

River near Alexandria, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 16205. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to exclude from the mails as a special category of nonmailable matter certain material offered for sale to minors, to protect the public from the offensive intrusion into their homes of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 16206. A bill to restrict travel in violation of area restrictions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16207. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16208. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 16209. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the making of grants to medical schools and hospitals to assist them in establishing special departments and programs in the field of family practice, and otherwise to encourage and promote the training of medical and paramedical personnel in the field of family medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 16210. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the making of grants to medical schools and hospitals to assist them in establishing special departments and programs in the field of family practice, and otherwise to encourage and promote the training of medical and paramedical personnel in the field of family medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 16211. A bill to amend the Randolph-Sheppard Act for the blind so as to make certain improvements therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 16212. A bill to designate certain lands in the Three Arch Rocks, Oregon Islands, Copalis, Flattery Rocks, and Quillayute Needles National Wildlife Refuges as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 16213. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment

for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 16214. A bill to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

H.R. 16215. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. HAYS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. POBELL, Mr. REES, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16216. A bill to provide for the elimination of the use of lead in motor vehicle fuel and the installation of adequate anti-pollution devices on motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 16217. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 15-percent increase in annuities and to change the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 1104. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 1105. Joint resolution with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.J. Res. 1106. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. Con. Res. 517. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the annual reduction of the national debt in order to establish a sound fiscal policy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ZWACH, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

H. Res. 856. Resolution for the appointment of a select committee to study the effects of Federal policies on the quality of

education in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WAGGONER (for himself, Mr. ROUDEBUSH, Mr. ASHBROOK, and Mr. FLOOD):

H. Res. 857. Resolution to reprint House Document 213, 83d Congress, first session, "Permit Communist-Conspirators To Be Teachers?"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DIGGS (for himself, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. REUSS, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. FRASER, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. REES, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. PATTEN, and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Res. 858. Resolution restricting Governor Maddox as a guest in the House of Representatives dining room; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 16218. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Stavarakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 16219. A bill for the relief of Edgar Harold Bradley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

313. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to prescribing more stringent emission standards for motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

314. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, relative to admission requirements at Veterans' Administration Hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

315. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of Guam, relative to uniformity of the national standards for welfare assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE BUSING ISSUE

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article entitled "Busing Issue Looks Explosive," written by Theotis Robinson, Jr., and published in the Knoxville News-Sentinel of recent date.

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

BUSING ISSUE LOOKS EXPLOSIVE

(By Theotis Robinson, Jr.)

The issue of busing students to achieve a racial balance is becoming explosive. In an effort to implement the Supreme Court's 1954 ruling on segregated schools, Federal

courts have been ordering some Southern school districts to employ busing as a means of achieving racial balance.

This has brought a reaction from many parents and public officials alike against busing. The Tennessee State Senate last week passed a bill banning busing and the House is expected to follow suit. The objectors to busing contend that the system of neighborhood schools would be destroyed if students were bused and that busing works a hardship on students. They argue that a student should attend the school in his neighborhood and not one across town.

All of this probably would be acceptable if it were not for the hypocrisy involved. Where were these defenders of "neighborhood schools" when black children were being bused not just across town but from one county to another so they could attend segregated schools? Black students were bused from Anderson County and Sevier County to Austin High School for many years. There probably are families in both Anderson and Sevier Counties in which both parents and their children were bused to Austin High School. And every black stu-

dent in Knox County also attended Austin. Those outside the city were bused in, but students inside the city had to get there the best way they could. It's too bad that the defenders of neighborhood schools did not see fit to protest back then. That they protest now only points up the hypocrisy involved.

BUSING TREATS SYMPTOMS

There is much to be said for and against the busing of students. One strong argument for busing is that this allows the white child and the black child to get to know each other and to learn to understand each other. The main problem in black-white relations is that there has not been enough communication between the races. If our children can learn to respect each other and communicate maybe they can solve many of the problems which we seem unable to solve.

The main drawback to busing, however, is that it is only getting at the symptoms of the more critical and complex problem of housing patterns. If our neighborhoods were not segregated then our schools would not be

segregated. Neighborhood schools simply reflect housing patterns. If the neighborhood is all-white, the schools will be all-white. If the neighborhood is all-black then all-black schools develop. But if the neighborhood is integrated then integrated schools should result. Such is not always the result in the case of integrated neighborhoods however. The percentage of black families living in East Knoxville is not even near the percentage of black students attending Austin-East High School. Black students make up nearly one hundred per cent of the school's enrollment. There are fewer than a dozen white students in the entire student body.

This does not reflect the housing patterns in East Knoxville, and supposedly there should be a greater number of white students attending Austin-East. But while many oppose transferring students from the school in their neighborhood to some other school for the purpose of achieving racial integration, the Knoxville Board of Education and presumably boards in other areas, find nothing wrong with students transferring away from the school in their neighborhood to some other school for the purpose of perpetuating a segregated school system. If the principle of neighborhood schools were strictly enforced in Knoxville, not under the present gerrymandered zones which the Board of Education purposely drew to limit the present gerrymandered zones within the bonafide and logical zoning plan, school integration would be more complete.

QUALITY OF TEACHING IMPORTANT

The question of integration or de facto segregation probably is not as crucial as the problem of providing quality education. The question in the minds of parents, both black and white, should not be one of overwhelming significance on the question of integration or segregation. The number one concern should be the quality of education that one's child is receiving. For most black people, however, integrated schools and quality education have gone hand in hand. The reason for this has been that boards of education have provided for the needs of all-white schools first, and what was left over was then spent in black schools. All too often this was not enough to provide a quality education for the black student. There has been a shortage of equipment and supplies in all-black schools and this has handicapped the black student. (As a student at Austin High School, my history class used books discarded from West High School. Most had pages missing, and all had been written in by West High students. West High received new books and Austin received discards.)

What the final answer will be is unknown. The problem of busing is certainly not a regional problem. Segregated schools can be found in all sections of the country. Last week, the city of Los Angeles was ordered to desegregate schools. Because of housing patterns, officials there say that the only way to integrate the schools is to bus students. But they also say that to bus students would cost more than \$20 million which the city does not have. They plan to go to court. There are no easy answers to our problems. It will take patience, hard work and understanding to find a solution. But hopefully, an answer will be found.

TRASH, WASTE, AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the problem of pollution has become one of the most serious issues facing our Nation.

The problem of pollution—in the air, in the water, and on land—has been unchecked for too long. We suddenly are realizing that, if action is not taken soon to preserve the quality of our environment, it will be too late.

One of the aspects of this problem is that our cities are unable to dispose of solid waste quickly, efficiently, and adequately. Many of our major cities are virtually imprisoned by trash.

I have introduced H.R. 642 which would amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act in order to provide financial assistance for the construction of solid waste disposal facilities.

Recently the Washington Post published a series of four articles on the problem of solid wastes entitled "Waste: Problem of the 1970's" and written by Jim Mann.

The articles, which appeared on February 22, 23, 24, and 25, 1970, deal with the problems of solid waste removal, new methods of disposal, the problems in the Washington area, and Washington regional efforts.

I commend Mr. Mann for writing these articles and bringing the problem of solid waste disposal to the attention of solid readers.

I urge my colleagues to read these articles. We must be willing to face the consequences of our present waste disposal methods.

We also must be willing to seriously face the task of learning how to get rid of our garbage without turning our Nation into a dump.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1970]
WASTE: PROBLEM OF THE 1970'S—CITIES ARE ENGULFED BY OCEANS OF TRASH

(By Jim Mann)

Washington, like metropolitan areas across the nation, is in the midst of a crisis in garbage and trash disposal.

National attention has suddenly centered on the dramatic problems of air and water pollution. But with less fanfare, those in the field called "solid waste disposal" have been forecasting national disaster in the pile-up of America's garbage and trash. Its piles of discarded automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines and television sets seem to grow almost without end.

The reason for their alarm can be stated quite simply: the amount of throw-away material is increasing rapidly and the number of practical ways of getting rid of it is declining.

America now spends about \$4.5 billion a year disposing of about 350 million tons of refuse. Federal officials expect the tonnage to double within 20 years.

The District of Columbia's sanitary landfill at Oxon Bay will run out by the end of February. With no land available within its borders, the District will begin to fill land across Oxon Bay in Prince George's County.

The sanitary landfill at Anacostia in Prince George's County was supposed to receive garbage and trash until 1976. A few years ago, the estimate was changed to 1974. Now, a Prince George's engineer believes that the landfill will be completed by 1972.

Throughout the Washington area and elsewhere, public works officials are trying to decide what to do about their incinerators, most of which fail to meet recently passed air pollution standards.

In their desperation, public works officials have been sponsoring or conducting an array of experiments, some of which might seem farcical to the average American whose gar-

bage disposal problems seldom extend beyond the chore of carrying out the rubbish.

Some ideas:

Virginia Beach, Va., is disposing of its own refuse and the refuse from nearby Norfolk onto a so-called "mountain of trash" 60 feet high and between 900 and 1,000 feet in diameter located about six miles from the Atlantic Ocean. The refuse will be covered with dirt and eventually turned into a combination amphitheater and roller derby. The nearby land from which the dirt is scooped will become a lake.

The mountain, which the local townfolk call "Mount Trashmore," will be the highest spot in the area. Officials expect that the amphitheater will attract folk concerts for the Virginia Beach summer vacationers. Similar hills to be constructed in Chicago and elsewhere may be used as artificial ski slopes while other areas plan to use landfill sites as golf courses or tennis courts.

At Clemson University, researchers are trying to find a replacement for the disposable bottle by developing a "dissolvable bottle"—one made of water-soluble glass with a thin coating of plastic, so that a housewife could crack the plastic covering of a used bottle and wash it down the sink.

In HEW's Bureau of Solid Waste Management, federal officials admit they are contemplating the regulation of the packaging industries to cut down on solid waste in the same way that the government now regulates air pollution.

In Japan, experimenters have been trying to develop a press that would turn garbage and trash into a filler for use in building blocks. It hasn't worked yet.

Within the Atomic Energy Commission, physicists are discussing the most futuristic solution to the trash problem—a "fusion torch" that uses thermonuclear energy to convert all waste compounds back to their original atoms. The end products may then be used elsewhere. For example, in one experiment, cellulose was broken down to its elemental parts and then recombined to make paper.

According to Richard D. Vaughan, director of the Bureau of Solid Waste Management, the nation's expanding population accounts for part, but only part, of the increase in refuse. In the past few years, there has also been a dramatic increase in the amount of trash that each person produces.

Vaughan cites as an example of recent problems the transformation of American hospitals.

A few years ago, the U.S. Public Health Service urged hospitals to switch to single-use syringes instead of the older ones that had to be sterilized for re-use.

Soon, Vaughan says, hospitals began to use single-use sheets, trays and other items. They now generate about 20 to 30 pounds of trash a day for each patient. Vaughan maintains that in retrospect "the hospitals should have considered the problems to the environment caused by the increased waste load."

In recent years, the two most popular methods in urban areas for waste disposal have been by incineration and by sanitary landfill. Each of the possibilities has now become troublesome.

Nearly all current incinerators pollute the air. With the recent passage of air pollution ordinances, these incinerators either will require expensive new equipment or will have to be replaced entirely.

According to Nicholas B. Stollaroff, Prince Georges urban engineer, the costs of building a new incinerator have risen from about \$5,000 a ton capacity to about \$11,000 a ton because of the more stringent air pollution codes.

Because of these costs, public works officials would prefer to dispose of their wastes by sanitary landfill—an engineering project in which garbage and trash are covered under layers of earth.

A well-designed sanitary landfill project differs in several respects from a dump or junkyard. At the Brown Station Road landfill in Prince Georges County, for example, the refuse is crushed by compactors, costing more than \$50,000 apiece, which reduce the volume of refuse by about 75 per cent.

The Brown Station Road landfill is carefully aimed at avoiding pollution problems by preventing contact with ground water. It is designed with firebreaks and firefighting equipment to control the usual town-dump trash fires. There are efforts to control dust and blowing paper. The refuse is covered with six inches of earth each day. Periodically, an additional cover of one or two feet is added.

The problem is that such landfill projects are already taking up an enormous amount of urban and suburban space. Once filled, the land can be reused for recreational facilities, but it cannot be used for building construction because engineers feel it is not sufficiently stable.

The long-term environmental effects of landfilling are not known. Most scientists think the refuse will eventually decompose, but the speed and results of decomposition are unclear. One local engineer said he suspects that "200 years from now, you will still be able to read the discarded newspapers and tin can labels."

Furthermore, public works officials are now facing a solid wall of civil opposition each time a new site is proposed for landfilling. As next-door neighbors, sanitary landfills seem to rank about equal in popularity with freeways, prisons and asylums.

Public officials admit they have been forced to become secretive about their choices for a landfill site. Three years ago, the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments released an engineering study of refuse problems in the Washington area that listed about 35 potential landfill sites. None of the sites has been used, an official explains, because their disclosure in the report allowed neighborhoods to organize in opposition.

With land becoming more scarce, some localities, like Virginia Beach, are building landfills upward, thereby cutting down on the number of acres of land they must occupy.

But as the incinerators become more expensive and urban land becomes scarce, most public works officials admit they are waiting for some kind of "technical breakthrough" to rescue them from the oceans of trash and garbage.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 23, 1970]
WASTE: PROBLEM OF THE 1970'S—TRASH CRISIS
CONTINUES AS CITIES SEEK RELIEF

(By Jim Mann)

Throughout the country, public officials charged with disposing garbage and trash are waiting for a new method, a new law, a new gadget to prevent disaster in the pile-up of refuse.

Public incinerators are becoming more expensive and less practical because of stronger air pollution codes, and space for sanitary landfilling in urban areas is becoming harder and harder to obtain.

So local public works officials are listening to ideas and watching for the results of all kinds of experiments.

One official, whose job it is to figure out what Prince Georges County will be doing with its trash in the year 2000, says that planning is difficult because "in 20 years we hope that somebody develops a new method which isn't even a gleam in somebody's eye yet."

Some of the new ideas are actually little more than new transportation and the same old disposal methods. Others, however, would use new technology or new laws; they might create radical changes in the American economy and household practices. One of the

most frequently discussed proposals is hauling by rail.

For several years, metropolitan areas such as Washington, San Francisco, Philadelphia and Milwaukee have been considering the use of railroads to ship refuse to rural areas.

Under most proposals, garbage and trash would be collected and processed into bales at a central transfer station in an urban area and would then be moved by rail to a sanitary landfill far from the city. Federal officials say that rural strip mines may also be filled with refuse transferred by rail.

The railroads like the talk about rail haul. In some areas, including Washington, they are actively competing to see who can get in to the trash business the fastest. For them it promises a new source of income and a new use for old railroad cars. Some railroads are also planning to use their own land holdings in rural areas for the disposal.

But rail haul has some drawbacks, and one of these is economic. The prices now being quoted are about \$7 per ton for rail haul. The most harried urban jurisdictions, such as the District of Columbia and New York City, may find it within their means to pay these prices. But counties like Fairfax and Prince George's, which operate landfills at costs in the neighborhood of \$2 per ton, will probably continue to look for new land rather than pay the rail rates.

Furthermore, federal officials admit that rail haul is only a short-term solution, one that will not cut down on the masses of refuse and the amount of land being devoted to its disposal.

They say rural areas will probably organize against landfills within their boundaries, just as urban and suburban neighborhoods have. "Nobody wants anybody else's garbage," says one public works official.

Thus, if the metropolitan areas want to dump their refuse in rural areas, they will probably have to pay more and more to do so.

At one point, San Francisco persuaded Lassen County in Northwestern California to allow disposal there. The city's offer was so attractive that Lassen County began to talk of garbage as a "million-dollar-a-year industry." San Francisco later backed out because it found the costs too high, a federal official reports.

Other frequently discussed methods:

Disposing in the sea—As the supply of land or waste disposal diminishes, public works officials have been eyeing the ocean as a possible site for future disposal. It would be feasible, some officials argue, to press garbage and trash into solid bales or blocks and dump these from scows or barges onto the ocean floor.

The U.S. Bureau of Solid Waste Management says it does not endorse such dumping. "We just don't understand yet what it will do to the ocean," says the bureau's director, Richard D. Vaughan.

Vaughan concedes that his department does not know how many localities are already disposing of garbage and trash in the seas. It expects a major report on the problem in June.

New York City has been dropping its sewage sludge into what Vaughan calls "an approved area" in the Atlantic outside New York for most of this century. A recent study by government scientists found that the sewage has killed nearly all marine life in the area.

Vaughan's bureau has been sponsoring projects on special kinds of disposal that might benefit the ecology of the ocean. In one, old tires thrown into the sea off the New England coast have proved useful sites for fish breeding. In another, Delaware will dump waste clamshells into Delaware Bay to see whether they can be used as cultch, a spawning bed for oysters.

Resource recovery—In the five years in which the Bureau of Solid Waste Manage-

ment has been functioning, it has come to realize that a solution to the nation's refuse problems must include more than new lands or oceans in which to dump the papers and bottles and beer cans.

More and more, federal officials talk of the necessity of new techniques. The most frequently used new phrases are "resource recovery" and "volume reduction."

In plain English, resource recovery means finding new ways in which refuse can be used again so that a smaller percentage of material is discarded.

Right now, resource recovery is much more a concept than a practice. Although several techniques have been suggested, none has been widely employed.

One frequently mentioned possibility is composting—processing garbage for use as a soil conditioner. It is a method that has been tried, with some success, in the Netherlands and West Germany.

An obstacle to composting, one that confounds many other plans for the reuse of wastes, is the necessity to separate the glass bottles and tin cans that cannot be used in composting from the garbage and paper that can; no machine performs this separation effectively, and it is not an enticing prospect for human labor.

Another problem is to ensure that the compost produced from the refuse will actually prove a valuable soil conditioner. Johnson City, Tenn., and the Tennessee Valley Authority are establishing a compost plant with federal funds as a demonstration project.

Other possibilities for resource recovery now being studied include:

The re-use of automobile bodies as scrap for steel production. President Nixon endorsed this idea in his pollution message Feb. 10.

The re-use of tin and metal cans, perhaps from compost plants, for use as scrap metals.

Use of broken glass to make paving compounds. If developed, this technique would ease one of the most serious of all trash problems, the seeming infinity of disposable bottles. Their re-use is now being studied by the Missouri School of Mines, federal officials say.

Re-use of waste paper by paper manufacturers—This process too would require that the paper be separated from other refuse. The "Now Generation," unlike previous ones, has not been encouraged to save its newspapers in the cellar to give to the Boy Scouts.

Volume reduction—This second concept in vogue means, in translation, finding ways to cut down on the masses of waste material that the country must handle each year.

No one is quite sure how. It might mean switching away from disposable bottles. It might mean putting some kind of tax on refuse material as an incentive for manufacturers to cut down on weight and volume.

Vaughan, the federal official most directly concerned with the problem, talks about "changing American production" in a fashion that would help solve the waste problems. He speaks of designing American consumer goods "with repair in mind," in order to move away from planned obsolescence. Perhaps, Vaughan suggests, certain products like plastics can be produced with additives that make them biodegradable, or able to decompose gradually by normal chemical processes.

Recently Vaughan has been speaking before a variety of trade associations with names like "the Society of the Plastic Industries, Inc.," and its counterparts in the packaging and automobile industries.

He says he is trying to persuade these industries to help find ways of taking care of the refuse problems that their products create. But Vaughan admits, "If we are not able to achieve satisfactory answers, the next logical step is regulation." The Bureau of

Solid Waste Management has no regulatory powers now, but Vaughan says it may some day seek that power.

Regulation of industry might mean requiring a manufacturer to stop using an especially troublesome plastic, Vaughan says. It might mean requiring the manufacture of automobiles with a greater salvage value.

Vaughan admits that the day his bureau seeks regulatory legislation may not be that far off.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 24, 1970]

WASTE: PROBLEM OF THE 1970'S—CITY LAGS IN REFUSE DISPOSAL

(By Jim Mann)

Washington has its own monumental garbage-and-trash problem. According to one federal official, the city ranks with New York, Philadelphia and San Francisco as the nation's worst in the field of refuse disposal.

The problem is becoming more acute. Consider the following:

Of the area's seven incinerators, at least six fail to meet the most recent clean air standards, report officials who operate them. Operators of the seventh, in Alexandria, are not sure whether it meets the standards. Only in Montgomery County are there plans to make changes.

By the end of February, the District, with its own supply of land for trash dumps exhausted, will start disposing of nearly half its daily trash across the Prince Georges County line at Oxon Bay.

By 1972 the District must develop completely new outlets for its 2,200-ton daily collection of refuse.

Montgomery and Fairfax counties are each trying to obtain new sites for sanitary landfills before the current sites run out.

Arlington and Alexandria are trying to find some new way to get rid of their trash so they can close their incinerators.

By far the most burdened jurisdiction is the District of Columbia. The inner city has a far smaller supply of land than its surrounding suburbs. It has a much greater concentration of people producing refuse. It has a much larger number of businesses and industries. And it has a much greater problem in obtaining the funds to do anything about the program.

According to the District's own figures, in 1960 it disposed of 425,000 tons of garbage and trash. In 1965, the total was 650,000 tons. Last year, it was up to 875,000 tons. By comparison, no other area jurisdiction disposed of more than 400,000 tons last year.

Not only is the District's total volume of trash increasing, its per capita volume is also increasing and at a faster rate than that of the outlying counties.

According to statistics released by Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, in 1966 the District generated trash amounting to 1,337 pounds for each resident. By contrast in the same year Arlington, Alexandria and Montgomery together averaged 900 pounds per resident.

By 1969 the difference was even greater. The District averaged 2,010 pounds per person and the outlying counties averaged about 1,000 pounds. The reason, most officials say, is that the District must dispose of the largest supply of business, industrial and office trash. That's a considerable task in a city famous for its red tape.

Waste disposal in Washington jurisdictions, 1969—In tons

District of Columbia	875,000
Alexandria	67,000
Arlington	92,000
Montgomery	250,000
Prince Georges	400,000
Fairfax	214,000

The old Kenilworth site, which District officials refer to as a "sanitary landfill" and nearly everyone else calls a dump, was finally

closed last fall after 27 infamous years. It is now being turned into a park.

In its heyday, Kenilworth handled hundreds of tons of refuse daily by open burning. Richard D. Vaughan, director of the Bureau of Solid Waste Management, says, "After Kenilworth, we don't know what to point to" as the worst refuse disposal site in the country.

If Kenilworth is history, the District has more than enough current problems. It now disposes of about 2,200 tons of refuse per day, about 1,200 tons by incineration and 1,000 by sanitary landfill. Neither of these two methods is satisfactory and both will be stopped within two years.

The city has four incinerators: in Georgetown, O Street SE, Fort Totten and Mt. Olivet. The first two are 38 years old and the latter two between 10 and 15 years old. All four were rated unsatisfactory in a 1967 federal evaluation and all four fall short of current air quality standards.

The age and reduced capacity of the incinerators make them more costly. According to the Council of Governments' statistics, the operating costs of the District's incinerators are now approximately \$8 per ton of refuse. In other Washington area incinerators, the operating costs are about \$6.70 per ton.

PARK SERVICE LAND USE

The additional 1,000 tons per day that the incinerators cannot handle has been disposed of by sanitary landfill on National Park Service land in the District near Oxon Bay.

According to Norman E. Jackson, sanitary engineering director for the District, this site will be filled by the end of February. The District will begin to place its refuse on National Park Service land across the bay in Prince Georges County. The land it uses will eventually be converted to recreational purposes. Jackson concedes that the District has not satisfied the objections of Prince Georges residents—but the District has no other place to go.

The city is hoping to have two new outlets by 1972. One is a long-awaited "Incinerator Number Five," to be located just south of Kenilworth near Pepco's Benning Road plant. The new incinerator, which will cost about \$18 million, is designed to burn 1,500 tons per day while meeting pollution standards.

The other outlet is a planned sanitary landfill operation in Prince William County at Cockpit Point, a 175-acre site for which the District is still negotiating. According to Jackson, the District is offering Prince William the controversial Featherstone Marsh site, where earlier District efforts to obtain a landfill site were blocked by conservationists. If it obtains Cockpit Point, Jackson says, the District would float its refuse down the Potomac to the site on barges.

Once the new incinerator and the Prince William landfill are in operation, Jackson says, the District will either remodel its incinerators or will convert them to "transfer stations" where refuse may be pressed into bales for placement on barges or railroad cars.

Other Washington jurisdictions are having their own struggles with garbage.

Arlington and Alexandria each are trying to find other disposal methods so that they may close down their incinerators.

F. H. Doe Jr., Arlington's utilities director, says his incinerator definitely does not meet air quality standards. Its pollution has aroused the citizenry in Alexandria's nearby Lynhaven district.

Of the pollution standards, Doe says, "We haven't paid too much attention to them, because we're not set up to do anything. I hope that before the federal people crack down, we get out of the incinerator business . . . We think it's more desirable not to burn."

REPLACEMENT DELAY SEEN

Doe estimated that finding a replacement for the county incinerator will take from

three to six years. He concedes that by this time his incinerator may be officially ruled illegal, but he adds, "Who's going to do anything about it? What's going to happen in practice is that we'll tell them we're working on this and they'll grant us an extension . . . Nobody's given me a deadline yet, and until they do I'm not going to worry."

Both Montgomery and Fairfax counties are looking for new landfill sites.

Montgomery, which disposes of most of its refuse in the large incinerator near Rockville, needs a new landfill site for the incinerator ash "right now," according to Robert S. Mangum of the Bureau of Refuse Collection.

The present site next to the incinerator has reached its capacity, and the county is extending its life only by dumping the wastes a bit higher than it intended. Last year a county plan to develop a landfill in the Potomac-Travilah area ran into civic opposition.

Montgomery is also about to upgrade its incinerator, adding new antipollution devices and raising the capacity from 1,050 tons a day to 1,400 tons. Since completion in 1965, the \$4.5-million incinerator has broken down, overheated and worked below capacity. A multimillion dollar incinerator suit by the county against the incinerator designers is still pending, Mangum says.

YEAR TO GO IN FAIRFAX

Fairfax has less than a year to go before its current landfill site is exhausted. It expects to present plans soon for a new, 600-acre landfill at a location that Harry L. Hale, the county's public works director, will not disclose.

Fairfax and Prince Georges are the two counties least worried about their trash problems. Hale says he hopes Fairfax, with its abundant supply of land, can dispose of refuse by landfill "perhaps forever."

In Prince Georges, Nicholas B. Stollaroff, the urban engineer, feels he has the refuse under control. Stollaroff, displays proudly a national public works award that he won in 1968 for the establishment of a waste disposal program. As part of the program, he designed the Brown Station Road landfill operation, which most officials say is the best in the area. It is expected to last until the mid 80s.

Even so, with Prince Georges trash volume increasing rapidly, Stollaroff will have to develop additional landfills that he says he will have to "sell" to the public.

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

WASTE: PROBLEM OF THE 1970'S—TRASH PLAN FOR AREA READIED

(By Jim Mann)

Within the next few months, the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments will make public the first regional plans for the disposal of Washington's trash and garbage.

According to John J. Lentz, the official who is organizing the plan, the regional organization hopes to start in January, 1972, with the daily disposal of 1,000 tons from the District of Columbia, 400 tons from Arlington and 400 tons from Alexandria.

These three jurisdictions most urgently need help in order to close down their incinerators, Lentz explains. Other jurisdictions will join the regional plan later as they choose, paying a sum in proportion to the refuse that they turn over to the regional group.

The waste will be transported by rail to an as yet undisclosed site outside the greater Washington area.

The Council of Governments itself has no legal authority to operate programs. The only project it runs directly at this time is a series of express buses between suburban areas and downtown Washington. The waste disposal will be handled through a separate

agency, the Metropolitan Washington Waste Management Agency.

If the Council of Governments actually succeeds in establishing regional cooperation in waste disposal, it will have overcome a long history of petty warring among Washington jurisdictions on this issue.

During summers in the 1890's, Washington barged garbage to a point across the Potomac River south of Alexandria for disposal. The practice so infuriated Alexandrians that some of them boarded and sank several of the Washington scows.

Love and kindness between jurisdictions has not increased much since then, at least with respect to garbage.

Today, for example, Montgomery County still polices its county incinerator to make sure that the trucks bringing in refuse are not coming from Prince George's County.

Prince George's charges private garbage collectors \$2.50 a ton for disposal at their Brown Station Road landfill. Some collectors—no one knows how many—decide that it is worth the extra time and gasoline to drive the trash to Montgomery, Howard, Charles or Anne Arundel counties, where the disposal is free.

In addition, many other garbage collectors in the Washington area go to the Montgomery incinerator because it stays open until 8 p.m. each night. Most other incinerators and landfills close before 5 p.m.

The counties become even more sensitive when one jurisdiction seeks to operate a sanitary landfill within another's borders. The District of Columbia has been defeated again and again in attempts to find landfill space outside the city limits.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PLAN HALTED

In 1968, Prince George's County refused to grant the District permission to operate a landfill at a site near Muirkirk. Last year, the District's plans to operate a landfill in Prince William County's Featherstone Marsh were halted when they ran into the opposition of conservationists, the County Board of Supervisors, and Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel.

In suburban counties, where land is more plentiful, public officials guard it carefully for use later on. Fairfax Public Works Director Harry L. Hale says he is not working actively with other jurisdictions on solid waste problems because, "I've got all the problems I can handle here in Fairfax. We're struggling to keep ahead."

The jurisdictional bickering has hurt the cities and counties that have the least available land—Arlington, Alexandria and the District of Columbia.

Norman E. Jackson, sanitary engineering director for the District, says he feels that boundary lines present a special problem for Washington that no other metropolitan area faces.

DOUBLE TROUBLE

"We cross jurisdictional lines almost immediately. The Baltimore inner city can look to the state of Maryland for help, for land or otherwise. We don't have the room, and when we go outside city lines, we have more jurisdictional problems than usual. We have to deal both with different counties and different states. It adds to and complicates the problem."

The relationship between a county and a state can also create problems for officials trying to establish a landfill. For example, Maryland requires the approval of the State Department of Health for the operation of a sanitary landfill.

According to Robert S. Mangum, director of garbage and trash disposal for Montgomery the necessity of obtaining state approval puts the county in a bind. "You don't want to buy land until you know you'll have state approval, and you can't get state approval until you at least own the land."

Many of these cross-jurisdictional prob-

lems may be eased with the advent of the new Council of Governments' program. But Lentz is very cautious about making predictions. He is afraid that the old mistrust of "metropolitan government" will crop up among local jurisdictions, and he is very careful to stress that in initiating the new waste disposal program, the Council of Governments will be solving a problem and not usurping power.

MAY SELL BONDS

Although the Metropolitan Washington Solid Waste Management Agency has actually been incorporated since 1967, it currently has no staff outside the Council of Governments' employees.

According to Lentz, the agency may sell public bonds in order to help finance the disposal system. The agency will be run by delegates from the participating jurisdictions.

While the regional system is being established, those who must deal daily with the garbage continue to wait for some kind of magical solution that will keep Washington's discards from piling up faster and faster.

Trying to imagine some sort of answer to his problem, one local engineer muses, "Maybe you could shoot the garbage up to the moon."

Then he pauses, recalling his science training, and says, "The increased weight would bring the moon closer and closer to earth. It won't work."

FORCED INTEGRATION

HON. GORDON ALLOTT

OF COLORADO

AND

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, readers of the Wall Street Journal have learned to expect wisdom and humane concern in the writings of Vermont Royster. The February 26 Journal contains an article by Mr. Royster that is wise, humane, and very timely.

The article is entitled "Forced Integration: Suffer the Children," and it speaks to some of the most vexing problems of our time.

Mr. Royster is to be commended for what he says and for the way he says it. The substance of his remarks—that coercion can defeat the purposes for which it is designed—is sound. The tone of his remarks—moderate and low key—is worth emulating.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Royster's article be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I, too, have read Mr. Royster's excellent article and am pleased to join the distinguished Senator from Colorado in asking 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:

FORCED INTEGRATION: SUFFER THE CHILDREN
(By Vermont Royster)

"Surely it is time to face up to a fact that can no longer be hidden from view. The attempt to integrate this country's schools is a tragic failure."

The words of Stewart Alsop in Newsweek will serve as well as any. They are startling, honest and deeply true. Whatever anyone else says otherwise, however shocked we may be, we know he is right.

