past months and no one has worked harder or with greater diligence. The people of Ohio as well as those of us in the Senate will certainly miss him.

THE 1970 CONGRESS: AN ASSESSMENT

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, this is the season for summations and evaluations of the record which Congress compiled—or failed to compile—during the past year.

In many respects, the abundant controversy and indecisiveness so evident in the Senate during the last session were really a reflection of the powerful crosscurrents buffeting the Nation as a whole. In a sense, the Senate mirrored the frustrations and confrontations which surfaced among the people.

Abraham Lincoln once said:

Honest statesmanship is the wise employment of individual meanness for the public good.

That seems to be an unusually cynical thought to come from the great 16th President of the United States. Yet, it can be said that the "individual meanness" so prominently exhibited by some Senators last year did serve the public good in at least some instances.

Much was wrong and inadequate about the performance of the 91st Congress. But in rendering such an assessment, it would be unfair to overlook the impressive list of positive, constructive accomplishments.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In effect, Congress ratified President Nixon's dramatic reordering of the Nation's priorities. For the first time in 20 years, the Federal Government allocated a larger percentage of the budget for human needs and problems than for the military.

As President Nixon proceeded on course to wind down the inherited Vietnam war, defense spending was cut too—at the rate of $6 billion a year, or 7 percent. But unfortunately for some, Government spending cuts are translated into fewer jobs. Such reductions eliminated 661,000 jobs in the Defense Department alone, and wiped out over a million jobs in defense-related private industry.

Spending for space was also reduced, from $4.4 billion in fiscal 1969 to $3.4 billion for this fiscal year. Here again, unemployment has been the result in some areas of the country.

Fourth quarter draft calls for 1970 were 27,000—down by 66,000 from the 93,000 who were drafted in the first quarter of 1969.

Clearly, we are in a period of transition from war to peace. It is a peaceful transition in some respects as the Nation shifts its gears. But there can be no doubt that President Nixon is keenly aware of the need to reinvigorate the economy on the domestic front, and he will press Congress hard for support to do just that in the session ahead. In his efforts, I am confident he will have the backing of a large majority of the American people, despite the fact that there may be loud bickering heard in Congress about ways and means for achieving his goal.

The Senate accomplished something, I believe, by laying aside the "antitrade" legislation which had passed the House. In so doing, the Senate signaled to those concerned at home, as well as to our trading partners around the world, that the United States is not about to retreat to a strict protectionist policy. The last thing we need is a world trade war which could prove economically disastrous, particularly for Michigan—the Nation's second-ranking exporter of manufactured products.

In 1970, the Senate voted to proceed with development of an anti-ballistic-missile defense system. During the debate most Senators recognized the necessity for maintaining a reliable deterrent to discourage any possible Soviet attack. At the same time, there was a consensus in the Senate that the United States should vigorously pursue every avenue and opportunity that might lead to a meaningful arms control agreement with the Soviet Union. In a year when consensus was not exactly the rule in the Senate, agreement on such points was particularly significant.

Crime fighters across the Nation were reinforced by the 91st Congress with stronger laws requested by the President to combat racketeering and terrorist bombings. More funds were provided for police training and a better framework was established for regional cooperation among law enforcement agencies. President Nixon's "total war against crime" is beginning to pay dividends. For example, the crime rate in Washington, D.C. is finally going down—instead of up.

New initiatives to cope with the alarming drug problem were made possible as a result of legislation requested by the President and enacted by Congress. Stiffer penalties—up to 12 years in prison—now await the criminals who peddle drugs. At the same time, prosecutors and judges will have more discretion dealing with first-offense youngsters who experiment with marijuana.

In addition, the new legislation will make millions available to help local

schools and colleges educate young people concerning the dangers and pitfalls of drug abuse.

The new drug legislation also includes a controversial no-knock provision which will strengthen the hand of law enforcement officers. It would permit a Federal officer to enter an accused's dwelling without knocking if the officer obtains a warrant in advance from a judge or magistrate who is satisfied that illegal drugs are held inside would be easily or quickly disposed of—for example, by flushing down the toilet—if the officer were to knock and give notice.

Eleven million young people from age 18 through 20 now have the right to vote in Federal elections as the result of a statute passed last year by Congress. However, the Supreme Court has held that the statute conferred no right upon this age group to vote in State or local elections. To avoid the chaos and confusion that would result from maintaining separate registration and voting procedures for different age groups, there will be an even stronger push in the next Congress for adoption of a constitutional amendment granting 18- to 20-year-olds the vote in all elections.

Working men and women can look forward to better conditions on the job as a result of the Occupational Safety and Health Act requested by President Nixon and enacted by Congress in 1970. This legislation is aimed at reducing the work-related accidents and illnesses which each year have been killing 14,000 Americans and costing 250 million lost man-days of labor.

In the swirl of controversy, many people may not realize that President Nixon requested, and Congress enacted, a bill which expanded unemployment insurance coverage to nearly 5 million more workers. In addition, the amount of unemployment compensation, as well as the duration of benefits, were increased for millions of workers already covered.

With congressional concurrence, President Nixon established a new Environmental Protection Agency in the executive branch. His reorganization plan, which became effective in September 1970, pulled together in one agency a variety of pollution research, monitoring, standard setting, and enforcement activities that had been scattered throughout the Government. As a result, antipollution efforts at the Federal level have been streamlined for a coordinated attack on the swiftly multiplying problems. Incidentally, Detroit has already been targeted for early attention by the Environmental Protection Agency.

President Nixon's proposal to set up a new Government corporation to handle the Nations mail finally cleared the Congress and became law in August. Although results are not yet apparent, there is at least new hope for improved mail service in the decade of the seventies.

The Taos-Blue Lake legislation, which I cosponsored along with Democratic Senator HARRIS of Oklahoma, was a historic first; it represented a symbolic step toward better relations between Indians and the Government. The act conferred upon the Pueblo de Taos Indians trust title to 48,000 acres of sacred land which they have used for religious purposes since the 14th century.

FAILURES

At times, it may be the appropriate function of a minority in the Senate to impede the legislative process. But should a minority be able to obstruct?

Voltaire once said:

The secret of making one's self tiresome is not to know when to stop.

Senators who refused to stop talking posed a major problem in 1970. Indeed, the Senate's business ground to a halt and we were completely bogged down in one parliamentary snarl after another.

Under present rules, debate on any issue is unlimited unless and until two-thirds of the Senators will vote to invoke cloture—cut off debate. Because I believe we must make it easier to terminate filibusters, I have supported an effort to change the rules so debate can be ended by a three-fifth—rather than two-thirds vote.

That is only one of the reforms in Senate rules that ought to be adopted, as I see it. For example, I do not believe it should be possible to attach nongermane—unrelated—legislation on another bill which happens to be going through the Senate. Because a number of nongermane "riders" were hung on the social security bill as though it were a Christmas tree, support for the whole legislative package finally collapsed. As a result, some 26 million older Americans will now have to wait until the new Congress tries again to pass a bill providing the additional benefits which are needed to offset increases in the cost of living.

And in order to adjourn the Congress by the end of the year, it became necessary to postpone until April a final decision on the future of the supersonic transport plane—SST.

The performance of Congress in the last session fell short in a number of other ways.

President Nixon's $10 billion program to combat water pollution by financing construction throughout the Nation of desperately needed sewage treatment facilities was not enacted by the Congress.

Congress completely ignored legislation which I introduced last February on behalf of the administration to provide new tools to deal with threatened nationwide strikes in the transportation industry. By refusing to face up to the crying need for reform in our labor management laws, Congress left the Nation vulnerable to at least three major crises in the railroad industry alone last year.

The record of the 91st Congress on health care was very thin. Some assistance for hospital construction was approved. And, of course, the new drug legislation is related to health. But the major effort in this field is expected in the next session after President Nixon proposes his sweeping new health care program.

Last year Congress refused to act on any of the several proposals to reform our creaky electoral college system, under which we elect the President of the United States. Many days and weeks were devoted to debating this important subject—but nothing was done.

The Congress missed many other opportunities to enact other important legislation, including bills for consumer protection, pollution control, emergency school aid, higher education opportunity, pay increases for enlisted men, selective service reform, and national bail reform.

MICHIGAN AFFAIRS

For Michigan one of the most important 1970 congressional actions was enactment of President Nixon's new merchant marine program, which brought the dawn of a new day for the financially ailing Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway.

An important part of the bill, which I helped to write in, waives past and future interest otherwise due on the seaway's debt. However, the Seaway Corporation will still be required to repay the principal which was borrowed to finance the original construction of the seaway.

As a result of the legislation, the seaway tolls should not have to be raised now. And, in turn, there should be less chance of a dropoff in seaway traffic, which is so vital to the economic growth of Michigan and other Great Lakes States.

The Great Lakes merchant marine fleet got a boost from a provision in the maritime bill which allows part of its earnings to be set aside in a tax-deferred reserve for renovating aging Great Lakes ships.

In response to my strong recommendation, the Maritime Administration modified the design of two classes of new ships to be constructed. The modification will narrow the ships enough so that they can traverse the seaway locks.

For the first time, the Great Lakes-Seaway has finally been officially designated in the new legislation as the Nation's fourth seacoast, qualifying the area's ports for maritime subsidy treatment on a basis similar to Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coast ports.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore finally became a reality in 1970, 9 years after the legislation was first introduced. Along with some others who live in or near the area, I had some misgivings about certain provisions in the legislation. However, now that it has become law, I am working hard for full funding by the Federal Government, as promptly as possible. If the money promised is actually provided, along with wise administration, the new national lakeshore can serve the maximum public good with a minimum of inequity for the few whose property rights will be affected by the legislation.

Both Michigan Senators were gratified by the swift cooperation they received from the Federal Water Quality Administration when there was an urgent need to neutralize an oil slick hazard in Lake Huron, caused by spillage from the sunken German freighter *Nordmeer* near Alpena. Working closely with Congressman PHIL RUPPE, we were able to see that the leaking hull was repaired, and the oil remaining in the hull is being pumped out.

Michigan was one of the principal victims when Congress failed last year to appropriate money to cover the Federal share, already obligated, of waste treatment construction costs.

As a result, Michigan has had to shoulder the Federal Government's share of the costs of sewage treatment facilities—some $197 million so far.

Working with Governor Milliken, I helped arrange for transfer to the State of the former Marine Hospital in Detroit, which has been closed since June 1969. The hospital's facility is now being converted into a mental health center where treatment will be available to help those with drug problems.

With the cooperation of the Federal Indian Health Service and leaders of Indian communities in Michigan, I helped establish a better organizational structure for getting needed health services to our State's Indian population. Indian communities will now have a health representative who will focus his effort upon utilizing available services to improve the deplorable state of health among many Indians in Michigan.

WORLD AFFAIRS

In 1970 it was apparent that President Nixon had the support of the Senate—begrudging and reluctant as it was—for his policy of Vietnamization and phased withdrawal from Southeast Asia.

Notwithstanding the heated, lengthy Senate debates over the Cambodian incursion and demands for fixed withdrawal dates, President Nixon moved steadily ahead with his program of disengagement.

About half the number of troops in South Vietnam when President Nixon took office will be out in May. And it is expected that no American troops will be engaged in ground combat in Vietnam by summer.

When he presented his five-point peace plan October 7, calling for a cease-fire, an Asian peace conference and release by both sides of all prisoners of war, the whole Senate suddenly united in support of President Nixon—at least for a little while. Indeed, the next day the Senate adopted a resolution expressing unanimous approval of the proposal which was laid before the Communists at the Paris peace talks.

However, during the subsequent lame-duck session, when the President requested $255 million in supplemental aid to help Cambodia fight its own war, the same old opposition minority was back in motion again. Finally, despite the protests, the Congress did approve the aid requested, after writing into law what President Nixon had already pledged: No American participation in ground fighting in Cambodia.

It seems ironic that the Nixon doctrine, in essence a plan to reduce the use of American troops while encouraging our Allies to do their own fighting, should have provoked such heated protests and prolonged debate in the Senate.

EUROPE

During the recess period which followed the 1970 elections, I traveled to Europe to serve as part of the Senate's delegation to the 16th annual North Atlantic Assembly which convened at The Hague.

European parliamentarians in attendance were keenly aware of our interest in shifting more of the burden for Europe's defense to the Europeans, now that they have fully recovered from the Second World War. It was encouraging when the assembly accepted our proposal that each NATO country should increase its contribution to the common defense to at least 5-percent of its gross national product.

Although President Nixon has indicated that we will not jump the gun with a unilateral pullback of American troops from Europe for the time being, understandable pressures are building in Congress for significant reductions in the U.S. commitment. We continue to spend some $14 billion annually for the defense of Europe. Although Europe is vital to our own security interests, at a time when Europeans stand on sound economic footing and when we need to direct more of our resources toward domestic problems in our country, it is not unreasonable to expect our European partners to pick up a larger share of the NATO tab.

MIDDLE EAST

In general, the Senate has supported President Nixon's Middle East policy, by approving aid for some of the nations, and by helping the administration to maintain a balance of military power as between the Arabs and Israelis.

President Nixon exhibited effective leadership when he arranged for a cease-fire in the area last August, and when he worked behind the scenes to halt the Syrian-Jordan flareup in September.

Although subsequent Soviet-Egyptian violations of the standstill cease-fire agreement have been deplored, apparently they have not thrown peacemaking efforts completely off track. It is encouraging that the parties at least are talking—rather than shooting.

Recently Israel moved to return to the United Nations-sponsored peace talks. The willingness of Congress to provide $500 million in credits for Israel, to offset Soviet arms supplies to the Arabs, was an important consideration.

Though all previous attempts to achieve peace in the Middle East have failed, we cannot afford to let up in the efforts. The world has too much at stake to allow the Middle East to explode.

As we continue to pursue the elusive goal of peace in the area, it is important that we maintain a balance and even-handedness in our policy to demonstrate our respect for both the Arabs and the Jews.

PRISONERS OF WAR

During my visit to Europe in November, I had an unusual opportunity to extend my efforts on behalf of the unfortunate American prisoners of war who are held by the Communists in Southeast Asia.

In Rome, Mrs. Griffin and I were privileged to have a private audience with His Holiness Pope Paul VI on Veterans Day, November 11. We found him deeply concerned and sensitive to the plight of all prisoners in the Southeast Asian war. He told us that the prisoners are constantly in his prayers, and he said he would include a special prayer for the Michigan men who are listed as prisoners or missing in action.

In Paris, after much difficulty, I was able to arrange an hour-long conference with Mai Van Bo, North Vietnam's delegate General to France. We spoke at length about the prisoner problem.

After he had emphasized several times that his government's treatment of our prisoners was humane, I proposed that his government permit me to visit its prison camps to verify his statement. I offered to travel blindfold, if necessary, to preserve his government's military security. Although he said my offer would be considered by his government, so far I have received no response whatever.

During my conference with the delegate general, I emphasized the obligations to prisoners of war which North Vietnam assumed when it became a party to the Geneva Convention. I pressed strongly for his government to: identify all prisoners they hold; release sick and wounded prisoners before Christmas--deadline now past—and transfer those prisoners held the longest to a third country, like Hungary, Poland, or Sweden.

I received no satisfaction from the delegate general—only an assurance that he would pass my proposal along to his government at Hanoi.

After a full month elapsed with no word, I decided that if there were to be any release of American men for the holidays, some dramatic gesture was necessary to turn the world's attention to Hanoi's callous disregard of international agreements on the handling of prisoners of war.

Accordingly, on December 15, I proposed in a Senate speech that our side release unilaterally 1,500 North Vietnamese prisoners, in addition to all sick and wounded.

I told my colleagues:

Such a dramatic, humanitarian initiative would create, worldwide, an expectation of response in kind by the Communist side.

The Voice of America and other international broadcasters like Radio Free Europe beamed portions of my speech into Vietnam, both North and South. Although the hoped for result has not materialized, North Vietnam and South Vietnam each took small but significant steps on December 22.

North Vietnam provided two Senate aides in Paris with lists of 339 Americans held prisoner. The names were already known but the lists did provide some fragments of new information, and they were labeled official. It appeared that Hanoi was responding a bit to the pressures of world opinion—even though its "list" was nothing but cruel propaganda for the most part.

A little earlier on the same day, South Vietnam's foreign minister announced that his government would release unilaterally all North Vietnamese sick and wounded prisoners who wished to be repatriated. Reacting with unusual swiftness, North Vietnam indicated that it would accept the men.

Out of some 200 sick and wounded North Vietnamese interviewed by the International Red Cross, only 39 reportedly have indicated a willingness to be sent back.

Christmas passed without the release by the Communists of any Americans or other free world prisoners. During the holidays the Communists took the unusual step of arranging for the Canadian Broadcasting Corp. to film television interviews with two American prisoners. The film, showing a few other Americans, apparently in healthy and comfortable circumstances, was viewed in this country on television on December 27.

Obviously, Hanoi's purpose in providing the film was pure propaganda—an effort to influence world opinion. But the fact that Hanoi is concerned about world opinion is of some significance.

Because we are able to talk to the nine Americans previously released by the Communists, we have firsthand testimony about the actual conditions in the Communist prison camps. Except for the propaganda film, there is no evidence that our prisoners are being favored with the tender care apparently accorded the seven prisoners shown in the television film.

Of course, my offer to visit the North Vietnamese prison camps where Americans are held still stands; but it was not answered. In this instance no news is not good news. But perhaps it is better than a flat refusal. Needless to say, the Communists are hard bargainers.

Occasionally, as we have seen, they do respond.

We must not be discouraged. We must press on for a favorable response and progress.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR STEPHEN YOUNG

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in paying tribute to STEPHEN YOUNG, I would make one personal note. In 1964, I went to Ohio to support him in a primary campaign in which he was being challenged on wholly nonpolitical grounds, irrelevant to the office of Senator and to his record—even irresponsible. He was reelected, and in the 6 years following 1964 has proved again his competence and the pertinence and validity of his ideas, the rightness and soundness of his earlier judgments.

It is my belief that had he run again in 1970, he would have been reelected and for at least 6 more years would have served his State and the Nation with the same good spirit, good judgment, courage, and vision that he demonstrated in his previous years of service in the Congress of the United States.

He had been right on all the great issues but singularly right on the matter of civil defense. Year in, year out, he has opposed the program as unsound militarily, psychologically, and scientifically. While others talked of going underground, STEVE YOUNG said let us take action needed to prevent and preclude fallout. When others said let us make America a nation of moles, STEVE YOUNG said let us live in the sun—unafraid and young.

THE PLIGHT OF THE PIMA INDIAN

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the inability of many Pima Indians to obtain necessary water is a deplorable situation which our Government created. It is the duty of our Government to remedy this gross injustice. An article depicting the damaging effects of our Government's failure to take remedial action was written with the hope that water which was diverted from use by the Indians shall be made available to them. Under leave granted, I include in my remarks the following article:

THE PLIGHT OF THE PIMA INDIAN

(By FLEUR FEIGHAN)

The Hohokam Indian culture endured for over 16 centuries in the southern desert which is now called Arizona. The Hohokams were a peace-loving tribe wnose social system was democratic. These industrious Indians had engineered and constructed a canal system 150 miles long by using water from the Gila River to irrigate their land for their crops of beans, corn, cotton and squash.

In addition, the Hohokams developed what is probably the first process of etching known to man. They made etchings inside shells with fermented saguaro cactus juice. About the year 1400 A.D. their importance waned.

The present day Pima Indians are believed to be one of their descendants. They live on the same land, under less prosperous conditions. They live without water and are relatively impoverished. The Pimas depended on the flow of the Gila River to irrigate their crops.

Many Pimas live only ten minutes from the city limits of Phoenix in a village called Komatke. Komatke has been in need of water ever since the Coolidge Dam was finished in 1928.

They never have had running water or elementary plumbing. At one time, they could rely on the flow of water from the Gila River but when it was dammed in 1928 the area became dry. Komatke village is one of the largest inhabited areas on the Gila River Reservation. Some areas on the reservation do have water and plumbing but for some reason Komatke have never been serviced.

In 1962, the Indians were asked to fill out applications for sewage lines which would run into their homes. After the information had been gathered, no aid was given. The Indians were later told that the Public Health Service was merely making a survey.

During this same period a tiny adjacent area with few inhabitants was given a sewage system from a well dug right from under Komatke Village. Needless to say, there is a constant stream of Indians on foot, in pick-up trucks and in horse-drawn wagons carting the precious water to their homes from the one available faucet. With no water, it is almost impossible to keep a sanitary house and keep a growing family clean and healthy.

One villager, Anselm Shelde, who lives near the pipeline which passes through Komatke said he asked Public Health if he could hook onto the line in order to bring water into his home. He was told he could do so at his own expense. He surveyed the area himself and after going through many obstacles he was turned down by Public Health on the grounds that if his line were to break, it would pollute the entire water system. Mr. Shelde then gave up and is still patiently awaiting government aid.

Another Indian, Adam Marks, bought a tract of land in Komatke on the initial promise of HUD's Tribal Housing Authority that they would finance a new housing project for the Pimas anywhere they chose to build in the area. After Marks bought the property, the Tribal Housing Authority changed the plan and decided to build the homes in a cluster nowhere near Marks' little tract of land. Marks is building his house anyway. He estimates it will take him 5 years if he works every Sunday and optimistically he is adding on a bathroom.

To add insult to injury PHS has built a new well to service only the new housing project which is tied up in a bureaucratic muddle. THA passes the buck to PHS and vice versa. THA claims they are waiting for PHS to survey the area for the pipeline because they cannot build unless there is plumbing planned. PHS in turn says they are waiting for THA to provide the plans for the location of the future homes before a plan for laying a pipe can be made.

Meanwhile the well which has been dug remains unused and as plans stand today, it will remain unused until the housing project is finished. At that time, the pipe will run down 51st Avenue and will not service any of the existing homes because that is the way the law reads. In addition, the old well in Komatke Village will be shut down and the new well will be pumping water to the tiny area adjacent to Komatke but will not service Komatke.

Unfortunately this type of doubtful logic is predominating at the local level in both agencies.

Emery Johnson, the Executive Director of the PHS for Indians in Washington, D.C. was not aware of what the local level was planning but had every confidence in his local administration whatever their plans may be. This type of insensitivity persists and that is why there has been no action to date.

The question is this; how long will it be before a major community of over 300 inhabitants on the Gila River Reservation, only ten minutes from Phoenix, will have the very basic needs of every day living.

This may well be at the very core of the Indian problem. Water, a very basic need, can alleviate some of the Indian's feeling of hopelessness and inadequacy which has literally killed initiative and generated squalor from generation to generation.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CHARLES GOODELL

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I cannot leave the U.S. Senate without paying tribute to one of the Members on the other side of the aisle, the junior Senator from New York, Mr. GOODELL, who was appointed to the Senate September 10, 1968, to fill the vacancy left by

the tragic death of Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

For his work in this body, Senator GOODELL was rewarded with the opposition of the White House, even though it is controlled by a member of his own party; and by another of the Vice President's vicious, scurrilous attacks. Senator GOODELL lost his seat in this body, but he gained a far greater honor—the honor of being on the Vice President's purge list. A man who incurs the Vice President's wrath as Senator GOODELL did, must stand for some good things. Senator GOODELL will long be remembered for the fine record he has compiled as a U.S. Senator.

He has served in the Senate with rare diligence and has shown the imaginativeness and concern that marked him as an outstanding freshman Senator. He has been one of the leaders in this body in the fight to reduce outrageously high military spending on, and to end the war in Southeast Asia, without further delay and without needlessly higher costs in money, and the lives of young Americans. This Nation will miss his voice and his service in this body.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GEORGE MURPHY

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, there probably is not a man on this floor who has known GEORGE MURPHY as long as I have. Not that you have to know GEORGE a long time to respect him, to love him, and to admire him, but having had the opportunity of knowing him through many years, I probably hold these feelings more strongly than do his friends and colleagues who have known him a shorter time.

I knew him when he was an actor and was struggling to assist other actors through their association. I knew him in his early days of association with the Republican Party as one of the first members of the entertainment world who realized that a man talented in that way had no reason to shun his responsibilities to his country and his fellow men. I have worked with him on conventions of the Republican Party, and I have traveled with him back and forth across these United States helping to raise money and helping to elect candidates to public office.

GEORGE'S presence in this body will be sorely missed, because we have had rare opportunities to be associated with a man of his talents, his energy, and his deep and loyal devotion to his country. I think it is this latter attribute which has been the hallmark of GEORGE'S public service, and I know from associates across this country that it has rubbed off on old, middle aged, and young alike.

A love of country and a willingness and ability to express it—not just now and then, but constantly—is an attribute that he will leave as his record and take with him into the life ahead, which I hope, and I know all of us hope and pray, will be a long and delightful one.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALAN BIBLE, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS—MARITIME CARGO THEFT INVESTIGATION HEARINGS

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, several days ago as Chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee I submitted to the Senate a committee report concerning the impact of cargo theft and pilferage on maritime commerce directly, and its dollar hardship on American businesses and the general public. This report examines many facets which contributes to losses that were estimated at $170 million last year as a result of activities by both organized and unorganized criminal elements.

In our committee's hearings, one conclusion emerged crystal clear. It is that the stealing of freight cargoes is one of the fastest-growing crimes nationally and a racket that costs Americans and small businessmen particularly, more than $1 billion a year.