The proof lies in the fact that Congress, in a confused sort of way, has made it clear that it no longer thinks forced integration is the way to El Dorado. Since Congress is a political body, that in itself might be evidence enough. But Mr. Alsop has also put the statement up for challenge to a wide range of civil rights leaders, black and white, ranging from Education Commissioner James Allen to black militant Julius Hobson, and found none to deny it. Beyond that, we have only to look around ourselves, at both our white and our black neighbors, to know that the failure is there.

But that only plunges us into deeper questions. Why is it a failure? And why is it tragic? Why is it that something on which so many men of good will put their faith has at last come to this? Where did we go wrong?

And those questions plunge us yet deeper. For to answer them we must go back to the beginning. It is the moment for one of those agonizing reappraisals of all our hopes, emotions, thoughts, about what is surely the most wretched of all the problems before our society.

A SIMPLE PROPOSITION

We begin, I think, with a simple proposition. It is that it was, and is morally wrong for a society to say to one group of people that because of their color they are pariahs—that the majesty of law can be used to segregate them in their homes, in their schools, in their livelihoods, in their social contacts with their fellows. The wrong is in no wise mitigated by any plea that society may provide well for them within their segregated state. That has nothing to do with the moral question.

In 1954, for the first time, the Supreme Court stated that moral imperative. Beginning with the school decision the judges in a series of decisions struck down the legal underpinnings of segregation.

Since emotions and prejudices are not swept away by court decisions there were some white people in all parts of the country who resisted the change. But they were, for all their noise, in the minority. The great body of our people, even in the South where prejudice had congealed into custom, began the task of stripping away the battens of segregation. Slowly, perhaps, but relentlessly.

Then some people—men of good will, mostly—said this was not enough. They noticed that the mere ending of segregation did not mix whites and blacks in social intercourse. Neighborhoods remained either predominantly white or black. So did schools, because our schools are related to our neighborhoods. So did many other things. Not because of the law, but because of habit, economics, preferences—or prejudices, if you prefer.

From this came the concept of "de facto" segregation. This Latin phrase, borrowed from the law, describes any separation of whites and blacks that exists in fact and equates it with the segregation proscribed by law. The cause matters not. These men of good will concluded that if segregation in law is bad then any separation that exists in fact is equally bad.

From this view we were led to attack any separation as defactor segregation. Since the first attack on segregation came in the schools, the schools became the first place for the attack on separation from whatever cause. And since the law had served us well in the first instance, we chose—our lawmakers chose—to use the law for the second purpose also. The law, that is, was applied to compel not merely an end to segregation but an end to separation by forced integration.

It was at this point that we fell into the abyss. The error was not merely that we created a legal monstrosity, or something unacceptable politically to both whites and blacks. The tragedy is that we embraced an idea morally wrong.

That must be recognized if we are to understand all else. For what is wrong about forced integration in the schools is not its impracticality, which we all now see, but its immorality, which is not yet fully grasped.

Let us consider.

Imagine, now, a neighborhood in which 95% of the people are white, 5% of them black. It is self-evident that we have here a de facto imbalance. We do not have legal segregation, but we do not have integration either, at least not anything more than "tokenism."

Let us suppose also that for some reason—any reason, economics, white hostilities, or perhaps black prejudice against living next door to whites—the proportion does not change. The only way then to change it is for some of the whites to move away and, concurrently, for some blacks who live elsewhere to move into this neighborhood. One is not enough. Both things must happen.

CREATING AN IMBALANCE

Or let us suppose the proportion does change. Let us suppose that for some reason—any reason, including prejudice—large numbers of white families move out of the neighborhood, making room for black people to move in, so that after a few years we have entirely reversed the proportions. The neighborhood becomes 95% black, 5% white.

Again we have an imbalance. Again we do not truly have segregation but call it that, if you wish: de facto segregation. In any event we do not have integration in the sense that there is a general mixing together of the blacks and whites.

Now suppose that we act from the assumption that this is wrong. That it is wrong to have the neighborhood either 95% white or 95% black. That the mix, to be "right," must be some particular proportion.

What action is to be taken? In the first instance, do we by law forcefully remove some of the white families from the neighborhood so that we can force in the "proper" number of black families? Or, in the second instance, do we by law prohibit some of the white families from moving out of the neighborhood? If we do either, who decides who moves, who stays?

The example, of course, is fanciful. We do none of this. No one has had the political temerity to propose a law that would send soldiers to pick people up and move them, or to block the way and prevent them from moving. No one stands up and says this is the moral thing to do.

Stated thus baldly, the immorality of doing such things is perfectly clear. No one thinks it moral to send policemen, or the National Guard bayonets in hand, to corral people and force them into a swimming pool, or a public park or a cocktail party when they do not wish to go.

No one pretends this is moral—for all that anyone may deplore people's prejudice—because everyone can see that to do this is to make of our society a police state. The methods, whatever the differences in intent, would be no different from the tramping boots of the Communist, Nazi or Fascist police states.

All this being fanciful, no one proposing such things, it may seem we have strayed far from the school integration program. But have we?

The essence of that program is that we have tried to apply to our schools the methods we would not dream of applying to other parts of society. We have forced the children to move.

There are many things wrong with the forcible transfer of children from school to school to obtain the "proper" racial mix. It

is, for one thing, wasteful of time, energy and money that could better be applied to making all schools better.

To this practical objection there is also the fact that in concept it is arrogant. The unspoken idea it rests upon is that black children will somehow gain from putting their black skins near to white skins. This is the reverse coin of the worst segregationists idea that somehow the white children will suffer from putting their white skins near to black skins.

Both are insolent assertions of white superiority. Both spring from the same bitter seed.

Still, the practical difficulties might be surmounted. The implied arrogance might be overlooked, on the grounds that the alleged superiority is not racial but cultural; or that, further, both whites and blacks will gain from mutual association. That still leaves the moral question.

Perhaps it should be restated. Is it moral for society to apply to children the force which, if it were applied to adults, men would know immoral? What charity, what compassion, what morality is there in forcing a child as we would not force his father?

It is a terrible thing to see, as we have seen, soldiers standing guard so that a black child may enter a white school. You cannot help but cringe in shame that only this way is it done. But at least then the soldiers are standing for a moral principle—that no one, child or adult, shall be barred by the color of his skin from access to what belongs to us all, white or black.

But it would have been terrifying if those same soldiers had been going about the town rounding up the black children and marching them from their accustomed school to another, while they went fearfully and their parents wept. On that, I verily believe, morality will brook no challenge.

Thus, then, the abyss. It opened because in fleeing from one moral wrong of the past, for which we felt guilty, we fled all unaware to another immorality. The failure is tragic because in so doing we heaped the burdens upon our children, who are helpless.

MUST WE TURN BACK?

Does this mean, as many men of good will fear, that to recognize as much, to acknowledge the failure of forced integration in the schools, is to surrender, to turn backward to what we have fled from?

Surely not. There remains, and we as a people must insist upon it, the moral imperative that no one should be denied his place in society, his dignity as a human being, because of his color. Not in the schools only, but in his livelihood and his life. No custom, no tradition, no trickery should be allowed to evade that imperative.

That we can insist upon without violating the other moral imperative. So long as he does not encroach upon others, no man should be compelled to walk where he would not walk, live where he would not live, share what company he would shun, think what he would not think, believe what he believes not.

If we grasp the distinction, we will follow a tragic failure with a giant step. And, God willing, not just in the schools.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION— PROFILE 70

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for too long we have neglected the needs of our Spanish-speaking Americans.

The history of the United States has been interwoven with the Spanish at least since the time Columbus discovered America under the patronage of the Spanish Queen Isabella, and their indelible mark throughout the centuries has enriched the heritage of our country.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Spanish influence has dominated this continent long before the discovery of America.

But today, while Spanish-speaking Americans comprise the second largest minority group in the United States, they feel alienated. They suffer from a language barrier; they are too often branded as stereotypes; they are not taught in our schools of the valuable contributions they have made to the culture, social, economic, and political histories of many countries, including the United States.

Recently, Mr. Armando M. Rodriguez, Director of the Office for Spanish-Speaking American Affairs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, delivered an excellent speech in Chicago placing into proper perspective the problems and needs of the Spanish-speaking Americans.

I should like to place in the RECORD today Mr. Rodriguez's excellent presentation because it so eloquently spells out the inspiring contributions made by our Nation's "silent minority."

Mr. Speaker, the speech follows:

BILINGUAL EDUCATION—PROFILE 70

For nearly three years I have traveled back and forth across our country as a representative of our national government, spurring both governmental and private agencies to direct some of their resources to the Spanish-speaking population. In doing so I have found our people—Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and Mexican-Americans—to be regarded in some communities as non-existent, in others with fear, in others with respect, and in others with suspicion. I also found that this population is referred to as Spanish-Americans, Latinos, Hispanos, Spanish-Speaking Americans, Spanish-Surnamed Americans, Americans of Spanish or Mexican Descent, Los Batos Locos and a number of other names I choose not to repeat here tonight. But whatever we are called, we are La Raza, a name that unites us linguistically and culturally.

I have also found out that there are approximately 10 million of us, that more than 80% of us live in urban communities like Chicago, and that more than 70% of us are in the three states of New York, Texas and California. I also found that the states of Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, New Jersey, Ohio, Wisconsin and Iowa are the fastest area for settlement of Spanish speakers in the country outside of New York, Texas and California. I also found that the Spanish speaking American population is the youngest in the country with more than 50% under age 20. I found that our educational attainment—based on 1960 census figures—is the lowest in the country for any distinctive ethnic or racial group (in Texas it barely reaches the 5th year of school); that the dropout rate of the Spanish speakers is the highest in the country, exceeding 50% in some of the high schools in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and San Antonio. That more than 80% of the youngsters from Mexican American families starting school in Texas do not finish. That in California less than 1% of the students enrolled in the seven campuses of the University of California are Spanish-Surname—how many of those are Puerto Rican or Mexican

American, we do not know. This is the higher education situation in a state where 14% of the public school enrollment is Spanish-Surnamed. A shocking statistic is that the Mexican-American enrollment at California State College in Los Angeles, located in the heart of East Los Angeles, a barrio of more than 400,000 Mexican Americans, dropped almost 50% last year. These are some frightening statistics that tell a little about the second largest minority in our country.

Who is La Raza when you strip away the educational and economic chains that bind him? For the most part, he is still an alien, unknown in his own land. This is true even in the Southwest, where the cultural heritage is a living reminder of the part that Spain and Mexico played in forming the character of this nation. The Mexican is pictured on the one hand as the peon, who, hat in hand, holds the reins for John Wayne in the movies, or is the Frito Bandito on T.V. On the other hand, he is the glamorous *hidalgo*, the ambassador of good will for the city of San Diego and a participant in the Rose Bowl Parade. Between the fanciful extremes of the peon and the *hidalgo* is La Raza. Probably the most telling observation ever to be printed about us came from the pages of *Newsweek* (May 23, 1966): "We're the best kept secret in America".

I would like to say here today that the secret is now out. We are fast becoming America's most promising human catalyst for the creation of a democratic society where cultural heritage and language assets are prime instruments in the acceptance of human diversity as major national goal. I refute that television report in April of last year that identified La Raza as "The Invisible Minority". If the producers could sense what I feel and see in my travels, La Raza would be identified as the "dynamic and responsible minority". The old image that the Puerto Rican or the Mexican American is neither Puerto Rican, Mexican nor American: he is suspended between two cultures, neither of which claims him, is rapidly disappearing. Tomorrow's Puerto Rican and Mexican American—those forceful, creative, bold youngsters under 25 will be the American citizens who successfully retain and cherish their cultural heritage and simultaneously participate fully in the larger cultural environment of our society. And I suggest that the frontier of this movement will be found in the urban areas of our cities throughout this country. Who is the Puerto Rican or the Mexican American? He is that unique individual who has suffered from cultural isolation, language rejection, economic and educational inequalities, but who has now begun to take those instruments of oppression and turn them into instruments of change. Bilingual and bicultural education in our public schools will be a reality very shortly. The national moral and legal commitment of our federal government for educational programs that reflect the culture and language of the students will be a common part of curriculums throughout the country. And to a great extent this sweeping movement must be credited to the patience and perseverance of our youth—cultural qualities that for so many years was termed, "passivity".

It is this sweeping movement, vigorously enunciated by the Youth Movement, that will destroy an environment now existing that says to us and particularly the youngster in school, that the only Americanism is that which permeates the textbooks with little or no reference to positive historical accomplishments unless achieved by the Anglo, Mexican American and Puerto Rican children can and will do well scholastically, but only in schools, including colleges, that not only emphasize the Anglo way of life, but also fosters pride in the Mexican American and Puerto Rican for his origin, history, culture, and bilingual background.

A high school girl from the barrio in East Los Angeles said: "We look for others like ourselves in these history books, for something to be proud of for being a Mexican, and all we see in books, magazines, films, and TV shows are stereotypes of a dark, dirty, smelly man with a tequila bottle in one hand, a dripping taco in the other, a serape wrapped around him, and a big sombrero".

This, my friends, is not the hispano here or anywhere in the country. I ask that all of you here join me in a fight to eradicate such stereotypes from every aspect of our media. The negative images of La Raza in advertising on TV is one of the most destructive forces now existing for the creation of a society where cultural and human diversity is an imperative thread in the strength of the total fabric. This fight must be won before freedom for all of us can be realized. I would like to quote from three different sources which reveal the deep feeling of pride, dignity and concern so important for all of us, not because it is good or true but because these feelings exist especially among our youth who fight for self-identity and positive image recognition.

"Who am I?" asks a young Mexican American high school student. "I am a product of myself. I am a product of you and my ancestors. We came to California long before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. We settled California the Southwestern part of the United States including the states of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado and Texas. We built the missions, we cultivated the ranches. We were at the Alamo in Texas, both inside and outside. You know we owned California—that is, until gold was found here. Who am I? I'm a human being. I have the same hopes that you do, the same fears, the same drives, same desires, same concerns, same abilities; and I want the same chance that you have to be an individual. Who am I? In reality I am who you want me to be".

This same concern for dignity and respect is found in the poetry of Alberto Alurista:

"Mis ojos hinchados
flooded with lagrimas
de bronce
melting on the cheek bones
of my concern
razgos indigenos
the scars of history on my face
and the veins of my body
that aches
vomito sangre
y lloro libertad
I do not ask for freedom
I am freedom"

And this freedom means education. And this freedom means a bigger share in the economic and political pot.

Olivia de San Diego says in her poem:

"I've heard Black is beautiful
But, I want you to know
Brown is beautiful
To feel is to be, to live
My feelings are beautiful because they're
real, because they're me
And I'm being brave enough, loving enough
To allow myself to feel, to be myself . . .
to grow

But —

Who can/will understand my frustration,
my pain
Who can I turn to
Who will help me untwist my stomach
My body is screwed with this pain . . . mi
grito es loud and long
Can't you hear it
That I feel ugly . . .
To discover after all these years . . .
That I don't love myself
That all these years I've been looking
At myself, through gavacho eyes
Judging, condemning
Damn! I was a racist against myself
I hated myself because of me????

No more, white man, no more
Gavacho, Gavacho
I'm brown, I'm brown
I'm a chicana
Y sabes que white man, pig, educator
No chinges, conmigo mas!"

Under the Bilingual Education Act of 1967 we are now operating 76 Bilingual Education Programs. More than 300 proposals were submitted for some part of the \$7.5 million provided by Congress. Just before leaving Washington I checked on the program for the second round of funding and proposal submission. This administration requested \$10 million and the House complied with their request despite the fact that the House on most education bills this session has approved appropriations equal to authorization. The Senate approved appropriations of \$25 million. Authorization for the Title VII, ESEA, for this fiscal year is \$40 million. Joint committee approved \$17 million. Dr. Albar Pena, Director of the Bilingual Education Unit, tells me that only 189 proposals were submitted for development of bilingual programs using federal bilingual funds. Statistically, this means a drop of more than 40% over the first year's requests. Certainly, the failure of a substantial additional funds must be named as one major cause of this drop. Hopefully, the re-direction of existing federal, state and local funds may have enabled many districts to set up or expand bilingual programs. Whatever may be the cause, there is ample reason for alarm. And I want to talk about bilingual education and this coming decade.

The interest in bilingual education is now high. One major task is to insure that this momentum is sustained and increased. Our national commitment to exploration in space resulted in two landings on the moon, at the cost of over \$20 billion. Our national commitment to reading was initiated in a major speech by the Assistant Secretary for Education, Dr. James Allen in Los Angeles last October. This national goal in education was firmly endorsed by President Nixon. I have been roaming this country stressing the legal and moral commitment our country has made to bilingual, bicultural education by the enactment of the Bilingual Education Act. I am extremely pleased that this meeting has focused on concern, commitment and involvement. This is the most appropriate time and place for a declaration of bilingual and bicultural goals.

I propose that by 1980 all our schools located where there is a plurality of language and cultural differences, be it ethnic or racial, be completely immersed in bilingual, bicultural programs that involve the development of all children to be culturally cognizant in two or more cultures; and have communication competency in their mother tongue and a second language.

This is the commitment I ask that you embrace and take with you from this meeting. The first shot from the starting gun for a movement for bilingual, bicultural education began in Tucson, Arizona with the NEA Conference in 1966. Let us carry on this goal tonight at this meeting that by 1980—bilingual, bicultural education will be the means by which all children realize their full potential in a linguistically and culturally pluralistic society.

This means that we must immediately stress in our educational commitment that bilingual, bicultural education in English and Spanish-speaking communities means an equal emphasis on English as a Second Language and Spanish as a Second Language. It means that we must recognize that bilingual, bicultural education is a continuing process in our curriculum beginning with pre-school for all children, and continuing through secondary school for ALL children.

It means we must immediately reject the unilingual education of bilingual children and provide a bilingual education for uni-

lingual children. It means that we must weave into every aspect of our curriculum a consciousness of the personal as well as the national importance of the creation of a society where monolingualism and monoculturalism is totally unacceptable. It means that, by 1980, the culturally deprived person in the society will be that person with a monolingual, monocultural makeup.

Our theme from now on should be that—commitment must be coupled with involvement. I suspect that our country has never before seen a period in which commitment and involvement have been so closely and visibly coupled. Certainly the issue of Vietnam has produced among Americans of all ages and likes, a sense of making their commitment—for or against our situation in Vietnam—a commitment that must include involvement. I have proposed a major commitment for all of us tonight, a commitment with a time schedule and a realistic but difficult goal. How do we get involved in this commitment?

The fact that you are here today spells some commitment. For you it also indicates involvement. But what kind of involvement? Some definite directions are now available. Within the last few months, two publications have devoted themselves to bilingualism. The first is the September, 1969 issue of *The Center Forum*, a publication of the Center for Urban Education in New York who devoted the whole issue to Bilingualism. I urge that you secure a copy of that publication. The second is more significant for the determination of involvement for all of us. The Bureau of Research of the Office of Education sponsored in June of 1969 a conference on bilingual education. The report of that conference is called, "National Conference on Bilingual Education—Language Skills." The report contains some extremely valuable information and ideas for increasing the involvement of all of us which, in turn, will deepen our commitment. And the total result will be attainment of our goal of a truly bilingual, bicultural society for all children throughout this country where a pluralistic linguistic and cultural environment is present. The report recommends three areas of general priorities:

1. Basic research needs to be performed in the area of language acquisitions—both of first and second languages.

2. A national system for collection and dissemination of information on bilingualism and bilingual education should be established.

3. Studies need to be performed in the areas of attitude and motivation and their effect on language learning.

Specific recommendations covered five major points. They are:

1. Basic Research
2. Language Acquisition
3. Teacher Preparation
4. Assessment
5. Methods and Materials

I urge that all of you secure a copy of this report. It can be obtained from the Bureau of Research, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

Note the points the report identifies as critical. Most of them are not new. There are a number of studies on teacher preparation, on methods and materials. A whole record of language acquisition is available in most university libraries. But how many of us—and I include myself—have become sufficiently involved to be able to help others in any of these areas. I suspect that most of us are still generalists. I want to see all of us get deeply involved and consequently skilled in at least one aspect of bilingual education. The profile of bilingual education in the next decade, culminating in a quiet but successful change from a monolingual to bilingual society, must begin by all of us getting up in skills that will bring about this change. I have been saying that we need

100,000 bilingual, bicultural teachers to effect a good bilingual program. I still stand by that statement. I want to add that these 100,000 bilingual, bicultural teachers must be well trained in the art of teaching subject matter bilingually. I want them to be so involved in their job that total commitment is just as intense as that of any astronaut. That there is no doubt at any time in their mind that the goal will be realized. There can be no feeling that the direction and the way to reach it is not right—and that the goal is as important as any undertaken by our country.

No one will be able to say that lack of involvement was the greatest obstacle to a successful landing on target in 1980 and a complete repudiation of the provocative question posed by the National Advisory Committee on Mexican American Education in their report, *The Mexican American: Quest for Equality*, a question that strikes at all of us when it says, "Educators, especially, must search their consciences for an answer to the question: is only a monolingual, monocultural society acceptable in America?" I challenge you tonight to take your commitment, join with involvement that is measured in competence and learning on the broad scope of bilingual, bicultural education and let's move—now! We have had enough time to put something together on the launching pad. All of us know enough to perform a vital role in the total takeoff. The important thing is that we make sure quality control is always present. I often see bilingual programs in classrooms with teacher and administrator commitment—my concern is that far too frequently there isn't sufficient involvement to guarantee a high level atmosphere of program operation. I guess what I am really saying is that involvement means becoming completely skilled in as many facets of bilingual education as you can—and then insisting on quality performance by all those involved. I don't want bilingual education to fail or flounder because we let our commitment become clouded with zeal without professional skills and responsibility to guide it. Commitment is not a cheap commodity—but the most precious ingredient in the attainment of our goal is involvement with competence. All of us must gear up to a greater level of skills than ever before. The Bureau of Research report is an invaluable guide in the determination for all of us as to what area we may want to become experts for competent involvement.

There are more than 10 million Spanish-Speaking citizens in our country. By 1980 there will be more than 15 million. We want all those students who are Spanish-Speaking to be bilingual, bicultural agents for a closer western hemisphere of human cooperation. We want all students in those areas where languages and cultures are pluralistic to become bilingual, bicultural agents for the realization of the strength of a world society where human diversity is promoted not destroyed. Some of you here are involved in education—now is the time to increase your involvement in education by supporting and providing leadership in a movement that asks little from all of us, but promises a whole new world of human relations.

Muchas Gracias.

GRAZING FEES—PART IX

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, when Secretary of the Interior Hickel decided

not to put into effect in 1970 the scheduled increase in fees for grazing on public lands, he issued a press release saying the action "will allow the Department of the Interior to evaluate a study and report by the Public Land Law Review Commission on the subject." The press release in full appears with my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 28, page 38238.

I share the Secretary's interest in the recommendations of the Commission. I have no way of knowing what those recommendations will be. But I have read with interest the materials submitted to and published by the Commission.

Among the volumes of material is one entitled "Organization, Administration, and Budgetary Policy, a Study Prepared for the Public Land Law Review Commission, Volume II Appendixes, December 1969." Appendix D, dated September 1969, is entitled "Federal Land Management Program and Policy Evaluation." I hereby call the attention of Senators who are sincerely interested in this important part of the public heritage to the words of Prof. Robert Marty of Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich., who summed up the situation on the public range.

After calling attention to the deterioration of the land—31 percent in poor or bad condition, 14 percent declining—Mr. Marty observed that:

Most of the increased expenditure is needed simply to make it possible to maintain current grazing levels on badly overused range allotments.

It is unlikely that substantially larger appropriations for range management will soon become available. It is also unlikely that public land agencies will soon be able to reduce grazing pressures significantly. The result is likely to be an increasingly grave deterioration of the public ranges.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that material from pages 25 through 29 of the study I have referred to be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND POLICY EVALUATION (By Robert Marty)

Forage program memoranda.—Forage programs are carried forward both by Interior and Agriculture. Six bureaus are involved: the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service in a major way; and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the National Park Service to a much lesser extent.

Interior's forage program comprises a sub-category of the "Land, Forage and Timber" program category. The sub-category has only two elements: "management and utilization" and "development". This structure is the same for both the fiscal year 1968 and 1969 program memoranda.

A good deal of effort has been expended on this program sub-category. A program description is provided, and the small relative importance of Interior's forage production as a part of the national total is developed. Program clientele are enumerated and identified with regard to the size of their grazing operations. It is pointed out that these persons have legal access to public land grazing, so control of range utilization by the Department is limited. Long-term objectives

for this program are stated as follows in the fiscal year 1969 program memorandum:

"(1) Protect the lands from abuse and deterioration and thus preserve wildlife habitat, retard watershed deterioration, and protect future production potential.

"(2) Provide livestock forage from BLM administered lands to help sustain the existing dependent livestock operation, to the extent that benefits justify such utilization.

"(3) To the extent favorable cost benefit relationships for grazing equal or exceed alternative or competing uses of public land resources, increase forage production to help meet increasing livestock forage needs, and to contribute to local and regional economies."

These objectives are to be obtained by undertaking an accelerated program of range allotment examination and treatment. The alternative of reducing grazing is judged to be inappropriate because of the legal rights to grazing involved, and the hardship to users which would result from such a course. Issues recognized include the need for studies showing when range improvement warrants its cost, the equity of current grazing fees, the external effects of public range use, and the control of user-built range improvements. Also, it is recognized that this program cannot be separated from the watershed program for these same acres. Some economic evaluation of alternate program levels was presented in the fiscal year 1968 program memorandum, but was dropped from the 1969 document.

In Agriculture the forage program is treated as a program element of the Department's sub-category dealing with crop and livestock production. As in Interior, the program is further sub-divided between management and improvement activities. The forage program in Agriculture is viewed as a minor component of a large effort, primarily research and extension, directed toward maintaining an adequate capacity for various sorts of agricultural production. As such it gets relatively little attention in the Department's program memoranda.

Forage programs represent a very difficult technical and political problem for both departments. Subsidized use of public range has been a well established fact of life in the West for many decades. Much public range is in high country and is well suited to supply summer grazing for nearby valley ranches. A system has evolved of assigning range use rights to dependent ranch properties on a long-term and continuing basis. Use charges have been only about one-third of the value of the grazing at most. The net value of these grazing rights has added substantially to the value of the allotment holder's ranch property. Allotment holders and their political representatives traditionally have been adamantly opposed to any increase in grazing fees or reduction in grazing rights.

The result has been a continuous overgrazing of much of the public range, causing a cumulative deterioration in the resource both with regard to its range and watershed capabilities. The Bureau of Land Management, the principal public land manager, classified only 16 percent of its rangelands as in good or excellent condition; some 31 percent as in poor or bad condition. And 14 percent of its range even now is declining in condition. Interior's program proposal for fiscal year 1969 called for an increase in expenditures from 9.2 million dollars in fiscal 1966 to 24.4 million dollars in fiscal 1973. This program would raise the animal unit months of grazing available from 15.1 million in 1966 to 15.8 million in 1973. Most of the increased expenditure is needed simply to make it possible to maintain current grazing levels on badly overused range allotments, by uneconomically heavy investments in range reseeding, fertilization, fencing, and other treatments and improvements.

It is unlikely that substantially larger appropriations for range management will soon become available. It is also unlikely that public land agencies will soon be able to reduce grazing pressures significantly. The result is likely to be an increasingly grave deterioration of the public ranges. There is something in the PPB system which does not allow this kind of a dilemma from being put forward forcefully.

JUSTICE DOUGLAS' BOOK "POINTS OF REBELLION"

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has been catapulted into the spotlight recently for various reasons. Many of my constituents write to me about the Court urging various actions by me. These inquiries bring into focus the different functions and responsibilities of the various branches of the Government in relation to the Supreme Court.

Simply and generally, the President nominates persons to fill vacancies upon the Supreme Court. The Senate "advises and consents" to the nomination. It may, by majority vote, for any reason reject—as with Judge Hainsworth—or confirm the nominee of the President. A nominee may withdraw from consideration—as did Justice Fortas.

The responsibility of the House of Representatives in relation to the personnel of the Court is only to impeach a sitting Justice. Impeachment means only to bring charges—which is comparable to filing a complaint. The Senate thereafter sits as the judge of the specific impeachment proceedings. The House charges; the Senate tries.

The Constitution provides:

The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other Officers; and shall have the sole Power of Impeachment. 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.

Most of the importunings of me to exercise my prerogatives or duties of impeachment are directed toward Mr. Justice William O. Douglas. The fact that the present Senate would probably almost unanimously reject his nomination, if his nomination were being considered presently, is not a basis for his impeachment now. Different criteria would be applied. The pragmatic, real situations would differ from the theoretical, legalistic principles.

His controversial opinions must be separated from chargeable judicial misconduct.

The questions of his conflicts of interest, his extrajudicial conduct, and his untoward associations and business dealings are tenuous evidential matters. The allegations require proof to become fact.

The Justice's conduct off the Court, his statements off and on the Court have greatly disappointed me and contribute to my assertion that the Senate would not confirm his nomination now if that were the issue.

His previous conduct, even cumulative, would probably be not sufficient to sustain impeachment charges by the Senate as presently constituted. Any impeachment proceedings now would be futile, exceedingly decisive, depreciative of the whole Court, wasteful of the time and energy of the Congress which is direly needed in other areas.

This does not mean that Justice Douglas should be immune to impeachment or removal from the Court for proper cause.

Justice Douglas' recent book, "Points of Rebellion," comes close to adding a last straw to a growing bill of particulars which every Member of the House should read as he contemplates his constitutional duties relating to the Supreme Court, and his constitutional functions within the tripartite system of our Federal Government.

I disapprove of anyone promoting rebellion. This line encourages violence. Change and reform are quite necessary, but it can and must be carried out without violent rebellion or the overthrow of government by force or intimidation.

I particularly deplore a Justice promoting rebellion from the sanctuary of the highest court of the land. A man of integrity and confidence would resign from the Court before becoming an advocate of a position which is certain to become an issue before his Court.

I also deplore a man using the prestige of the Supreme Court to promote a political position. Without his position on the Court, Mr. Douglas would have a negligible following and little attention from the media or the book publishing industry.

I am convinced that Mr. Justice Douglas is purposely extending his line of "rebellion against our system of government" as far as possible while still safeguarding his position on the Supreme Court. Impeachment now would martyr a person and a political philosophy not worth martyring.

FACTS NEEDED ON INVOLVEMENT IN LAOS

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "People Need the Facts on Laos Involvement," published in the Nashville Tennessean of February 17, 1970.

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

PEOPLE NEED THE FACTS ON LAOS INVOLVEMENT

Renewed fighting between Communist and loyalist forces in Laos revives the question of

how deeply the United States is involved in the defense of the Laotian government.

As the fighting swirls around the disputed Plain of Jars it is reported from Saigon that U.S. fighter-bombers are flying combat support for the government forces in Laos. Sources say the planes are flying the combat missions from a half-dozen bases in Thailand. They also said some planes may be flying from Da Nang in northern South Vietnam and Seventh Fleet carriers in the Gulf of Tonkin.

These reports have not been verified by official U.S. sources, but if they are true the fighter-bomber support seems to represent a new level of American activity in Laos. From fighter-bomber support in combat, it is only a small step to active participation by U.S. ground forces.

It seems to be an impossible task for the people to get any reliable information out of the Nixon administration about what this nation's commitment to Laos consists of how many fighting men are stationed in Laos, and what their role is to be if the fighting in Laos is intensified.

President Nixon and other U.S. leaders have conceded only that U.S. air raids are being carried out on the Ho Chi Minh trail in eastern Laos—the main North Vietnamese infiltration route to South Vietnam. The purpose of these raids purportedly is to protect the U.S. position in South Vietnam rather than to take part in the war in Laos.

However, the evidence is becoming more convincing all the time that the U.S. is doing more in Laos than the people are being told about. It is unlikely that the persistent reports about the presence of American soldiers in Laos and the use of fighter-bombers to support government troops are being generated out of thin air.

Congress has been concerned for some time that the U.S. might be drawn into a situation in Laos like the debacle the nation is involved in in South Vietnam. That is why the Senate voted in December to bar American combat ground troops from Laos and Thailand and placed a \$2.6 billion limit on military aid to the two countries. The restrictions were attached to a \$69.3 billion defense appropriations bill.

At the time the White House was announced as being in favor of the restrictions. But now the Pentagon is pushing a move in Congress to have the restrictions removed. As the fighting in Laos intensifies, it seems to be getting harder and harder for the U.S. military to restrain itself.

The people need to be told more about what the nation's involvement in Laos really is and what the administration's plans are for the future. Latest reports from that front indicate that Congress is correct in expressing concern that another Vietnam may be developing in Laos.

LINCOLN NATIONAL BANK IN PHILADELPHIA DROPS PRIME INTEREST RATE

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I was gratified to hear on the news last night that Norman Denny, president of the Lincoln National Bank in Philadelphia had elected to drop the prime interest rate from $8\frac{1}{2}$ to 8 percent effective March 1.

In this day of spiraling prices, constant increases in the cost of living, and

growing deficits in the balance of payments, we are faced with the highest interest rate in history.

I have written Mr. Denny to commend him for taking this action, and I would encourage other Members of Congress to do the same. It is my strong hope that other bankers—large and small—throughout the country will follow this fine example.

"KEEP AMERICA CLEAN AS HOME" IS STREATOR CHILD'S MESSAGE IN PRIZE-WINNING LETTER

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that a little girl in my congressional district has won a national contest—and, at the same time, sounded a challenge to America to clean up our country as her mother cleans up her home.

The little girl is Tina Marie Saxton, 8 years old, who lives with her mother, Mrs. Linda Saxton at 1824 South Barr Street in Streator, Ill., where she is a second grader at Wilson Elementary School.

Along with thousands of other schoolchildren all over the country, Tina entered a contest sponsored by member companies of the Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, who produce more than 90 percent of the bottles, jars, and other glass containers in America.

In Streator the contest was sponsored by two of the glass container industry's leading firms, who have large plants there: Owens-Illinois Inc., and Thatcher Glass Manufacturing Co., a division of Dart Industries.

The contest had the purpose of helping to stimulate an awareness of litter among youngsters from first grade through high school, and letters poured in by the tens of thousands to television comedian Henry Gibson, who agreed to judge the contest. Some were long, some short, I am told, but all expressed the thought that America would be a much nicer place in which to live if people would only take a more personal interest in stopping littering.

Tina Marie Saxton's letter said it better than children many years older; it was chosen the winner. In simple, childlike language she went right to the heart of the cleanup program America so desperately needs. She wrote Henry Gibson:

When I think of litter in America I think of a dirty house. I think everybody should clean up America just like my mother cleans house. We don't throw litter on our floors at home, so we shouldn't throw it on the ground as that is America's floor.

As the contest winner, Tina and her mother enjoyed a long trip across country to southern California, where she received her award and achieved the dream of so many children—she toured Disneyland.

THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT AS A SCHOOL

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I believe that when a Member of Congress finds himself obliged to be a critic, it is only fair at the same time to praise positive efforts on the part of those he so often urges to do better.

Postmaster General Blount and Kenneth Housman, Assistant Postmaster General for Personnel, have come up with an idea I think deserves praise and may I add, a program that deserves to be expanded into many cities including my own city of Philadelphia.

The Post Office Department will establish a pilot program this summer which is based on the store front academy idea which the Urban League originated, in six of our largest cities, Detroit, Newark, Atlanta, Chicago, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C.

The Department will establish these academies which have as their purpose the remedial training of youngsters in their own neighborhoods and the granting of high school equivalency certificates at the end of training. The youngsters who participate in the program will work part time in the Post Office Department to support themselves. These young men will actually be trained in two store front establishments in each of the six cities, with additional training in formal schooling in transitional academies.

The key to success in the program will be the participation of postal employees. It was they who made a success of last summer's "drop out" employment program. Postal employees volunteered to work as partners with youngsters who were dropouts and at the end of the summer 93 percent returned to school.

Postal employees are closer to the American public than any representative of the Federal Government. Letter carriers are in the ghetto every day, talking with postal patrons, and stopping in at every neighborhood business in the ghetto to deliver the mail. Under this program, they will seek out neighborhood youngsters who have dropped out of school and urge them to participate in the program. When a youngster enrolls he will have the individual attention he never received in the huge city schools. The youngster will have a job to go to when he is finished. He can join the postal service, go back to school, or enter industry.

I think that sometimes we forget what a great asset to the United States the Post Office Department is. It is, after all, the one institution that has multiple facilities in our poorest neighborhoods. It can train and employ thousands of our people who would have no hope of employment otherwise because so much of industry and government is located far from the ghetto. In this program, postal installations will also be available for additional training. In the next 10 years, under present conditions, the Depart-

ment will not only need all of its 700,000 employees, it will need 300,000 additional employees to move the mail. The Department will need young people as much as many of our young people need gainful employment.

The 30 postal employees who will be employed in the two street academies and transition school in each of the six pilot cities will be of great help to the 2,826 youngsters who will receive training each year. The cost for each student will be about \$2,400. Regular postal employees who will also participate in the program will only cost the Federal Government \$380 for each student. I think this is a small investment, when we consider the great good that can be accomplished.

I would add only one point of criticism. I think the program should be much bigger. But small as it is, I think that industry and other Government agencies should take note of this program. It will be a success and when it is, it will be a challenge to every company and Government agency in this country.

W. W. (BILL) SELLERS

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district recently lost one of its most distinguished citizens in the death of W. W. Sellers. He was a man recognized as a leader in the textile business in our area and one who had given unstintingly of his support to many worthwhile educational and charitable activities. The following is a tribute from the Burlington, N.C., Daily Times-News:

W. W. (BILL) SELLERS

The deep involvement which W. W. (Bill) Sellers held in this area's business and industry was not widely known. He was active primarily through Sellers Hosiery Mills, Inc., but his many other offices and directorships showed the vast responsibilities he held and the confidence and respect which was placed in him.

He seldom talked business, however. In his conversations, he showed that his thoughts were directed more to such interests as Elon College, Community YMCA, his First Christian United Church of Christ, and to family and friends.

He also was one who remembered well the development of this area as he had observed it. He knew many people, and he could cite personal details about their place, as well as the close impressions he gained and held through the years.

With this personal interest, he also could show his sense of humor, for he enjoyed a good and real story that had a lighter touch to it. The less serious side of life was a part of each day, though he reflected the serious side, also, as he gave himself to duty, to helping others, and in meeting what he felt was responsibility beyond what was expected. The deeds he performed in the interest of others were known by a few people, though not many, for that was his preference.

He was a part of a pioneer family in this area, and he was loyal to it and to the heritage which had come to him. When the family had a reunion at his home last year, there probably was no one who felt a deeper pride

and who received more joy through it than he did.

Mr. Sellers was, in basic terms, a kind gentleman, one who was wise in business, warm in his association with associates and friends, and conscious of doing his part for the area which was his home and which had given him his opportunity.

His illness, as it became known, saddened those who felt this closeness to him and those who held this respect and admiration for him. His death, in turn, rekindles the recognition of what he meant to his city and county as an individual and leader. Though modest in his own way for his many deeds to be known generally, his life was strong and effective. It is this tribute which remains.

DOES HANOI HAVE A HEART?

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the dilemma of what to do for our POW's and MIA's in Communist control still confronts us in ever increasing agony.

An editorial from U.S. News & World Report, February 23, 1970, by David Lawrence presents another facet of the problem.

Other countries, international agencies such as the United Nations and the World Council of Churches, and international churches, have mostly remained conspicuously and incomprehensively silent regarding the most inhumane treatment ever accorded a human being and his family by any power.

Only the Catholic Church and the Red Cross have demonstrated any humanitarian concern.

Each of us should encourage our churches, and international organizations to use their good offices to end this uncivilized torment and agony being suffered by our POW's and MIA's and their families.

Appeals to many groups, who often proclaim to be humanitarian in other respects have fallen on unconcerned hearts.

The Communist technique of imprisonment of aliens utilizes separation of the prisoners in many far-flung places of detention—which often results in mentally cruel and physically brutal treatment. This permits the central authority of the Communists to deny and avoid any responsibility for the care, treatment or safety of the prisoners. It also denies to the allies any opportunity to rescue the prisoners.

No nation, no military organization, no power has ever treated prisoners of war, or common criminals, more despicably.

Never has the humanitarian community of the world ever responded less enthusiastically for the welfare of other mistreated human beings.

I am chagrined that the humanitarian community of the free world has remained silent on this humanitarian issue. I am surprised that the Communist nations, and peoples, have not raised their voices against the outrageous treatment of POW's and MIA's in North Vietnam.

I insert the editorial of Mr. Lawrence:

DOES HANOI HAVE A HEART?

(By David Lawrence)

What has happened to the 1,354 American servicemen missing in action in Vietnam over the past five years? Information has been received from one source or another that 422 are being held in North Vietnam, but nothing whatsoever has been disclosed about the fate of the other 932.

Undoubtedly many of these men are scheduled in the prisons of North Vietnam. They are deprived of all contact with the outside world. They are not permitted to receive mail or packages. Their families are not allowed to know whether any are alive, and, if so, how they are faring.

This is a kind of torture that not only outrages all sense of humanitarianism but is banned by international agreements. The Hanoi Government itself gave formal adherence to the 1949 Geneva Convention on the humane treatment of prisoners, but now scorns these obligations. The pact specifically provides:

"Immediately upon capture, or not more than one week after arrival at a camp, even if it is a transit camp, likewise in case of sickness or transfer to hospital or to another camp, every prisoner of war shall be enabled to write direct to his family. . . . The said cards shall be forwarded as rapidly as possible and may not be delayed in any manner."

"Prisoners of war shall be allowed to send and receive letters and cards. If the Detaining Power deems it necessary to limit the number of letters and cards sent by each prisoner of war, the said number shall not be less than two letters and four cards monthly. . . . Such letters and cards must be conveyed by the most rapid method at the disposal of the Detaining Power; they may not be delayed or retained for disciplinary reasons."

The agreement also calls for prompt identification of prisoners, adequate diet and medical care, communication with other prisoners, quick repatriation of the seriously sick and wounded, protection against abuse or reprisals, and inspection of camp conditions by a neutral intermediary, generally the International Red Cross.

Besides North Vietnam, 125 countries are parties to the Convention, including the United States, the Soviet Union, France, Great Britain, Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Rumania and Hungary.

For the first time in modern history, the Red Cross has been denied all contact with prisoners of war. Similarly, the United States Government has unsuccessfully sought in every way through diplomatic channels for news about the missing men. Wives of the men have tried appeals to representatives of Hanoi in Paris and through other sources to learn whether their husbands are alive. The efforts have been in vain.

All this has cast a shadow over the "peace" negotiations at Paris. A question is raised, now whether any regime in Hanoi can be relied on to adhere to future agreements it may sign.

Why does the Hanoi Government withhold information concerning the prisoners? Why will it not furnish at least a list of those who are still alive? What possible military purpose is served in keeping this information secret? There is no logic whatsoever in the position taken by the North Vietnamese Government, and surely it can win no friends by such a course.

What are the other nations of the world doing about it? What are the allies of North Vietnam—particularly Red China and the Soviet Union—saying to Hanoi? The people of the world have a right to know why military assistance continues to be given to a government that treats human beings with incredible cruelty.

Isn't it about time, too, that the countries of the free world spoke out? Isn't there a humanitarian instinct somewhere in the United Nations that can be expressed in a cause like this?

Surely the world hasn't been broken apart to the extent that an international organization such as the United Nations can stand aside and pay no attention to what is happening in North Vietnam with respect to the treatment of the captives and their families!

There can be no greater agony for the wives and parents of the prisoners than to be kept wondering whether a husband or son is being tormented and what suffering he might be undergoing.

What is even more incomprehensible is the silence on the subject by the free world. Acts of inhumanity in the past have usually been denounced unequivocally. Little has been said, however, about the American prisoners held by North Vietnam.

No international organization can afford to allow to go unchallenged such brutishness as the continued failure of North Vietnam to disclose the identity of prisoners and to permit them to communicate with their families. This example of inhumanity should no longer be ignored by the United Nations collectively or by the governments of the world individually. North Vietnam must realize that belligerents are expected to give decent treatment to prisoners.

Most of the North Vietnamese leaders have a background of Buddhism—a faith that certainly calls for humaneness.

ON TAXES, THE BLIND LEAD THOSE WHO CAN SEE

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, over the past weekend the newspaper carried stories about a new program conducted by the Internal Revenue Service for the training and hiring of blind persons as telephone taxpayer-service representatives. The program for training is being conducted with the aid of a grant from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I believe this is money well spent for a constructive program of benefit to all our citizens. I am impressed not only by the imaginative nature of the program, but also by its 100-percent record of success, and I want to call the newspaper story from last Saturday's Washington Star to the attention of my colleagues. The article follows:

ABACUSES AT IRS: ON TAXES, THE BLIND LEAD THOSE WHO SEE

Sometimes the blind can guide those who see, and it's happening during these days of worry over income taxes.

The Internal Revenue Service has 31 blind persons in major offices across the country answering telephones and fielding taxpayers' questions. They are among the some 1,300 taxpayer-service representatives who give advice free.

Although the taxpayer with a problem has no way of knowing whether the voice of the expert on the telephone is that of a blind person, it's possible he could hear the click of an abacus.

The Oriental calculating instrument with counters on rods or in grooves is used by most of the blind tax experts for arithmetic problems. They wear telephone headsets to keep their hands free.

The IRS started its program of training the blind to help taxpayers four years ago and hopes to have 75 or 100 at the telephone posts in the next few years.

"We've not had a single failure in this program," Nicholas Williams, IRS coordinator for the employment of the handicapped, said in an interview.

"We don't pamper them. These people stand or fall and so far they have all been successful."

Larry Greco, publications analyst for IRS, said the blind are not coddled and "they want it that way; they want to accomplish something on their own."

Greco is involved because the tax instruction booklets and pamphlet aids are published in braille for the blind.

The braille publications for the blind taxpayer can be requested from the Library of Congress—free, just as the sighted taxpayer gets them in the mail with the form.

The IRS experts who are blind get additional help in braille, including a pamphlet called "The 50 Most Asked Questions."

The blind workers are trained in four-month courses at the Arkansas Enterprises for the Blind at Little Rock through a grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America and the Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 400,000 students participated in the contest competing for five scholarships. The contest theme was "Freedom's Challenge."

Miss Rhonda Jo Matsler of Las Cruces, N. Mex., presented the winning speech from the State of New Mexico. She will be here in Washington, D.C., at the Veterans of Foreign Wars annual congressional dinner on March 10. Miss Matsler is an outstanding young lady of accomplishment and ability. I commend her speech for the reading of my colleagues:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

These words separately mean nothing, it is the idea behind the words. This idea is the acceptance of responsibilities meeting the challenges put forth by a democratic nation. In accepting freedom's challenge I, a young American must make the transition from adolescent to a mature young adult. In doing so I will become a stable, well informed citizen.

There are many organizations, YWCA, Girl Scouts, FHA, these organizations are to guide and that is all that they can do. It is up to the individual to accept freedom's challenge, to meet their responsibilities. In meeting these challenges, I will become a good citizen of these United States.

A democratic nation can be compared to a family, a family containing many members. Each member must shoulder his share of the responsibility in order to help that family survive. As in a family, the citizens of our nation must accept their responsibilities and fulfill their obligations to our nation. These challenges must be met if our country is to go forward.

One of freedom's basic challenges is the preservation of freedom itself. Our forefathers brought freedom to the people of

this nation. The citizen must guard it by overcoming all obstacles and meeting the challenges put before it. This is a basic way in which everyone can meet freedom's challenge.

Young people have recently become more involved with the political aspects of our democratic system. This is as it should be. We are becoming aware of the need for all citizens to participate in affairs of government. In viewing this trend we find that our participation is making us more aware of the challenges involved. When we recognize these challenges we can then face up to them.

As a high school student I can accept freedom's challenge by finding and meeting my responsibilities. I will go to school and strive for the best. I can encourage others to accept freedom's challenge by facing their responsibilities. In doing this, I will become a working part of our democratic nation. Meeting freedom's challenge in every way I can.

We must accept our responsibilities. Become a working part of the nation in order to keep it strong. The young Americans must use their energy positively. They must meet freedom's challenge.

Freedom is like a door. Behind this door lies all the challenges of true freedom. Here in this great country we often call this door, the door of opportunity. When we open this door we find opportunity. When we open this door we find all the opportunities available in a free country. However, in order to take advantage of these opportunities, we must also accept the responsibilities inherent with all freedoms. It is up to us to open the door. Every young American must open this door and shake hands with freedom's challenge.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, at the moment America seems to stand at a crossroad which has three branches. One branch leads to anarchy, chaos, and destruction; another leads to tyranny and order without freedom; the middle one leads to freedom in the American way of responsibility.

Over the past several years we seem to have been rushing headlong toward the two extremes. For a moment in time, the leadership of President Nixon has motivated us to take a good, hard look at which way we desire to go.

The signs are contradictory and difficult to read. Nonetheless, I am optimistic.

An 18-year-old girl from my district, the great State of Wyoming, is one of the reasons for my optimism.

Miss Kristin Ann Vivion, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Vern Vivion of Rawlins, is the 1970 Wyoming winner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars "Voice of Democracy" contest.

Miss Vivion typifies the best of American youth and the spirit, expressed in her essay for the Department of Wyoming's Veterans of Foreign Wars "Voice of Democracy" contest, brightens my hopes for America.

Miss Vivion is not willing to "cop out" on freedom; rather, she is eager to accept freedom's challenge. I believe she speaks for a majority of the young people of Wyoming and America.

Mr. Speaker, I include the award-winning essay of Miss Kristin Ann Vivion in the RECORD at this point:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Kristin Ann Vivion)

"The rocket's red glare, bombs bursting in air, gave proof through the night that our flag was still there" . . . This was freedom's challenge nearly two hundred years ago, and since that night, countless Americans have fought, labored, sacrificed and died so this flag may wave on. Even today they die, for the American adventure is not over, and the challenge of America is not dead.

Freedom's challenge rings out today when my contemporaries defile our flag—now grown to 50 stars—at the very minute our soldiers defend it in Viet Nam. Freedom's challenge screams from the ghettos here at home. It beckons from the Peace Corps and Vista. But the challenge is never more heart-rending than when a black hand reaches out to say "Accept me" . . . Freedom isn't free. It wasn't that night 200 years ago and it isn't today. Freedom is purchased with dedication and sacrifice. And it means responsibility and taking a stand. Perhaps this is what this challenge is really all about.

So if today we would answer freedom's challenge in the same spirit our forefathers did, we cannot stay uninvolved and comfortable while the vocal minority tears our country apart. We must have the courage to follow where our hearts would lead us and be unashamed of some old-fashioned patriotism. It's time we stood up and defended the Constitution and the Bill of Rights as the greatest documents ever conceived by man. And it's time to remind people again of the American success story—that this is the only country on earth where every man can reach for a star!

Freedom's challenge has never been more demanding than to my generation because we stand in danger of losing our heritage. The concepts that built this nation are attacked on every side every day. Confusion abounds. Communal living, the new morality, an anti-establishment attitude, are all around. To be unpatriotic is popular; to say God is dead finds favor. To deny all standards seems to be the "in" thing.

Yet, somehow, the faction preaching these doctrines doesn't frighten me. I have faith in my fellowman and in America. For the great silent majority of us are not ashamed if "America The Beautiful" brings a tear to our eye. We fill with pride at our flag on parade, or a friend just home from Viet Nam. And there are countless numbers of us standing in the wings, working and preparing ourselves for tomorrow's citizenship privileges. We want to serve this great country; we want to build, not tear down. We want to help make our weak stronger, our poor more comfortable. And, yes, we want to help give opportunity to the oppressed and education to the uneducated.

This is the American dream; this is freedom's challenge. I saw an eternal flame at Arlington that reminds me. And I hear immortal words echoing from half-way around the world and down through the years to inspire me and my generation: "To you from failing hands we throw the torch, Be yours to hold it high" . . .

JUDGE THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1970

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Judge Thaddeus M. Machrowicz

this Nation has experienced the loss of a distinguished jurist, public figure, and patriot. Personally, I have lost a dear and valued friend.

Prior to his appointment to the Federal bench by President Kennedy, in 1961, Judge Machrowicz had served as an outstanding Member of this body for over a decade following his election to the Congress in 1950. During his service in the House he served with distinction, first as a member of the Judiciary Committee, then the Public Works Committee, and finally on the prestigious Committee on Ways and Means. In all of his committee assignments he was a serious and diligent participant in those committees' deliberations. During his service on the Public Works Committee he played a role second to none in the successful enactment of the long stymied St. Lawrence Seaway legislation.

Prior to coming to the Congress Thaddeus Machrowicz had already compiled a record of notable public service. An immigrant born in Poland, he left the University of Chicago at the age of 17 when World War I erupted to serve as lieutenant with a volunteer division of the Polish army organized in Canada. After World War I he helped to repel the 1919-20 Communist invasion of Poland. Following his military service he was a member of the American Technical Advisory Commission, a group organized to put Poland back on its financial feet. Upon his return to the United States he resumed his education and received a law degree from the Detroit College of Law in 1924. From 1934 to 1936, he was Hamtramck city attorney and in 1938 joined the legal staff of the Michigan Public Service Commission. In 1942, he became a Hamtramck justice of the peace, a position he held until his election to the Congress.

Thaddeus M. Machrowicz held for his adopted country a patriotic fervor of great intensity. He was a firm and unyielding opponent of communism and all other insidious ideologies. His patriotism was matched with deep personal religious convictions. I join my colleagues in paying tribute to his memory and mourn his passing. He will be deeply missed. Mrs. McCormack and I extend our heartfelt condolences to Mrs. Machrowicz and her loved ones.

**NEW MEXICO CITIZENS EXPRESS
VIEWS ABOUT U.S. VIETNAM INVOLVEMENT**

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the results of a questionnaire concerning our country's involvement in the Vietnam conflict which was recently sent by my office to the citizens of the 14 counties in the First Congressional District of New Mexico.

The questionnaire read as follows:

Realizing everyone wants an end to the war, I am asking for your considered judgment on the best way to accomplish this. Your exact feeling may not be reflected by any of the choices listed, but please mark the one that comes closest to your idea of what course of action the United States should now follow in Vietnam:

1. Pursue any and all conventional means necessary to attain a military victory.

2. Increase military and diplomatic pressure, including resumed bombing and blockading of harbors, until North Vietnam agrees to a ceasefire and bilateral withdrawal of troops.

3. Continue the war at the present level, with no further withdrawals, and at the same time pursue settlement by current diplomatic means.

4. Train South Vietnamese troops to replace American troops as fast as possible, consistent with the safety of our soldiers and the South Vietnamese people.

5. Withdraw all American troops on a set timetable of two years or less, turning over complete responsibility for the conduct of the war to South Vietnam, and continue to provide training and war material.

6. Withdraw immediately all of our armed forces.

Some 23,810 returns have been received. The results follow:

Responses	Questions					
	No. 1	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4	No. 5	No. 6
Total First District:						
Him.....	12.9	15.8	1.3	31.5	20.3	18.3
Her.....	9.1	14.6	1.0	33.3	23.1	18.9
Bernalillo County:						
Him.....	13.3	15.9	1.4	32.3	19.7	17.4
Her.....	9.1	14.2	(1)	36.0	23.4	16.6
Colfax County:						
Him.....	(1)	13.6	(1)	18.2	40.9	27.3
Her.....	2.1	14.3	(1)	15.0	39.7	25.2
Guadalupe County:						
Him.....	28.6	14.3	(1)	22.4	21.5	13.2
Her.....	12.8	13.2	(1)	25.9	24.8	23.1
Harding County:						
Him.....	21.4	25.7	(1)	24.8	22.9	4.2
Her.....	20.7	17.6	(1)	20.3	33.4	7.8
Los Alamos County:						
Him.....	18.6	15.6	(1)	24.1	22.2	17.3
Her.....	16.6	10.4	(1)	33.3	20.1	19.2
Mora County:						
Him.....	14.3	35.7	(1)	24.4	12.3	13.2
Her.....	13.2	26.3	(1)	40.3	11.5	8.6
Quay County:						
Him.....	13.6	27.7	(1)	31.8	14.3	12.6
Her.....	13.2	26.3	(1)	40.3	11.5	8.6
Rio Arriba County:						
Him.....	18.2	11.3	2.2	26.5	15.9	22.7
Her.....	17.3	9.7	5.4	28.2	16.3	23.1
Sandoval County:						
Him.....	2.8	17.1	(1)	43.7	10.6	25.7
Her.....	3.3	16.6	(1)	43.3	13.3	23.3
San Miguel County:						
Him.....	5.6	17.2	2.8	30.2	27.8	16.3
Her.....	3.2	16.1	3.2	32.3	32.3	16.1
Santa Fe County:						
Him.....	9.4	13.8	1.1	33.3	18.3	23.8
Her.....	7.1	15.2	3.0	30.3	16.2	28.3
Taos County:						
Him.....	3.9	20.2	(1)	27.6	27.1	21.2
Her.....	3.2	23.8	(1)	20.9	29.0	23.0
Torrance County:						
Him.....	23.1	7.6	4.3	41.8	12.3	10.8
Her.....	18.9	5.6	3.2	44.4	11.2	16.6
Union County:						
Him.....	7.5	36.8	(1)	29.3	21.0	10.5
Her.....	5.8	23.5	(1)	35.3	23.5	11.8

¹ Less than 1 percent.

I believe that it is significant that over 70 percent of those answering indicated favor for various degrees of withdrawal, of which about one-half support, basically, the President's policy; while less than 30 percent favor increasing military activity, and only about 1 percent favor continuing involvement at the present level.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE MARKS 52D ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 52d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia.

It is also a reminder that 30 years have elapsed since Estonian freedom and self determination were crushed by the Soviet takeover of that nation during World War II. The incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union by force of arms has never been recognized by the United States.

The fate of the Baltic States should be warning to the United States to remain strong and vigilant. However, today many people in our Nation are preoccupied with the idea that we should unilaterally reduce or dismantle our defense establishment and somehow rely on good will to protect us from our adversaries.

Unfortunately, these critics are evidently individuals who have failed to heed the lessons of history or are too young to recall the brutal tactics employed by the Soviets to subdue the Baltic peoples. Common Soviet methods included such things as murder, mass deportations of individuals into slave labor, the expropriation of property, and the suppression of basic human rights and freedom.

During the decade of the 1960's it appeared that the Soviet Union was beginning to moderate its position and was attempting to be more civil and rational in its approach to the West. However, the construction of the Berlin Wall, the continued denial of elemental freedoms in the captive nations, and the Soviet misadventure in Czechoslovakia have provided a more sobering view of the real interests of Soviet policy.

Several weeks ago I heard a rather insignificant radio news item, which demonstrated a great deal about the authoritarian nature of the Communist system. The news item concerned several Czechoslovakian airport workers who lost their jobs simply because they gave flowers to Alexander Dubcek, former President of the Federal Assembly of Czechoslovakia, on his departure into virtual exile as the new Czech Ambassador to Turkey.

Evidently, this simple gesture was considered too much of a political affront to the current regime to go unpunished.

The 52d anniversary of Estonian independence should be an occasion for each of us to reflect on our own good fortune as American citizens.

While the American experience in democratic government teaches us that it is not without many faults, an examination of world history will also reveal that no other nation has ever been more responsive to its citizens than ours.

As Winston Churchill said:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The inherent vice of capitalism is the unequal sharing of blessings; the inherent virtue of socialism is the equal sharing of miseries.

It is my hope that the decade of the 1970's will usher in a new era of negotiation with the Soviet Union which will hopefully succeed in establishing a freer and more open world community.

THE URGENT NEEDS OF AMERICA

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, there is something seriously wrong with the order of our national priorities. I am convinced they must be changed and placed in the right order, so that urgent domestic needs are no longer ignored because of a tragic, unpopular and costly war—a war that has claimed the lives of over 40,000 of our best young men, costing the Nation over \$100 billion.

I firmly believe that most of the American people want to see the waste of war end, so that the Nation can concentrate its main efforts on constructive programs to help our people enjoy the fruits of peace, instead of suffering the agonies of war. This does not mean that we should ignore our treaty obligations and military needs. America must always remain militarily strong, for weakness would only invite disaster.

Mr. Speaker, so much more needs to be done before the promise of America becomes a reality and the conscience of America can rest. Hope and rhetoric are no longer enough. Only the victory of man should be acceptable, victory over his ancient, but implacable enemies—war, disease, ignorance, hunger, and fear. They cannot be conquered overnight, but we can start to execute victory over them now.

And, if we are unwilling or unable to convert this great promise to reality, we will deserve the indignation of this generation as well as the condemnation of history.

Thomas Wolfe reminded us of the promise of America:

So, then, to every man his chance—
To every man, regardless of his birth,
His shining, golden opportunity—
To every man the right to live,
To work, to be himself,
And to become
Whatever thing his manhood and his vision
Can combine to make him—
This, seeker,
Is the promise of America.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this promise can be fulfilled if we have the will and the courage.

Some of the problems that demand vigorous action and solution include:

Education—the heart of any great nation—is the most critical problem we face today. Over 23 percent of our high school students are dropouts—a condi-

February 26, 1970

tion that often leads to economic suffering and even crime. About 50 percent of those who enter college fail to graduate, and our adult population contains over 3 million illiterates. I believe that Federal aid to education should be expanded until every American has the chance to reach the limit of their ability to learn.

Health. Ecologists warn that our environment is in actual danger of ultimate destruction, because of the growing pollution of our air, our water, and even our land. Several programs have been enacted in the fight against pollution, including two bills I cosponsored: the Air Quality Act of 1967, and creation of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. Notable progress has been made, but pollution control must be intensified until the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the land we use, are free of contamination.

Medical research should be increased until all of the chief killers of man are conquered—heart disease, cancer, stroke, mental illness, and others. Life must be prolonged not only in years, but enriched as well. It is shocking that America—the wealthiest nation in the world—ranks 26th in the United Nations longevity table. We should be first.

The cities. The once-great cities of America are slowly dying. No longer prosperous and secure, they are now only a shadow of what they were. One million persons a year are leaving the cities of America and have moved to the suburbs. In many cases, city housing is both inadequate and dilapidated, education is substandard, employment opportunities are limited, and crime is rampant.

Yet, when citizens reach the suburbs, they also face serious problems there—property taxes so high, they are virtually confiscatory, and even suburban dwellers feel the heavy impact of crime. The FBI's uniform crime reports for the first 9 months of 1969 disclosed that suburban crime increased at a higher rate over the previous 9 months than the rate suffered by cities.

Mr. Speaker, our cities can recapture their past greatness. Only the Federal Government can rescue the cities from their critical condition. With two-thirds of our people living in cities and most of our wealth concentrated there, the rejuvenation of urban areas is imperative, for it would not only strengthen the economy, but would help unify our people.

Equal opportunity. Encouraging progress has been made in equal opportunity, but not enough. Every American should be judged by one fair standard: their ability, performance, and character. America cannot be respected abroad if it fails to practice true freedom at home. It is easy to advocate equal rights, but the real test of sincerity is whether it is practiced. What we do, not what we say, is the real and only test.

Transportation. Travel by automobile, once a pleasure and comfort, is now almost a nightmare, often involving congestion, injury, and death. Incredibly, 475,000 Americans were killed in traffic

accidents in the 1960's and 1,700,000 Americans were lost in auto accidents since 1900—a toll higher than all the fatalities in wars fought by our people.

Those who travel by rail are also in serious trouble. Passenger trains have been discontinued by the thousands in the postwar years and what was once a loud roar of activity, is now merely a whisper. Service has been reduced enormously, but fares continue to rise. If this policy of discontinuation keeps up, passenger trains will disappear and millions of persons who now depend on them will be forced to travel on highways already close to saturation and chaos.

The millions of Americans who rely on mass transportation deserve the superb service they once enjoyed. Above all, the highways of the Nation should be improved, cars should be more carefully designed and manufactured, and safety programs must be expanded. America's traffic toll is a national disgrace.

A source of important help is a bill sponsored in the Senate by HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat of New Jersey, and supported by the Nixon administration. This measure would provide two-thirds of a community's cost for improving mass transit programs. If enacted, New Jersey, for instance, would receive substantial Federal grants.

The American people are looking to the Congress for leadership and help. I hope that we can provide that leadership and help, not only in transportation, but in all the other fields where problems exist.

Political reform: Mr. Speaker, since I entered the House of Representatives in 1963, I have often urged Congress to streamline and modernize its operations. I hope this will finally be done this year, because many Americans lack faith in congressional procedures.

But an urgent need also exists for political reform in the Nation, and it should be achieved soon, for never in our history has our youth been more interested and informed about civic and governmental affairs. And our young people are determined to keep on working and fighting for reform until it is accomplished.

I believe they should be allowed to vote at the age of 18 because they are qualified. There is nothing emotional about such a feeling. It is simply an incontrovertible fact that should be faced by both Government and voter.

A bill has also been introduced by me that would provide opportunities for American youth to serve in policymaking positions and to participate in National, State, and local programs of social and economic benefit to the country.