Another factor that has impressed me in our examination is that cargo theft, whose losses are in the millions yearly, have come to be an almost accepted, "we-can't-or-shouldn't-do-anything-about-it" practice. Numerous witnesses testified that martime theft is regarded by many as a regular cost of doing business. Witnesses said that some employees and others with unlimited access to waterfront docks and terminal areas believe that pilferage and thievery is one of the routine fringe benefits or a "built-in-compensation." Witnesses said these employees range from cargo handlers to checkers, truckers, and in some instances to security guards themselves.

For a country which has always taken pride that it is a Nation of laws, this is a shocking admission. I, for one, believe that not only should we do something about it but we can do something about it with affirmative and dedicated efforts. This underlying philosophy, which permits casual theft as a side benefit of employment, is completely destructive to our way of life and certainly contributes to a moral decline of our citizenry.

Mr. President, the committee's report provides a series of recommendations which we believe can provide a substantial step forward in controlling a great deal of this casual pilferage and thievery by closing many of the loopholes which aid and abet the thief and his cohorts in maritime commerce.

Two Federal agencies, the Department of Transportation and the Federal Maritime Commission, come in for criticism in this report which covers the third phase of a 2-year continuing investigation by our committee into air, truck, maritime, and rail cargo theft.

Our committee reaffirmed a recent Senate Appropriations Committee report charging the Department of Transportation with "rhetoric, vacillation—and an indifferent attitude" in dealing with the growing cargo theft problem. I ask unanimous consent that this excerpt from the Appropriations Committee Report, No. 91–1372, entitled "Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1971," 91st Congress, second session, November 25, 1970, pages 4 and 5, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

This committee is concerned by the indifferent attitude and lack of affirmative action expressed by the Department in the serious problem of cargo theft in all modes of transportation. This problem has been estimated as costing the American public upwards of $1 billion a year. In July 1969, the Department witnesses testified before the Senate Small Business Committee, stating "that the Department of Transportation (was) aware of and concerned about the problem of loss of * * * cargo through damage and pilferage." At that time they informed that Committee that a general study of the problem was nearing completion. In testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee on September 30, 1970, some 1½ years later, the Department indicated the study was not yet in final form. At this hearing they further testified that they were giving high priority to a systematic effort to explore the many problems of crime prevention in the freight transportation sector.

It is apparent that the Department, after numerous congressional hearings, is still merely studying and exploring the problem, with no definitive program for affirmative action. The Department has also been seemingly reluctant to consult with the Senate committees conducting an investigation in this area. It is the intention of this committee that the Department officials periodically inform the Congress of activities and progress in this vital area. Further, the Department is urged to take a more affirmative approach in dealing with this problem and eliminating the rhetoric and vacillation now apparent.

The first and one of the most important recommendations of our committee's report urges the Federal Maritime Commission to develop a uniform cargo loss reporting system for the maritime industry. Mr. President, that Commission today is the only commerce regulatory agency which has not recognized its responsibility in developing this information. We would hope that the Maritime Commission would reassess its position opposing a uniform loss reporting system because both the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board have undertaken to propose a rulemaking to require loss and theft reports from surface and air transport carriers.

Mr. President, our committee estimates that maritime cargo losses were in excess of $170 million during the past year. Certainly, neither the governmental regulatory agencies nor the carriers, nor the shippers, nor the public which pays the price of crime by inflated prices, know the true loss figure. I submit no one can know this dollar total with any degree of accuracy until a uniform loss reporting system to cover both import and export of cargo is established.

The Federal Maritime Commission has advised the committee that it feels the Treasury Department's Bureau of Customs will be able to provide this information. I subscribe to the position of the Comptroller General in his letter of October 29, 1970, to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce (Mr. MAGNUSON) relative to my bill, S. 3595, to establish a commission on safety and security of cargo. In his letter, the Comptroller General sets forth his conclusion that the Bureau of Customs rules and forms "are designed primarily to satisfy the customs laws and to assure collection of import duties" and that "original statistical information provided for the purpose directly by regulated water carriers rather than upon data filtered through the Bureau of Customs" might better serve the purpose of securing accurate losses of maritime commerce theft and the reasons therefore.

Personally, I am at a loss to understand why the Federal Maritime Commission is reluctant to do this since certainly a $170 million per year maritime cargo theft loss figure must have a significant economic impact on maritime commerce—the very regulatory purpose with which the Federal Maritime Commission is charged.

This severe economic drain caused by wholesale thievery which contributes to inflationary pressures must be controlled if at all possible. If this loss reporting system goal cannot be accomplished administratively, my efforts to accomplish it statutorily will continue.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the executive departments and agencies concerned with this report will consider most earnestly the recommendations of our committee report. We must work together to formulate a hard-hitting program so that the shipper, the small businessman, and the consumer will be confident of the safety, security, and integrity of his cargo moving by the oldest form of commerce known to man—maritime shipping.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR STEPHEN YOUNG

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, STEPHEN YOUNG retires from public life after having devoted over 40 years to the service of the people of Ohio and of this country. The number of years in public life is of itself remarkable, but it is the manner in which STEPHEN YOUNG discharged his public trust that earns him the great respect and esteem of those of us fortunate to have served with him in the Senate.

All of us, of course, will remember his many contributions to this body—especially his timely and courageous warning of the dangers that lay ahead if this country persisted in following an ill-conceived policy in Indochina. How much better off we would be today had we followed his advice—advice he gave without regard to personal political consequences.

But STEPHEN YOUNG will perhaps be best remembered for the strength of his convictions, his outspoken candor, his courage and independence. Although he has chosen to leave us, the exacting standards which he imposed upon himself will remain—as he would have it—as a prod to the conscience of each of us in those inevitable moments of indecision and doubt we all face in discharging our public trusts.

FLAG DAY—A MEMORABLE ADDRESS BY THE REVEREND ALEXANDER ST. IVANYI, S.T.M., D.D., OF LANCASTER, MASS.

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to include in the RECORD a very fine and inspiring address by the gifted and eloquent minister of the First Church of Christ in Lancaster, Rev. Alexander St. Ivanyi, S.T.M., D.D,, delivered on Flag Day 1970 in historic Lancaster, Mass.

The able, distinguished Rev. Alexander St. Ivanyi is known as a highly trained scholar and eloquent preacher, who graces any occasion he attends.

His Flag Day remarks are exceptional, since in a relatively brief talk he moves with skill and facility from the American Revolutionary War to the cupola of the beautiful church designed by the famous New England architect, Bulfinch, situated on the lovely village green where the brilliant divine presides.

The Reverend St. Ivanyi, a native of Hungary, has touched with feeling and sincerity upon the things that Old Glory stands for and means to ordinary Americans, and he has done so in a scholarly way with reference to some of our great leaders. I believe that many people, who will have the opportunity to read this fine talk in the RECORD, will be appreciative, and inspired by the high tone and depth of its patriotic sentiments and wonderful tribute to Old Glory. The address follows:

FLAG DAY ADDRESS, 1970

(By Rev. Alexander St.-Ivanyi, S.T.M., D.D.)

When Francis Scott Key, the Fredericktown, Mr. lawyer, gazed through the fog "by the dawn's early light," to see whether our flag was still "gallantly waving" on Fort McHenry,—all he had to fear was the British Fleet in Chesapeake Bay. Today, when we gazed through the fog "by the dawn's early light," to see if the flag was still "gallantly waving" from the cupola of our beautiful Bulfinch church,—there was no British Fleet to threaten it. There were, instead, various groups of our own people that we feared on account of our flag. "Old Glory" has become the subject of attack—not only in some foreign capitals, but especially at home—by demonstrators for all kinds of "causes." Hippies and Yippies, anti-Vietnam and pro-Ho-Chi-Minh partizans, underprivileged and super-pacifist revolutionaries who vie with each other to desecrate our flag.

We, Lancastrians, have an everyday reminder of the flag and Francis Scott Key's experience with it. Fort McHenry was named after James McHenry, Secretary of Defense in both the Washington and John Adams administrations. A direct descendant of his not only lives in Lancaster but is one of our most gracious and admired leaders (Priscilla McHenry, the former Mrs. Duncan F. Thayer and, presently, Mrs. Charles W. Farnsworth). Her presence in our midst reminds us of the struggles, sacrifices and heorism that made that flag of beleaguered Fort McHenry the most respected national symbol in the world. Yet now, that our flag represents the richest and most powerful country in the world, there are those who trample it in the mud, and here are we, all the rest of us, who stand by, wringing our hands, but doing nothing to defend it.

As you know, I was not born in this country. Instead of that being a handicap, however, it is an advantage today. No one can justly accuse me of "jingoism," I do not even belong to any "Establishment." On the other hand, as Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, the Elder, put it: "The flag of the U.S. is the flag just as much of the man who was naturalized yesterday, as of the man whose people have been here many generations."

Inasmuch as I was naturalized twenty one years ago, not yesterday, permit me to confess that I love and honor this flag, *our* flag, just as much as anyone in this country. On the basis of my experiences, on the other hand, *before* the twenty-one years of my naturalized citizenship, permit me also to assure you that there is no other flag, anywhere, which would symbolize so much freedom, goodwill and human dignity as Old Glory. Yes, I know, our country is not perfect, no country ever is. There are grievances, legitimate complaints, bitter injustices. Pulling down our flag, however, will not solve these problems. Just on the contrary, we might open the gates of destruction until a totalitarian dictatorship can and will take over. Then, of course, no one can fight for reform, or even protest against greater injustices than we now have. Old Glory is the surest guarantee that the injustices and grievances can and will be remedied.

"The things that the flag stands for,"—said President Wilson,—"were created by the experiences of a great people." And these experiences were in the fields of liberty, human rights and "the pursuit of happiness." Let us not make these experiences discontinue by destroying their symbol, the flag. For, by destroying the symbol, we will also destroy what it symbolizes, that spirit of a people that made it great. It is a sad mistake to take the flag for simply a length of colored bunting. It is not the material that counts in anything but the meaning, the values and aspirations that two hundred million Americans cherish and two thousand million human beings wish they could share. Just be in a foreign country, and be lonely or subdued or frightened as we often are. Then, quite of a sudden, lay eyes on Old Glory. On the portals of a U.S. Embassy, on the mast of an American ship, or just in a store-window. How your eyes will brighten, your spirit soar again, your confidence be restored. You will discover, no matter how sophisticated and "citizen of the world" you think you are, that Henry C. Bunner's old lines suddenly begin to sing in your mind:

"Off with your hat as the flag goes by!
And let the heart have its say;
You are man enough for a tear in your eye
That you will not wipe away."

Do we have to go abroad, do we have to—Heaven forbid!—taste the bitter fate of those who lose their freedom, home, hopes: to love and honor our flag, as long as we can freely do so? I say, do not wait till history will teach us the cruel lesson! "Off with our hats as the flag goes by!"

STATEMENT OF ALAN BIBLE, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS STREET LIGHTING PROGRAM AS AID TO CRIME PREVENTION

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, for the continuing information of Members of Congress and the citizenry and business community of the Nation's Capital, I call attention to the excellent progress of the high-intensity street lighting program currently in progress here in Washington, D.C.

The Senate Small Business Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, in its continuing hearings on the impact of crime against small businessmen across this country, has cited street lighting as one of the major factors in the prevention of crime. The report of the Small Business Administration, "Crime Against Small Business," published by the Select Committee on Small Business in 1969, stated that "effective street lighting is one of the best deterrents to robbery and burglary."

It is my purpose to make another report to the Senate on a new street lighting program begun some months ago by the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic, designed to provide protection for the citizenry of the Nation's Capital City but to provide affirmative aid to many of the crime-ridden small businessmen in high-crime areas.

First, I would like to mention the series of editorials broadcast by WMAL radio and TV over the past year, and commend its management for the outstanding public service it has performed in helping to generate public support and acceptance for the installation of these needed lighting units throughout the city. I would like to single out its editorial manager Mr. Dan Hackel, for his effective work and commend him for it.

Second, the December issue of Nation's Cities magazine carries an article by John E. Hartley, Assistant Director of the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic, describing this widely acclaimed program. I would urge that other cities consider use of the precedent established here in Washington as a guide for undertaking street lighting projects that would be similarly advantageous to small businesses and the citizenry generally across the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the series of editorials and the article be printed in the RECORD in order that it can be known that Washington has initiated a program that could be applicable to many other cities:

THREE EDITORIALS BROADCAST BY WMAL/AM/FM/TV

(Broadcast on Thursday, Mar. 5, 1970)

LIGHT NIGHT

Night is turned into day by brilliant lights at the Catholic University campus. The intense glare, super-powered beyond ordinary street lights, creates illumination bright enough to read a textbook. The lights blaze because a coed was slain last December. Campus police have added escort services and heavier security, but they say the lights have had the most dramatic impact. The same effective remedy could be applied to downtown Washington, buttressed by police. A high-intensity street-light program should begin in a selected area of nighttime shopping, restaurants or entertainment. With fear gone, people will return to downtown Washington. The project can expand as increased crowds and light make it impossible for criminals to operate. In the long run, more police and courts and corrections reform are needed . . . but their effects *are* long-run. At relatively low cost, lights can be installed immediately. Downtown Washington must turn *on* the lights . . . or turn itself off.