"The New Politics" has transformed our political life. Political democracy and independence have replaced political oligarchy. It is both right and wise to enlist now the participation and support of those who will help lead the Nation in the future. This would not only be good for political parties, but for the Nation as well, for whatever progress we have made as a people has resulted from freedom.

Mr. Speaker, like the late and inspira-

tional Senator Robert F. Kennedy, I believe that "the future does not belong to those who are content with today, apathetic toward common problems. Rather, it will belong to those who can blend passion, reason, and courage, in a personal commitment to the ideals and great enterprises of American society."

That was the dream of Robert F. Kennedy, yet, it is the dream and faith of every American who yearns for a country that is just and compassionate, as well as wealthy and strong.

Mr. Speaker, I pledge myself to this commitment, and if we achieve it, our people and our Nation will become truly great.

THE POSTAL UNIONS STAND FIRM AGAINST THE POSTAL CZAR

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat disturbed when I read recently that because of the desperate need for a salary increase, postal unions were considering supporting a postal czar in return for a promised pay raise. I understand the need for a pay raise for Government employees. Postal employees in the city of New York for instance, earn \$2,000 a year less than a garbageman. I understand this need for a decent wage better than I do the statement of the Director of the Bureau of Budget; that Government employees should give up their justified pay increase on July 1 for a 6-month period in order to set an example for the Nation.

On February 20 I received a statement, dated February 19, and signed by Mr. Patrick Nilan, legislative director of the United Federation of Postal Clerks and subscribed to by all seven AFL-CIO unions to the effect that they were standing firm against a postal czar concept.

This takes a lot of courage. There have been rumors of the President's willingness to support a pay increase of something like \$4 a week for postal employees, in return for their support of a postal corporation under another name. The unions of course know that this would not be a compromise at all. With the increase in inflation it would not even keep them standing still. In any case, a good portion of the \$4 increase would be eaten up in an increased retirement contribution.

I think we have to get to work and pass H.R. 13000 which will provide a decent increase for all Federal employees. We also need labor relations by law in the Federal service and we need it now.

It is a shame that the Federal Government will not pay a living wage. If the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Mayo, gets his way, Federal employees will finance a balanced budget out of their pay checks. The example set by the President and his administration is a suggestion to industry in coming wage negotiations with unions in the

private sector to refuse to negotiate in a meaningful way.

I think if private industry asks its employees to offer up 6 months of a pay increase to hold up profit margins, we will have a wave of nationwide strikes. A strike is a disaster to the company involved and the individual workers who are employed by the struck company. It is nob by some magic concerted to a non-disaster when the losses from strikes are totaled up on a nationwide basis.

I think it is time for the Congress to pass a workable postal reform bill and a pay raise for all Federal workers. I do not think we should stand by and see postal workers blackmailed because of the need for decent wages into supporting bad legislation.

Mr. Patrick Nilan, the legislative director of the United Federation of Postal Clerks, is well known to every Member of Congress. He is a strong and courageous leader and I am more than happy at this time to insert his statement of February 19 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

FEBRUARY 19, 1970.

We are writing to you as a Member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to make certain there is no misunderstanding concerning the legislative position of the United Federation of Postal Clerks, in particular and also the other 6 exclusive postal employee organizations on postal reform—postal corporation—any combination of reform with postal pay and collective bargaining.

Contrary to what you may read in the newspapers or may hear from White House officials and Postmaster General Winton M. Blount, UFPC and the other 6 postal organizations have not "bought" any postal corporation concept and have not agreed to accept any postal employee pay—collective bargaining "package" short of the employees' benefits' position statements enclosed in the file accompanying this letter. The 7 exclusive postal organizations are urging your Committee to draft a postal reform bill which will include the postal employee benefits and guarantees referred to in this file.

I am today sending similar letters with our proposed postal employee benefits "package" statement to all Members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for their information and hopefully, to avoid any possible misunderstanding concerning our collective and unified position on these matters. The statement contained in the enclosed file is our "must" legislative program concerned with any postal reform which your Committee may report. You will note this legislative statement is dated January 26, 1970—our position is the same today, as it was on January 26.

Also, our 7 exclusive postal organizations as recently as one week ago on February 12 reaffirmed our absolute and total opposition to any reform legislation, such as the postal corporation proposed in H.R. 11750. While I am addressing this letter and enclosures to you, particularly, on behalf of the United Federation of Postal Clerks, the enclosed postal employees' benefits "package" is the legislative position of all 7 exclusive postal employee organizations representing 700,000 postal workers in collective bargaining with the Post Office Department.

It is our hope that you will have an opportunity to carefully review Exhibit C, which is our proposed "Chapter 8—Labor Management and Personnel Relations." Basically, the provisions in Chapter 8 have been taken from established labor laws, in-

cluding the following Acts: Norris-La-Guardia, National Labor Relations, Taft-Hartley, and Landrum-Griffin. In addition, there are provisions from Executive Order 11491 signed by President Richard M. Nixon on October 29, 1969. Most of Chapter 8 would finally provide recognition of postal labor organization, collective bargaining, and labor-management relations for postal employees similar to that established more than 30 years ago for management and labor in the private sector.

We are also enclosing for your information two editorials published in the February, 1970 issue of our *UFPC Union Postal Clerk and Postal Transport Journal*.

These editorials entitled, "Unfair Labor Practice" and "Who's Discriminating" effectively contradict and destroy the felonious arguments of the unaffiliated National Postal Union and National Alliance of Federal and Postal Employees, who are opposed to the exclusive recognition and bargaining rights which our 7 Exclusive postal employee organizations originally won under the Kennedy Executive Order 10988 and presently provided for in the Nixon Executive Order 11491. We propose to have these rights become a matter of law through enactment of either the enclosed "Chapter 8 of EXHIBIT C, Chapter 47 of Title VII of H.R. 4", or "H.R. 4803 and S. 309."

We will appreciate your support of the enclosed position statements concerned with postal employee benefits and guarantees under any postal reform legislation approved by your Committee and equally important, opposition to the postal corporation concept proposed in H.R. 11750.

Your continuing interest in the legislative program of the United Federation of Postal Clerks and the other 6 exclusive postal organizations referred to in this letter, and named below, is appreciated very much.

President Francis S. Filbey, United Federation of Postal Clerks (AFL-CIO).

President James H. Rademacher, National Association of Letter Carriers (AFL-CIO).

President Monroe Crable, National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees (AFL-CIO).

President Michael J. Cullen, National Association of Special Delivery Messengers (AFL-CIO).

President Chester W. Parrish, National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees (AFL-CIO).

President Lonnie L. Johnson, National Association of Post Office Mail Handlers, Watchmen, Messengers & Group Leaders (AFL-CIO).

President Herbert F. Alfrey, National Rural Letter Carriers' Association.

Sincerely,

PATRICK J. NILAN,
Legislative Director.

PROPOSED PRISONER EXCHANGE

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with his usual reckless disregard for truth, the North Vietnamese spokesman at the Paris peace talks has charged the Nixon administration with "fascist repression" in the handling of the Chicago conspiracy trial. He also demanded the full release of the five convicted defendants and their attorneys.

Prior to this particular announcement, the Communists have implied that the seven defendants in the Chicago trial

were being treated as political prisoners of war because they oppose U.S. involvement in Vietnam. As usual, the Communists could not have been further from the truth. The indictments brought against the accused militants fairly reflected the complaints the Federal Government had concerning their disruptive and riotous behavior at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago last summer.

The Paris declaration, however, raises an intriguing possibility that is well worth pursuing. I think our negotiators in Paris should explore with the North Vietnamese, the possibility of exchanging the Chicago seven and their attorneys for a specified number of our American prisoners of war who are being inhumanely held captive by the Reds.

Despite the fact that the Chicago seven and their attorneys have been convicted of breaking the laws of the land, I think the exchange would be well worth it. I do not think the price to be too high for this great Nation to pay, if by paying the price the release and freedom of some of our imprisoned servicemen can be assured. Besides, since the Chicago radicals parade their hatred and contempt for the American system of government, perhaps everyone would be better off if the whole rat pack left this country and went to North Vietnam.

NEW LEGISLATION FOR DAY-CARE CENTERS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, in a dramatic appeal to New York City delegation Members in the House yesterday, a group of 50 representatives of the New York day-care coalition agencies pleaded their case for special planning grants which they said were necessary in order to set up day-care centers in New York City.

Frustrated by Federal and State laws requiring certain minimum standards for grant applications, the group came to Washington to see what could be done to help their cause.

Essentially the problem is this: Local groups wishing to set up day-care centers in their neighborhoods are thwarted from obtaining Federal-State funds allocated for this purpose because they are unable to muster the initial money to get the professional advice necessary to apply for the grant.

In New York City's case, when the coalition applied to the social services department, they were told to look for a site, get a board of directors, and incorporate. They simply had no funds to do these things. Establishing guidelines for operation and a program plan are two other prerequisites that local non-profit organizations are unable to meet without professional help and advice.

Less stout-hearted groups would have stopped right there, but the New York City day-care coalition decided that if they could obtain a special planning grant they could meet the grant applica-

tion requirements. However, they were politely told by the Director that no grants were available for planning purposes.

These energetic people then applied to local antipoverty agencies for planning grant funds and technical assistance. The same answer was repeated:

We have no guidelines to help you establish day care centers, we can offer you no technical advice, and no funds are available for planning grants.

It did not seem to matter that the stated goals of the coalition were the creation of day-care centers in all the poverty areas of the city so that low-income mothers with preschool children who wanted to work could become wage earners and thus be freed from the welfare rolls. This is precisely one of the prime goals of antipoverty agencies.

What then are some solutions to this problem on the Federal level? The first answer is, of course, money—funds that get to the local community most in need of these services.

We have seen that in the case of New York City, local organizations do not have the expertise available to them to set out the initial plans for day-care centers. Planning grants are therefore a viable way to overcome this first hurdle.

I have included this concept in the bill I would like to outline for you today, Mr. Speaker. It deals with day-care centers, and the needs of senior citizens. It does this by approaching the primary need of the initial facility itself.

In terms of Federal participation, there is virtually none today for construction, and not nearly enough for renovation of day-care centers. Only two Federal programs which are administered by the Small Business Administration relate to day-care construction—and these are restricted to loans and the insuring of loans made to profitmaking institutions.

EXPANDING THE NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES GRANTS ACT

Primarily, my bill expands the scope of the Neighborhood Facilities Grant Act to include grants for single purpose as well as the multipurpose neighborhood centers. Day-care centers and senior centers are specified within this bill as eligible single purpose centers.

In addition, my bill expands the concept of this section of the act to include applications for renovation and expansion of existing facilities as well as for new construction. This is especially important in inner city areas where available sites are either nonexistent or too expensive for development.

Often these areas have suitable existing structures which could be renovated or expanded to meet the city codes and Federal agencies requirements for public day-care centers.

This bill also tries to stay within the bounds of the original concept of the Neighborhood Facilities Grants Act by encouraging the development of large multipurpose facilities. This is done by allotting a greater share of Federal participation to the establishment of such centers.

However, one important feature is also added which I feel has been neglected

in the past. Any multipurpose neighborhood facility which is established must consider the day-care and senior citizen need of the community. When the need is apparent, separate space must be set aside in the large multipurpose center to accommodate both day-care and senior center services.

PLANNING GRANTS

Lastly, and most important, is the provision I have included in this measure to give communities planning-grant assistance when they need it. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to make planning grants to local nonprofit organizations for the purposes of hiring a staff and formulating guidelines for establishing day-care centers.

Altogether, \$150 million has been allotted over a 3-year period for both grant programs, starting in fiscal year 1971.

DAY-CARE NEEDS EXPLORED

Mr. Speaker, today the entire Nation accommodates only 531,000 children in licensed day-care centers. This is a small figure when compared to the approximate 10.5 million workingwomen who have school-age children.

About 4 million women who are working have preschool children under 6. But what about all the mothers with preschool-age children who would like to work if day-care centers were available to them at little or no cost? Accurate statistics on these mothers are not available in low-income areas, where they are needed most.

Let us turn to the figures we do have—those on children, the neglected segment of our society. One has only to look at present statistics to see how little attention America has paid to the needs of its children.

It has been estimated that there are approximately 5.5 million children who are in need of preschool programs, a need which day-care centers could fill. Of these 5.5 million children, between 2 and 3 million are suffering from severe malnutrition.

Let me bring this problem down to manageable proportions. New York City has only 115 publicly funded day-care centers. Of well over 100,000 children in the city who need day care, only 8,500 children participate in the program.

Experts have long proclaimed that day-care centers could serve a very valuable function in the community, aside from simply providing a babysitting service for working mothers. In poverty areas, day-care centers could help compensate children for the cultural and educational deprivation they may experience as a result of living in poverty.

BENEFITS OF DAY-CARE CENTER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Day-care centers of the future with promising and innovative educational programs could help overcome the initial hostility created in a child of poverty when he enters into a first-grade situation not ready for its demands. Many educational experts feel that inadequate preparation during the crucial preschool years is a major reason for the academic failure of many deprived children, and their subsequent early dropout from school in later years.

The failure pattern once experienced, usually results in a hostility toward the school environment and a feeling of inadequacy in performing successfully within it. This same pattern can be carried over to work situations.

Day-care centers with sound preschool educational programs could provide children from poverty backgrounds with the preparation they need during the crucial preschool years to successfully meet the demands of grade schools.

WHAT THE CONGRESS MUST DO

Mr. Speaker, the need and value of day-care centers is clearly evident. Moreover, the members of the New York City day-care coalition have brought to the doorstep of Congress problems that must be overcome so that money now available for day care can be utilized to the fullest.

The President has announced his intention to provide better programs and more money for day care. I invite you, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues in the House to join me in sponsoring this measure I have introduced today so that we can lighten the welfare load and stimulate the development of day-care centers that are really an asset to the community.

IN SUPPORT OF NATIONAL BOY SCOUT WEEK

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the week of February 7-13 was National Boy Scout Week. Sixty years ago, on February 8, the Scouting movement in America was formally organized in Washington, D.C. Today the Boy Scouts of America boasts of more than 6 million members.

It is fitting and proper that this outstanding youth organization be given due recognition. Many of today's local, State, and national leaders are former Boy Scouts; but, more important, tomorrow's leadership is being developed in Boy Scout troops all across our land today. The efforts of this association to inspire young boys to noble purposes is among the highest of objectives. The modeling of young minds to provide our country with a future responsible citizenry is a noteworthy public service.

As Americans living in turbulent times, we all realize the importance—indeed, the necessity—of well-qualified and properly motivated leaders. The young people of today will be heir to our problems and to our achievements. They will be called upon to shape the destiny of our Nation. The job will be a tough one, but I am confident that with proper training and development such as that provided by the Scout organization our youth will persevere and keep America American.

In the February 12 Franklin News-Post of Rocky Mount, Va., there appeared letters written by eight Cub Scouts as part of an achievement program. The subject was "Why I Love America." It is always gratifying and encouraging to learn of young people in our Nation who are proud to proclaim

that they are Americans. In order that the contents of these inspiring letters may be shared with my colleagues, I insert them in the RECORD:

WHY I LOVE AMERICA

(By Tim Arrington)

America—the U.S.A. is the country where I live and am proud to say so. Many brave men have fought and died for the freedom which we now enjoy and we should all work trying to keep these freedoms. This is a country where we can work, play, worship, sing, speak, pray, go and come when we please. There are countries in which these things do not exist. I just love my country—The United States of America.

(By Barry B. Brugh)

I love America because we have a home to go to. And a school to go to and work. I love America because we are free to go anywhere we want to go. And we have food to eat. I love America because we have the freedom to say what we think.

(By Walter Hartman)

I like America because it is a free country and the people in America are free to do what they want to do. And you have a lot of good friends in America to. And you have your own homes to live. And because there are no kings to tell you what to do.

(By Jeff Hodges)

I like America because we have our freedom and America is beautiful. America has beautiful mountains and trees. And there are pretty homes in America, we have roads to travel on and good fields to work, and to live on. We have good stores to buy food, clothing and other things.

(By Greg Dillon)

I love America because we have freedom to establish justice. We have flowers and trees.

We have men fighting in Vietnam to protect us.

I think our country is the greatest in the world because we can worship God.

Three American men have already walked on the moon.

(By Clayton Leach)

I like America because we are able to work for any place we want to. We were the first on the moon. We have Thanksgiving and go to Church where we want to. We can write letters and say what we want to. I like my home here. That is why I like America.

(By Vernon McClure, Jr.)

I love America because we have freedom. We can have guns and we can hunt and fish. Our country was founded by Christians and we have freedom to speak of what we want. We have freedom of property. We can worship as we please. And we can have the press.

(By Thommie Hodges)

I like America because it is beautiful. It has good schools and good churches. Farmers can farm and raise vegetables and fruits. Also raise cows and pigs and chickens so you can have good things to eat.

America also has good people and places to work. And America also has Cub Scouts and Boy Scouts for our boys.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the problems facing the environment are receiving widespread attention from Congress, the mass media, and the public.

The fact that the public, including students, are mobilizing against the increasing pollution of our environment is a healthy indication that concern for this issue is growing. The public are the victims of inaction, and their involvement is the most important ingredient in any plan for action.

The university, because of its unique position in society, can play a constructive role in helping Government to devise programs and policies to reverse environmental deterioration.

At the University of California at Riverside, a political scientist is making a study of air pollution and its impact on the public in California. The study will also attempt to analyze the effects of California's air pollution control measures on its citizens. Perhaps the most encouraging aspect of this study is the utilization of graduate students in observing the operations of various air pollution control districts. In addition, "The Politics of the Environment" is being proposed as a new course of study at the Riverside campus.

Mr. Speaker, I commend such creative initiatives by our universities in this field. I feel the Federal Government should encourage and assist our educational institutions in developing programs, curriculums and activities concerning the problems of environmental quality and ecological balance. The educational sector must begin teaching Americans about the complex elements that make up the balance of our ecology. Likewise, the universities can provide the means for studying environmental problems using the resources of its natural and social sciences disciplines.

Particularly, because of the positive contributions that universities will hopefully make in the fight to halt the desecration of our environment, I insert in the RECORD one outstanding example of what our academic communities are doing in this field:

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

RIVERSIDE, CALIF.—"Aerial garbage" will be the academic research concern of a young political scientist for the next three years at the University of California, Riverside.

But Dr. Ronald Loveridge, UCR assistant professor of political science, will take a different—maybe unique—look at what is one of the major issues of the day. He will look at air pollution from the viewpoints of the common citizen.

"Very, very little work has been done by political scientists in the area of the environment, and in the area of air pollution specifically," he said. "Any information in this area is close to impossible to find."

Dr. Loveridge will be primarily concerned with three aspects of the public's involvement in air pollution. These are:

The attitudes of the California public of air pollution and its effects psychologically, socially, politically and economically on society; and the public's willingness to support different kinds of solutions.

An examination of administrative effects of the California air pollution control districts (APCD); the effectiveness of one district compared to another, particularly in the two major districts, the Los Angeles APCD and the Bay Area APCD.

Lastly, a general study of air pollution politics in California in the 1960's.

The findings of the first study will serve Dr. Loveridge as a general information base telling him what the public actually thinks about smog.

In the second project he will be assisted by a number of graduate students in political science. These students will spend four to six weeks at the various air pollution control districts studying the operations first hand. This will not only aid Loveridge in his research, but it will also give the students an opportunity to apply classroom theories in practical situations.

For the third study—that of the politics of air pollution—Dr. Loveridge will spend considerable time in Sacramento interviewing lobbyists, politicians and other government officials.

As a result of this work, the 31-year-old professor hopes to teach a course titled "The Politics of the Environment." A course proposal is now being studied by the department of Political Science and will shortly be submitted to the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate for approval.

Loveridge has already completed some preliminary research in the area of pollution and has been invited to address professional meetings of pollution experts. Most recently his invitations have included addressing the annual Laymen's Air Pollution Conference held at UCR last fall and the first National Symposium on Habitability, to be held in March in Los Angeles.

In addition, Loveridge has been instrumental in assisting with the development of the Project 70 proposal which calls for a mobilizing of scientific efforts on the nine campuses of the University of California in an attempt to halt air pollution. The proposal is currently being considered by the University's Board of Regents.

Loveridge was educated at the University of the Pacific (bachelor's degree) and Stanford University (master's and doctoral degrees).

MASSACHUSETTS VA HOSPITALS FACE SERIOUS CRISIS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the survey of the Veterans' Administration hospital system which is being conducted by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is continuing to reveal that serious problems do exist at most VA hospitals because they are underfunded and understaffed. In December 1969 the Veterans' Affairs Committee had received information from the five Massachusetts VA hospital directors and the outpatient clinic director that their facilities were underfunded by over \$1.7 million. In January 1970, the Veterans' Administration Central Office released about \$402,000 in additional funds which means that Massachusetts hospitals were underfunded by about \$1.3 million for fiscal year 1970. Funds for dental care, mostly for Vietnam veterans, are short by at least \$65,000 even with a recent supplementary allowance of \$17,500; the community nursing home care program was shorted by about \$275,000; and all the Massachusetts hospitals are short funds to hire additional personnel to properly operate their hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, the present average national ratio of about 1.5 staff for each patient in VA general medical hospitals is wholly inadequate. It should be at least two staff for each patient and psychiatric hospitals should have at least a 1-for-1 ratio. The national average

for private sector general hospitals is 2.72 employees for each patient and some university hospitals operated in connection with medical schools are even higher.

Mr. Speaker, the investigation being conducted by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee revealed that under the hospital staffing formula which I advocate, Massachusetts VA hospitals are approximately 400 positions short of needed staff. These extra positions would cost about \$3.6 million annually. A few of these positions would be difficult to fill at current VA salary scales, but most are recruitable. Massachusetts VA hospital directors also reported that community nursing care programs at their hospitals were underfunded in fiscal year 1970 by approximately \$389,000. Projected workloads indicate that more funds are needed, approximately \$81,000 for fee basis dental care, due to increased workloads created by returning Vietnam veterans.

In mid-February, 1970, Massachusetts VA hospital and clinic directors reported they had received some supplemental funding support for fiscal year 1970. Approximately \$115,000 was allocated to reduce the reported \$389,000 deficiency in the community nursing home care program. The Boston outpatient clinic was allotted \$17,500 to apply against the estimated backlog of \$81,000 in fee dental authorizations. The remainder, approximately \$370,000 was provided to reduce fund deficiencies in personnel salary costs and other operating expenses.

The 936 bed Bedford psychiatric hospital reported the largest deficiency among Massachusetts hospitals—\$589,000. Funds totaling more than \$470,000 are needed to provide over 60 positions to better staff the hospital. The remainder is required to alleviate shortages in drugs and medicines, hospital linens, medical and dental supplies, maintenance and repairs supplies and services and other recurring operating expenses.

Hospital Director John J. Whalen said that in order to stay within his operating funds, "We will by necessity hold nursing and housekeeping staff at minimal levels; postpone expansion of direct care services." Whalen reported that some specialized medical programs for the care of veterans at the Bedford hospital were inadequate in scope or could not be implemented because of personnel and fund limitations for fiscal year 1970. These included the alcohol treatment unit, seven personnel needed at an annual cost of \$94,000; day-care center, five personnel at an annual cost of \$70,000, and an intensive care unit, 10 personnel at an annual cost of \$120,000.

With regard to the community nursing home program, Director Whalen reported that "Funds allocated the hospital were insufficient to support the program at the level of the prior year." He advised that an average of 40 patients were maintained in community nursing homes during fiscal year 1969, but funding for fiscal year 1970 would provide for an average of only 25. Whalen said the program was underfunded by \$51,768. The hospital later received a supplemental allocation of funds in January 1970, in the amount of \$16,738 which has been applied to the deficiency reported for the community nursing home-care program.

Dr. Francis B. Carroll, director of Boston's 800-bed hospital, reported fiscal year 1970 funding deficiencies of over \$440,000. Approximately \$192,000 is needed to better staff the hospital with about 21 additional positions. The hospital director told the congressional committee that:

One of the most pressing problems which has given us great concern has been the inadequate staffing of our nursing service. With the opening of the coronary care and medical intensive care units there has been an increased demand placed upon the nursing service. This means that our desperately ill patients are not being provided with the amount of nursing care they need. Additionally there are insufficient nursing assistants to transport and remain with very ill patients who are waiting diagnostic or therapeutic procedures in various clinics.

Dr. Carroll added:

There is inadequate nursing support for the checking of each medication card against the doctor's orders, and there are times when we only have one nurse to oversee two acute medical wards.

Dr. Carroll also indicated that because of noncompetitive salary rates the hospital would be losing two radiologists, including the chief radiologist, on July 1, 1970, and thus far they have been unable to recruit replacements for these two positions. Dr. Carroll told the committee that the hospital's social work service, "is hampered by a limited number of social workers whose time is taken up in handling crisis situations rather than in assuming an important role in translating the needs of the veteran to the family and the implications of his disease to the patient himself." The hospital director reported a shortage of over \$145,000 for fiscal year 1970 to place veterans in community nursing homes at VA expense who no longer need expensive hospital care.

Dr. Carroll advised the committee that it had been necessary for him to divert over \$153,000 from his maintenance and repair funds and new equipment acquisitions in order to keep from reducing personnel below the already substandard levels.

The Boston VA hospital received supplemental funds in January totaling \$190,388. Carroll said the additional funds for community nursing home placements in the amount of \$20,388, together with an additional \$25,000 of recurring funds diverted from other operations, "will provide some relief, but we will be short approximately \$100,000 for accomplishment of potential outplacements for the remainder of the fiscal year." The remainder of the supplemental allotment would be applied toward personnel salary shortages and approximately \$53,500 would be restored for equipment procurement and maintenance and repair.

Dr. Carroll told the Veterans' Affairs Committee:

In summary, the \$190,388 has reduced our deficiency in essential requirements, but we will continue to operate this hospital with a less than desirable staffing ratio; a backlog of equipment and maintenance and repair; and, less than full implementation of several new programs.

Dr. James L. Benepe, Jr., director of the 1,000-bed Northampton psychiatric

hospital, reported a 1970 funding deficiency of over \$285,000. He stated \$215,000 was needed for approximately 20 positions to better staff the hospital. Dr. Benepe also stated that the patient load at Northampton has been reduced by over 300 and that it appeared that his staffing ratio has improved because Veterans' Administration central office has continued to fund this hospital at the prior year level even though the load had been reduced. The hospital director expressed some concern that the 1971 funding for his hospital would be sharply reduced because of decreased workloads, and if this situation materialized the hospital may lose some staffing support to operate its blind clinic and its alcohol rehabilitation clinic. These two specialized programs are much needed but are inadequate in scope due to lack of personnel ceiling and funds.

Dr. Benepe also pointed out to the Veterans' Affairs Committee that there was a need to replace, "the fire protection system including the 28-year-old fire truck." He added that the fire alarm system does not meet local, State, and Federal regulations. Dr. Benepe also stated that the sometimes snow covered fire escapes are, "insufficient and antiquated."

The Northampton hospital director also indicated that he was highly disturbed that the Veterans' Administration is failing to recruit new and competent psychiatrists primarily because the salary level is not competitive. He said that because of, "wage inequities currently I believe we are locked into a future of second-class care." The Northampton hospital director added:

Compared to other hospital systems in the Country it may now still be the best, but compared to what is possible it's a sorry second.

Dr. Benepe later advised the committee that supplemental funds in the amount of \$42,811 had been received in January 1970, to cover the cost of community nursing home care of 16 service-connected veterans. The hospital had previously reported to VA's central office that this program was underfunded by approximately \$145,800.

Dr. W. Winick, director of Brockton's 988-bed psychiatric hospital reported a funding deficiency of \$156,000 in fiscal year 1970 to cover approximately 30 positions. The hospital was \$46,000 short in fiscal year 1970 funds which would be used to place veterans in community nursing homes at VA expense who no longer need expensive hospital care. Dr. Winick also reported that over \$90,000 had been diverted from the hospital's maintenance and repair and new and replacement equipment funds in order to support salaries for the hospital staff. Part of these funds were needed to provide additional space for rehabilitation programs, to install handrails in corridors of the geriatric patient wards, replace laundry-chute doors with fireproof doors, and to replace radiological apparatus.

Dr. Winick later advised the committee, in January 1970, that supplemental funds in the amount of \$9,960 had been received to apply toward the previously reported shortage of \$46,000 for the community nursing home care program.

The director of the West Roxbury VA hospital, C. F. Heard, Jr., reported that he was short of funds for 1970 by about \$260,000. About \$98,000 was needed to better staff the hospital which the director claimed is about 23 positions short. The hospital director stated that in February 1969, it became imperative to integrate the medical and surgical intensive care units, "because of inadequate staff to safely operate them independently." He also reported shortages of nursing personnel for the operating room and that staffing for the spinal cord injury units was barely minimal to provide around-the-clock service. Staff morale on these particular units is reported to be, "low because of consistently impossible heavy workloads." The hospital director also stated that additional corrective therapists were needed to meet increased demands for quadriplegia treatment and the development of new programs in post-operative prosthetics, cardiac diagnosis and treatment and research activities. The hospital director also indicated that an additional educational therapist was needed to provide adequate educational evaluation, guidance and training for an increasing number of young Vietnam veterans requiring this phase of care.

In order to make up for some of the staffing deficiencies, approximately \$72,000 is being diverted from the hospital's maintenance and repair and replacement equipment funds in order to support hospital staffing at its present ongoing rate. Over \$10,000 was diverted from the operating room equipment budget and the balance of some \$24,000 was needed for equipment such as tilt and turn beds in the spinal cord injury service, a blood flow system and blood gas meter in the meter service and X-ray equipment. The director also stated that he was over \$11,000 short for drugs and medicines, \$14,000 short in medical supplies, \$18,000 short to have consultant and attending physicians to come to the hospital for special hospital cases.

Director Heard subsequently advised the congressional committee that he had received additional funds in the amount of \$200,000 in January 1970. He said the receipt of the additional funds, "Will enable us to be funded for the major portion of our salary deficit." He reported the balance needed would come from funds diverted from equipment plus the director's contingency reserve.

Dr. Thomas J. Quigley, director of the VA Outpatient Clinic, located at 17 Court Street in Boston, reported funding deficiencies of about \$29,000 for personnel salaries. Part of this funding deficiency will be made up by deferring the purchase of clinic equipment and in maintenance and repair funds. Clinic funding shortages of \$3,000 were pinpointed in the Eye, Ear, Nose and Throat Clinic, \$4,000 for physical medicine and rehabilitation purposes, \$3,500 in the X-ray service, and the balance in day-care center and medical administrative services.

Projected increased workloads for dental care, primarily for returning Vietnam veterans, revealed a shortage of approximately \$81,000. A later report to the committee indicated that the Boston Outpatient Clinic received \$17,500 to ap-

ply against this backlog; \$25,000 was also allotted for the balance of fiscal year 1970 to maintain employment levels.

Mr. Speaker, I am most concerned about these serious deficiencies in the Massachusetts VA hospitals. The Veterans' Affairs Committee will soon hold hearings in an effort to determine what steps must be taken to keep the VA medical program from falling further behind and to insure that America's veterans receive prompt and proper medical care.

TRANSPORTATION AND OUR ENVIRONMENT, AND THE INTERACTION BETWEEN THEM

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we have just begun what will be a long discussion of the needs of our environment versus the needs of people to move freely in it. Too often we tend to see transportation needs as inconsistent with ecological needs. I, for one, feel that both can coexist freely in a society that uses all its resources properly.

I was recently privileged to speak to the Mississippi Valley Association, which has now changed its name to Water Resources Associated. The new title properly reflects its members' concern for our environmental and transportation needs.

During their annual meeting earlier this month, Senator ROBERT DOLE of Kansas also addressed the group. His comments, which follow, clearly set forth some guidelines needed in balancing our demands for resource use with our demands for resource conservation.

In addition, Charles D. Baker, Assistant Secretary Designate for Policy and International Affairs of the Department of Transportation, also spoke to the group. In his remarks, he quite clearly sets forth his Department's views on the overall transportation picture.

Both of these speeches, I believe, contribute greatly to a much needed discussion of transportation and our environment, and the interaction between them. I strongly urge all my colleagues to give both articles a close perusal so that they may benefit from the enlightened remarks of both these gentlemen.

The speeches follow:

REMARKS BY SENATOR ROBERT DOLE

I am delighted to be here today to share some of my thoughts on the development of America's great water resources. Recognition of the importance of taking affirmative action to protect our environment has long been a concern of your organization. Since 1919, you have continuously fought for a coordination of our total water uses with soil improvement, fish and wildlife development and the needs of the American people. Because of your established interest and expertise, the Nation must look you for guidance, as it awakens to what President Nixon described as the "major concern of the American people in the decade of the seventies."

Water projects, their design and construction as well as the procedures by which they

are approved are an important part of this concern. Over the years an elaborate procedure for approval of these projects, which appears to have its own momentum, has evolved. Because of these procedures, it is difficult to identify the weak and unnecessary elements. It is safe to say, however, that Congress shares a great deal of the blame for most of the archaic authorities under which the civil works programs of the Corps of Engineers presently operates. Authorities enacted in the late 1800's and early 1900's may not be suitable for the 1970's.

Not only the authority, but the enormous body of rules, regulations, guidelines, and other materials have become extremely complex and at the very minimum extremely confusing to the public. This work places a burden on the Committee on Public Works as it carries out its role in the biennial approval of the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Act. Several of my colleagues and I on the Public Works Committee are considering the best means by which the committee can exercise its other constitutionally charged function to conduct oversight hearings on the general program of the Corps. It is hoped that we may begin this review during this session of Congress and that your organization will play a meaningful role in identifying inefficiencies and recommending alternatives to the existing program. Specific questions involve such things as the benefit/cost ratio, relocation of individuals or communities and, of course, the considerable amount of time between the authorization of a project and its construction. This last factor often adds to the complexity and difficulty of the previous two. As you are well aware, it is not unusual for a project once authorized to not be initiated—much less completed—for several years following the studies and data upon which the project was authorized. This, of course, adds to the burden that the public must shoulder.

One of my own observations regarding the present system for the development of water resource projects is that the public does not participate in as meaningful a way as projects of this substance and magnitude dictate. Too often the public's role in the present administrative process occurs so late in the procedure as to put them at a distinct disadvantage. By that time, the corps has developed a tremendous documentation in support of or in opposition to a particular project. We must incorporate into this system public participation at an earlier stage.

The thrust of President Nixon's state of the Union message and an earlier address concerning the environment was that we must develop an integrated and comprehensive approach to environmental problems. This message, of course, applies to water resource projects. We must consider such projects in the total context of the environment and utilization of the environment. We must consider the effects of water resource projects on adjacent land use, population distribution, concentration of industry, and a whole myriad of factors that contribute to either environmental degradation or environmental quality. It should be acknowledged at the outset, however, that the achievement of a comprehensive approach is extremely difficult and one which will take dedication and commitment from all levels of our society and, of course, all levels of government. We are now coming full cycle to realize that decision-making regarding the environment cannot be left solely to the Federal Government or even the Federal Government working with State governments. To achieve an environment of quality, we must have the participation and help of all citizens. Your role, therefore, is not one of waiting for decisions from government. I would hope Congress will exercise its responsibility to make such participation

legally possible and that your organization and your members, as citizens, will endeavor to participate in a meaningful way.

REMARKS BY CHARLES D. BAKER

A year and a half ago I had the pleasure of speaking here in St. Louis to the Annual Convention of the Propeller Club. I am indeed pleased to be here today and have the opportunity to make a few brief remarks on the Department of Transportation's view of the inland waterways and their tremendous significance to the nation.

Waterways have been a major key to the country's development from its earliest days. Without them, Pittsburgh might not exist. The mighty Mississippi is the lifeblood of this golden gateway—your beautiful St. Louis. Today, some 38 States, with almost 95% of the country's population, are served by commercial water transportation on rivers, canals, bays, and lakes. Over 80 of the nation's cities with a population over 100,000 are located on commercial navigation channels. Tie this in with the fact that 1700 companies are in commercial operation on the inland waterways, pushing more than 17,000 barges, and the picture takes on large proportions.

Now the Mississippi Valley Association, a major voice in this vital industry—or rather aggregation of vital industries—started off life some 50 years ago concerned with flood control and foreign trade. In the ensuing half-century, I note with interest that not only has the geographical significance spread to a point where it is nation-wide, but its areas of concern have likewise broadened. And so today, MVA, with offices in Louisiana and Nebraska, in Missouri and Washington, D.C., is concerned most broadly with water resources or perhaps more accurately with the broad scope of resources associated with our waterways. It is no accident that the 12 gentlemen on the board of MVA came from 12 different States, representing the heartland of the nation.

And as we go into the second half-century of MVA, what does the future hold? Before going into some of the particular issues and how we in the Department of Transportation view them and relate to them, some broad comments seem to me to be in order. First, I think we all recognize that the nation's priorities—its needs—are changing; are properly and necessarily being relooked at, re-examined, and being constantly redeveloped.

What in the past many have merely talked about have now become factors to be reckoned with. Consider the very world around us.

If we are to live to see the year 2000—and it is a mere 30 years away—we must face the challenge to our ability to maintain life and mobility as we enjoy it. As I see it, this means the preservation of a decent environment in the face of rapidly advancing technology, including that of transportation.

Most of you know of our decision to revise support for the giant jetport on the edge of the Florida Everglades. You probably read about the decision to relocate an Interstate highway in New Orleans to protect the historic French Quarter. In San Antonio, another highway decision was made which geared Federal and local efforts more significantly toward people and their environment.

We will all be doing more to assist curbing the pollution of air whether caused by air or surface vehicle, and to abate the spoilage of our inland and coastal waters. (In this connection, I am very pleased to note that your organization will be considering many of these issues in the course of this convention.)

However, I wish to note here that the priority we are placing on restoring and protecting the environment does not detract from or eliminate the need for developing

and expanding the capabilities of our transportation system! In his statement issued in connection with the Florida jetport agreement, President Nixon made this clear in stating:

"The agreement affirms the need to conserve our natural heritage; it does not deny the need for new airport facilities in Florida. The Federal Government will cooperate in finding ways to create such facilities without new threats to the environment."

Thus, in my view, we are all faced with a new and broadened challenge; to continue to develop and expand our national transportation system—for without this we simply cannot continue to prosper as a nation—but to also do it in such a way that our environment is protected, nay enhanced. And I submit that this challenge is one which our transportation industry has recognized for many years and one to which it will respond with increasing efforts in the future.

And let me here inject just a word on what our national transportation system must do. By almost any estimate we must be prepared to nearly double our capability as the nation goes into the Eighties. (Some analyses suggest an even larger increase) and to put this in financial perspective, the private sector of our national transportation complex will invest some 30 billion dollars in the next decade!

Another general observation seems in order, having to do with the subject of regulation. Our regulatory system was originally set up to achieve a desirable economic goal. This meant the user would be protected and balance would be achieved between the supplier and the user and among the several modes. But transportation has changed radically during this past century.

Regulations that were originally designed for one purpose, may now no longer serve it, or might even work against it. Section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act prescribes mixing rule provisos. Aside from the basic issue of mixing in a tow vs. mixing in a barge—and I personally favor relaxing the constraints—I think all would agree that a classification of commodities made up in 1939 is ready for up-dating.

Thus, I think the process of regulation will come under increasing scrutiny. I am not suggesting wholesale de-regulation which some discuss, but which few would support. I am suggesting that our transportation industry, including the vital shallow draft part of it, will be involved in some re-looks and up-dating of the regulatory process.

I have remarked on some of the challenges and opportunities our industry faces. Let me comment for a moment on how DOT fits into this. The Department opened for business on April Fool's Day—an auspicious beginning—1967, on the theory that the various Federal involvements in transportation would function better under one roof than several.

When the Department of Transportation was being created, no major interest opposed the legislation as such. Many groups did express some quite understandable, but nonetheless parochial concerns. It is no secret that some waterway interests were among that number. And Section 7 of the Department of Transportation Act, dealing with the development of investment criteria is with us today as proof of that concern and clout. Some two and one-half years have gone by now; waterways are still here, the Corps of Engineers is alive and well, no really major Section 7 issue has been fought out, and, for better or worse, life goes on.

Today, the Department of Transportation's roles and missions are many. As they affect those concerned with water, they include the numerous activities of the Coast Guard, the role of the Bureau of Public Roads in bridge

construction and in solving the problems of soil erosion, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, our role as a member of the Water Resources Council, improving the quality of the environment, and the problems of economic regulation. I have named but a few of our interests and before I proceed further, I want to say a word about our relationship to the outside world.

Times, I think, are changing and in my view for the better. One real change is the enlarging dialogue that has developed between the Department of Transportation and the many groups and interests affected by its actions. (Perhaps we have all followed the President's thought in his Inaugural Address and lowered our voices just a little). Hopefully, we are listening as well as hearing.

Where the Department was viewed with apprehension, we now have, I think, a close rapport with most, if not all, of those with whom we deal. Indeed, this fellowship is such that many would like to formalize it even further by joining with us on an organizational basis. Our trucking, shipper, and waterway friends would like to see the creation of new operating administrations to represent their interests. Our forwarder and pipeline friends have also made similar views known.

Whether we take this approach (which seems doubtful because in large measure we are not their administering programs) or whether we establish some (industrial) relations focal point in the Office of the Secretary, it is clear that all concerned have recognized the importance of transportation to our national life and want to work to improve it. For Secretary Volpe's part, the door is open. We want to hear from you on a frank and open basis, no holds barred. We are staffed to recognize your problems, place them in what we trust is the proper national context, and proceed from there. Undoubtedly, we will disagree at times but let us do so honestly and with a minimum of recriminations.

As to the waterways, I think we have made a good beginning. I think we have heard every possible waterway viewpoint on the pending Amendment to the Water Carrier Mixing Rule in Section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act. If within our lifetime we can resolve this long pending controversy, perhaps we can further get to the business of making the regulatory process flexible enough to respond more promptly to economic, technological, and social change. (Somehow, I find it hard to accept the fact that in 1970 we need to be bound by a custom of the bulk trade established in 1939). Since I think you agree with this proposition, I am sure we can proceed to other areas in need of organizational, program, and substantive reform.

In other important matters affecting waterways and water carriers, we have worked closely with industry. I would cite our horizontal and vertical bridge clearance activities, the development of our recreational Boat Safety Act, the new rule of the road for navigation, and our legislative efforts to license tugboat operators and to develop bridge-to-bridge communications. Your interest and concern—expressed by many waterway interests—in the relationship of the Coast Guard and the Department of Transportation is appreciated, and is an example of industry concern with a joint problem.

Before leaving the subject of DOT and its concerns and missions, I would like to comment specifically on the nation's oldest Armed Service, the Coast Guard, which the Department can proudly point to as one of its largest and most important components. This Service's responsibilities that relate to you are many. Port security and safety—pollution prevention and control—certification

of tank barges—navigation aids and regulations; these are just some of the things that Admiral Smith's splendid command pursues. And so, I cannot resist the observation that while your industry is critical to us and to anyone concerned with transportation, so also I think are we critical to you, not simply in legislation, regulation and the like, but also in the fundamental operations of the shallow draft industry.

I've discussed the industry and the government. We have looked at some of the emerging issues. And so what does this mean for the future and for all of us? The fact is that technology is continually changing, and not just on the river. The technology of your land transportation competition is changing also. Even the river is changing! The Corps of Engineers two years ago made this evident. They reported that, the Missouri, for example, is 100 miles shorter than it was in 1955. This means the current is swifter and the power needed to push barges upstream is greater. The Mississippi, too, has shortened itself more than 100 miles since 1942, and swifter currents have resulted. And as technology is changing so are the priorities and perspectives that I mentioned earlier. Concern with safety is properly increasing and our Coast Guard has its very significant Boat Safety Bill on the Hill now. We've already mentioned the mixing rule, but there is other legislation, some with wide support, some controversial, but nonetheless of consequence.

In the face of all this, I think several things are called for.

All of us must recognize the major issues of environment and safety.

We must concurrently accept the transportation challenge we face and gear up to build and invest.

I think we should all accept the proposition that regulation should not be principally an exercise to intrigue lawyers but should be a fairly straightforward movement toward desirable economic goals, and if revisions will better achieve those goals, let's explore them.

And finally I think we in Government need you in industry to work with us, to tell us what you think, to help avoid that worst of all possible worlds—an uninformed Washington.

We need new ideas in transportation, and in some instances change. Goals and thinking should not be limited to updating precedents of a bygone day. Rather, they should encompass all areas in transportation including environmental quality, pollution control, technology and safety, manpower and management, the need for new organizational apparatus, the status of transportation planning, investment and financing, and the special problems of international transportation. It is this type of development that I think the nation needs and which we—you and I—must deliver.

THE SENIORITY SYSTEM IN THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Study Group yesterday made available to its members a special report on the seniority system in the House of Representatives, a subject of some interest to many of us and a matter of increasing

public discussion. Public discussion of the seniority system is nothing new and as my friend and colleague from Texas noted 3 days ago such discussions usually provide more emotion and rhetoric than enlightenment. This DSG special report, however, does not fall in that category. It argues neither for nor against the seniority system. Instead, like other DSG research materials, it is a fair and balanced presentation of the facts regarding the history of the seniority rule, a thorough summary of arguments supporting and opposing the system, and presentation of some of the proposed changes which have been advanced from time to time. It is, I believe, a useful study and I recommend it to members and others interested in this issue:

THE SENIORITY SYSTEM IN THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES¹

The seniority system in the House of Representatives has again become a subject of public debate and concern, primarily as a result of its importance to and involvement with the issue of Congressional reform but also as a result of efforts to make it an issue in this year's election campaign. Because it is the subject of many myths and much misinformation on the part of both defenders and critics, DSG has prepared this special "fact sheet" report to provide a general overview and factual perspective of the seniority system. Specifically this DSG Special Report is designed to set forth the facts regarding development of the seniority system, summarize the arguments for and against the present system, and outline the various alternatives and modifications which have been suggested.

BACKGROUND

Contrary to widespread belief, the seniority system in the House of Representatives is a

¹ There are actually two seniority systems in the House, one dealing with committee assignments and selection of committee chairmen and the other pertaining to assignment of office space, patronage, parking, and other household items. This DSG Special Report deals only with the former.

relatively recent development which has no legal or constitutional basis. It is neither a law nor a rule of the House. It is a custom which has become rigid and absolute in recent years—primarily since World War II.

While the origins of the seniority system are usually attributed to the 1910 revolt against Speaker Cannon, seniority had for many years been one of the prime factors involved in appointments of committee chairmen. Prior to 1910, Speakers not only named the chairmen of each committee but committee members as well—both majority and minority. In making these appointments, Speakers generally followed seniority. For example, a recent study of seniority in the House indicates that from 1880 to 1910 Speakers appointed 750 chairmen, following the seniority in 429 instances and violating seniority 321 times.

Following the revolt of 1910, a Committee on Committees procedure, similar to that in effect today, was established to handle Democratic committee assignments and selection of committee chairmen. Over the next three decades, the rule of seniority gradually took hold. Nonetheless, it was still frequently ignored. The same study, for example, shows that of 900 appointments from 1910 to the end of World War II, seniority was followed 676 times and violated 224 times.

But unlike the decades prior to 1910, seniority violations after the revolt were more often compensated by naming the Member whose seniority had been violated to chair another committee or appointing him to some other position. Prior to 1910, 40% of seniority violations were uncompensated while only 12% were uncompensated in the period from 1910 to the end of World War II. Most of the post-1910 violations involved application of the norm that no Member should chair more than one committee, however, some also involved party policy decisions, especially in the period prior to 1919.

Since World War II, the rule of seniority has become virtually absolute, primarily because the Reorganization Act of 1946 reduced the number of committees from 48 to 19, thereby eliminating the array of minor committees used to compensate seniority violations. In fact, the only real seniority violation involving the appointment of committee chairmen in the past two decades was the removal of Adam Clayton Powell as Chairman

of the Education and Labor Committee in 1967.

As mentioned, many of the seniority violations following the 1910 revolt involved party policy decisions. An insight into how the system worked following the revolt has been provided by former Secretary of State Cordell Hull who as Congressman from Tennessee during that period served as a member of the Democratic Committee on Committees which then as now handled Democratic Committee assignments and designation of committee chairmen.

Writing in his memoirs, Hull gave the following description of the work of Committee on Committees in making committee assignments for the 62nd Congress:

"We were determined to strip each committee of every possible vestige of special privilege and so to mold such committees as those on Agriculture, Labor and the Judiciary that they would join in securing maximum recognition by legislative actions for classes of American citizens who had been long neglected or discriminated against by numerous policies of the government . . .

"If we had the least doubt about a prospective member's attitude we sent for him beforehand, cross-examined him and pledged him unequivocally to do teamwork. We turned down William Sulzer as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee because he was extravagant. Edward Pou of North Carolina was removed from the Ways and Means Committee and Claude Kitchin, from the same state, substituted for the reason Pou had once voted for a tariff on lumber (Pou recovered to become Chairman of Rules in 1917 and 1931-34). All this was a tremendous job, but we accomplished it in good time, and thus made up the committees of the House. The result was an effectively working organization along progressive lines."

It is also noteworthy that there were more seniority violations in the appointment of committee chairmen in the 10 years following the 1910 revolt than in the preceding 10.

Following is a chart of seniority violations in the appointment of chairmen since 1881 based primarily on data in the study referred to earlier. (See Palsby et al., "The Growth of the Seniority System in the U.S. House of Representatives," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. LXIII, No. 3, (September 1969), pp. 787-807.)

VIOLATIONS OF SENIORITY IN APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—1881-1969¹

Congress	Year	Speaker and party	Seniority followed	Seniority violated	Total committees	Congress	Year	Speaker and party	Seniority followed	Seniority violated	Total committees
47	1881	Keifer (R)	2	37	39	70	1927	Longworth (R)	43	1	44
48	1883	Carlisle (D)	8	30	38	71	1929	do	38	7	45
49	1885	do	21	19	40	72	1931	Gerner (D)	27	18	45
50	1887	do	20	21	41	73	1933	Rainey (D)	38	7	45
51	1889	Reed (R)	20	27	47	74	1935	Byrns ² (D)	32	13	45
52	1891	Crisp (D)	12	35	47	75	1937	Bankhead (D)	42	4	46
53	1893	do	25	24	49	76	1939	Rayburn (D)	37	9	46
54	1895	Reed (R)	13	39	52	77	1941	do	39	7	46
55	1897	do	36	16	52	78	1943	do	34	11	45
56	1899	Henderson (R)	42	15	57	79	1945	do	37	9	46
57	1901	do	49	8	57	80	1947	Martin (R)	19	4	13
58	1903	Cannon (R)	43	11	54	81	1949	Rayburn (D)	19	0	19
59	1905	do	51	8	59	82	1951	do	18	0	18
60	1907	do	45	13	58	83	1953	Martin (R)	17	1	18
61	1909	do	42	18	60	84	1955	Rayburn (D)	19	0	19
62	1911	Clark (D)	25	27	52	85	1957	do	19	0	19
63	1913	do	33	20	53	86	1959	do	19	0	19
64	1915	do	50	6	56	87	1961	Rayburn ² (D)	20	0	20
65	1917	do	45	10	55	88	1963	McCormack (D)	20	0	20
66	1919	Gillett (R)	35	22	57	89	1965	do	20	0	20
67	1921	do	44	15	59	90	1967	do	20	1	20
68	1923	do	40	17	57	91	1969	do	21	0	21
69	1925	Longworth (R)	37	22	59						

¹ Data from 1881 to 1963 is from the previously cited article by Palsby, Gallagher and Rundquist. Data from 1963 on is from DSG.

² Byrns died in office and was succeeded by Bankhead; Rayburn died in office and was succeeded by McCormack.

Note: (R) Republican; (D) Democratic.

THE PRESENT SYSTEM

Structurally, the present system of selecting committee chairmen is similar to that established following the revolt of 1910. All Democratic committee assignments, including designation of chairmen, are made by the Democratic Committee on Committees which consists of the Democratic members on the House Ways & Means Committee.² The Committee on Committees follows the custom of seniority without exception in designating committee chairmen.

The work of the Committee on Committees is subject to approval of the caucus. However, the caucus has altered a decision of the Committee on Committees on only one occasion in recent times, primarily because there has been no opportunity to do so. The lack of opportunity is a result of the fact that for many years the Committee on Committees was permitted to report its recommendations directly to the House, where they received *pro forma* approval, rather than returning to the Democratic Caucus for consideration and approval of its actions.

In 1965 DSG won re-instatement of the practice of having the caucus review the recommendations of the Committee on Committees, and in 1969 this review resulted in the stripping of seniority from Rep. Rarick of Louisiana for supporting an opposition presidential candidate in the 1968 election. The disciplining of Reps. Williams of Mississippi and Watson of South Carolina for the same offense during the 1964 elections was accomplished by the caucus instructing the Committee on Committees before it met rather than altering its recommendations afterwards during the review process.

Theoretically, then, the present system now does provide the caucus with an opportunity to consider the fitness, performance and acceptability of individual chairmen. In practice, however, there is no realistic opportunity for such consideration because Committee on Committees' recommendations designating committee chairmen are handled as part of one large resolution covering the committee assignments of all Democratic Members.

Thus even with caucus review, what exists, for all practical purposes is an automatic system where seniority is sovereign and inviolate in the selection of committee chairmen.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THE PRESENT SYSTEM

Following are the main arguments which are made in defense of and in opposition to the seniority system as it exists today:

Arguments for the seniority system

There are no workable alternatives for the seniority system.

The seniority system assures capable and experienced leadership. It guarantees that chairmanships go to the members who have had the greatest opportunity to master the complicated procedures of the House and the subject matters of their committees. This experience is particularly useful in giving a chairman the greatest perspective on programs and proposals. An experienced chairman can help the committee avoid the pitfalls of approaches which have been previously tried and found unsuccessful.

The present system avoids competition among committee members for the chairmanship. It thereby fosters cooperation since members are more likely to work together effectively when they are not campaigning against each other.

² The Republican system differs in that its Committee on Committees consists of one member from each state that has Republican representation in the House. Each member casts a weighted vote equal to the number of representatives from his state. Otherwise the GOP system is generally similar.

The seniority system eliminates pressure group influence in the selection of the committee chairman with jurisdiction over the area of their interests.

The seniority system works. It assures that when one chairman leaves office, he will be succeeded by the Number Two man on the committee who has been anticipating the day he would become chairman and has therefore been learning the job and its responsibilities. Thus, the system fosters stability and prevents the deleterious effects of selecting a chairman who is unprepared for the job.

The present system guarantees that the most expert politicians will become committee chairmen. Seniority in the House presupposes political acumen. The member with the greatest seniority has proven skill in getting reelected. This skill is extremely useful in evaluating proposals before the Congress to determine the sentiment of the voters and the effect of enactment upon the reelection prospects of party members.

The seniority system as it now operates permits great independence on the part of committee chairmen since they are not held to the test of party responsibility. This independence prevents the emergence of a strong and autocratic Speaker. Further, it allows a chairman to make decisions based on his own best judgment as a result of his familiarity with the circumstances. Because the present system grants a chairman wide discretion, he need not act on the basis of current political fashion but may take a long range view and better serve the needs of the country.

While the present system does produce an occasional bad chairman, other proposed systems would have the same result. In addition, the other proposed systems would curb the autonomy of the chairman and would prevent a chairman from acting his conscience without fear of reprisal from the Speaker or the caucus.

Seniority helps to insulate the Congress from encroachments by the White House and other quarters. At present, a President will not seek dismissal of a committee chairman who does not support his program since such an effort would be futile. However, non-automatic chairmanships would open the door to interference in Congressional affairs by the Chief Executive, especially where he is a member of the majority party.

The seniority system provides the best opportunity for a member of a minority group to become a committee chairman. If a member starts out young enough and continues to be reelected to Congress, he will eventually become a committee chairman automatically. If chairmen were chosen by another method, it would be more difficult for blacks, women and other minority representatives to assume the post of chairman.

The seniority system provides the best opportunity for flexibility and compromise in fashioning new legislation. Because, in effect, committee chairmen are not now bound to a party platform or accountable to the caucus, they are freer to compromise with the minority members of their committees. This increases the possibility of passing legislation.

There is no need for outside control over committee chairmen because committee members themselves can spur or veto an unresponsive or obstructionist chairman.

Automatic selection of committee chairmen promotes peace and harmony within ranks of the party. The seniority system thus avoids the politicking, logrolling and factionalism that would accompany any other system.

The seniority system stabilizes committee membership by discouraging members from switching committees. This enhances the effectiveness of the committee in handling legislation since not only the chairman, but

also many committee members, are familiar with the subject matter.

A chairman's age is not a valid consideration since age alone does not cause diminution of mental vigor, alertness and leadership ability. Nor does it mean that a man become more conservative or lose touch.

Arguments against the seniority system

The seniority system has fragmented and diffused power in the House, thereby crippling effective leadership and making it impossible to present and pursue a coherent legislative program. In 60 years time, the pendulum has swung from one extreme where virtually all power was lodged in one man, the Speaker, to the other extreme where power is scattered among dozens of powerful committee and subcommittee chairmen. Thus, as George Galloway notes in *Congress at the Crossroads*, "If the chairmen of committees owe their places not to their political parties but to the accident of tenure, then they can follow their own inclinations on legislative matters and disregard the platform pledges and legislative program of party leaders."

The seniority system not only allows chairmen to be unresponsive to their party and the leadership, it also has permitted certain chairmen to obstruct, distort and emasculate party programs and policies with impunity. Thus over the past two decades, a small handful of powerful chairmen have been allowed to prevent Congress from responding to the nation's needs until the problems became searing crises. The classic example of such obstructionism is former Rep. Howard W. Smith of Virginia who, as chairman of the Rules Committee from 1955 to 1967, personally killed or blocked civil rights, housing, education, health, welfare and other needed social legislation for years.

The seniority system gives the power of the Democratic Party in Congress to those most opposed to Democratic programs and policies. DSG voting studies show that one of three Democratic committee and subcommittee chairmen vote against Democratic programs and against the majority of their Democratic colleagues more frequently than does the average Republican. In fact, opposition by Democratic chairmen was responsible for half of the major defeats suffered by the Democratic majority during the 90th Congress. Similarly, rigid Democratic adherence to the seniority system has, in the past 15 years, resulted in giving committee and subcommittee chairmanships to 59 Members who in 1956 signed the "Southern Manifesto" pledging that they would employ "every available legal and parliamentary weapon" at their disposal to reverse the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision and defeat all civil rights legislation coming before Congress.

The seniority system undercuts moderate and progressive political candidates in the South. As long as national Democrats in Congress give committee chairmanships to die-hard opponents of Democratic programs and principles and permit them to defy and obstruct those programs and principles, Southern voters have no reason to elect moderate or progressive candidates. Thus Southerners loyal to the programs and principles of the Democratic Party have been defeated and run out of politics altogether.

The present system gives undue Democratic power to a region which votes overwhelmingly against Democratic Presidential candidates. In 1968 every Southern and border state except Texas voted against the Democratic Presidential candidate. In 1964, only six states in the nation voted against the Democratic candidate—all Southern except one, the home state of the GOP candidate.

The seniority system has resulted in a steady increase in the average age of committee chairmen. One-hundred years ago the average chairman was in his forties—today

he is 70 years old. There are only three chairmen under 60 years of age in the 91st Congress; of the remainder, eight are in their sixties, seven are in their seventies, and three are in their eighties. Thus, at a time when other American institutions—colleges, corporations, etc.—are turning over the reins of leadership to younger men, the leaders of Congress have been getting older. Thus the system aggravates the tensions and strains in the society at large, especially when it produces powerful chairmen who are hostile to change and dedicated to protecting and preserving the status quo.

The seniority system maintains the same individuals in power too long. For example, eight of the present chairmen have held their chairmanships for more than 12 years and three have been chairmen for 22 years. The remaining chairmen have held their posts for less than 10 years, however, their predecessors held their chairmanships for an average, of 15 years each. Thus the average chairman can expect to hold power for at least a full decade and frequently longer.

The rule of absolute seniority results, on occasion, in the selection of mediocre, senile or otherwise incompetent chairmen and preserves them in office. Ironically, Members of Congress become committee chairmen about the time in life when most other Americans are forced to retire. If the same retirement rules were applied in Congress, all but five of the present 21 chairmen would have been forced to retire long ago—some more than 10 and 15 years ago.

The system permits committees to become personal fiefdoms of strong chairmen and special interests.

The system denies competent younger men a chance to exercise their leadership talents at the time in life when they are most able to meet the rigors of the job. It is therefore wasteful and inefficient.

The seniority system produces chairmen who are generally unrepresentative of America at large and are therefore unresponsive to its needs. Only those who get re-elected time after time can reach the top of the seniority ladder and become chairmen. Thus the system favors members from static one-party Southern districts and safe machine-dominated big-city districts, and tends to deny power to members who represent other sections of the country, especially those sections which are changing and are more politically competitive.

ALTERNATIVES AND MODIFICATIONS

Numerous proposals have been made for changing the present absolute system of selecting committee chairmen solely on the basis of seniority.

These proposals fall into two general categories:

Alternatives, which would involve discarding the present system and selecting chairmen on some other basis; and

Modifications, which would retain the present system insofar as possible while making only those changes necessary to correct major shortcomings.

The alternatives would not necessarily eliminate seniority as a factor in selecting chairmen, but would leave the matter totally to the discretion of the nominating authority.

The principal modifications, on the other hand, are based specifically on continuation of seniority as the dominant—but not the only—factor in selecting chairmen. These modifications are designed to provide an opportunity for consideration of factors other than seniority and introduce an element of flexibility and choice into the present rigid system while retaining the advantages and benefits the seniority system provides.

The main thrust of the major proposals, both alternatives and modifications, is not to eliminate the seniority system but to assure that committee chairmen will be responsive to their party caucus and the leadership regardless of how chairmen are se-

lected—whether on the basis of seniority, drawing straws, or the color of their eyes.

Following are some of the major alternatives and modifications which have been proposed:

Use the seniority system to *nominate* chairmen subject to majority approval by the caucus. This proposal would entail a separate vote in the caucus on the chairman of each committee. If the senior member of a particular committee failed to receive majority approval, the caucus would consider the next most senior member, and so on until a chairman acceptable to the majority was elected. This modification would preserve seniority as the dominant factor in selecting committee chairmen, while providing for automatic and separate consideration of each potential chairman's fitness and acceptability without becoming involved in campaigns for various chairmanships.

Have the caucus elect committee chairmen from among the three most senior members of each committee. Like the first proposal, this modification would maintain seniority as the dominant factor in selecting committee chairmen while providing a mechanism for considering the fitness and acceptability of the most senior candidate and possibly by-passing him.

Authorize the Speaker to *nominate* chairmen subject to approval by a majority of the caucus. This would represent a compromise between today's system and pre-1910 days when the Speaker alone *appointed* all committee chairmen. Supporters of this proposal claim it would permit the most effective leadership while protecting against abuse and autocracy by subjecting the Speaker's decisions to caucus approval. Should the caucus reject one of the Speaker's nominations, he would continue making nominations until an acceptable chairman was found.

Authorize the majority members of each committee to nominate their chairman subject to caucus approval. This proposal is usually criticized on grounds that committee members would be under too much pressure to vote for the present chairman. Such a system would also be severely influenced by unbalanced committee make-up resulting from past decisions in making committee assignments.

Authorize the members of each committee—both majority and minority—to select their own chairmen subject only to approval of the whole House, which would probably be *pro forma*. This alternative is criticized on the same grounds as the preceding proposal, plus on grounds that it would introduce cross-party alliances into the selection process and totally eliminate any vestige of party responsibility by making chairmen primarily responsive to the alliance which elected them.

Establish a new special committee to *nominate* chairmen subject to majority approval by the caucus. This proposal would retain the present Committee on Committees for consideration of all committee assignments other than selection of committee chairmen. The new special committee could be elected by the caucus, or could consist of the majority Members of an existing committee, such as Rules, or could be made up automatically of the sixth, seventh or eighth ranking Member of each standing committee. The latter would result in a 21-man committee which would change somewhat every two years and which would consist of middle-rank Members who could bridge the gap between senior and junior Members, but who would still be senior enough to tend to follow seniority in their decisions.

There are also three other frequently-mentioned proposals for modifying the present system. These proposals, however, all merely limit the length of time a Member may serve as chairman without touching the problem of making chairmen more responsive to the caucus and the leadership. They are as follows:

Set an age limit and require chairmen to give up their chairmanships when they reach that age.

Set a limit on the number of years a member can serve as chairman and require that after serving as chairman the Member leave the committee entirely and begin service on some other committee.

Rotate the chairmanship among the top three members every two years. Thus the senior Member would be able to serve as chairman only two out of every six years.