(Broadcast on July 13, 1970)

DOWNTOWN STREET LIGHTING

Downtown Washington is alive and well at night. Sponsors report the "Go Downtown" campaign has been a great success. Crowds are increasing for evening shopping and entertainment. Although it's too early for specific figures, the Convention and Visitors' Bureau says business has improved. It proves that people will come to a re-vitalized downtown, if they can be assured attractive and safe conditions. The safety has been aided by the rush to completion of high-intensity light installations. Proof of the impact of the brilliant lighting is already available. The police report nighttime crime went down 46 per cent along 7th street since installation of the bright lights. More of the lights are awaiting installation downtown. Fortunately in this time of peak electric demand, the new fixtures draw no more current than existing lights. While there are many demands for electric service, PEPCO should give the highest priority to the downtown installation. "Go Downtown" can be an even more brilliant success in the future.

(Broadcast on Dec. 16, 1970)

EXPAND LIGHTING

Washington has been given a dramatic example of the power of bright lighting at night. The General Services Administration last night inaugurated its Federal Triangle illumination, as we have been urging. Special high-intensity beams bathed the federal buildings in light, emphasizing their classic beauty. The lighting alone is a tourist attraction. A side benefit is security for the buildings, and safety for passers-by. However, it will take more than the present installation to help reduce crime. The highly directional lights on the buildings spill only a little additional illumination on adjacent streets and sidewalks. Even with the added light, few people inhabit the Federal Triangle at night. The city needs more high-intensity lighting in residential and commercial areas. The Federal Triangle illumination is a commendable improvement. The bright idea should be expanded to more buildings and streets in the nation's capital.

[Article From "Nation's Cities" Magazine, Dec. 1970 Issue]

(By John Hartley)

By day, residents and tourists view Washington, D.C., as the "place" to live and visit, but by night the city suffers the same problem typical of many other large cities.

As a result of increasing crime rates, Washington has exerted a concerted effort to improve the safety of all its inhabitants—efforts directed not only toward significantly expanding police manpower but also toward improving street lighting in high crime areas.

The streets of our Nation's Capital had been poorly lighted insofar as the application of street lighting for crime deterrence was concerned. Approximately eight years ago we embarked on a street lighting program based on traditional International Illuminating Society Vehicular and Pedestrian Traffic Standards. It was completed, with the exception of downtown and Georgetown, in early 1969.

While this $2.5-million project was effective in terms of traffic safety, it is now apparent that Washington street lighting levels, based on traffic requirements alone, accomplished very little with only minimal effectiveness in the area of nighttime crime reduction. However, a new era has begun, and new the Department of Highways and Traffic is using lighting for the primary purpose of reducing the city's crime rate.

Two incidents provided the impetus for our current street lighting crime-reduction program. One was the 1969 All-Star Baseball game at the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium and the other a senseless killing on the Catholic University campus. Both situations created a deep public concern. To counteract this situation we ordered the immediate installation of new high-intensity lighting at both locations.

Since we had earlier experience with Lucalox lighting at a number of high-accident locations and had achieved outstanding results, we ordered this high-intensity sodium vapor lighting at Kennedy Stadium as a crime deterrent experiment. Following the stadium installation, police officials reported fewer bands of roving vandals in the vicinity of the parking lots. They attributed it to the fact that the improved lighting eliminated the shadows where they had previously lurked. Likewise, although campus police at Catholic University added additional coed escort services, they believe that the new high-intensity lighting has had the most dramatic impact on crime reduction on the campus.

We did, however, encounter a major technical problem with the city's historic "Washington Globe." This traditional iron-posted unit has long been favored by the Fine Arts Commission, and its seven-member team has encouraged retention of the "globe" in our monumental areas.

Although the "globe" is a fixture befitting the dignity of the Nation's Capital, it is somewhat inefficient since it tends to throw much of the light upward and, until recently, we were unable to satisfactorily adapt a high-intensity lighting source to these upright units.

Based on the outstanding results achieved with the earlier Lucalox lighting system, we approved a proposal by General Electric's Lighting Systems Department engineers to equip the globe light with a Lucalox light source. Their efforts resulted in the development of a special conversion kit that could be easily installed by our local utility, the Potomac Electric Power Co.

In November 1969, GE donated 20 test units for a globe conversion on Independence Avenue adjacent to the James H. Forrestal Building. Public reaction was again favorable and local media supported our efforts to provide Washington with a crime lighting program.

The Potomac Electric Power Co. installs and maintains most District-owned lighting fixtures and has assisted us in getting these lamps installed as quickly as possible. Charles Nicolson, manager of PEPCO's Governmental Customer Department, said recently that "the new system provides better than twice as much light as mercury vapor lamps and almost five times as much light as incandescent lamps—but requires no additional power."

ABC's Washington affiliate, WMAL–TV, under the direction of Editorial Manager Dan Hackel, began broadcasting light vs. crime editorials. For example, one stated recently that "a high-intensity street lighting

program must continue. . . . In the long run, more police and courts and correction reforms are needed . . but their effects are long run. At relatively low cost, lights can be installed immediately. Downtown Washington must turn on the lights or turn itself off."

We were not about to "turn off"—especially in view of Mayor Walter E. Washington's keen interest in maintaining the momentum of our new program. At this request, our engineers got together with police personnel and selected key high-crime areas for immediate illumination.

We chose these areas by using "Carney Block" statistics. A "Carney" block is an area where crime statistics are tabulated and the data therein are compared with "Carney" blocks in other areas.

After the areas were selected, we requested and received an appropriation of $365,000 from Congress to begin the installation of new lights. Following an analysis of police statistics, a later WMAL editorial said "this appropriation made it possible to reduce crime by 25 per cent on 7th Street, N.W., alone." Mayor Washington, Deputy Mayor Graham Watt and Chief of Police Jerry V. Wilson praised the results of high-intensity lighting. Needless to say, the experimental crime reduction installation on 7th Street was so successful that the project has been expanded.

A grant of $110,000 from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, through our Redevelopment Land Agency, made it possible to raise the light levels to 11 footcandles and take on new crime areas. Among these key areas were an extension of the original 7th Street project; 14th Street, N.W.; H Street, N.E.; and Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E., in the vicinity of the Capitol.

Looking ahead, our plan involves the installation of high-intensity lighting on any street, arterial, or alley where crime statistics indicate a need. In this way, we will assure the personal safety our citizens must have and, at the same time, retain the beauty so natural for our city.

With a continuation of the public support we have received so far, Washington, D.C. will be the nation's safest and best lighted city—24 hours a day.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GORE

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is always difficult to say goodby to a departing colleague, and this is particularly true with respect to Senator ALBERT GORE. For ALBERT GORE became a vital part of the national legislative system during his 32 years on Capitol Hill. But it is certainly not difficult at all to pay tribute to the man. There are few Senators in the entire history of our Nation who have written a more illustrious record in 18 years of Senate service.

ALBERT GORE has that splendid combination—courage and foresight—that makes a great legislator. His pioneering work on the Public Works Committee, particularly his role in establishing this Nation's great Interstate Freeway System, might have been enough in itself to assure him special recognition. And many would have been content with his fine record in foreign affairs, for even those who disagreed with him could not overlook his sincere dedication to his Nation's interest.

But ALBERT GORE was perhaps at his best and will be remembered most for the great advances he supported and achieved in tax reform. Relief and equity for the middle- and low-income taxpayers across our Nation came largely as the result of ALBERT GORE'S untiring and dedicated work.

It is sad to realize the very qualities that made ALBERT GORE a great Senator also conspired to end his career in Congress. His foresight perhaps put him ahead of his time with his constituency. His courage would not let him abandon his beliefs to follow the popular political winds.

Our warm friendship and respect go out to ALBERT GORE. The absence of his wisdom and leadership will be felt for a long time to come.

HOOSIER COUPLE WINS COVETED AFB AWARD

HON. BIRCH BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I am pleased to note that two of my constituents, Mr. and Mrs. Meredith Ayres, have been selected to receive a coveted young farmer and rancher award. This honor, which is based on farm management efficiency, financial progress, and other noteworthy accomplishments, was conferred recently by the American Farm Bureau Association at its annual convention on only three of the more than 300 young couples from 20 States who were entrants in the national finals.

Owner and operator with his family of a 655-acre farm featuring a large dairy herd, specific pathogen-free hogs, and extensive corn, soybean, and pasture lands, Meredith Ayres has had an outstanding career as a 4–H Club president, dairy representative, FAA chapter president, Farm Bureau board president and member, church deacon, and school PTA president. Meredith has been assisted greatly in achieving his distinguished record by his father, Bob Ayres, and his wife, Sharon, who also has been very active in community affairs and is the mother of three childrn.

The people of my State join me in extending congratulations to this fine couple for their excellent achievements and for the well-deserved recognition they have received. As a further tribute, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a short article which appeared in the January 1971, issue of Nation's Agriculture be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

CLOSE-KNIT FAMILY: FOR NATURAL PARTNERSHIP

(By Delmer E. Groves)

It takes a close-knit family to form a natural farming partnership. But, that's the case with Meredith Ayres YF&R winner from Indiana. Almost from the moment he started following Bob Ayres around the farm, the boy knew he'd eventually join his dad in a partnership. That's been his goal for as long as he can remember.

And that's what it is today. That's the sort of deep, quiet feeling that exists on the Ayres acreage—and extends to all members of the family. That's Mr. and Mrs. Bob Ayres, who started it all, son Meredith and his wife Sharon, son-in-law Dick Cromer and his wife Linda.

And then there's brother Richard Ayres, just starting high school and with the same resolve that Meredith had to join the Bob-Meredith-Dick partnership when he graduates—and there's sister Janet, studying interior decorating at Purdue. She doesn't want to be forgotten either.

This is the kind of family that's made Farm Bureau such a great organization—they are not selfish— they're interested more in the other family members than in putting self ahead. No hippies, no fanatics here.

But it takes a lot of hard work; and faith in a Higher Being; and some of the more compassionate qualities like love and understanding.

Meredith is accustomed to working in the field all day; then coming home at dark and working, for example, on a new hog house for relaxation.

There are three main areas of Meredith's three-way partnership: the 100-cow dairy herd; SPF purebred Duroc breeding herd; and an extensive corn-soybean-meadow-pasture program on 655 acres. In addition, he's main operator of a farm supply service for seeds and other products which operates through their farm.

Meredith had early training in his chosen occupations from his father and through 4–H and FFA experience. He was president of 4–H for three years and was state achievement winner and 4–H dairy representative. And he's been a 4–H leader for 12 years.

In FFA, he was chapter president two years, was named a Hoosier Farmer, was state treasurer and won the state farm electrification award.

By 1958 he was ready—and his Dad was ready—for an active partnership. Meredith had enough money to buy a tractor and some farming tools and his Dad needed the son's help. At that point they had 120 acres, a 30-cow dairy herd, were just starting in the SPF (specific pathogen-free) hogs, and Meredith had just rented an 80-acre farm. The next year they converted to pipeline milking and started to increase the size of the dairy herd.

Two years later, brother-in-law Dick Cromer came in to form a three-way partnership. They had accumulated sizeable assets, mainly as a result of lots of hard work and family cooperation.

A 10-stall milking parlor was built. They also constructed a slotted floor farrowing house, bought and rented more land, changed to larger machinery, and built a new slotted-floor, open-front finishing house for the select boars. In the meantime, they attend short courses and other educational events to glean ideas on improved practices, which they could build into their operations.

Based on 1969 records, their 100-cow Holstein herd is up to a production average of 15,470 pounds of milk and 608 of butterfat. Pigs from the 60 purebred Duroc sows had a feed conversion ratio of 2.56, carcass length of 29.5, 74% in lean meat, .95 backfat and 46% in ham and loin.

Soybean yield in '69 was as high as 60 bushels per acre and they've been soybean champions for the past six years. They were also county corn champions the past three years with a top measured yield of 197 bushels in 1969. Average was 150 bushels of corn an acre. With some corn blight this year, yield average was cut to a little over 100.

Meredith and Sharon are active in about every organization touching their rural com-

munity just south of Flora. He's been a Democrat Township Farm Bureau board member for three years and is now president of Democrat-Monroe Farm Bureau. Meredith is also active in the Extension Service and commodity groups and the county fair. He is a deacon and both he and Sharon teach Sunday School. And Meredith is president of the school PTA.

Yes, it appears the busiest people get the most done.

REPRESENTATIVE PHILIP J. PHILBIN

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, on the retirement of my friend and colleague, Congressman PHIL PHILBIN, I want to express my personal affection and high regard for his distinguished service as a Member of the House of Representatives since 1943.

Mr. Speaker, at various times I have had occasion to consult with Congressman PHILBIN on subjects before this body—always with an awareness of his sincerity, his earnest concern for the subject before us, and his faithful and straightforward attitude toward me as a friend and colleague.