THE CHALLENGE OF SHARING FREEDOM

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year over 400,000 students participated in the contest, competing for five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. The contest theme was "Freedom's Challenge," and I am proud to announce that a young lady from my First District of Florida is the winning contestant. She is Karen Louise Hurston, currently enrolled in the Seoul Foreign School in Korea, and I am submitting for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD her excellent speech, "The Challenge of Sharing Freedom," which I know my colleagues will enjoy and appreciate.

The speech follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF SHARING FREEDOM

A pair of star-crossed lovers, full of impassioned and unadulterated love, discovered how rich and full love could really be. Shakespeare's legendary Juliet, talking to her Romeo, answered his question, "For what purpose, love?" She replied:

"But to be frank, and give it thee again.

And yet I wish for the think I have.

My bounty is as boundless as the sea,

My love as deep; the more I give to thee,

The more I have, for both are infinite."

Beautiful and innocent Juliet had discovered love is one thing that, when given, more is received.

Freedom is also this way. It is more than living the way one pleases, more than doing what one wants, more than just being free. Freedom is a thought that begins in the mind of an individual and roots itself in his heart. Democracy makes all free under law, but that is not the end of true liberation. Our forefathers had this idea of emancipation and were so full of it that they shared it with others, and the result of this sharing is our free America.

When an individual himself is liberated, he has no prejudice. There is not such a thing as a free bigot. However, with freedom comes responsibilities. To the genuinely free person these responsibilities are not a burden, but an understanding.

A totally free individual will recognize the fact that his expressions of freedom should not interfere with the expressions of others. Because there are people who do not understand this, there are laws.

The challenge of freedom enters the individual at two points. First, the individual has the challenge to uphold his personal independence. Then, when an individual is full of freedom to the point that he wishes to share it, a second challenge enters the individual to help others gain their freedom.

There is one thing about genuinely being free that many have come to respect. When a person is authentically free, a concern for all man's emancipation appears. This concern expresses itself in action, in thought, and in deed. A soldier at a lonely outpost on a demilitarized zone is not just defending the freedom of the country involved, but preventing the removal of freedom for all mankind. You can have a part in this action. All those eligible, exercise your right to vote. If you wish, exercise your right to protest, to petition, to assemble peaceably. All free individuals have the right to develop their personality the way they feel best, as long as this does not interfere with the freedom of others.

Freedom, a state of mind, cannot develop alone. A free individual will reach out to share his liberation with others. This means that true freedom is accompanied by a brotherly compassion for others. Many have been known to interpret personal freedom as taking advantage of others for their own benefit. These individuals are not free, for they are bound by their lust for gain. The free individual knows that only in giving freedom can he receive it, and only in dying to his selfish motives can he live a truly free life.

So, if anyone were to ask, "For what purpose freedom?" you could reply:

But to be frank, and give it thee again, And yet I wish for the thing I have for you. My bounty is as boundless as the sea, My freedom as deep; the more I give to thee, The more I have, for both are infinite to those who have the Challenge of Freedom.

JUDGE DAVID STAHL

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the people of Pittsburgh, and I, lost a dear friend last week when Judge David Stahl passed away.

The tragic accident that took Dave Stahl's life robbed us of his dedicated public service and his gentlemanly demeanor.

Dave Stahl was eulogized in a recent editorial in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

I would like to insert this editorial into the RECORD so that my colleagues will fathom the nature of this man whose brilliant career was cut short by death:

JUDGE DAVID STAHL

Compassion, integrity, legal scholarship and calm were epitomized in the life of Judge David Stahl, whose death Saturday created a tragic and unexpected void on the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. Judge Stahl brought all of these noble qualities to bear in a career devoted to making the law truly an instrument for justice.

As a teacher of law, as Pittsburgh City Solicitor, as Attorney General of Pennsylvania and as a quiet leader in numerous voluntary causes before he ascended the bench, Judge Stahl combined thoroughness and objectivity with a passionate concern for the accomplishment of social goals. He gave unstintingly of his energies and his talents to every demanding assignment. His example and his imprint on the law, including the revised constitution of Pennsylvania, will survive him as a monument. The true measure of his passing is suggested by the challenge it will present to the President in finding a judge of equal stature.

CCXVI—325—Part 4

AMERICA'S MARITIME CHALLENGE

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the best hope for peace, security, and prosperity for our Nation lies in its oceanic strength. Yet, at the close of the last decade, our Nation had dropped to fifth place as a maritime power. As we enter the 1970's, U.S. ships carry only 5 percent of our trade, and as our fleet continues to shrink, the Soviet maritime capability continues to grow.

In light of the deterioration of our maritime capabilities, I insert in the RECORD the address given on this vital issue by Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Mrs. Bentley's remarks follow.

REMARKS OF MRS. HELEN DELICH BENTLEY, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

With the dawn of the 1970's, the presence of the flag and the fleets of the United States upon the seas of the world is a rising symbol of world stability and global peace.

In every corner of our universe where men of goodwill plan for continued prosperity, free enterprise and mutual security, the existence of American sea power is the benchmark for all the perspectives that are being projected. Ships, and the men who man them, must carry our concepts of life, liberty and justice among free men into the dawning of the year 2000.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Navy League, I am honored to be among you on this occasion. I bring a message of toil, determination and persistence to carry the maritime conviction, which we share, to the men and women of America. For the time is now; no longer can we afford the luxury of talking to ourselves. We must band together in dedication to the public educational process which has been neglected for too long.

As your history records, "The League can do much, if it will!" I must say, I subscribe to this confidence as I urge you to general quarters. For the sea, we know, will yield its bounty only in proportion to our vision, our boldness, our determination and our knowledge.

Unfortunately, too few Americans and too few Free World global thinkers are forthrightly facing the problems that lie ahead in assuring the needed strength that we must have to keep our children from awakening one day under a yoke of foreign totalitarian rule.

Here with the Navy League, I deeply appreciate the opportunity you afford me to be associated with a group banded together throughout their lives, we share a common conviction that our nation must not forget that sea power—in its total sense—is the foundation upon which rests the American cause of "peace with honor," that in oceanic strength lies the best hope of survival and long-term prosperity of our nation.

Today, President Nixon stands before the world as a leader dedicated to peace in this world. As a statesman and sailor, understandably, he has turned seaward in quest of a better formula for stability and strength.

It is my firm conviction that in the years ahead American sea power must inextricably be the chosen path to peace, just as it has served as a discriminate instrument for keeping the peace down through the centuries.

The President of the Navy League, James

M. Hannan, has—in my opinion—already dedicated the Navy League to the proposition that "sea power" is, in fact, "peace power." He promises to pursue this proposition with firm resolve by helping America remember this precept.

The Navy League's support of his leadership, to me, assures us that the Free World has no intention of either knuckling under to the challenges we face or of politely perishing, as our enemies would hope.

President Hannan cites the great Theodore Roosevelt to the effect that we seek to be strong upon the high seas, to spread our trade in peace, and to be able to defend the integrity of our homeland. Though our position on the high seas has deteriorated, unmistakably, now is the time to get on with building our maritime strength.

General Foch, a brilliant and beloved French leader in World War I, was once questioned by a newspaper man about one of the General's great advances against overwhelming enemy forces. Foch is reported to have replied that seeing the foe before him in powerful array, he noted that the left flank of his own Allied forces was crumbling. He looked to the right and found his entire right flank crumbling before the enemy attack.

There was only one thing left to do, said Foch, and that was to attack. This audacity overwhelmed the foe and snatched victory from certain defeat.

As the New Year approaches and I look back over 1969, there is a great deal that reminds me of the situation I have just cited. Our mercantile fleet has dropped our nation to 5th place as a maritime power. United States ships carry only 5 percent of our own trade. Our U.S. Naval Fleet also is shrinking while the Soviet maritime threat is increasing.

We did nevertheless, in 1969, augment the oceanic interest in our nation. For the first time in years, that interest penetrated the White House and brought from President Nixon a presentation of both policy and program to the Congress of the United States, and a reaffirmation that we must maintain our strength upon the sea lanes of this globe. President Nixon's message to the Congress is perhaps the most significant maritime pronouncement that has come from the White House since the last great war.

Today the United States proclaims that it intends to pursue all prudent efforts to improve our relations with the Soviet Union. Strength at sea can serve to underwrite the transition.

We are preparing for discussions on limiting nuclear weapons. Here, as McGeorge Bundy, President of Ford Foundation, observed, the sea-based Polaris-Poseidon Missile System provides a real basis for hope.

We are searching, with our European allies, for ways to reduce tensions in Europe and to ultimately resolve the fundamental issues there. Obviously, the freedom of our oceanic confederation rests upon maritime capability and strength.

We are pursuing important talks on the Middle East.

I can think of no more stabilizing influence on the course of world affairs—no better sign of a hopeful future—than assuring that this nation shall have strength at sea. Against such a background of strength I am certain we will find that all our negotiations—formal and informal—will contribute more to global security. Only a strong nation can assure those with whom it is negotiating that there exists capacity to honor treaty obligations and maintain security arrangements.

It is a paradox of past years, I hope, that this nation—once a major sea power—has turned from the sea, while Russia—traditionally a land power—has turned to the sea. Since the USSR is now our major competitor in the world—for both the minds of men and their adherence to our economics, and

our divergent philosophies on freedom and the rights of the individuals—a final look at our divergent attitudes toward a merchant marine will be of value.

One thing is certain, the Russians and ourselves are 180 degrees out of phase in regard to the importance we attach to a merchant marine. There is no in-between. Either they have been and are 100 percent right, and we are 100 percent wrong, or we are right and they are wrong.

At the time of the Cuban confrontation, the Soviets paid "through the nose" for the lack of their own merchant ships, and were forced to charter the ships of other nations for their Cuban adventure. But, Cuba taught the Soviets a lesson, and from that day forward they have concentrated on building a Merchant Fleet "second to none." Since that date, from about 5 million tons, they have risen to 12 million, and they are continuing to build at a rate of about one million tons a year. Russian officials themselves boast that by 1975 they will have achieved 16.5 to 18 million tons of new merchant shipping. They speak of the profits made by their ships in trade with the world. They speak of the foreign ports they enter and boast of the fact that their seamen serve as ambassadors to other countries, cementing friendship for Russia and advancing the Communist view among people of foreign lands.

They speak of flying their flag in world ports and the prestige it brings to the USSR. They speak of the use of their swift, streamlined ships in developing trade ties with new and older nations alike.

What they do *not* speak of publicly—but what has become evident to maritime nations—is the extent to which modern, newly constructed Russian ships have now begun to undercut world shipping rates in competition with the ships of other nations.

Unfortunately for the Free World, too many persons in the upper echelon of the Government of the United States and in European countries pooch-pooched those who raised their eyebrows over the expansion and activities of the Soviet Union on the high seas. They discounted every reference that the Russians had ulterior motives.

Many Europeans changed their minds after last summer when the Soviet Union decided it wanted return cargoes for its ships transporting weapons of war to North Vietnam. These return cargoes should come from Australia which was practically on the trade route since the Suez Canal was closed. They were really very polite about it—seeking membership in the conference under the terms that the Soviet ships have 36 of the existing 72 sailings to Western Europe. The conference naturally turned them down and a rate war ensued.

Russian ships have entered third-flag trade—never touching Russian ports—between Japan and Canada, undercutting American flag and other national shipping between Japan and the West Coast of the United States. In doing so, they provide a perfect example of what I mentioned earlier—the use of ships as a key instrument of national policy. We should never forget what we are observing is a nation-to-nation confrontation in the maritime arena. What is required is knowledge and policy support on the part of our government and the competitive incentives to win.

As plain as the facts seem to all of us who have a weather eye fixed on the situation, it is most unfortunate that we have not convinced more Americans that it is a bona fide Soviet intention to "bury us at sea." All of us must resolve, as the 1970's dawn, to tell it to the American people and to tell it "like it is." Here, based on your impressive records, Navy League can make a major maritime contribution. The key consideration is oceanic education and public knowledge.

It has been one of my great privileges, as the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Com-

mission, to have had the opportunity to consult with Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, The Chief of Naval Operations, United States Navy. Admiral Moorer is one of the impressive naval leaders of this century. More than that, he is a great American and another man of vision, dedicated to maintaining in this world the principles fathered with the birth of this nation. He is articulating the crucial need for our nation to adopt a maritime strategy. His world-wide oceanic intelligence network daily brings new proofs of growing and spreading Soviet oceanic power.

As the President's principal advisor on naval matters, he recognizes the need for oceanic doctrine. As an articulate leader, he is emphasizing to the American people that we must turn to the sea to insure the safety of our citizens and the security of the Republic.

Across his desk come continuing reports that the Red Fleet—so prevalent today in the Mediterranean—is now penetrating and plowing the waters of the Persian Gulf. There are ominous overtones to its visit to Cuba, in our very backyard, at the time of the launching of the first moon flight. The Soviet fleet pays more and more calls on the East Coast of Africa, and their men go ashore to fraternize and to propagandize.

Recently, the Soviet Chief of Naval Operations was the honored guest and speaker at the graduation exercises of the Ethiopian Naval Academy.

High-level Kremlin delegations visit with India and Pakistan policy makers and planners, selling the proposition that the Soviet fleet would like to use India and Pakistani ports and explore the possibilities of a great and flourishing Russo-Pakistan trade, as they penetrate the vacuum of the strategically significant Indian Ocean.

In the Philippine seas, the Soviet fleet also is in evidence. The Russians talk trade and friendship and, somehow, the Communist Hubs in the Philippine hills find their arms stores replenished.

Make no mistake about it, the oceans of this globe are in fact the maritime springboard for launching the world-wide aggression of Soviet imperialistic ambitions. While the Soviets flex their maritime muscles globally, concepts of coastal security world-wide must, of necessity be changed and are undergoing a metamorphosis from defense to offense.

Kremlin strategists, never satisfied with any status quo, are carefully making explorations in the fields of maritime propulsion and oceanic dynamics. The success of their nuclear submarines has encouraged spin-off projects, and naval intelligence definitely indicates in the days ahead a greater employment of nuclear power to enhance the mobility of their maritime prowess.

We know the Soviet Fleet ranges into Australia, has been reported in the waters of the Argentine, and regularly calls at Vancouver, Canada. Eight hundred foreign ports have played host to the Soviet Navy and Soviet Merchantmen in over 100 countries of this globe.

Ladies and gentlemen, through exploitation of the oceans, the land-locked power of the Czars is now a world-wide presence, spreading influence and control for the Soviet imperialism.

Now, we could follow the theory that what we are seeing here is the ordinary, normal growth of a great power. What is there about all this to get us excited? Well, ladies and gentlemen, even an amateur global strategist today must realize that, spread out as the United States is, with its global NATO and SEATO commitments and its far-flung foreign interest, unless we have the ability to communicate—by ship—our lifeline of world leadership is in peril.

There may be many who say, "Get out of Europe. Get out of Viet Nam. Abandon our

foreign commitments. Let's retreat within our own continent and build an impregnable "Fortress." Well, ladies and gentlemen, I know that I do not have to point out to you of the Navy League the fallacy that a "Fortress America," without sea power to protect it—without military might to keep the ocean lanes open for vital commodity exchange—is an empty shell that could topple to the first aggressor or fall into ruin from within.

There is but one answer. It is a simple answer. The United States, without adequate seapower—military and mercantile—will not rise to its 21st Century opportunities.

Whether the United States rises to its oceanic destiny may well depend on the educational activities of the Navy League and the few organizations which share its unique commitment to the ocean.

The work you are doing with Gil Slonim and Jim Hannan serves as a source of pride for your entire membership and augurs well for our nation. But I must be frank to admit that our work is just starting. We have merely gained our maritime steerage way with the President's pronouncement. The hard work lies ahead. Never has the nation needed the Navy League more.

The brightest spot of 1969 is that fact that the President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, has recognized this need and has sent to the Congress of the United States a maritime program of challenge and opportunity. This is not a partisan judgment. Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee and Representative Edward A. Garmatz, Chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, both Democrats, share this conviction. This is the way the nation must go—unified and forward in a march to regain our proper position on the high seas, first in every category if we are to continue to lead the free world.

In his program, Mr. Nixon points out that past government policies and industry attitudes have not been conducive to cooperation between labor and management, and government for that matter.

Specifically, President Nixon stated: "Past government policies and industry attitudes have not been conducive to cooperation between labor and management. Our program will help to improve this situation by ending the uncertainty that has characterized our past maritime policy. Labor and management must now use this opportunity to find ways of resolving their differences without halting operations. If the desired expansion of merchant shipping is to be achieved, the disruptive work stoppages of the past must not be repeated."

President Nixon has lived up to his campaign promise in providing the Nation with a program that will modernize and rehabilitate the American Merchant Marine. The message has already gone to Congress and the legislation is now being prepared to provide an expenditure by the government of \$3.2 billion for the next 10 years to provide 300 highly productive American flag merchant ships to carry the Stars and Stripes over the high seas.

However, this program will not be a success unless private funds amounting to about the same \$3.2 billion are matched by the steamship companies and the financial community.

What I am saying, is that for any new maritime program to be a success there are two primary requirements: The first is, government participation to make up the differential on the higher costs of operating American ships to maintain the American standard of living in competition with the foreign flag vessels which with the lower standard of living of other countries are much cheaper to build and more cheaper to operate. The second—and a very important

one—is the proper economic atmosphere to attract private investments, money from the business and financial community which is necessary if the American Merchant Marine is to continue as a free enterprise business proposition.

With the money market as tight and expensive as it is today, no business is willing to risk any capital whatsoever where any uncertainty prevails and particularly where uncertainty in the labor picture prevails.

To back up the President's maritime proposal, I should like to present a five-point program I personally consider to be crucial in the revitalization of the American Merchant Fleet and its protection:

First, with the provision of policy incentives, American national strategy must be oriented to the oceans.

Second, maritime research must be given the same high priority as the aerospace industry to build the modern, competitive clipper ships of the 21st Century.

Third, the American shipbuilding industry must be the world's best through every creative, competitive, innovative effort possible, backed by the fullest ingenuity and know-how of American technology.

Fourth, programs of oceanic education must be instituted and pursued at every intellectual level within our system to regain the knowledge and understanding of the truly seafaring nation that the United States must become to retain its world leadership and a competitive position on the world oceans.

Fifth, we must have labor stability.

Let us hope that with the implementation of the Nixon sea-oriented policies the time of the soft and simple theories of the land-oriented "whiz-kid" approach will be gone and that we will find a more enlightened audience in the Capitol, better ready and better geared to help us convince the nation that American sea power is Free World peace power and what it portends is prosperity.

I look forward to participation in your Oceanic-Maritime Symposium in Washington, D.C., on February 18 and 19 of next year—for 1970, I am confident, will launch us, as a nation, into the prosperous "Decade of the Seas". Let us resolve at this time to take a determined and deep look into the "Maritime wealth of world oceans."

JANUARY PARITY

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, during his campaign for the Presidency, President Nixon stated with his agricultural policy, which I quote from "Nixon on the Issues":

Dedicated efforts to improve market prices and strengthen our market economy; 74 percent of parity is intolerable in my book; farmers are entitled to better, and I pledge that in my Administration they will have better . . .

The parity average for January 1969 was 72 percent. Today, the January 1970 average is 75 percent. An increase of 3 percent. I do not agree with all the decisions the President and Secretary of Agriculture have made concerning the farm program. I feel if we are to use the guideline as stated above, more must and should be done to raise the income of our farmers. We should have a higher increase than 3 percent in 1 year's time.

As is my custom, I hereby insert the January 1970 parity figures along with the January 1969 figures for comparison:

Commodity	January 1969	January 1970
Wheat	47	47
Corn	65	64
Cotton	41	40
Milk	83	82
Butterfat	74	75
Wool	44	41
Barley	65	61
Flax	67	62
Oats	69	63
Sorghum	64	67
Soybeans	70	64
Beef	78	82
Hogs	74	96
Chicken	67	87
Lamb	85	77
Turkeys	65	96
Eggs	83	96
Average	72	75

CHICAGO TRIBUNE READERS APPROVE OF "SEVEN" TRIAL RESULTS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune has conducted a public opinion poll to ascertain how the readers of this highly respected newspaper, which has a circulation throughout the country, reacted to the much discussed trial of the Chicago seven.

The results of the Tribune's public opinion poll follow:

TRIBUNE POLL SHOWS: READERS APPROVE OF "SEVEN" TRIAL RESULTS

Public opinion response to the Tribune poll on the results and conduct of the controversial conspiracy trial shows that 92 percent approve the jury decision and 82 percent indicate approval of Judge Julius Hoffman's conduct of the proceedings.

A breakdown of the total vote tabulated thus far is as follows:

I approve of the conduct of the trial (82%)	9,086
I disapprove of the conduct of the trial (18%)	2,027
I disapprove of the results of the trial (8%)	979
I approve of the results of the trial (92%)	11,707

Readers expressed a greater interest in the outcome of the trial than in the debate over the relative conduct of participants in the legal battle, which resulted from rioting during the 1968 Democratic national convention in Chicago.

"All of these individuals are well educated. While they propose to destroy our present setup, nevertheless I have not read of anything they have proposed to take its place," a reader stated.

A new citizen of Hungarian descent wrote: "I never in my life saw what is happening in this country. Any person who would desecrate the flag or carry Viet Cong flags is a traitor to his own country. This I believe strongly: It is all caused by Communists, as I lived under them for 20 years."

COMMENTS JUDGE HOFFMAN

A supporter of the trial results and its conduct wrote: "Do you folks [in Chicago] know that many, many people including myself have no desire to visit Chicago because of fear? Wake up if you wish to save your city."

An Iowa City housewife wrote: "I think

Judge Hoffman should be highly commended. It was a most difficult procedure, made so by the conduct of the men on trial."

"These professional juvenile delinquents must be made to understand that they cannot come into a city and tear it apart to suit their childish whims. We establishment squares and we of the silent majority will not buy it—it's not our bag," another wrote.

CALLS TRIAL A "MOCKERY"

Dissenters included a 19-year-old Western Illinois university student who wrote, "I would like to add that I believe this trial is, has been, and will remain the biggest mockery of the United States judicial system in recent years."

A Harvey reader wrote: "Every once in awhile, a judge makes a fool of himself; so Judge Hoffman as of now takes first prize. When protesters are jailed and the stupid pigs are praised, the civil rights of Americans have fallen in a pigpen."

The next results of The Tribune poll will be in Friday's newspaper.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy Contest. A winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as a guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The winning speech from my State of Utah was written by Sharron Albrecht, who lives in Richfield, a city in my congressional district. The speech so well exemplifies the strength of purpose of our American youth that I wish to share it with my colleagues:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

A wild animal finds freedom in running through a dark forest, his home. A baby bird finds freedom in trying out its shaky wings. And I, I find freedom in having been born a citizen, of the United States of America. Freedom, a word that America knows more about than any other country in the world. Freedom, a noble word with a noble meaning that outshines any other. Freedom has been able to give its opportunities only to some people. I have been fortunate because freedom has given me a country of which to be proud.

Mountains with their blankets of tiny snowflakes that glitter like diamonds, rise majestically in front of my eyes and speak of the strength and power in freedom and democracy. The warmth of a cozy, crackling, fire tells the story of the joy and happiness found in living in a democratic country. The fields of golden wheat waving gently in a soft breeze under a sky kissed with pink from the setting sun symbolize the prosperity of freedom.

Freedom lies in each small flower as it blossoms into maturity. It stands forth from every towering pine tree and gaily laughing brook. It can be found in busy city streets with the constant noise and turmoil of people going places and doing things. It belongs to a mother and her daughter, to a father and his son, to each of us is given the joys of freedom. Everywhere I go my eyes behold sights of beauty and wonder that I can enjoy because I am a free person. How does this marvelous freedom challenge me? It challenges me to be my very best. I want to be

someone, to have contributed to our democracy, to help keep our noble heritage shining brightly. Freedom is a never-ending challenge.

As winter melts into spring, as the streams enlarge into small rivers with their overload of melted snow, I want to be able to say, I have taken advantage of the freedom I have inherited. I have freely chosen the church I want to belong to and participated in that church to make myself a better person, better able to serve my country. As summer drifts into fall and her gaily colored leaves fall gently to the ground, I hope to be able to say, I have taken advantage of the schools I can freely go to. I have tried to gain as much knowledge as possible, and have tried to widen my horizons so I will be better equipped to support my country. As fall dreams into winter with her blanket of softly fallen snow, I hope to be able to say, I have worked and achieved as much as possible. I have used my time that is freely mine to do with as I please to my very best advantage. Freedom lies on my doorstep. It offers its challenge to me. A challenge which I alone must live up to. I must take the freedom given me and use it, use it to expand my knowledge, to make something of myself, to create a stronger person who will add to his country. I want to contribute to this country that has given me so very much.

COMMEMORATION OF 52D ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1970

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity once again to pay tribute to the gallant Lithuanian people on the occasion of the 52d anniversary of their national independence.

For nearly a century and a quarter, these brave and noble people were assailed with the full force of Russian tyranny. Their lands were confiscated; their schools were closed; they were subject to persecution because of their religious beliefs; Lithuanian language and literature were outlawed; and the press was used almost entirely as an organ for Russian propaganda.

Finally, in the peace that followed World War I, the courageous Lithuanian people succeeded in proclaiming their national independence. During the next 22 years they devoted their unbounded talents and energies to creating a modern and progressive state, which became a valued member of the family of nations. Unfortunately their freedom was short lived.

In 1941, hapless Lithuania fell to the Nazis. After 3 years of terror under Hitler's legions, this unfortunate nation was enslaved by the brutal warriors of Communist Russia. The United States has never recognized the forcible incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, and we properly set aside this time each year to announce to the world our strong objections to Soviet enslavement of these heroic people.

It is my fervent hope and prayer that the day will soon come when the freedom-loving people of Lithuania will once again live in liberty as an independent nation.

A TRIBUTE TO FATHER SERVODIDIO

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a testimonial dinner-dance in honor of the Reverend John T. Servodidio was held at New Dorp's Tavern on the Green on February 20. More than 350 friends attended the affair—a tribute to this young priest whose zest and dedication as director of the Staten Island Catholic Charities Family and Community Services has won the respect and appreciation of the entire community. I consider myself fortunate to have been one of the many sponsors of this most-fitting tribute which was aptly reported in the Staten Island Advance. I include a press report and a proclamation by the borough president of Staten Island declaring February 20, 1970, as Rev. John T. Servodidio Day.

COMMUNITY HONORS PRIEST FOR SERVICE

Music, laughter and good will filled the Tavern on the Green, New Dorp, last night as 350 friends of the Rev. John T. Servodidio, director of the Catholic Charities Family and Community Services on Staten Island, gathered for a testimonial dinner-dance in his honor.

The affair was organized by friends of the priest to honor him for his service to the community. Special guests at the event were his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Pasquale Servodidio, and his brother, sisters, nieces and nephews.

The main speaker, Bishop Edward D. Head, praised Mr. and Mrs. Servodidio as the "roots" from which the blessings of Father Servodidio flow, and praised the priest as a man who "challenges his friends to be bigger people."

Anthony Jacobi of Our Lady of Mount Carmel-St. Benedict's R.C. Church, West Brighton, the parish in which Rev. Servodidio served 10 years as assistant pastor, then thanked the priest for his service to the young people of that community.

The Rev. Arthur D. Phillips, pastor of Fellowship Baptist Church, Mariners Harbor, spoke of the priest as a man who is "totally involved in all he does." Mrs. Mills Skinner, widow of the Rev. Skinner of Shiloh A.M.E. Zion Church, West Brighton, likened Father Servodidio to a cork in the ocean that can be knocked about but never drowned.

Andrew Barberi, football coach at Curtis High School, thanked the priest for his contributions to the youth of the West Brighton area both in and out of athletics.

The awards and gifts presented to Father Servodidio were introduced by Eugene Mosiello. An American Legion award was presented by Aldo Benedetto, past state commander; a Catholic Youth Organization award by Eugene Overmeyer, director, and a gift from the boys in the neighborhood was presented by Mosiello.

A poem was then read by Mrs. Edna Williams of the West Brighton Community Council, praising "Father John".

Father Servodidio then spoke, thanking everyone for their "overwhelming" tribute and tracing his interest in good works back to the example set by his father.

He said he was gratified to see "our black brothers and sisters here at this affair, because what can be done here can be done outside. We can create a real community like this 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and then we would have no problems."

Ralph J. Lambert served as chairman for the dinner and was master of ceremonies.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas: Reverend John T. Servodidio, Director of Staten Island Catholic Charities Family Community Services, being conscientious and a diligent citizen of Staten Island and as such an asset to our community; and

Whereas: Reverend Servodidio has performed his duties with a hard won knowledge and a deep appreciation of the privilege of living in true democracy; and

Whereas: we express our gratitude to Reverend John Servodidio for his service and dedication to our community. He is a man among us, a man who has expressed a living sensitivity to the world around us; and

Whereas: a man who has the virtue of awareness that is expressed by his dynamic action for people, and has a continued concern that is selfless and sincere,

Now, therefore, I, Robert T. Connor, President of the Borough of Richmond, by virtue of the power and authority vested in me by the laws of the City and State of New York, do hereby proclaim Friday, February 20th, 1970 as

REVEREND JOHN T. SERVODIDIO DAY

In the Borough of Richmond and urge all the members of our community to join in paying tribute to Father Servodidio who has given much of his time, effort and understanding in helping so many people.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the Borough of Richmond this thirteenth day of February in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventy.

ROBERT T. CONNOR.

ROBERT M. COX HONORED BY JEWISH WAR VETERANS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, McKeesport Post 181, Jewish War Veterans, in my 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, has made it a practice each year to single out for special recognition the individual which the post feels has contributed the most to the brotherhood of man in the preceding year.

The 1970 recipient of this community service award is Robert M. Cox, a McKeesport businessman and a longtime friend of mine. Mr. Cox was recognized as the "man of the year" for his charitable, humanitarian, and civic activities. Sam Weinberg, commander of the JWV post, presented the award to Mr. Cox and described the recipient as symbolizing the spirit of brotherhood.

I had the privilege of attending the banquet where Mr. Cox's outstanding record in community service was praised by many civic and religious leaders. Among those who spoke of Mr. Cox's devotion to his fellow man were Leonard C. Staisey, chairman of the Allegheny County Board of Commissioners; Mayor Zoran Popovich of McKeesport; Mayor John L. Patterson of White Oak; Samuel Vidnovic, McKeesport City treasurer; the Reverend James L. Nelson of Zion Baptist Church; Rabbi Milton Turner of the Tree of Life Synagogue; Msgr. Michael Dravecky of Holy Trinity Roman Catholic Church; Rabbi Leonard Winograd of Temple B'nai Israel and

the Reverend William J. Ireby of Sampson Mills United Presbyterian Church.

The principal speaker at this brotherhood banquet, the eighth such event held by the Jewish War Veterans, was Judge John G. Brosky of Allegheny County's Common Pleas Court. Pointing to Mr. Cox's many achievements, Judge Brosky said the honor bestowed on him by the JWV was the summation of all his activities in many areas of community service.

Mr. Cox has been a driving force behind the rebuilding of McKeesport. He erected a new store which served not only as an example to other merchants but also as a demonstration of his faith in the future of his city and its citizens. Because of Mr. Cox the city of McKeesport is a better place and its residents owe much to him.

LITHUANIAN FREEDOM RESOLUTION

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday evening, February 22, in East Chicago, Ind., a large mass meeting of American-Lithuanians and friends of Lithuanian freedom held an overflow banquet commemorating the 52d anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

I include with my remarks a letter dated February 22, 1970, from the Lithuanian American Council, and also a resolution unanimously adopted at the gathering.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL,
February 22, 1970.

HON. RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed Resolution was adopted at a mass meeting of American Lithuanians sponsored by the Lithuanian American Council of Lake County, Indiana, in commemoration of the 52d Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania at St. Francis Church Hall, 3905 Fir str. East Chicago, Indiana on the 22nd day of February 1970.

A. G. VINICK,
Chairman.
P. INDREIKA,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, It is thirty years since Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia were partitioned between Germany and Russia,

Whereas, Russia's foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko in recent statements to other nations urged them "To take a more sober view on this question and recognize that it is impossible to keep seized foreign areas as a result of aggression and that they should be returned to those to whom they belong."

Whereas, To this day the Soviet Union still holds Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia in its "concentration camp" as Anatoly Kaznetsov, refugee author defined it,

Be it resolved, that we urge the Government of the United States to use its power and influence to help Lithuania and other Baltic States regain their freedom and sovereign rights in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and

not to make any treaty settlements with Soviet Russia, until this has been achieved, and be it finally

Resolved, that this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, and copies thereof sent to the Secretary of the State, the Senators and Representatives of the State of Indiana, and to the press.

CAMPUS UNREST: A CLARIFICATION OF LEGAL ISSUES

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, although campus unrest is still a part of our social scene, I believe the great majority of college and university administrators, faculty, and students have made significant strides in coming to grips with the underlying causes of violent dissent. In addition to hundreds of campus study groups and committees, professional education association task forces, and other efforts, the American Bar Association inaugurated last summer a commission on campus government and student dissent. The following distinguished educators and attorneys served on this panel:

William T. Gossett, former president, American Bar Association, 1968-69, chairman;

Morris B. Abram, president, Brandeis University;

Mary I. Bunting, president, Radcliffe College;

Lawrence R. Caruso, legal counsel, Princeton University;

Ramsey Clark, former Attorney General of the United States;

Samuel Dash, director, Institute of Criminal Law and Procedure, Georgetown University;

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president, University of Notre Dame;

Edward H. Levi, president, University of Chicago;

Glen A. Lloyd, lawyer and former chairman, board of trustees, University of Chicago;

John A. Long, president, law student division, American Bar Association;

Bayless A. Manning, dean, Stanford University Law School;

Jerome J. Shestack, chairman, section of individual rights and responsibilities, American Bar Association;

Richard E. Wiley, lawyer and former chairman, young lawyers section, American Bar Association.

Logan Wilson, president, American Council on Education;

Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director, National Urban League;

A. Kenneth Pye, dean of the Duke University School of Law, and William Van Alst, ne, professor of law at Duke, served as project codirectors.

Excerpts from the commission's report were printed in the February 24, 1970, issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education. It is a very thorough and thoughtful statement on the essence of academic freedom and student rights as well as clarifying the responsibility of students.

It deals with such things as the differences in student rights between private and public institutions, freedoms of campus newspapers, the unique rights and responsibilities within the classroom, and the issue of double jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, it is this kind of effort which leaves me with the hope that the Congress will not have to adopt any further legislation directed at campus unrest than we already have.

The excerpts follow:

CAMPUS UNREST: A CLARIFICATION OF LEGAL ISSUES

BACKGROUND

While disruptive protest has not been and is not characteristic of most colleges and universities, both the number and intensity of the disruptions cause deep concern in a nation that is now providing an opportunity for higher education to more students than any other society in history.

Of great concern, also, are the grievances of university students and their opportunity to express these grievances.

It is ironic that many of the disruptive disturbances have taken place in institutions least deficient in their sensitivity to student concerns. Indeed, the commission believes that the very excellence of a given university and its lack of repressive policies may be conditions conducive to unrest.

Students may be less willing to assert perceived grievances if summary repression is the only foreseeable result. Complete apathy in a vigorous academic institution, however, is not to be expected or desired. It may sometimes be as much a cause of concern as confrontation itself.

Expression of grievances may be desirable, but it is equally desirable that the tension be expressed in forms which are consistent with law.

There is also reason to suggest that some issues have been the subject of demonstration on campus not because the university has more (or even as much) influence or responsibility than other institutions for the determination of national and international policies, but simply because its very fragility and tolerance constitute an invitation to those who may seek to use these issues to attack the institutions of our society.

No university, however progressive, can avoid confrontation with those who are determined to use it merely as an instrument of revolutionary politics.

The importance of the orderly functioning of our universities is too great to tolerate the number and kinds of disruptions that have become commonplace.

At the same time, there is a risk that certain efforts to maintain order may themselves be excessive and may indirectly contribute to disruptions infringing upon rights of students within a university freely to express their dissent and to be dealt with fairly when charges of misconduct are asserted against them.

The commission's recommendations are based upon the premise that within a university it is possible for men of good faith to engage in free expression, and that it is possible for institutions of self-government, including university disciplinary proceedings, to operate effectively. These conditions exist in the overwhelming majority of American institutions of higher learning.

Unfortunately, there are universities where, on occasion during recent years, different conditions have prevailed. For example, disciplinary hearings have been interrupted, hearings have been turned into politicized propaganda tirades, coercion has been exercised to preclude rational consideration and determination of the issues involved.

A university should not permit its fairly established procedures to be frustrated by conduct of this nature. University discipli-

nary proceedings are fragile instruments. A university does not have a career judiciary, or marshals, sheriffs, or bailiffs to enforce its orders and maintain order.

Any dedicated group of disrupters can interfere effectively with the deliberations of any university tribunal. Such a situation is akin to the type of insurgency which justifies martial law, and an institution may be required to depart from its normal procedures (such as closing a hearing to the public) when it is immediately threatened with disruption.

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

Our recommendations distinguish generally between public and private institutions because their needs and circumstances may differ sharply, especially for institutions with announced doctrinal commitments and specially limited vocational or religious objectives, and where the First Amendment may not apply.

At the same time, our recommendations for public institutions may also be appropriate for many private institutions as well. To a considerable extent, this similar treatment of student expression in many private institutions as in public institutions reflects the fact that a clear distinction cannot always be made in a given case as a matter of law, educational policy, or institutional need.

Increasingly, for instance, more and more private institutions rely upon governmental assistance to underwrite new construction, research, salaries, and student aid.

The Supreme Court has said: "... When authority derives in part from government's thumb on the scales, the exercise of that power by private persons becomes closely akin, in some respects, to its exercise by government itself."

Whether the First Amendment will be held to apply to certain private institutions or at least to certain aspects of their operations when they are financed and otherwise significantly involved with government has not yet been decided by the Supreme Court. Nevertheless, prudent planning requires the recognition that the court may hold that the amendment is applicable.

The commission wishes expressly to note that not all of our suggestions necessarily reflect established requirements even as applied to public institutions. To a certain extent, this is unavoidable because the law is not entirely settled.

More substantially, however, our recommendations attempt to report standards that may be seen as fair and feasible, faithful to the law as it has developed, and also responsive to the needs of students and the constraints of higher education.

Public colleges and universities

Students enrolled in public institutions of higher education are entitled to the same First Amendment freedoms that they hold as citizens. In the context of the campus itself, the fair exercise of those rights involves the following considerations.

1. Freedom of association. Students should be free to organize and to participate in voluntary associations of their own choosing subject to university regulations insuring that such associations are neither discriminatory in their treatment of other members of the academic community nor operated in a manner which substantially interferes with the rights of others.

Under appropriate circumstances, e.g., where university funds may be involved, or where support is provided other than through voluntary contributions of the members themselves, the university may reasonably require a reliable accounting procedure and a list of officers or other persons responsible for the overall conduct of the association.

While a faculty adviser may be of benefit to an association and provision may be made to encourage this degree of faculty support, a voluntary student association ought not be

subject to the control of its adviser nor should freedom of association be denied to groups unable or unwilling to secure assistance of this kind.

Affiliation of a voluntary student association with extramural organizations is not by itself a sufficient reason to deny that student association the use of campus facilities, although reasonable provision may be made to safeguard the autonomy of a campus organization from domination by outside groups.

Freedom of association on campus may properly reflect personal or political interests of the members not necessarily related to the operation of the university or its regular instructional program.

Acts of intimidation or disruption of the university may properly be forbidden by rules applicable to all members of the academic community, including voluntary associations.

2. Freedom of speech and assembly. Rules specifically applicable to speech and assembly on campus should be clear and specific to avoid the possibility of arbitrary enforcement and to avoid degrees of uncertainty which might otherwise inhibit the exercise of orderly and peaceful expression.

No rule should restrict any student expression solely on the basis of disapproval or fear of his ideas or motives. At the same time, the fact that students may pursue interests in political action through speech and assembly on campus does not abrogate their accountability as citizens to the constitutional laws of the larger society, and the university is entitled to reflect these constraints in its own regulations.

In addition, institutions of higher education have a serious obligation to protect the operation of the university from disruption and to protect the members of the academic community and all others authorized to use their facilities from harassment and coercion.

Modes of speech or assembly that are manifestly unreasonable in terms of time, place, or manner may be forbidden by clear and specific university rules. Such rules are a condition rather than a limitation of freedom within the university.

In addition to being protected in the exercise of their own freedom of speech, students should be free to invite and to hear any person of their own choosing.

Routine procedures required by a public institution before a guest speaker is invited to appear on campus, such as those applicable to other assemblies on campus, should be designed to insure only that there is an orderly scheduling of facilities and adequate preparation for the event.

Institutional control of campus facilities thus should not be used as a device of censorship. Guest speakers, not otherwise associated with the university, are nevertheless accountable for their conduct under valid general laws, and the university may seek the assistance of those laws under appropriate circumstances.

3. Freedom of the press is in a basic sense but a special aspect of freedom of speech. As a consequence, many of the rules protecting and limiting other modes of expression on campus will apply equally to the regulations of publications.

Ideological censorship is thus to be avoided in the determination of printed matter available on campus; access to publications is not to be denied because of disapproval of their content; and regulation of student publications that operate on the same basis as other private enterprises should be subject only to the same control as those respecting the reasonableness of time, place, and manner of distribution.

Similarly, valid general laws proscribing willful defamation, public obscenity, and other actionable wrongs apply equally to printed matter as to other forms of expression on campus. Finally, just as the institution has an obligation to discourage interference with speech, so also may it prohibit

acts of vandalism or other misconduct that seeks to hinder the orderly distribution and availability of publications on campus.

The fact of institutional subsidy and liability does not warrant censorship of editorial policy or content in any broad sense. The university may provide for limited review, however, solely as a reasonable precaution against the publication of matter which would expose the institution to liability.

At the same time, editors and managers of student publications should be protected from arbitrary suspension and removal from office because of student, faculty, or administrative disapproval of editorial policy or content. Only for proper and stated causes should editors and managers be subject to removal and then by orderly and prescribed procedures.

Where the student press is supported by compulsory student fees or other significant university subsidy or where there is a generally accepted public identification with the particular institution, it may properly be subject to rules providing for a right of reply by any person adversely treated in its publication or in disagreement with its editorial policy or its treatment of a given event.

University published and financed student publications should appropriately indicate that the opinions there expressed are not necessarily those of the university or the student body. Moreover, other student publications may fairly be required to indicate that they are not published or financed by the university, and that opinions expressed therein are without university endorsement.

4. Within the classroom. The classroom is not an unstructured political forum. It is a center for the study and understanding of a described subject matter for which the instructor has professional responsibility and institutional accountability.

Control of the order and direction of a class, as well as control of the scope and treatment of the subject matter, must therefore immediately rest with the individual instructor, free of distraction or disruption by students or others who may be in disagreement with the manner in which he discharges his responsibilities.

Thus, disruption of the classroom itself or conduct within the classroom insubordinate of the instructor's immediate authority may appropriately be forbidden by the rules of the university.

Given the fact that the classroom may not be utilized to ventilate grievances relevant even to the conduct of the class itself, at least when the instructor indicates his reluctance to depart from the assigned materials, universities should provide some orderly means outside of the classroom for the review and disposition of such grievances.

Private colleges and universities

Students enrolling in private institutions of higher education are generally subject to whatever extent of regulation each institution has determined to be appropriate to its own needs and circumstances.

The Constitution does not require that a private seminary subordinate its belief in revealed truth to criticism within its own walls, nor does it forbid the dedication of private assets for secular purposes which the grantor or his trustees desire to limit specifically as they think best.

A private college is generally free to determine to its own satisfaction the nature and conditions of the educational service it wishes to offer. In a pluralistic society, the basic value of all of these institutions inheres in the fact that they offer alternatives which remain highly attractive choices to many people.

Correspondingly, the principal obligation of these institutions to those whom they encourage to enroll is primarily one of clear and honest disclosure. Where the institution thus makes clear its own expectations

and provides an understanding of what it deems incompatible with its purposes as well as what it will attempt to provide, respect for its rules may be expected in the conduct of its students subject to whatever process of change the institution has otherwise established.

In practice, however, some private institutions (e.g., a school with a fixed doctrinal or ideological objective) may also need to reflect their special characteristics in their staffing and admissions policies, as well as in their rules and publications.

Otherwise, some students and faculty may come into the institution in spite of, rather than because of, the institution's special characteristics. Their displeasure with policies with which they disagree may result in controversy which in turn may trigger a disruption, despite the institution's attempt to make its policies clear in its rules and publications.

Many private institutions neither feel a need for regulating student political expression in any manner differently from what we have recommended for public institutions, nor do they think it desirable to set themselves apart in this respect.

Indeed, it deserves to be said that a number of private institutions do not maintain even that degree of restriction on student political activity which the law allows even to their public counterparts. The commission fully supports the many distinguished private colleges that have adopted such policies.

The respect intends only to acknowledge that variation among the circumstances of all our institutions of higher learning makes it imperative to recognize that each institution must enjoy a substantial measure of freedom in reconciling these recommendations with its policies and objectives.

ORDER WITH JUSTICE

The interests of the public and higher education will be best served by entrusting the primary responsibility for the maintenance of order on the campus to the universities when they are willing and able to perform the function.

Searching self-evaluation, the identification of valid grievances, and prompt attention to institutional shortcomings provide the most effective assurance for the maintenance of order. As in other fields of endeavor, prevention is to be preferred over therapy.

Not all confrontations can be avoided. In such cases, primary reliance should be placed on university disciplinary procedures, supported by university security personnel, for the maintenance or restoration of order and the prevention of future disturbances. The imposition of effective sanctions against students guilty of misconduct after prompt, fair disciplinary proceedings will normally be sufficient to maintain an acceptable level of order without the necessity of outside intervention.

Nevertheless, conditions can arise where a university may be required to seek the assistance of civil authorities or civil authorities may, on their own initiative, determine that intervention is necessary in order to protect persons, property, or the orderly functioning of the university or to put a halt to flagrant violations of law.

University disciplinary procedures

The commission is concerned exclusively with appropriate procedures in cases where a substantial sanction, such as suspension or expulsion, may be imposed for alleged misconduct by a student.

The recommendations of the commission are not intended to apply to purely academic decisions by a university, nor do they apply to cases in which the penalties involved are not serious.

Furthermore, the commission recognizes that a student, with knowledge of his rights,

may prefer and may choose to accept informal procedures for the determination of guilt or the imposition of a sanction.

[Following are] principles for achieving reliability and fundamental fairness.

THE NEED FOR RULES

A number of colleges and universities have instituted disciplinary proceedings against students on the basis of their "inherent authority" to maintain order on campus, in spite of the absence of any rule forbidding the particular conduct which formed the basis of the charge.

Where the particular conduct involved substantial disruption and was otherwise of such a nature that the students could not reasonably have supposed that it would be condoned by the institution, the university's authority to proceed simply on the basis of its inherent authority has generally been upheld by the courts.

On the other hand, one federal court of appeals has recently rejected the view that inherent authority alone is a sufficient basis for serious disciplinary action, further observing that the doctrines of vagueness and overbreadth that other courts have applied to political activity "presuppose the existence of rules whose coherence and boundaries may be questioned."

Given the unsettled state of the law and the reasonableness of competing points of view on this subject, the commission is not inclined to recommend either that a university may never act against a student other than pursuant to a published rule clearly furnishing the basis for a specific charge or that it may freely act against the student even in the absence of any clearly applicable and previously published rule.

Rather, the commission believes it more useful to state the various considerations according to which an institution may better determine what fundamental fairness may require in the circumstances of a given case.

A college or university ought not be expected to formulate elaborately detailed codes of conduct comparable to consolidated criminal statutes of a state.

For most purposes, however, it is feasible for a college or university to describe its standards with sufficient clarity and to publish those standards in a form readily available to its students in a manner which, while not exaggerated in length, detail, or complexity, will provide fair notice of what is expected and what is forbidden.

Where a rule has been adopted which is applicable to behavior involving some aspect of freedom of speech, association, or assembly, there is a special obligation that the rule be stated with clarity and precision.

The scope of rules

[The commission's view is] that university rules may appropriately overlap certain state and federal statutes, and that the concept of double jeopardy does not limit the scope of a university's rules. Thus, a student who disrupts a classroom in a manner that subjects him to a general statute applicable to assault and battery may also appropriately be subject to university disciplinary processes as well.

Conversely, the fact that certain student conduct is not necessarily subject to any state or federal statute does not make it inappropriate for a college to forbid such conduct, as may ordinarily be true of cases of cheating on examinations or plagiarism.

The relation of college rules to general laws is therefore largely coincidental, and the scope of university rules is appropriately determined by the announced objectives of the university.

At the same time, the commission recommends that a college or university ought not proliferate its rules beyond the point of safeguarding its own stated objectives.

Equality of enforcement

The university has an obligation to apply its rules equally to all students who are similarly situated. This does not mean, however, that a university is required to refrain from prosecuting some offenders because there are other offenders who cannot be identified or who are not presently being tried for some other valid reason.

Impartiality of the trier of fact

The truth or falsity of charges of specific acts of misconduct should be determined by an impartial person or group.

Notice of the charge

A student accused of specific acts of misconduct should receive timely notice of the specific charge against him. The charge should be sufficiently precise to enable the student to understand the grounds upon which the university seeks to justify the imposition of a sanction and to enable him adequately to prepare any defense which may be available to him.

Information concerning the nature of the evidence

If a student denies the facts alleged in the charges, he should be informed of the nature of the evidence on which the disciplinary proceeding is based.

He should either be given the right to confront the witnesses against him or be provided with the names and statements of the witnesses who have given evidence against him.

Opportunity to be heard

The student should be given an opportunity to respond to the evidence against him.

Basis of decision

The trier of fact before whom the hearing is conducted should base its decision on the evidence presented at the hearing.

Representation of accused

A student should have the right to be represented at the hearing by any person selected by him, such as a fellow student, a faculty member, a lawyer, or a friend from outside the university community.

Interim suspension

As a general rule the status of a student should not be altered until the charges brought against him have been adjudicated.

Experience has shown, however, that prompt and decisive disciplinary action may be required in extreme cases before there is an opportunity to conduct a hearing, as in cases in which a student's continued presence on campus constitutes an immediate threat or injury to the well-being or property of members of the university community, or to the property or the orderly functioning of the university.

The imposition of interim suspension should entitle the suspended student to a prompt hearing on the charges against him. Fundamental fairness may require an informal review of the decision to impose interim suspension in the absence of a prompt hearing on the charges.

Relationship between campus authority and civil authority

Intervention by public authority may take several different forms: the issuance of an injunction; selective arrests; the introduction of substantial numbers of police into the campus; civil suits for damages. All have advantages and disadvantages. Whether or when there should be recourse to any of these techniques raises questions of judgment and discretion, rather than issues of law.

The commission can do no more than to indicate some of the considerations that should influence the decision of what tech-

niques should be utilized and when they may be most appropriate.

Injunctions

A number of institutions have sought injunctive relief for the purpose of quelling campus disturbances, with varying degrees of success.

There are a number of advantages to the use of injunctions in cases of student disorders:

An injunction can be narrowly drafted to deal with a specific disturbance with much more precision than a general statute, thus responding more effectively to the disruption while avoiding unduly broad limitations upon freedom of expression.

The injunction constitutes a public declaration by the courts of the unlawful nature of the actions taken or threatened by the disrupting students. The issuance of an injunction may generate a favorable public reaction to the position of the university.

It may persuade moderate students to refrain from participating in the disruption. It imposes restraint upon the disrupting students by a non-university governmental entity. Students may obey a court order when they would ignore the orders of a university official. The injunction may provide students with an opportunity to end a disruption without losing face.

There are also disadvantages. It is frequently necessary to utilize local law enforcement officers to serve process. In most states, the injunction is not self-enforcing, although at least one state statute makes a violation of an injunction of a crime in itself.

Enforcement of an injunction through court proceedings may involve some of the same problems as those presented when police are used to quell a disturbance. A university that is not prepared to enforce the injunction through contempt proceedings should not seek one. To obtain an injunction in such a situation might permit a court decree to be flouted by students with impunity.

Criminal sanctions

Arson, assault, breach of the peace, conspiracy, disorderly conduct, false imprisonment, inciting riot, malicious destruction of property, riot, willful interference with meetings, trespass, and unlawful entry are examples of the wide range of conduct that fall within the traditional ambit of the criminal law.

In addition, a number of states have recently enacted new legislation dealing with civil disorders or specifically relating to student disturbances. Recently enacted statutes in different states make it a crime to refuse to disperse or leave a building or property when notified to do so by a designated official; prohibit interference with freedom of movement or the use of facilities; punish "willful disturbance," conduct that "impedes, coerces, or intimidates" university personnel, or "disruptive acts"; make it a felony to enter and destroy records; or prohibit the possession of firearms or "Molotov cocktails" on campus.

Also, several states have modified their riot laws or enacted comprehensive riot control legislation. Additional state legislation authorizes designated university officials to require persons who are not students or employees to leave the campus or permit such officials to place the campus off limits to persons outside the academic community.

It is doubtful that most students realize the broad range of conduct that is subject to the criminal law. Local arrangements between "town and gown" and discretionary enforcement of campus of drug and alcohol laws have, with the passage of time, insulated some members of some campus communities from a recognition that their conduct is subject to all the laws of the jurisdictions in which they are located.

Recourse to the initiation of criminal charges by a university should normally be limited to circumstances when it is impossible to deal with the problem adequately within the university.

There are clear dangers involved in ordering police to enter a campus in large numbers. The university should recognize that any massive intervention of police on the campus carries with it the possibility of "broadening support for the radical movement, polarizing campus opinion, and radicalizing previously uninvolved persons."

Nevertheless, a university and the members of its community may find themselves in a defenseless position, guarded by only a small cadre of security officers who have received little training in the maintenance of order, in the face of determined efforts at disruption by large numbers of persons.

To permit wide-scale lawlessness may encourage students to believe that the law may be flouted with impunity, and that the role of police is confined to controlling conduct outside of the university.

Civil action for damages

Civil suits for damages should be brought in appropriate cases by a university or members of a university community for injuries arising out of student disturbances.

The Importance of Planning

Few things are more important than for universities to establish contact with civil authorities and develop in advance understandings concerning the circumstances that will justify intervention and the manner in which they will react if intervention becomes necessary.

Double Jeopardy

The fact that a student has been subject to university disciplinary proceedings does not in any way preclude a subsequent trial of the student for the same conduct by public authorities, if his conduct violated the laws of the jurisdiction.

Likewise, the fact that a student has been tried in the criminal courts does not preclude the assertion of an appropriate disciplinary sanction against him by the university. There is no legal basis for the claim of "double jeopardy" in either case. The institution should recognize the possibility, however, of injustice resulting from the imposition of multiple sanctions for the same conduct.

Legislative Denial or Revocation of Financial Assistance

The commission views with deep concern . . . [federal and state] statutes and proposals for terminating financial aid to students who engage in disruptive activities and to the universities which they attend.

A university might be required under such legislation to cut off financial aid on a basis of its own determination despite doubts as to the legality or constitutionality of its action. Termination of aid would be required without reference to relative culpability.

These proposals could operate in a discriminatory manner because they apply only to those who receive federal financial aid, a specific class of needy students. Thus, the wealthy student who leads a campus disruption would be unaffected by the legislation while a follower could lose the financial assistance needed to complete his education.

Proposals to withdraw all aid from institutions of higher learning could deny assistance to innocent students who need financial aid. Training for University Security Personnel

Funds should be made available for the development of training programs for university security personnel, and these programs should include a substantial component designed to make the officers sensitive to the aspirations and tactics of student groups.

A LESSON IN "NIXONOMICS": OR HOW NOT TO FIGHT INFLATION

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the American people are as unanimous against inflation as they are unanimous for apple pie. Therefore, the rhetoric about how much a public official or an administration is against inflation cuts no ice. The question is what is being done about it. People who are hit by inflation are entitled to results—not campaign oratory.

THE FACTS ABOUT INFLATION

The first fact is that during 1969, the first year of the Nixon administration, we had the greatest piece of inflation—a 6.1 percent rise in prices—that we have had in 18 years. The second fact is that during the same period when prices were going up out of sight, real wages were coming down. Thus, in December of 1969 the average factory paycheck, in terms of buying power, bought less than a year ago.

Other things that went up or down are worth looking at to see who did something about inflation and whether that something was bad or good. In 1969 interest rates reached the highest level since the Civil War. They went up 41 percent. Bankers' profits went up accordingly. Treasury Secretary Kennedy's former bank, Continental Illinois Bank & Trust, had January-June profits up \$3 million—over 10 percent—from 1968 levels. The bankers are fighting inflation by making record profits. And remember that interest rates—the price of borrowing money—are unlike other prices. The Government directly controls interest rates; it tells bankers exactly how much they can charge to loan money.

President Nixon says high interest rates—high prices for borrowing—help stop inflation. I say all that high interest rates do is make it impossible for the little man to borrow, while the giant corporations go on borrowing and pass the costs on to the consumer. One thing high interest rates have stopped, however: homebuilding. Housing starts are low and getting lower. The housing shortage gets worse every week. We are building less than half of what Congress said we need to build to adequately house our population by 1980. And all because nobody can afford to borrow money to build.

President Nixon says Government spending must be limited to fight inflation, and he vetoed a bill providing money for education and health research on this ground. The fact is that Congress cut the President's budget requests by over \$5½ billion during 1969 and most of that came from the bloated defense budget—not health and education. In only four instances did Congress appropriate more money than the President asked for, and these instances totaled less than 2 percent of all money appropriated. On the other hand, military appropriations were cut more than \$8 bil-

lion below what the Defense Department requested. And we cut other appropriations substantially below what the President asked for: the District of Columbia budget by 33 percent, military construction by almost 20 percent, and foreign aid—mostly military—by almost 60 percent.

The budget fight was not a contest between those who oppose inflation and those who favor it, although this is what the President would like the American people to believe. It was a fight about where to cut the budget. The President requested money for such nonessential spending as the SST. He refused to veto a bill which authorized more than \$1 billion for Navy ships which he had not even asked for. But he did veto a bill for education and health. Yet repeated studies have shown that spending on education produces over twice the return per dollar invested as public works projects, and thus is less inflationary than most other Government spending.

WHAT PRESIDENT NIXON HAS NOT DONE ON INFLATION

The President still endorses the old Republican philosophy that the only way to fight inflation is high-interest rates, tight money, and budget surpluses—which means high taxes. That is the same philosophy that brought us three recessions in 8 years under President Eisenhower. It is the same myth that John F. Kennedy exploded when he gave America unprecedented prosperity and price stability—the best in the world—during 1960-64 while maintaining small budget deficits to promote economic growth and cutting taxes. It is probably no coincidence that President Nixon's economic philosophy just happens to be one that also benefits bankers and large corporations—which are mostly Republican—over middle-income families, homebuilders and small businessmen—who are mostly Democrats.

But if the President's reliance on an outworn economic philosophy has been unwise, his refusal to use other anti-inflationary tools is indefensible. President Kennedy showed that wage and price controls were unnecessary if the moral authority of the Presidency was put behind realistic guidelines. I and other Congressmen have repeatedly urged the President to form a council of labor, business, and Government leaders which could set reasonable guidelines for wage and price increases. The President could then use his powers of persuasion and the pressure of public opinion to insure restraint. But the President has refused to use this proven method.

What is more, a Democratic Congress has given the President power to directly control business and consumer credit. He now has legal authority to control the amount of business and consumer borrowing—and thus spending—directly, rather than relying on high-interest rates and tight money which hurt the little man and depress housing starts. But the President has refused to use this method either.

Finally, although every economist in

the country—whether liberal or conservative—admits that it is the billions spent on the Vietnam war which caused inflation, the President has reduced this spending only minimally. Thus while inflation caused by the war rages out of control, the President continues to pour billions of American tax dollars down that bottomless well. While we spent \$23 billion in Vietnam last year, the President vetoed an education and health bill which appropriated only a little over \$1 billion more than he had requested.

THE FUTURE OF "NIXONOMICS"

But all this is past. We all know how bad inflation has been. The question is what will happen next. Will Nixonomics be able to stop raging inflation without throwing us into a recession? I believe that the danger of recession, with all its devastating social and economic consequences, looms very large.

Economic indicators like industrial production and the stock market were already indicating by December of last year that the growth of the economy had slowed to almost nothing. So the economy has stopped growing, but prices continue to rise. And while the economy fails to expand, we continue to add 175,000 workers per month to the labor force, and 2 million people per year to our population. And with the same amount of goods, services, and wages to divide among these new arrivals, everyone's share goes down. Then profits go down. Then men are laid off. That is called a recession, and that is just where we are heading unless the administration begins to loosen money controls, lower interest rates, use its influence to encourage wage and price restraint, and employ direct controls on business borrowing.

That fact is that high taxes and high-interest rates are just too clumsy to be used as tools for management of a modern, highly complex, industrial economy like ours. It is the classical Republican "hands off" attitude—exemplified by the President's refusal to put his prestige behind wage and price guidelines—which will lead to a recession. And with recession comes business decline, economic stagnation, and massive unemployment.

THE ADMINISTRATION BUDGET

And finally, after vetoing appropriations for health and education on the ground that they were inflationary, the President has sent to Congress a budget so precariously balanced that it is almost certain to wind up actually as a deficit budget. For example, the President counted on revenues in his budget which the Congress has not even voted yet; he counted on accelerated collection of withholding taxes; he assumes a 6-month deferment of military and civilian pay raises; he assumes congressional approval of highway and airport user taxes which have already been rejected once by Congress. In fact, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee has estimated that if the President's assumptions do not work out, there will be a \$5 billion deficit, instead of a surplus.

And the reason for this deficit, if one occurs, will be that we continue to pour literally billions into military weapons and the war in Vietnam. This year for the first time since troops were committed to Vietnam in 1965, the President has refused to disclose the cost of U.S. military operations in Southeast Asia. Perhaps we are still spending over \$20 billion a year in Vietnam; perhaps the amount has been slightly reduced. But the taxpayers and the Congress will never know—the White House refuses to disclose what portion of the Defense Department budget is going to support the war.

The President's chief economic advisers cheerfully are predicting a substantial increase in unemployment—seeking to assure America that such an increase is necessary and proper to control inflation. I find it hard to imagine that this logic will be persuasive on those 5 or 6 percent of Americans who will be the unemployed victims of Nixonomics. And I refuse to believe that this unemployment is a necessary ingredient of inflation control.

So it is not really a question of how many times the President says he's against inflation. We are all against it. The question is, What is he doing about it? Judging from the evidence available so far, the answer is "not enough to control it," but a great many people are going to suffer from the wrong things that are being done in the name of inflation control.

MISSISSIPPIAN RECOGNIZED

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I was quite proud to learn this week that one of my constituents, Mr. Joe T. Cook of Louisville, Miss., has been awarded the George Washington Honor Medal by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa. Mr. Cook is editor of the Winston County Journal and won the award for his editorial entitled "What's Right With America." It should also be noted that this Mississippian won this award last year with his editorial entitled "Speak Out for America." Freedoms Foundation honors each year, through its awards program, those individuals, institutions, and organizations that have promoted a better understanding of the American way of life through the things they have written, said, or done during the past year. I am also quite proud of the fact that Mr. Cook's winning editorial was the same one I thought so much of and had reprinted in the *Record* last year for all my colleagues to read. Mr. Speaker, I salute Mr. Joe T. Cook of Louisville, Miss.—an outstanding American who is working to make this great Nation of ours even greater.

THE CYBERNETIC STATE

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1970

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, there are as many versions of the American future extant these days as there are individuals who have passed typing I and who have gained access to a communications medium. The glut of prognosis, prediction, and projection has created what has been termed the "futures market," which is just as unpredictable and, for many, just as profitable, as are winter wheat futures. The cloud of apocalyptic rhetoric has obscured the horizon; and the mainstream of rational thought has been badly polluted by the waste products of Ph. D. mills.

This effusion of forecasting is, in most cases, about as accurate and as reliable as was the forecast which caused a weatherman's picnic to be rained upon recently. That is why I was especially delighted to read an article in the February 1970 issue of *Trans-Action*, by Allen Shick, a research associate at the Brookings Institution. He is no apologist for those who have walked the corridors of power—as he has himself by his service as a consultant to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, the Bureau of the Budget, the Rand Corp., and the President's Advisory Council on Government Reorganization.

Nor is he overly enamored of "buzz words" and slogans which fit so conveniently on posters and in the similarly one-dimensional minds of those who parade the streets—which some have used as the corridors of publicity.

Mr. Shick's article "The Cybernetic State," is tightly reasoned and extraordinarily provocative. I am not at all sure that I can endorse the totality of his opinions and thoughts in this article but I do share his concerns and consider the areas he discusses to be the most important issues of our times.