Mr. Speaker, during this session of the Congress, important legislation in behalf of my constituents came before the Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee of which Congressman PHIL PHILBIN served as chairman. In the presentation of testimony, in the development of the committee report, and in the action taken in this Chamber as well as in the other body, Congressman PHILBIN was attentive to the merits of the legislation and was effective in producing the desired and equitable result.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall no Member of this body who displayed greater warmth of personality nor more friendly feelings of concern than Congressman PHIL PHILBIN. His constituents can be justly proud of the faithful and effective service which he has rendered to them and to the Nation. In all that he undertakes in the future, I wish him well.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHN WILLIAMS

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, it is a great privilege to rise to express my respect and admiration for the probity, integrity, conscientiousness, and high quality which has characterized the work of JOHN WILLIAMS in the Senate. In many, many ways, JOHN WILLIAMS has been a Senator's Senator.

Although he and I have differed on many basic issues, I have always admired the thoroughness of his preparation, the fairness of his conduct, and the astuteness of his arguments in support of his views on the floor of the Senate.

The Senate should be a forum for the expression of a wide diversity of viewpoints, from a wide diversity of perspectives. Senator WILLIAMS' vigilance as watchdog over any unwarranted expenditure of Federal funds, his insistence upon full and public justification for proposed new Federal spending, his sensitivity to ethical questions and matters of personal conscience, and his absolute invulnerability to outside pressures and forces all are qualities which will be sorely missed upon his retirement as U.S. Senator from Delaware.

JOHN WILLIAMS has consistently been thoroughly prepared on the floor of the Senate by virtue of having expended enormous time and energy in personally researching, analyzing, and formulating arguments on major policy questions. It is with genuine sadness at his retirement that I pay tribute to the many brilliant moments of his long and distinguished career and express my genuine respect for the high honor which he has brought to the Senate by the manner in which he has upheld the public trust.

HON. JOHN McCORMACK

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the 92d Congress will be starting at a disadvantage, it, unlike the past 22 Congresses, will not have JOHN McCORMACK as a strong, reliable leader. Yet, because of his past performances and his exemplary service, we of the 92d Congress will be able to legislate more wisely.

The name of JOHN McCORMACK means many things; a proper Bostonian, a stanch party man, a prestigious speaker, a boy from Southy, an American in loyalty, an Irishman in wit, a progressive, a friend, and a good man.

Speaker McCORMACK started his life as a poor resident of South Boston, and has always felt that anyone who could obtain a position in which he could help his fellow man was lucky. He grew up in the Irish tradition that public service was an honor. This feeling was not only expressed in the work and help that he gave his fellow Bostonians, but also, in his driving efforts to help all Americans.

It has not been an easy time to be a leader in the Democratic Party. Our party has often been divided on many issues. Such national catastrophes as the war, the economy, and the civil rights issue have created extremes in both parties. Speaker McCORMACK has acted with constant discernment separating the logical from the illogical, the good from the bad, the feasible from the impractical and gently meshing together ideas that were acceptable to a majority of Members in our party. I firmly believe that if it were not for the firm leadership of the Speaker, the Democratic Party would have been irreparably damaged.

As a progressive, JOHN McCORMACK constantly strove for new reforms for the common man. His years of Speaker were years of advancement for the aged, the minority member, the laborer, and the poor. These are the people with whom he empathized most.

Such legislation dealing with medicare, aid to education, civil rights, antipoverty programs, social security, and the Peace Corps can credit Speaker McCORMACK with their success since it was through his constant support and careful guidance that they were passed.

As a man, the Speaker is humble and friendly. Many a time I have witnessed his own personal tours of the Capitol which he gladly gave his young visitors. He was especially pleased to see youngsters sitting in his seat, the most honored seat in Congress. He was always willing to listen to new ideas, even from the most freshman of Congressmen. Never did the Speaker feel that he could not learn.

I have been fortunate enough to have known the Speaker for years. I love him as a warm, kind person. He helped me during my earliest days in Massachusetts politics, through to my first days in Congress, up until this very day. I am sure, just as will the people of Massachusetts and the country, that I will continue to need his help and counsel. I, as a spokesman for the people of Boston, say "thank you" for dedicating your life's work to us.

HON. MENDEL RIVERS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved by the recent loss of my personal friend and colleague, L. MENDEL RIVERS. He was a loyal American and an outstanding leader. Many tributes will be offered in his honor, yet the greatest tribute I can give is that Chairman RIVERS was a man of strong principle, and a man who lived by them.

L. MENDEL RIVERS came to the House some 30 years ago and served this country during some of its most difficult years. He became chairman of the Armed Services Committee and in this position he worked to maintain the military superiority of the Nation.

Chairman RIVERS introduced legislation, and saw that it passed, to improve the lives of men and their families in the Armed Services. Chairman RIVERS fought for increased salaries, fringe benefits, and guaranteed rights for American servicemen. This work has won for him the loyalty and respect of serviceman, citizen, and colleague. He worked to modernize every aspect of our Nation's defense, particularly the Navy, and to bring both military capability and military justice to the highest level.

On the floor of the House, he evoked the interest of both supporter and critic

because of his clear and dynamic manner. He was a vital catalyst for the Members of this House, and the people of this Nation. He fine tuned and strengthened the position of everyone regarding the military. He made all of us look hard and evaluate the military, particularly the role it would play in the future development of the United States.

MENDEL RIVERS' hard work and dedication will always be appreciated. Mrs. O'Neill and I extend our deepest and most heartfelt sympathies to his lovely wife, Margaret, and his three fine children.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR SPESSARD HOLLAND

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the close of the 91st Congress brings us to a time of parting with old friends—colleagues whose work and ability we have come to know and respect over the years.

I am very sorry that this session marks the end of the Senate service of the senior Senator from Florida, SPESSARD HOLLAND. We all know his clear and persuasive voice in debate, his legislative skill, his experience, and wisdom.

With all the burdens of his work in agriculture, in appropriations, in the framing of constitutional amendments, Senator HOLLAND has never forgotten the needs and interests of the people of his State. I am sure the people of Florida are proud of his service and loyalty, and of Mrs. Holland who has been his great helper. SPESSARD HOLLAND's abilities, integrity, and fairness have had their influence in the Senate and on our country, and we shall miss him.

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it has been my honor to be associated with Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN of Ohio for the years in which I have been a Member of the House. I would like now to join my colleagues in paying tribute to MIKE as his long and outstanding career in Congress comes to a close.

MIKE will truly be missed by all of us. Through his years in Congress he has developed a well-deserved reputation as a dedicated worker. MIKE's primary concern, the laws of immigration, brought each of us into contact with his efforts. His clear understanding of the intricacies of the policies of immigration and naturalization has been of inestimable value to the House and to the Nation. We all realize how precious and important the right of access to American citizenship is. No one in my memory has mastered a clearer conception of the statutes of immigration than MIKE did. MIKE's handling of these laws and proposed changes in them was marked by an exemplary sense of human values and a keen understanding of what America means to a refugee desirous of the shelter of freedom.

It goes without saying that MIKE's legislative contributions are many. A particular highlight in his career was the signing into law of the Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965 that ended years of discrimination in our immigration policy. All of us who were present remember the degree of dedication with which MIKE worked to insure the passage of this legislation. Twenty years of discussion and debate preceded this modernization. MIKE's tremendous contribution in the development and passage of this legislation will long be remembered by this body and the Nation will long reflect his devotion to its well-being.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend MIKE FEIGHAN on his outstanding career and dedication to the Nation, to the State of Ohio, and to his constituency. I wish him good fortune in the years ahead and in any venture he undertakes.

HON. JEFFREY COHELAN

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of this session of Congress, I am filled with a certain sadness. My good friend and colleague, JEFF COHELAN, has fallen victim to the vicissitudes of political life and will not be joining us when the 92d Congress convenes.

JEFF COHELAN has served in the Congress for 12 years, and during these years he dedicated himself to improving the lives of his countrymen. He is a man of deep compassion, a man of conscience. He has fought hard to right the injustices in our land and to end its divisions.

As a Member of the House Appropriations Committee, JEFF distinguished himself as an extraordinary leader in the fight for higher funding of education and health programs. Deeply aware of the plight of the economically oppressed, he secured higher funding of student assistance programs. He sought to secure funds for medical manpower programs and training facilities. His concern as a Congressman was for people, and he brought every human quality in his power to bring them a better America. We will miss this scholarly legislator, always so quick to listen and lend a helping hand when it was necessary.

I know that all of my colleagues join me in wishing him well in his future endeavors. JEFF COHELAN has been an outstanding Congressman in every sense. I know he will continue to contribute his energy and devotion to our Nation.

LEGISLATIVE REPORT OF SENATOR RALPH W. YARBOROUGH SECOND SESSION OF THE 91ST CONGRESS

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is my privilege to present to the people of the State of Texas my report on the activities and accomplishments of the final session of the 91st Congress.

The 91st Congress will be remembered in history not only for its legislative accomplishments but also for its duration. It was actually a Congress composed of three sessions instead of the cutomary two. For the first time in many years, Congress adjourned prior to the general election in November 1970, reconvened on November 16, and worked until January 2, 1971.

This additional session was exceptionally demanding on its Members. In fact, this entire 91st Congress has been time consuming on all Members, as the first session in 1969 remained in session until December 23, 1969, and the two different sessions added in 1970, the last ending January 2, 1971, for all practical purposes kept the Congress in session for almost 2 years. This has given me an opportunity to pass many important pieces of social legislation that might have otherwise died.

It is particularly pleasing to recount the number of important bills I was able to see through to final enactment in the period after my defeat on May 2. During the period of May 2 to October 15, the day Congress adjourned for the preelection recess, I was able to obtain final passage of six major bills; five of these were authored by me and I was one of the principal cosponsors of the other. These bills are:

The Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act of 1970.

The Regional Medical Centers—Heart, Cancer, Stroke and Kidney Act.

The Allied Health Professions Act—Public Law 91-519.

The Communicable Disease Control Act.

The Developmental Disabilities Service and Construction Act.

The Sam Rayburn Memorial Veterans Administration Hospital Act.

One of these important bills, the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act of 1970, was unwisely vetoed by the President. This made it my duty to floor manage the efforts to override this veto. Fortunately for the people of America, our efforts to override were successful and this important bill become law despite the President's objections. In overriding this veto, I became the first "lame duck" Senator since the direct election of United States Senators began in 1913, to successfully floor manage the override of a Presidential veto. This is a distinction I would have been more than willing to have never had; but I did not let my defeat in the May Primary in Texas defeat the health needs of the people.

The third session or "lame duck" ses-

sion which began on November 16 was another period of legislative achievement for me. Despite the predictions of the distinguished minority leader of the Senate who called this third session which ran from November 16 until January 2, 1971, an "unmitigated disaster," I was successful in enacting three bills which I authored. These bills are:

The Family Medicine Act.

The Model Secondary School for the Deaf Act.

A bill easing the requirements for 24-hour nursing services for small hospitals under medicare act.

Unfortunately, the President attempted to pocket veto the family medicine bill. There is a grave question as to whether the President legally vetoed this bill; however, the real issue is that the President has disapproved of legislation which was designed to ease our critical medical manpower crisis by providing funds for the education of doctors to practice family medicine.

In addition to these bills which I authored, Congress also enacted eight bills which I personally had cosponsored and had in several cases, added important amendments to. Seven of these bills came out of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of which I am chairman. They were pushed through the committee under my direction and drive as chairman. These bills are:

The Employment and Training Opportunities Act of 1970, the Occupational Health and Safety Act, the Family Planning Act, the Alcohol Abuse Act, the National Health Service Corps Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the Lead Base Paint Elimination Act, the Omnibus Disaster Assistance Act (from the Public Works Committee).

Again, the President vetoed another important piece of social legislation, the Employment and Training Opportunity Act. This comprehensive manpower training bill which was designed to train thousands of Americans for gainful employment, was greatly needed in this time of rising unemployment. It was particularly disturbing to me to see this bill vetoed because it contained two programs which I introduced; bilingual manpower training program and the special manpower training for victims of major disasters, the first time either of these provisions had ever been written into law. I believe that this veto will become a major issue in the months to come.

In summary, during the period of May 2, 1970 to January 2, 1971, Congress passed 18 major bills of which I was either the author or a principal cosponsor. All in all it was a rewarding session for me and for all our people. Although Congress did not act on all the measures I believe it should have, great progress was made during this legislative period. In this my final report to the people of Texas, who I am grateful to have served for 13 years and 8 months, I will highlight the accomplishments of this active and creative period in our Nation's history.

HEALTH

The Senate Subcommittee on Health, of which I am chairman, was active in its consideration of the many health matters under its jurisdiction. Specifically, it reported out 15 bills which became public law, two resolutions concerned with the conquest of cancer, and one bill which is presently in controversy over whether or not the President properly used his authority in claiming a pocket veto.

The bills which have become public law are as follows:

Hospital Construction and Modernization (Public Law 91–296); the largest hospital bill in the history of the Congress authorizing a total of over $2¾ billion, with $1.29 billion in grants to the States for construction or modernization of hospitals and other health facilities for fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973; establishes a new 3-year program of guaranteed loans to cover up to 90 percent of the cost to private nonprofit agencies for medical facility construction or modernization of public facilities and for such loans authorized $1.5 billion over 3 years; and provides a new 3-year $20-million-per-year program for modernization or construction of emergency rooms. This is the bill the President vetoed and was overriden.

Communicable Disease Control (Public Law 91–464) authorizes a 3-year program to continue assistance in eliminating diseases susceptible to vaccination or communicable disease programs. This is especially significant for Texas which has the worst communicable disease rate in the Nation.

The Family Planning Act (Public Law 91–572) provides comprehensive, voluntary family planning services and information readily available to anyone in the United States desiring such information. The bill authorizes $382 million over the next 3 years for these programs.

Community Mental Health Amendments of 1970 (Public Law 91–211) improves and extends for 3 years the Community Mental Health Centers Act; authorizes for construction grants $80 million, $90 million, and $100 million for fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973, respectively; authorizes grants for initial operation of community mental health centers $45 million, $50 million, and $60 million for fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973, respectively; extends the program for facilities and services for alcoholics and narcotic addicts for 3 years and authorizes therefor $30 million, $35 million, and $40 million for fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973, respectively, and reduces the authorization for fiscal 1970 from $25 million to $15 million; adds a program of special facilities, personnel and services for children and authorizes therefor $12 million, $20 million, and $30 million, for fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973, respectively.

Medical Libraries Amendments (Public Law 91–212) extends the program of financial assistance for construction of health library facilities for 3 years, with support for training of health librarians and information specialists. Authorizes funding for 3 years at $63 million beginning fiscal year 1971.

Migrant Health Amendments of 1970 (Public Law 91–209) extends until the end of fiscal year 1973 the programs to improve the health services and conditions of migratory workers and their families. Authorizes $20 million, $25 million and $30 million for fiscal years 1971 through 1973, respectively.

Grants to Schools of Public Health (Public Law 91–208) provides $9 million, $12 million and $15 million for fiscal years 1971 through 1973, respectively, to make formula grants to schools of public health; authorizes $45 million over the 3 years for graduate or specialized training in public health; and extends project grants for traineeships for professional health personnel and authorizes $16 million for fiscal 1972 and $18 million for fiscal year 1973.

Developmental Disabilities (Public Law 91–517) extends the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act for 3 years, beginning fiscal year 1971 with a total 3-year authorization of $295 million. Other services and special project grants were provided for to assist the developmentally disabled and $52 million over the 3-year period is provided for such provisions.

Regional Medical Programs and Comprehensive Health Planning and Services Act (Public Law 91–515) extends regional medical programs 3 years through fiscal year 1973 with a $525 million authorization; also authorized $247 million for health services and facilities; $1,013,-500,000 for comprehensive health planning and $60 million for health surveys and studies. Kidney disease is added to the heart disease, cancer and stroke amendments covered by this act.

Family Practice (attempted pocket veto) (Public Law 91–) authorizes $225 million over 3 years for grants to public and nonprofit medical schools and hospitals to develop programs for training related to the family practice of medicine. Another $8 million was authorized for expediting the planning and development of needed programs.

Health Training Improvement Act (Public Law 91–519) extends for 3 years the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act and authorized $90 million for construction, $45 million for basic improvement grants, $125 million for special improvement and special project grants, $30 million for traineeships, $3 million to encourage full utilization of allied health professions, $15 million for scholarships, $12 million for work-study, and $18.5 million for loans.

National Health Service Corps (Public Law 91–623) authorizes $60 million over 3 years for a program allowing the use of the Public Health Service doctors in areas of medical and health need.

Equalization of retirement benefits for Commissioned Officers of the Public Health Service (Public Law 91–253) eliminates inequities in the computation of retirement pay between the Public Health Service and other uniformed services of the United States.

Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Elimination Act (Public Law 91–) authorizes $10 million for fiscal year 1971 and $20 million for fiscal year 1972 to provide financial assistance to local governments to carry out programs for the elimination of lead-based paint poisoning and establish a research and development program.

Demonstration Elementary School for

the Deaf (Public Law 91–587) authorizes Gallaudet College to maintain and operate the Kendall School as a demonstration elementary school for the deaf.

Vocational Rehabilitation Extension (Public Law 91–610) authorizes a basic 1-year extension of vocational rehabilitation programs at the level of $1,010,000,000 for fiscal year 1972. This extension facilitates State government appropriations for matching funds.

To combat the national health crisis, the subcommittee also began hearings on national health insurance, holding 2 days of hearings on S. 4323. This was considered a beginning step in enacting a comprehensive program of health care for the United States.

During the first session of the 91st Congress, the subcommittee held hearings on the proposed closing of the Fort Worth, Texas Clinical Research Center, which led to its remaining open. These hearings were held on April 16, 17 and 18, and June 13, 1969. Similar hearings were held on September 10 and 12, 1969 over the threatened closing of public health service hospitals, producing convincing evidence that they should remain open.

In total, the Subcommittee on Health held 39 days of formal hearings during the 91st session of Congress.

THE CONQUEST OF CANCER ACT

This session of Congress marked the beginning of a major attack on this Nation's most dreaded disease—cancer. In April of 1969, I introduced S. Res. 376 which called for the establishment of a National Committee of Consultants on the Conquest of Cancer and charged that Committee with the task of investigating the status of cancer research and reporting its findings and recommendations to the Senate. This resolution was cosponsored by 53 Senators of both parties and was unanimously passed by the Senate.

The Committee, which is composed of 13 distinguished scientists and 13 prominent laymen from all walks of life, submitted its report to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in early December. Based on months of study and research, the Committee recommended that Congress establish a new independent agency to develop and administer a national program of cancer research.

Taking these recommendations into consideration, together with the experience I have gained as a member of the Health Subcommittee for 13 years, two of those years as chairman, I introduced a bill entitled "The Conquest of Cancer Act." This bill would: (1) establish an independent agency to be known as the National Cancer Authority; (2) transfer all the functions of the National Cancer Institute to this Authority; and (3) charge this new agency with the responsibility of developing a major systematic attack on cancer.

This bill has won the support of 26 Senators of both parties who have cosponsored it. Although it could not be passed this session, I have been assured by several Senators, including the distinguished majority whip, Senator KENNEDY, that this bill will be given high priority in the 92d Congress.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT

The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported to the Senate an unprecedented bill in the Occupational Health and Safety Act of 1970. This act, which became Public Law 91–596, places in the Secretary of Labor the responsibility for establishing occupational health and safety standards applicable to all employers in the United States and its territories whose activities affect commerce. The Secretary of Labor is also assigned responsibility for conducting inspections and investigations to assure compliance with such standards and with the act's further requirement that each employer must maintain a workplace free from recognized hazards. An independent three-member commission is created to adjudicate charges of violations and to assess civil penalties which are provided for by the act. The act also places in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare responsibility for conducting research in the fields of occupational health and safety, and for this purpose creates with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Institute of Occupational Health and Safety. A further feature of the act is the creation of the National Commission on State Workmen's Compensation Laws, which is to undertake a study and evaluate all State workmen's compensation laws and report to the President and Congress by July 31, 1972.

This landmark bill, of which I am a cosponsor, is similar to the bill I introduced and held hearings on during the 90th Congress, I am proud that during my final term in Congress I was chairman of the committee which passed this measure which has been needed for so long. It was passed with my unstinting work as committee chairman to get quorums and push this bill through.

EDUCATION

I am proud to report that the second session of the 91st Congress was a time of continued progress in education.

A bill of which I am particularly proud that became public law was my bill to establish a model secondary school for the deaf at Gallaudet College for the Deaf in Washington, D.C. This school will serve as a training ground for all those who are involved in educational training of deaf children throughout the world. I am very pleased to have gotten this bill through Congress and written into law before my term expired.

Congress also completed work this session on the comprehensive elementary and secondary education amendments. This bill which came out of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee authorizes $24.5 billion for fiscal years 1971 through 1973 to fund such important education programs as school libraries resources, educational materials for educating deprived children, bilingual education, school nutrition and health services, adult education, and many others. This landmark bill is now Public Law 91–230.

Having served on the Subcommittee on Education for over 13 years and having authored or cosponsored or been a major supporter of every major educational law during that period, I am pleased that we were successful in passing such an excellent bill this session.

Another important bill which came out of the Education Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee was the Impacted Areas Aid Act. This bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make payments to local education agencies for the purpose of assisting these school districts in meeting the cost of educating children whose parents live or work on Federal property. This bill authorizes $2.5 million to be used for this program. This bill will be of great assistance to schools in cities such as San Antonio and El Paso which have so many military families and Federal workers.

During this session, Congress also passed the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1970. This bill extends for 5 more years the library services program which has benefited so many communities throughout the country. I was one of the original sponsors of the Library Services and Construction Act, and I am glad that we were successful in giving new life to this vital program.

Another important library bill which became law during this session was the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act, Public Law 91–345. This bill establishes a 15-member National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for the purpose of developing overall plans for carrying out our national library policy. This Commission will be a valuable addition to the educational structure of America.

During this session, I introduced S. 4398, the Post Secondary Education Act, which would provide a 2-year free college education to every qualified American. This bill marks the beginning of the fight to complete America's educational commitment to all our people. Although I could not finish the work on it in this session, I earnestly hope that it will be completed in the years to come.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

During the second session of the 91st Congress, work was completed on a number of important bills which will greatly benefit the lives of America's veterans. Of greatest significance to many veterans who are receiving educational benefits under the cold war GI bill which was enactment of Public Law 91–219, the Veterans Educational and Training Assistance Amendments of 1970. This bill was introduced by me as S. 338 in January of 1969. Under my original bill, education and training allowances paid under the cold war GI bill would have been increased by 46 percent. The reason for such an increase is that under the present law the allowances paid to veterans cover only 67 percent of the cost of the veterans' cost of education. In comparison to the 98 percent that was covered by the Korean conflict GI bill, the veterans of the Indochina era are not receiving the treatment that they so justly deserve.

My bill passed the Senate unanimously; however, the House passed its own bill which provided only for an in-

crease of 27 percent. After long conferences with the House, we in the Senate were able to persuade the House to agree to an increase of 35 percent in these allowances. This increase, although not as much as I believe is justified, does represent a significant step toward bringing these benefits in line with the ever-rising cost of education.

Also included as part of the Veterans Educational and Training Assistance Amendments of 1970 are several new programs which are designed to assist educationally disadvantaged veterans. One of these programs would provide special instruction to prepare veterans to enter higher education programs after graduation. Another of these new programs provides individual tutoring services to veterans who are having difficulty with their programs of instruction. Also included in this bill is a special veterans outreach program which is designed to advise recently discharged veterans of their rights under the GI bill. I am proud to have cosponsored these important new programs which I believe will increase participation in veterans education and training programs.

During this session, Congress made important progress in the area of veterans housing. After careful consideration by the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, the Senate passed the Veterans Housing Act of 1970. This bill, which the House also approved, establishes a new loan program for the purpose of assisting veterans to purchase mobile homes and condominiums. This bill also removed the expiration dates for GI bill home loan entitlements and restored eligibility to many veterans to participate in this important program. Having seen the good the veterans home loan program has done, I am pleased to have been a cosponsor of this important bill which has now become Public Law 91–506.

In the final hours of this session, we were successful in passing H.R. 370, the disabled veterans automobile allowance bill. This important measure would increase the special automobile allowances provided for our disabled veterans from $1,600 to $2,800. This bill, which has passed both Houses of Congress, also provides the Veterans Administration with the responsibility for providing, repairing, and replacing all the necessary adaptive equipment and devices for these automobiles. This is a program that I have supported for years and I am glad that during this Congress we were successful in passing these very necessary improvements in it.

Another bill, which I was successful in steering through the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs and enacting into law, which is of particular significance to Texas, would designate the veterans hospital at Bonham, Tex., as the Sam Rayburn Veterans Administration Hospital. During his lifetime, the great Speaker of the House of Representatives devoted his time, energy and talent to aiding America's veterans. It is only fitting that this Veterans Administration hospital, located in his home town, be named in his honor.

In addition to the bills produced by the Veterans Affairs Subcommittee, the subcommittee conducted two investigations of great importance to veterans. First, the subcommittee investigated in depth the status of veterans health and hospital care. This investigation uncovered facts which clearly showed to a shocked American public that many of our Veterans Administration hospitals are overcrowded and understaffed. In short, our veterans are not receiving the first-class medical and hospital care that they so justly deserve.

Based on this investigation, I joined with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, Senator CRANSTON, and introduced an amendment to increse the funds for Veterans Administration hospital and medical care programs. This amendment gained overwhelming approval in the Senate and combined with the House action, we were finally successful in obtaining an overall increase in these appropriations of $105 million.

The Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs also looked into the perplexing problem of unemployment among Vietnam veterans. This investigation revealed that the rate of unemployment among these veterans is the highest in the Nation. I am hopeful that during the next Congress, these hearings will produce major legislation in the area of veterans reemployment.

Another measure which I am proud to have been a cosponsor that became law during this session was the Disabled Veterans Compensation Act. This important bill provided an across-the-board increase of between 10 and 12 percent in the allowances paid to America's disabled veterans. These increases have been too long in coming, and I am glad I was able to see this measure through to its final enactment before my term expired.

Finally, during this session, the $27 million that I have fought for throughout my years in the Senate to construct a South Texas Veterans Administration Hospital was released. Groundbreaking ceremonies took place this fall and work is now underway on this great 760-bed hospital. This marks the realization of a dream for which I have labored for over 13 years.

In summary 1970 was a year of many great accomplishments in the area of veterans legislation. I am pleased that I was able to play a part in these great achievements.

COMPENSATION FOR INNOCENT VICTIMS OF CRIME

This past year also saw the first legislative floor action on a proposal I have been advocating for 5 years—my program to compensate innocent victims of crime. I reported to you last year that the Senate District of Columbia Committee had held hearings on my bill, S. 2936 to compensate innocent victims of crime in the District of Columbia. This proposal was incorporated into the D.C. crime bill in March of this year. Unfortunately, the proposal was lost in conference with the House, but nevertheless, this was the first time in the history of the United States Congress that an innocent victims compensation proposal has received favorable consideration by Congress.

THE BIG THICKET

During this session major progress was made toward the creation of a Big Thicket National Park, the goal I have fought for since 1966. In June of this year, the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held field hearings on my bill, S. 4, to create a 100,000-acre national park in the Big Thicket area. At these hearings, many noted conservationists and scientists endorsed my bill and urged its prompt passage. In December, the subcommittee completed its hearings in Washington and the bill was reported favorably to the Senate on December 8. On December 16, 1970, S. 4 unanimously passed the Senate.

In the House, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee was unable to obtain the necessary quorum to take action on S. 4 during this session. Despite the failure of the House to act on S. 4, the passage of this important bill in the Senate has smoothed the way for the ultimate passage of this legislation in a future Congress. Congressman BOB ECKHARDT of Houston has introduced a Big Thicket National Park bill in the House and I am sure that he will continue the fight to save the Big Thicket in the 92d Congress. I intend to continue my efforts for this legislation as a private citizen and I hope that in the not-too-distant future the dream of a Big Thicket National Park will become a reality.

RELIEF OF TEXAS DISASTER VICTIMS

During the spring and summer of 1970, four major disasters struck Texas, leaving in their wake death, destruction, and misery. These disasters were the Plainview and Lubbock tornadoes, the San Marcos flood and Hurricane Celia. I toured each of these areas and talked with the victims. After Hurricane Celia, I opened, at my own expense, an office in Corpus Christi and staffed it with members of my personal staff to aid the people in this area.

My experience during these recent disasters and after Hurricane Beulah and Carla, convinced me of the need for a comprehensive and permanent Federal disaster program. For this reason, I became one of the first cosponsors of S. 3619, the Omnibus Disaster Assistance Act, when it was introduced in this Congress. After the recent Texas disasters, I found that S. 3619 did not cover certain important needs of disaster victims. Therefore, to make a good bill better, I introduced three amendments to S. 3619 which were accepted by the Senate and the House.

The first of my amendments provided authority to the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness to make grants to disaster victims for the purpose of assisting these unfortunate people in making their mortgage or rent payments on their homes. In many cases, a disaster victim not only suffers physical injuries and damage to his home but also loses his source of income. In those situations,

the victim often cannot make his mortgage or rent payments and is ultimately forced out of his home. My amendment will provide relief to people who are placed in this situation and will aid many disaster victims to retain their place in the community.

My second amendment grants authority to the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness to provide legal assistance to low-income disaster victims who cannot otherwise afford an attorney. This legal aid program will help these people process their just claims arising from the disaster and aid them in securing their benefits under the Federal disaster laws.

My third amendment applies the new benefits and programs of S. 3619 retroactively to April 1, 1970, to assure all the victims of the recent Texas disasters that they will benefit from this important bill. Of particular significance to Texas disaster victims is the increase in the amount of Small Business Administration and Farmers Home Administration disaster loans that can be canceled from $1,800 to $2,500. This program will greatly aid low-income and middle-income disaster victims who are struggling to rebuild their homes and their lives.

S. 3619, including my amendments, became law on December 31, 1970. I was glad I was able to make a contribution to this important legislation.

TEXAS PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I have been in a position to obtain funds for a number of Texas public works projects during the second session of the 91st Congress. The construction of dams, reservoirs, and the various other flood control and navigational projects are vital to the growth of the country. These projects serve as tangible evidence to our people that their tax dollars are being put to good use. I am pleased that I have been successful in my efforts to get the needed money appropriated for many of these important projects.

The public works appropriations bill, H.R. 18127, which passed both Houses of Congress contains a total of $5,239,342,000. Approximately $51 million of the total amount appropriated this year was designated for various projects in the State of Texas. I am pleased that we have had such excellent success in 1970 in securing funds for so many projects that are important to the people of my State.

One of the projects which has considerable implications for the future economic development of the Brazos River Basin is the Millican Dam and Reservoir project. The cities of Bryan and College Station stand to benefit most directly from Millican Dam which will not only provide flood protection for the area, but will also insure an adequate supply of surface water for industrial, agricultural, and recreational use. I was able to persuade my colleagues on the Senate Approriations Committee to allow an additional $100,000 for the Millican project. Along with the $50,000 appropriated by the House, the project will receive a total of $150,000. This will allow orderly progress on the project to continue, while insuring that proper care is exercised to preserve the area's ecological balance. When completed this dam and reservoir will serve as a lasting memorial to General Earl Rudder, the late president of Texas A. & M. University, who believed so strongly in this project and worked so hard for it during his lifetime.

Another project which was funded this year under the public works appropriations bill is the Aquilla Reservoir which is to be located about 10 miles southwest of Hillsboro, Tex. This reservoir will protect the people and property of the area from the present flood menace, and it will provide 199,333-acre feet of water to replace the deteriorating water well system. No funds were requested by the administration for this critical project, and I am pleased that we were able to obtain $100,000 for preconstruction planning for the reservoir.

There are a number of other new Texas projects which have been too long delayed that received funding under the public works appropriations bill. These new projects include: First, $300,000 in preconstruction planning money for Aubrey Reservoir, which will be used to construct a badly needed water supply for the Dallas and Denton area; second, $410,000 in planning funds for a chloride control project on the Arkansas-Red River; and third, $60,000 preconstruction funding for the Cedar Bayou project on the eastern Texas gulf coast. The Cedar Bayou project will eventually provide for the construction of a channel permitting the water transportation which is needed by the many new industrial concerns which have located in the area.

In addition to the new projects mentioned above, construction money was appropriated by the Congress for several existing projects which were either insufficiently funded or cmitted entirely from the administration's budget requests. First, we were able to secure $350,000 that was not requested in the budget for the Corpus Christi ship channel. This money will allow construction to commence on this project which, when completed, will allow 15 million tons of commerce to be shipped through the Corpus Christi channel each year. Second, $4 million was appropriated for the San Gabriel River project in Williamson County, Tex. We were able to include $2 million more that was requested in the budget. This additional money will permit land acquisition and construction to begin on this vital flood-control project.

Texas has always been known as a State of great variety and contrast. This generalization is particularly true with regard to our water resources. Within the boundaries of our State, we have water rich Texas gulf coast as well as the arid high plains of West Texas. I have always sought to guarantee that our water resources are developed, year-by-year, in a constructive, systematic manner. Sensible, well planned public works projects, along with adequate control on pollution can insure that we can have economic prosperity while at the same time, preserving the quality of our environment.

TEXAS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

As a member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations, I was in a position to be instrumental in obtaining funds for a number of important construction projects at various military installations across the State of Texas. The appropriation of such money is essential if we are to fulfill our obligation to provide for adequate training, housing, medical, and other facilities for our servicemen. These projects are critically needed in order to maintain the morale and well being of our military personnel and their families.

The military construction appropriations bill which finally was passed by both the Senate and the House of Representatives contained $58,915,000 for various projects in Texas. Approximately $19,553,000 of these funds were added in the Senate, which represents an increase of 54 percent over the $39,362,000 which was allowed in the original House bill. As a Senate conferee in the deliberations with the House, I was able to secure these additional funds for several vital, new projects in Texas.

One of the most significant items that I was able to get included in the final version of the bill is $15,741,000 for the construction of a 543,640 square foot aircraft engine overhaul facility at Kelly Air Force Base in San Antonio. This facility is needed to replace obsolete buildings, and when completed it will allow the efficient overhaul of 1,600 engines each year, with the work to be done by approximately 2,000 specialists at the San Antonio installation. This modern new facility will increase productivity, reduce inefficiency and thereby permit the Air Force to realize savings that will amortize the total cost of the new structure within 1 year.

It is also particularly gratifying to me that I was able to persuade the House conferees to allow a total of $5,553,000 for the Naval Air Station at Corpus Christi. This represents an increase of $3.4 million over what was provided in the original House bill. This additional money, which I was able to get added in the Senate, is badly needed to repair facilities at the base which were severely damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Celia which swept the Texas gulf coast around Corpus Christi on August 3, 1970. These funds will provide for the repair or restoration of a number of buildings at the naval air station including a training building, enlisted women's quarters, commissary, fire station, warehouse, and various other structures.

The final version of the bill which passed both Houses of Congress also contains $809,000 for Fort Bliss at El Paso. These funds which were added by the Senate, will provide for the construction of a building to house an ingenious moving target simulator to be used in the training of Army gunners. This device will not only give the military the ability to train their gunners in all kinds of weather, but will also substantially reduce the danger and certain other problems connected with live training exercises. This project is thus expected to enable the Army to considerably reduce

the expense that is normally connected with their training program for air defense gunners.

In addition to the projects already mentioned, I was able to get an additional $75,000 appropriated for Bergstrom Air Force Base in Austin, bringing the total appropriation for this installation up to $337,000. The money which was added in the Senate will provide for the installation of various sound suppression units at the base which are needed to protect both military personnel and the surrounding community from the hazards connected with the noise generated by jet engines.

These funds which we were able to add in the Senate will provide for the vital educational, medical and housing facilities which are so important to our military men and their dependents. These are not only necessary projects, but they are also responsible expenditures. If I had not been able to get this additional money, it would have had severe implications for the economic stability of many areas of Texas which have already suffered a number of economic setbacks in recent months. I am pleased that I was able to obtain the funds for these military installations across the State.

AID TO RURAL HOSPITALS

In the final hours of this session, I was successful in obtaining Senate approval of an amendment to the medicare law which would ease the registered nurse requirement that hospitals must meet to participate in the medicare program.

As a result of the present law, many small rural hospitals have been unable to treat medicare patients because they could not hire enough registered nurses to maintain such a nurse on duty 24 hours a day. In many communities the hospitals have been forced to close altogether because of the lack of registered nurses in the area to meet this requirement.

This amendment which I introduced in the Senate and which was introduced in the House by Congressman BURLESON allows this requirement to be waived if the following conditions are met: (1) the hospital must have made a bona fide effort to meet this requirement; (2) there must be a lack of registered nurses in the area; and (3) the hospital must make a continuing effort to hire the necessary nursing help.

This bill, which passed the Senate late on New Year's eve, will keep the doors of our rural hospitals open to meet the needs of our citizens.

AGRICULTURE

The year 1970 will long be remembered as the year that American agriculture suffered its most serious legislative setback since the days of Ezra Taft Benson.

Late in 1969, I joined with Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN in introducing the coalition farm bill, S. 3068. This bill, which had the backing of over 20 of the country's most respected farm organizations, would have renewed and extended the Agriculture Act of 1965, with certain important improvements. After months of work, the Senate Agriculture Committee reported out a farm bill which embodied many of the important features of S. 3068.

On the floor of the Senate, I cosponsored an amendment which strengthens this bill by providing that payments to the feed grain farmers be based on 75 percent of parity. This amendment was approved and became a major part of the Senate version of the bill.

The House, unfortunately, yielded to strong administration pressure and passed out a much weaker bill. In conference, the continued efforts of the administration made compromise impossible and the bill that finally emerged eliminated most of the major programs proposed by the Senate. I worked for the defeat of the conference report, however, our side of this issue lacked the votes necessary to prevail. I am hopeful that in the next Congress action will be taken to improve this weak piece of legislation.

There was one bright spot for Texas farmers this session, however, and that came with the granting of a "Green Thumb" contract to Texas. The "Green Thumb" program, which I have supported for years, provides gainful employment to retired farmers doing vital conservation work. This program helps improve the quality of our environment while providing jobs to many of our older citizens. I worked hard to bring "Green Thumb" to Texas and I am glad we were successful this year in obtaining it.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

Two bills amending the Railroad Retirement Act were enacted into law during 1970:

Public Law 91–215 is an act to guarantee the fiscal integrity of the Railroad Retirement supplemental pension fund which was in danger of terminating payments prior to the enactment of this legislation, and also provides a system of retirement incentives.

Public Law 91–377 provides a temporary 15 percent increase in Railroad Retirement benefits, pending a study of the financial structure of the Railroad Retirement pension system by an independent commission appointed for that purpose.

S. 988 has been approved by the Senate but has not been acted on in the House of Representatives. It would permit certain individuals retiring under the Railroad Retirement Act to receive annuities while serving as elected individuals.

ALCOHOLISM AND NARCOTICS

Landmark legislation was also enacted in the area of alcoholism and its treatment. S. 3835 establishes a National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism within the Public Health Service. It establishes a formula grant to allow States to develop treatment preventive and treatment programs, and a project grant program to allow local community and private nonprofit programs to develop community-based programs. It establishes prevention and treatment programs for all civilian Federal employees.

Public Law 91–527, the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970, authorizes funds for two separately funded education programs: Drug education projects oriented to the school systems of the country and the teachers and children within it; authorizes grants for development and evaluation of curricula, preservice and inservice training programs for teachers, counselors, and other educational personnel. Community education projects authorizing grants for development of peer group assistance programs, such as telephone counseling, workshops, seminars, and counseling neighborhood information centers.

Aanother landmark measure, the bill (S. 3562) to provide a comprehensive Federal program for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence passed the Senate but did not clear the House. This bill was patterned along the same lines as the alcoholism bill referred to above, except that its target was drug abuse and drug dependence.

Because of my firm belief that we must develop an effective approach to the problems of drugs and alcoholism, I cosponsored these measures and worked hard for their approval.

MANPOWER

The President's veto on December 16, 1970, of the Employment and Manpower Act of 1970 was a great disappointment to me and to many Senators, Democratic and Republican.

The manpower bill was worked on in my committee for 2 years. Extensive hearings were held coast to coast. The bill was the final product of extensive and complete legislative consideration. It was passed by a Senate vote of 68 to 6. All of the Senators in my committee and particularly Senator NELSON, worked very hard on this bill. All of our efforts went down the drain on the veto. The ones who really lost are the American people. With unemployment at a 7-year high, and rising, with inflation the way it is, the millions of poor, unemployed and underemployed received a cruel Christmas present.

The bill included my Bilingual Manpower Training Act, which provided for the first time special bilingual manpower and training programs to increase opportunities for employment and promotion for persons with limited command of the English language.

My disaster relief amendment was also included in the bill which authorizes the Secretary to furnish job training slots to local authorities to assist in disaster relief activities.

Both of these concepts received wide support and I expect that they will be included as part of a manpower bill that will be passed next session.

CONCLUSION

The 91st Congress is now history and time will be the final judge of the work that was done in this Congress. In my judgment, Congress accomplished many worthwhile things over the strong and presistent opposition of the administration. For this reason alone, the 91st Congress will occupy a significant place in our history.

With the end of this session of Congress, my service as the senior U.S. Sena-

tor from Texas also comes to an end. Three times the people of Texas have chosen me to be their voice in the Senate and during the over 13 years I have been in office, I have tried to serve these people to the best of my ability. As I leave the Senate, I have no regrets, and nothing but gratitude to the people of Texas for bestowing on me the honor of serving them. In the years ahead, I shall continue to devote my time and energy to those causes that will benefit all mankind.

THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, since coming to the House in 1953, I have been privileged to know three fine men serving as Speaker of the House of Representatives. The first was Joseph Martin of Massachusetts, a Republican who made me as a freshman Democratic Member welcome to the House, who was kind and considerate and courtly, and who helped me overcome the nervousness and fears which assail us all here when we first arrive. My next Speaker was Sam Rayburn, who challenged me to learn the rules and the ropes and to dare to pursue new avenues of legislation, and who was a stern taskmaster and a great teacher. And my third Speaker is JOHN W. MCCORMACK, who has helped me—as he has every Member—to legislate better and to serve our constituents; he has been accessible to us and always interested in our own legislative problems and he has devoted his career as Speaker to the service of the men and women who constitute this House.

Mr. Speaker, I have never known a kinder person, a more dedicated servant of his country, or a more devoted practitioner of the art of friendship than JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, a man of great moral fibre, of great spiritual strength, of abiding faith in God and in his fellow man; above all, he is a man of love for humanity as for his own family.

We all reciprocate that love when we express our appreciation to this man for the great service he has rendered to the United States and to three Presidents and to hundreds of the Members of this House during his Speakership. Prior to becoming Speaker, he served with comparable success and effectiveness as majority leader and was instrumental in writing much of the great legislation of this century. I know that some of the laws in which I take personal pride and on which I devoted endless time and effort could never have become law without the guidance and support and assistance of JOHN W. MCCORMACK. I shall always be grateful to him for the manner in which he has helped me to serve my constituents and consumer causes generally.

RETIRING AS "UNDEFEATED CHAMP"

As Speaker MCCORMACK retires from Congress—retiring as an "undefeated champ", as some of my people in South St. Louis would say—we who were reelected to return in the 92d Congress know that we will miss his fatherly concern and guidance and his affectionate help and assistance on our legislative activities. Speaker MCCORMACK's love of the House has been obvious to all of us and has been demonstrated in the fair and impartial manner in which he has conducted the proceedings of the House so that every Member has been accorded equal treatment under the rules, regardless of political affiliation or political philosophy.

A partisan Democrat through and through when it has involved the political skirmishes themselves, Speaker MCCORMACK has never permitted narrow partisanship to interfere with the work of the Chair; he has been fair to Republicans as he has been to all of us on this side of the aisle. But under his "equal fairness" doctrine in the conduct of the House's affairs, I think it is fair to say that his eyes have twinkled a bit brighter when he looks in our direction to recognize a Democratic Member.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the retirement years are joyful and productive and that they will enable Speaker MCCORMACK to sift through and organize for scholars and posterity the important and historic papers and documents on which he worked so successfully as a great star of the House of Representatives.

THE HONORABLE JOHN JOSEPH HICKEY

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on Tuesday, September 22, I learned the sad news that one of our former colleagues in this body, John Joseph Hickey, had died.

His death came as a shock to the State of Wyoming, which he had served long and ably as Governor, U.S. Senator, and finally as a member of the 10th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

On Thursday, September 24, I had the sad duty of attending the funeral services in Rawlins, Wyo., for Judge Hickey. Part of those services was the saying of the Funeral Mass by the Most Rev. Hubert M. Newell, D.D., Bishop of Cheyenne.

Mr. President, Bishop Newell's homily is a most moving tribute to the memory of Joe Hickey. I believe Joe's wife, Win, his sons, and his countless friends will find comfort in knowing as Bishop Newell read from the Book of Wisdom: "The souls of the just are in the hands of God and no torment shall touch them."

While Joe was with us, he touched us with his courage, his integrity and his ability. Now that he is gone, we mourn his passing, but we shall always remember his strength.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that Bishop Newell's homily at the funeral of J. J. Hickey be printed in the RECORD.

Homily preached at Funeral Mass of Judge Joseph J. Hickey, at Jeffrey Memorial Center, Rawlins, Wyo., Sept. 24, 1970, by the Most Rev. Hubert M. Newell, D.D., Bishop of Cheyenne.

At this beautiful season when the changing colors of autumn and the chilling breezes herald the approach of Wyoming winter, we join in Holy Mass for John Joseph Hickey, praying with all our hearts that the Lord Whom he loved and served so well will bid him a speedy welcome to the glories of the Resurrection.

Death is always a shock, and when it takes one whose life was only beginning to touch the autumnal years, one who so shortly ago was vigorous and strong, the center of a happy family, a respected member of a distinguished profession, one whose life enriched his community and state, it is to all worldly intents and purposes a great tragedy.

In these moments, the thoughtless man is inclined to look up to the heavens and ask, "Why?" "Why?" With so many aged persons in nursing homes who have outlived their intellectual faculties, yet cling to life; with the hopelessly sick and the insane for whom life is a heavy burden, and who yet linger on—why could not one of these have been taken instead of a person who is loved, and esteemed, and needed, one who has the qualities to give to the world what it so sorely needed.

The answer is that death is part of God's providential plan. To poor earthbound mortals, it may seem the end. But to the man of faith, it is a new beginning, the piercing of the barrier between time and eternity, the dawning of the everlasting day for which life is but the prologue, the preparation.

How beautifully this thought is expressed in the reading from the Book of Wisdom which we have just heard: "The souls of the just are in the hands of God and no torment shall touch them. They seemed in the view of the foolish to be dead, and their passing away was throught an affication, and their going forth from us, utter destruction. But they are in peace." (Wis 3: 1–3)

As we contemplate these words, we hope that Joe Hickey is experiencing blessed peace, joined again to his good mother and father who gave him life and love, and who shared with him a religious inheritance that has been the bulwark of his life.

Let me be quick to say it is unseemly that I or any other person should presume to declare that another human being has entered into the company of God, the angels and saints. Only God knows the complexities of the human person, and only he can make the judgement as to who can enter the presence of Divinity.

It is given us to judge only with human knowledge, but this we can say as we stand before the Lord's altar, that John Joseph Hickey was above all else, a man of faith, of prayer, whose first loyalty was to God and to the religion he practiced with the quiet courage of a man, and with the unaffected simplicity of a child.

If Joe Hickey attained high honors as a citizen, if he was an ornament to his profession, if he was esteemed as a public official who served in the most responsible offices of city, state and national government, if he was entrusted again and again with responsibilities that are not given lightly by a community or state, it is because it was recognized that these offices and these responsibilities would be vindicated with an uprightness, an honesty, a fidelity that derived their inspiration from deep and vital religious convictions.

In saying this, I tell you nothing that you, his friends, do not already know. You have seen and admired these qualities in him. You have loved and respected him because you recognized he had the courage to let the great religious truths in which he believed, shape and guide, and give dimension to his actions. You will revere his memory because you know in the depths of your hearts that you are better persons for having known him.

It is customary when a man of prominence dies to say that in his passing, the community in which he lived has sustained a loss. This is being said of Joe Hickey and it is true. Our state has been blessed with many assets: oil, and minerals, and timber, and vast ranch lands, and miles of breathless scenic beauty, but its greatest treasure is its people. Joe Hickey was a precious part of Wyoming's human resources who will be sorely missed by us all.

It is appropriate that he should be buried here in Rawlins, for it was here in humble circumstances that he laid the foundation of a distinguished life. Wherever he traveled, after leaving here during World War II, his heart remained in Rawlins. His family would have preferred that these services take place in St. Joseph's Church, across the way, where he worshipped and served Mass many years ago. But they were prevailed upon, out of consideration for so many friends, to have the Mass in this commodious Jeffrey Memorial Center.

It was this same sense of consideration that led them to limit the number of honorary pallbearers to the judges of the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals. The number of the other friends and associates who might rightly have been included was much too great. His family hopes that all his friends in Wyoming and elsewhere might regard themselves as his honorary pallbearers.

Since the first news of his serious illness shocked us in mid-summer, Mrs. Hickey and the two sons whom Joe loved so dearly and of whom he was so proud, have been comforted and strengthened by the solicitude of hundreds upon hundreds of friends from every section of the state and country, and reflecting every level of society. Their bereavement is made more bearable now by the knowledge that their loss is shared by so many.

We would have them know that as we pray that the Lord will grant Joe an eternity of joy in Heaven, we are begging the same loving Lord to console them and to strengthen them now and in the future. We remind them of the Lord's own words, spoken at another burial many centuries ago, when Mary and Martha wept before the tomb of their beloved brother, Lazarus: "I am the resurrection and the life: whoever believes in me, though he should die, will come to life; and whoever is alive and believes in me will never die." (John 11: 25–26)

May we also, who share in this Mass, Joe's friends and associates, realize that life is short and extremely uncertain. In God's providence, we too are moving toward that hour when we shall pass through the portals of death. May this occasion remind us that life is meaningless unless it is seen in the light of eternity, unless it is viewed as a season of grace when we prepare by faith and by good works for the fulfillment of the noble spiritual hopes that struggle for expression in our hearts. In every generation and every culture, wise and learned men have striven to put into words the end and purpose of human life. The simple answer of the catechism that Joe Hickey learned at the knee of his mother so many years ago still says it best: "God made us to know him, to love him, and to serve him in this life so that we might be happy with him forever in the life to come." May God give us the inspiration to know and to apply these words in our lives.

May the Lord grant eternal rest to the soul of Joe Hickey. May the light of Heaven shine upon him, and may his soul and the souls of all the faithful departed rest in peace. Amen.