If nothing else "The Cybernetic State" can be read as another reason why the Congress must address itself to the radical changes in political and personal structures and postures which the new technology demands. I believe that much of what he says is solid evidence supporting the call I made to the House to establish a select committee on technology, human values, and democratic institutions. As Mr. Shick points out, we are undergoing a time of accelerated alteration of our basic form of government and my purpose in offering House Resolution 717 on November 19, 1969, was to make sure that elected representatives continue to be able to influence meaningfully the actions of the Federal Establishment.

Mr. Speaker, it is all well and good to work toward a society in which responsible men, freed from passion, will exercise disinterested intellectual evaluations of policy. I believe that this is the situation today: benevolent men make beneficent judgments. But this is not a guarantee of success, for few people will voluntarily move into a furnished

room of mind and conduct, no matter how extravagantly opulent and soul-satisfying the environment may seem to whoever created it.

And I see another flaw in the implicit value judgments of men of good will. We cannot be sure that the second or third generation of users of the intricately constructed cybernetic systems will all be card-carrying members of the Society of Decency and Sanity. Cybernetics means computer-catalyzed control servomechanisms and, once established and the "loop being closed," totalitarianism is merely a program, not a pogrom.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I believe "The Cybernetic State" is particularly pertinent to most decisions we must make in this Chamber and I am pleased to include it in the *Record* at this point:

THE CYBERNETIC STATE

(By Allen Shick)

Visions of the cybernetic age always have been of two sorts. Some have foreseen a period of unparalleled freedom, with man possessing the autonomy and leisure he has sought for ages. The cybernetic state would care for many of man's needs but would not exact a loss of freedom and selfhood; freed from the bonds of necessity and collective action, man would attain new command over himself and the world. The other version sees man as inevitably enslaved by the state, surrendering to powerful and uncontrollable institutions the freedoms that mark his selfhood. He will be controlled by the seeing hand which dictates his actions and thoughts. Man will be programmed—genetically or through thought control. He will be free to obey.

One can make a plausible case for either version or for both. Certainly both potentials are latent in cybernetics, though the actualities of history lend scant encouragement to the hope that the potentials will be used only for good. The story has always been the same. Man discovers fire for warmth and sustenance, but he also uses it to burn and destroy. Prometheus unbound is not always beneficent.

The Constitution of the United States might not quite endure for the ages, but it has survived great transformations in the conduct of public affairs. In few sectors have the changes been more pronounced or portentous than in the creation of the vast administrative structures that dominate the economy and the polity of the country today. The entire administrative staff of George Washington's government could be fitted comfortably into the offices of a medium-size bureau. As a government we have undergone several critical changes in the relationship between the administrative and the political. At the start the United States was designed as a political state; the growth of industry and public regulation in the nineteenth century led to the emergence of an administrative state; New Deal activism opened the door to the bureaucratic state; now, according to some expectations, we stand at the threshold of the cybernetic state.

Though it is possible to place each of these states into time zones, aspects of each appear in all periods of American history. The political, which was prominent in the earliest times, still carries over in the main representative theatre—the Congress—as well as in other national institutions. The cybernetic, which appears to be the emergent form today, certainly was operative in Alexander Hamilton's day through some of the accounting controls maintained over financial transactions. What characterizes an age is the dominance of one form of political-administrative relation, not the total absence of the others. The computer may be the logo of

the cybernetic age, but the dawn of this period was portrayed in various artistic and scholarly works long before the first computer was constructed. Moreover, long after a particular form has been replaced, certain of its characteristics continue to show vigor and growth. Even if bureaucracies is displaced by cybernetics, we can anticipate the further development of large-scale bureaucracies for particular functions.

The cybernetic state of 1984 is not a product of the constitutional decisions of 1787. The Framers were occupied with building a political state, that is, with creating representative institutions through which power would be exercised and controlled. They did not—and could not—look to administrative or bureaucratic structures for the power or the controls, nor could they deal with the myriad of administrative details pertaining to the operation of the new government. Thus, there is scarcely a hint in the Constitution of the great organizational machines that would be created in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and which ultimately would recast the distribution of powers and rights into something other than was envisioned originally.

FROM THE POLITICAL TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE STATE

In designing the political state, therefore, the constitutional architects concentrated on rules of representation, qualifications for office, the scope and powers of the several branches, the allocations between national and state jurisdictions and the establishment of limits on political action. These limits were aimed, for the most part, at the representative institutions, primarily at the national legislature. "Congress shall make no law" was the First Amendment formula for protecting political rights; trial by jury, along with its associated procedures, was the formula for guarding judicial rights. No explicit protection was incorporated into the Bill of Rights against infringement by administrative fiat or proceeding. Of the basic rights, only the "search and seizure" prohibition was generalized to cover all public actions, though its actual intent was to curb police power.

The passage from the political to the administrative state was due largely to the growth of national industry, the creation of new regulatory instruments and agencies prompted by that growth and the mobilization of administrative expertise to manage public activities. Whatever power Congress gave to administrators, it gave away voluntarily, and often with the blessing or the prodding of the president. The first national regulatory instrument, the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) was established in 1887, and three years later the Sherman antitrust controls were enacted. Resistance came from a different quarter, the judiciary, which insisted on applying the established constitutional standards to the new administrative structures.

One initial judicial response was to apply A. V. Dicey's "rule of law" doctrine to the administrative arena: "...no man is punishable or can be lawfully made to suffer in body or goods except for a distinct breach of law established in the ordinary courts of the land. In this sense the rule of law is contrasted with every system of government based on the exercise by persons in authority of wide, arbitrary, or discretionary powers of constraint." Applied strictly, this rule would have barred virtually all administrative adjudication, but it ultimately came to mean that the fundamental procedures of law (notice, hearing, examination, etc.) would have to be adhered to in administrative proceedings.

In striking out against the emergent administrative state, the courts relied on a parochial reading of the commerce clause and a stretched version of the 14th Amend-

ment's due process clause. National power over the economy was curtailed in the Sugar Trust case (1895), the Child Labor cases (1918, 1922) and various New Deal cases. Much economic activity was deemed beyond the reach of the police powers of the states. For this view the courts found bountiful constitutional support by converting the 14th Amendment, which had been stripped of its Negro rights functions by the Slaughterhouse and Civil Rights cases (1873 and 1883), into a protection against state regulation of business activity.

But the emergence of the administrative state was to be determined in the legislative and executive arenas, and though the courts could harass and delay, they could not prevent the establishment of powerful regulatory instruments that were only feebly controlled by their creators. Following a spate of anti-New Deal decisions in the mid-1930s, the Supreme Court abruptly abandoned the review of economic legislation and began to concentrate on other areas of constitutional agitation. Since 1936 not a single piece of federal legislation has been invalidated as an unwarranted delegation of power to an administrative body.

Though it has some operating responsibilities of its own, the basic purpose of the administrative state is to regulate the new corporate concentrations of wealth and power. The administrative state, thus, continues to abide by the doctrines of the separation of public and private and of the basic soundness of the private market. Its task is not to impose a political solution, but to make use of specialized skills to correct for certain market defects or improprieties. To accomplish this requires a separation of the administrative from the political, a separation which was built into the major regulatory agencies and accepted as the cardinal precept by the intellectual fathers of the administrative state—Frank Goodnow, Woodrow Wilson, William F. Willoughby and others. By means of this separation, administration is made superior to politics, and efficiency replaces representation as the key operational norm of public policy. The fundamental constitutional rules of representation continue to apply to the political sphere, but not to membership on regulatory agencies, advisory boards and other appointive institutions. Regulatory agencies are made exempt from the sacred doctrine of separation of powers and are assigned substantial judicial, legislative and executive powers. As larger and more diffuse grants of power are turned over to efficiency experts and new concentrations of functional expertise are established within the cabinet structure, executive departments, particularly their bureaus and subunits, gain a good deal of de facto independence for the political institutions. They are also liberated from the president, who is no longer capable of directing their regular affairs, and from Congress, which no longer can exercise close supervision of their actions.

FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE TO THE BUREAUCRATIC STATE

The bureaucratic state began to displace the administrative state when the primary function of government changed from regulation to operation of business. Though the federal government had assumed a *doing* role in selected programs many years earlier, the New Deal era can be regarded as the great leap to bureaucratism. The bureaucratic state was designed to replace the market with public enterprises, not merely to correct for its deficiencies. It represented a refusal to accept the market's verdict that millions of elderly people must be poor, that rural communities must lack electric power lines, that the housing supply must be substandard and unable to meet demand, that farm incomes must sink below subsistence levels. The regulatory commissions that marked the ad-

ministrative state have come to pale by every comparison with the operating bureaus of the federal government. Federal bureaucrats in the Bureau of Public Roads pass judgment on the location and design of federally aided but locally constructed highways and thereby exercise far greater sway over transportation policy than does the ICC; federal SST (supersonic transport) decisions probably will have greater air travel implications than will the combined regulatory actions of the Federal Aeronautics Administration and Civil Aeronautics Board.

Federal jurisdictions sweep over state and local boundaries, for a bureaucracy must always be structured according to its functions rather than according to local tradition. This movement is fueled by massive grants-in-aid and by federal involvement in functions long reserved for local action, such as law enforcement, poor relief and basic education.

In the bureaucratic state, the administrative and political are joined, united by interest-group brokers who traffic between the bureaucracies and the people and weave complex clientele-congressional bureau relationships for the purpose of channeling the public enterprises into the service of private interests. A new public market thus is created, resembling the private one in certain aspects, but lacking both the ultimate test of profit and the unremitting competition of adversaries. Interests bargain with one another at the public trough, but they also form coalitions and drive out competition when it suits their objectives. Politics and administration sometimes seems to be split again—in a divorce of convenience—as when advisory groups are comprised of functional specialists and community leaders in order to keep the program free of politics. But it all is for the sake of enhancing interest politics, and efficiency becomes the instrument of established group interests rather than a value in itself.

Interest groups form and begin to dominate the political-administrative process because in the bureaucratic state enormous interests are at stake, and the rewards for public success often far exceed what can be obtained in the private market. Moreover, all the political-administrative actors benefit in some way from the brokerage services provided by groups. Voters do not have an electoral mechanism for transacting their public business directly with the bureaucracy, nor do they often possess the skill or resources for doing so. Bureaucrats use the groups for stirring clientele support for their demands on the president and Congress and for protecting themselves from executive and legislative supervision. Congress looks to the groups for learning about what the public wants and for gaining electoral support. The president uses the groups for mobilizing the electorate and for communicating his policies to the masses. Each one must pay a fee for the brokerage services, and as a result, the interest groups govern the terms of the politics-administration process. Hence, the unification of politics and administration does not restore the constitutional representatives to their original political positions. As a further debilitation by the commanding role of the interest groups.

Of primary importance is the need to find constitutional support for the legitimacy of interest politics. Political writers rediscover Madison's *Federalist* No. 10 and elevate it to a status superior to the constitutional scriptures themselves. In providing an intellectual justification for group politics, this discovery establishes competition in the political arena as a desirable substitute for market competition. It enables social checks and balances to take the place of legal checks and balances. It provides a substitute for electoral representation. It satisfies the requirement for external control of administration. Congress doesn't do the job well any more, but the groups do. They dis-

tribute the benefits of public activity widely, at least among those within the ambit of group operations.

The courts lose interest in administrative regulation and become concerned with the nationalization of civil rights and the granting of constitutional status to the rights of association. Operating under the Frothingham rule, which bars taxpayer challenges to federal programs, the vast programmatic development of the New Deal through the Great Society period escaped judicial review. The courts nationalize the Bill of Rights and apply federal standards to a widening group of police and criminal actions. They nationalize racial policies in the schools and in other public programs. They nationalize representation and apply strict one-man, one-vote rules to state legislatures and municipal councils.

Interest groups gain constitutional status, but they thereby become affected with a public interest and become subject to public controls. In *Thornhill v. Alabama* (1940), the Supreme Court extends free speech protection to peaceful picketing in labor disputes. Almost two decades later, with the 1959 Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, Congress adopts a bill of rights for union members. The integrated bar (which means requiring membership in a state bar as a condition for eligibility to practice law) was upheld in *Lathrop v. Donohoe* (1961), and the courts frequently have upheld group-licensing requirements for particular professions. In a series of cases involving the NAACP, the Supreme Court affirmed the right of association. Certain interest group activities were brought under public control in the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 which was upheld in *United States v. Harris* (1954).

Still another judicial response occurs when the bureaucratic state reaches its full form and the cybernetic age begins to dawn. Unlike previous eras in which the courts told governments what they must not do, the courts now begin to instruct governments as to what they must do. Thus, recent court decisions in the welfare field have required bureaucrats to provide welfare benefits to indigents who have not satisfied local residence requirements, to families which have a man in the house and to pay benefits above ceilings enacted by the state legislature.

As the bureaucracy grows and creates the technological skills for its operation, certain critical transformations begin to occur in its character. The lines between public and private begin to break down, efforts are made to break away from the lockstep of functional bureaucracies, government regulation tends to become insular. These and many smaller and larger changes signal the beginning of the cybernetic state. And as the character of the state changes, so too does the focus of constitutional development, as it is expressed in the case law and in agitation for constitutional reform.

FROM BUREAUCRATICS TO CYBERNETICS

In the postindustrial cybernetic state, government functions as a servomechanism, concerting the polity and the economy to achieve public objectives. As a result, government changes from a *doer* of public activities to a distributor of public benefits, and the kinds of programs it operates reflect this change. For example, welfare has been one of the key programs of the bureaucratic state involving a large-scale welfare bureaucracy with thousands of governments and millions of people. As welfare becomes cybernetized, it shifts to some form of guaranteed income, adjusted automatically as the income of the recipient rises or falls. (It doesn't matter for our purposes whether the guarantee is in the form of family allowances, negative tax or other means, though of course each form carries a different set of costs and benefits.) Government

action is triggered automatically by changes in the economic condition of the individual. Government writes the "program" (in the computer sense of the word), establishes socio-static norms (such as the "poverty level"), monitors the system and activates the money-disbursing machines. This is far different from the conventional welfare bureaucracy in which eligibility and benefits are determined by corps of case workers in accord with overall legislative and administrative rules.

Embryonic cybernetic-type programs have been established in health where Medicaid and Medicare now far exceed in cost the standard health programs such as local health clinics, public hospitals, Hill-Burton grants, publicly aided research and so forth. But the new health programs are only imperfectly cybernated because government lacks the means of controlling medical costs or for monitoring the demands on the system made by its clients. We can anticipate that aspects of program cybernation will bloom in other functional areas—education, public transportation and housing seem to be attractive possibilities.

In the public sector, perhaps the greatest advances have occurred in the macroeconomy where the refinement of national income accounts over the past 30 years has given federal authorities a substantial capability to guide the economy and to make quick adjustments as economic conditions change. But the macroeconomy is not yet fully cybernated. The accounts are not perfected to a reliability where governments can use servo-mechanistic controls; that is, it cannot fine-tune the economy and be sure that it will get the results it expects. Furthermore, Congress has not shown much enthusiasm for proposals to empower the executive to take nonlegislative corrective action. For example, it is not likely to adopt in the near future Herbert Stein's proposal for a permanent surtax that is adjusted upwards or downwards as rates of employment and other economic barometers fluctuate. Yet we should not underestimate the capabilities gained over the past generation, and it is possible that a cybernated macroeconomy is nearer than we think.

Cybernetic development lags behind in the microeconomy, partly because the accounts still are in a primitive condition, and partly because the resistances to cybernation are stronger here. Some first steps have been taken, as the recent publication of *Towards a Social Report* shows, but we will have to progress a long way before we have social indicators comparable in scope and reliability to the basic economic indicators. Cybernation cannot operate under uncertainty, for in this condition corrective action must always be tentative and discretionary. Moreover, there is little current evaluation of public programs and, hence, little feedback from results to decisions. The introduction of Program-Planning Budgeting (PPB) and related types of policy systems gives evidence of the directions in which reformers would like to move, but it is now four full years since PPB was launched in Washington, and its meager accomplishments demonstrate that the job is not easy. Furthermore, in the macroeconomy, adjustments could be made for the benefit of all, and though the relative shares might be altered as a consequence of public action (not everyone benefits equally from economic growth), almost everyone gains. In the microeconomy, however, adjustment means taking from some to give to others. Government action has to be redistributive. Hence, it is likely that this will be one of the last policy functions surrendered by the representative institutions.

In the cybernetic state, the lines between public and private crumble. Government enters markets previously reserved for private entrepreneurs, but new private institutions enter arenas hitherto dominated by public bureaucracies. The penetration of govern-

ment into private spheres is especially revolutionary in certain service areas such as doctor-patient and lawyer-client relationships. But as the lines between public and private erode, private institutions recapture some of the functions long regarded as public. Thus, in some instances, elementary education is turned over to private contractors, usually operating with public funds and always under public control. The market is rediscovered, but it is harnessed to public purposes, and its behavior little resembles that of the traditional form.

As public and private commingle, distinctions between them become meaningless. Private institutions acquire legal status as "public accommodations," as provided in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and sustained by the Supreme Court in *Heart of Atlanta Motel Inc. v. United States* (1964). Some recent court rulings have brought private clubs, perhaps the last bastion of privation, within the orbit of public control. It is no longer possible to tell where the private ends and the public begins as public and private funds and workers flow and work side by side in development, job training and countless other programs. In the basic social accounts, the public-private distinction no longer is significant; more and more, the accounts concentrate on the aggregate social input and output, regardless of its public or private character.

A similar amalgam occurs in the political and bureaucratic spheres. Administrative actions become politicized, and political actions become bureaucratized. Consider these two examples from the storehouse of current events. The supreme political act of determining legislative districts has been turned over to computer specialists, sometimes under court order, sometimes by legislative acquiescence. When this happens, legislative districting ceases being a political act, however great its political consequences are. Administrative actions have been politicized in the "maximum feasible participation" arenas as the floodgates of political activity, including formalized election procedures, have been opened to policy decisions that previously were made bureaucratically.

The regulatory functions of government which loomed so large in the administrative state, turn inward as government develops self-regulatory devices essential for its servo-mechanistic role. Corps of federal regulators man the guidelines in the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity and regulate other public officials (mostly state and local) through a network of grant controls. Moreover, departments begin to use the computer to extend their program reporting, auditing and evaluating procedures to their own operations.

FROM EFFICIENCY TO EFFECTIVENESS

Yet even as government regulation turns inward, its policy perspectives turn outward. In the bureaucratic state, decision-making tends to be insular, concerned with the internal dynamics of the organization rather than with the effects on the citizenry. For preparation of his programs, the public official looks to his files and from there to the reports and accounts they contain, not to the hospital ward or the classroom. In drawing up his claim on public resources, he looks to last year's records and decides what to add and what to subtract. The cybernetic state, however, is goal-oriented. It is concerned with the income of families, the condition of the economy, the health of mothers, the intelligence of children. Efficiency norms which are relevant to the internal operation of organizations no longer hold the commanding positions they once had. Effectiveness criteria take their place as the guiding determinants of public policy.

To achieve this looking outward, the cybernetic state must be systemic rather than

functional. In the development of the bureaucratic state, the functional arrangement was useful because it promoted efficiency, mobilized the use of specialists and gave representation to professional interest. For a goal-directed cybernetic institution, the functional form is an encumbrance, for it allows the interests of the functionalists to get in the way of the results. To take a common case: An education bureaucrat in HEW cooperates with a contact in the National Education Association (NEA) and obtains agreement that 25,000 volumes is the appropriate minimum for a high school library. This standard is transmitted via the state functional bureaucracies to school boards and via NEA publications to school administrators. Soon the 25,000 minimum gets adopted by the accreditation agencies as one of the conditions for holding accreditation. While this numbers game is being played, it is hard to keep in mind how many books high schoolers read, what they read, what they learn from the books and whether other forms of communications can substitute for books. In other words, the function gets in the way of the goal.

The cybernetic form of organization is based on systems such as model cities in which functional specialists may continue to operate, but not as the key policy makers. The system is guided by systems engineers, planners and other generalists whose perspectives transcend the functional specialties.

In a full-blown cybernetic state, politics and bureaucracy would wither away, though their forms might remain. That is, there still might be contests for public office, but the process would not have its old importance. To the extent that socio-static norms limit conflict, the scope of politics would be narrowed. Whether or not we ever reach the "political fiction" world of genetic or thought control, there will be less disagreement in the future than existed in the past. Already, in the macroeconomic sphere where the cybernetic condition is most advanced, differences between Democrats and Republicans now are minimal, despite the great stakes involved and the history of party controversy.

As government becomes self-regulative, with its actions guided by goal criteria, the bureaucracy also might begin to shrink in size and importance. Government will have nuclear "central guidance clusters," such as the Council of Economic Advisors, but it will not have the need for armies of bureaucratic doers. Thus, as welfare shifts from poor relief to income maintenance, the logic of maintaining thousands of social workers on the public payrolls decreases.

In similar fashion, the interest groupings which dominated the bureaucratic state no longer retain their central positions. If it operates by means of cybernetic systems, government no longer requires the intermediation of these groups for communicating its goals, receiving policy preferences from the public and controlling the actions of the bureaus and representative institutions. The president can use the mass communications media to reach the public more effectively than through group exertions. Mass, class and individual identities become more important than group associations.

In the cybernetic state, there is both a massive collectivization of action, continuing the trends established in the earlier administrative period, as well as increasing privatization of life. Among the recent straws in the wind, we can point to the growing penetration of the hospital market by national corporations, the institutionalization of research and the dominance of contemporary philanthropy by the foundations. At the same time, life is increasingly privatized; that is, individuals are more isolated from one another and have greater liberty in personal behavior. Individuals are freed from traditional social and communal bonds: the

Pill enables them to engage in private sexual practice free of effective social sanction; a television in each room allows each member of the family to watch his program without obtaining approval from others; a multi-car family can send the husband to his club and the wife to her group with both maintaining contact with one another via remote communications. The combination of collectivization and privatization is what gives the cybernetic state its Janus-like character, capable of elevating the individual to new levels of personal autonomy or of crushing him under the yoke of public oppression.

As the character of the state changes, so too do the methodologies for studying it. Political science is transformed into policy science, not merely a change in semantics, but in focus as well. For politics ceases to be the central concern; after all, if politics withers away, why study it? The policy sciences deal with the purposes of government and with the organization of intelligence for their attainment. They encompass both public and private spheres and concentrate on the content of policy rather than on the process of choice. The analytic constructs also change—from processes and institutions to systems and communications nets.

At this point in the development, it is difficult to gauge how far we have moved from the bureaucratic to the cybernetic or to predict whether the cybernetic state will in fact be realized. The bureaucratic state has not yet reached its final development, and some of the current reform proposals are relevant to it rather than to the emergent cybernetic form. We do not know whether all the (good and bad) dreams of the future are technologically feasible or whether all that is feasible will be done. Perhaps there will be a Luddite uprising against cybernation and its systems. But our task here is not to foretell the future—there are enough year 2000 wizards on the market already—but to comment on the current state of affairs. Enough cybernetic tendencies have surfaced to have bestirred the minds and actions of reformers and to have created new kinds of constitutional issues.

CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES IN A CYBERNETIC STATE

Examination of the potential character of the cybernetic state suggests the kinds of things that will stop being constitutionally active or will be less significant than they once were. Probably the greatest wane will be in the area of civil liberties, for as the political processes diminish in salience, there will be less incentive to try to stretch these rights through constitutional action. The traditional First Amendment rights, such as free speech, might be more important to individuals who are concerned about their personal lives than to those concerned about marshaling political resources to influence public action. Of what use will be the right to speak if the speaker has little ability to challenge the dominance of the experts and systems engineers and little ability to sway the course of public policy by his vote?

Yet it is possible to foresee agitation for two types of political rights in the cybernetic age. First might be the right *not* to engage in political activity, not to be part of the collective mass that is politicized in the service of the state. Though Supreme Court rulings stand in the way, the right to remain silent, the right not to speak or to answer, might once again become defensible on First Amendment grounds. Second, the concept of *speech plus* might be further stretched to provide constitutional protection for overt political actions above and beyond the protection conventionally afforded the expression of ideas. Search and seizure litigation will have a prominent place on court dockets as new cybernetic technologies are used for surveillance. But many of the hot criminal procedure issues of the 1960s probably will diminish in importance,

and if this occurs, a chapter on the great constitutional battles of the bureaucratic period will be concluded.

In every age the list of constitutionally active issues consists of the things we want to gain and the things we want to avert. In the cybernetic age, four types of constitutional issues might move to the forefront: the protection of personal rights; control of the cybernetic system; forms of political participation; and the structure of government.

The protection of personal rights. We have already noted that in a cybernetic state the distinction between public and private tends to dissolve and that, as institutions become more collective, the individual finds his life more privatized. For many future-gazers, the stereotype of the cybernetic tomorrow is of Big Brother watching over you, possessing the means to monitor every move and thought and constantly guiding your actions. Whether or not this fear is justified, constitutional guardians are already on the alert against moves that might bring us closer to 1984. The recent uproar over the questions to be asked in the 1970 census gives one indication of the sensitivity to governmental invasions of privacy. Still another indication was the opposition in Congress and elsewhere to proposals for a national data center. Despite all protestations of being misunderstood and despite the offering of assurances that privacy would be protected, the scientific and governmental proponents of the data bank were unable to sell their pet project to Congress.

Privacy already is a big issue in the courts, and it probably will get bigger. Until recent years the courts viewed the right of privacy as a derivative of protections against self-incrimination and unreasonable search. But in two landmark decisions, the Supreme Court established privacy as a fundamental constitutional right. In *Griswold v. Connecticut* (1965), a state law prohibiting the use of contraceptives was overturned. "We deal with a right of privacy older than the Bill of Rights—older than our political parties, older than our school system." The second decision, in *Stanley v. Georgia* (1969), voided a conviction for possession of obscene films. "If the First Amendment means anything, it means that a state has no business telling a man, sitting alone in his own house, what books he may read or what films he may watch." And in a clear reference to that awful cybernetic tomorrow, the Court declared: "Our whole constitutional heritage rebels at the thought of giving government the power to control men's minds."

It is unlikely that we have seen the end of privacy cases. Many new circumstances could bring the issue to the courts time and again: security checks, census questionnaires, rights of public employees, students or inmates protesting the use of TV monitors, the use of drugs in the home, the sexual conduct of consenting adults, invasion of privacy by private groups.

Privacy will perhaps be only one form of the coming constitutional issue; what is the state's and what is the individual's? As the lines between public and private become blurred and as the tensions between the state's thrust for collective action and the individual's quest for autonomous behavior increase, we can anticipate heightened uncertainty and controversy over the respective spheres of the state and the individual. For example, can the state compel an individual not to smoke? Can it require adults to work? Can it force mothers to send three-year-olds to school? None of these issues is distinctively new; but what is new is the ground on which they are being fought and will be decided. Prohibition was a moral issue, but smoking is already a scientific one.

Control of the cybernetic systems. Two types of visionaries want to control the cybernetic state; the first, to ensure the real-

ization of its noble capabilities; the second, to avert its coming.

Inasmuch as the cybernetic system is fueled by the communications that course through its networks, carrying messages from command posts and feedback from monitors, control is often desired over the communications apparatus, both the network and the content of the messages. We have mentioned recent objections to census probes and central data systems. In addition to these attempts to withhold data from the state, control is exercised by opening up publicly held information to outsiders. If information gives power, its possession should not be monopolized by the state. This is the ethos of the Freedom of Information Act which became operative in 1967. The act enables an individual to sue a federal agency for access to information which has been denied to him. The initial experience under this act gives little encouragement to the hope that the government will eagerly open its books to public examination. It might be that only the confrontation tactics of "Nader's Raiders" and like groups can wrest the secrets from the state.

As the distinction between public and private narrows, the right to know also is applied to the private sector. The recent spate of truth-in-lending and truth-in-packaging legislation gives evidence of the ferment in this sector.

But the duality of rights sought in the cybernetic age reflects the dualism of visions of the future. The right of privacy is not always compatible with the right to know. The government that gives away information under the Freedom of Information statute might be taking away another man's privacy. Man can be manipulated by being kept in the dark or by being exhibited in the open. How these two rights are reconciled will be one of the critical constitutional tests of the cybernetic age.

A cybernetic state operates under socio-static norms: employment rates, poverty levels, educational criteria. Traditionally, we have been willing to entrust the establishment of these standards to professional interests. Economists tell us what an acceptable rate of unemployment is; doctors tell us what the normal life expectancy is; school administrators decide norms of educational achievement. But as these norms come to be the servomechanistic trigger of public action, it is possible that the competence of professionals to set the standards will be challenged. Perhaps the Orshansky scale used by the Social Security Administration to define the level and incidence of poverty in the United States will be challenged in a "Brandels" brief which demonstrates that it costs much more than \$3400 a year for a family of four to subsist in New York City. Just as individuals quarrel over the setting of the thermostat in their homes, so they may begin to contest the official policy norms. The due process and equal protection clauses have the elasticity to do the job.

Many of the challenges are likely to come from those most affected by government action, especially recipients of public benefits and public employees. Welfare recipients have carried their case to the courts, the streets and government offices, sometimes with conspicuous success. Groups of public employees such as FEPS (Federal Employees for a Democratic Society) have agitated for "the creation of a genuine 'participatory democracy' both within our Federal agencies and within our society-at-large."

The notion that those who benefit most from government control should have the greatest control over its policy seems to be a conflict of interest, but it is merely a new twist on the standard interest group ideology that those whose interests are most at stake legitimately have the largest voice in shaping the policy. Cross out welfare recipients and put in television stations, and

the notion is neither revolutionary nor absurd.

Forms of political participation. The basic form of political participation was molded for the political state, a system of free elections for public representatives. This system has persisted through two centuries of change, but it no longer possesses the relevance it once had, at least not for those who are dissatisfied with the shape of things. As the character of the state changed, new forms of participation grew up, interest and functional representation in particular. The cybernetic state probably will continue the old rituals of participation, but it might add some new forms suited to the problem of controlling the cybernetic apparatus.

Judging from the activism of the New Left—and that might not be a reliable guide—we can expect both withdrawal from politics and political confrontation, with the same persons vacillating between the two patterns. "Woodstock," as one participant put it, "was just like government and politics and law just didn't exist."

The belief that what is important is not changing government but changing yourself might be one of the romances of youth, but it seems to enjoy wide currency today. Yet youth has also marched in the peace moratorium, worked in the ghettos, blocked entrances and challenged authority. Though they have no confidence in the efficacy of representative politics, the New Left does believe in direct political action. Yet the cry of "participatory democracy" so loud and clear at Port Huron seven years ago is muted these days. To participate is to offer oneself for co-optation, to join the establishment, and to surrender a commitment to radical change. Whether through withdrawal or confrontation; the challengers do not seek change through the Constitution.

The structure of government. The cybernetic age opens up two thrusts for change in government organization: new forms of community government and new structures for cybernetic guidance; the former to enhance the opportunities for participation, the latter to create a government that functions cybernetically.

Participation can be as part of a mass—faceless, remote, not able to relate to the central institutions. Or it can be in institutions that are cut down to man's size. Mass participation exists when man is politicized in the service of the state. Personal participation for most citizens, however, can only be within a community, the scope of which is immediate to their life wants. For the first time in many years, political scientists are concerned with the optimal size of cities, and government reformers want to reduce rather than expand the scale of local government. Maximum feasible participation, whatever its virtues or defects, can only occur in the neighborhood where one lives and transacts his personal life. Obstacles to community government exist at both the state and municipal levels. Dillon's rule has never been repealed: the state continues to enjoy constitutional preeminence over its subdivisions. Proposals for a constitutional structure that vests political status in the community have been voiced by several writers. Viewed from the perspective of the neighborhood, City Hall might be a bigger obstacle than the State House; indeed, enterprising community leaders now negotiate agreements with state officials to bypass the formal municipal structures. It is not likely that community recognition will come de jure; rather, through the operation of grant programs and government policy, neighborhood units might be able to gain a measure of political autonomy.

Community government is valued by minorities because it offers them some self-government apart from the larger majority. Blacks are approximately 10 percent of the national population, but their proportions and strength grow as the scale of govern-

ment shrinks. Community control is a modern version of Calhoun's concurrent majority, and, accordingly, there are areas in the country where it can be made to work against the interests of black and others. But few among the minority—whether the blacks or the poor or the dissidents—take comfort in the minorities rule assurances of the pluralists; only members of the majority seem to benefit from that kind of minority rule. Blacks see metropolitan consolidation—once the darling of the liberal set—as still another means of robbing them of the municipal power that their numerical status within the city entitles them to.

The second restructuring of the state is to provide for the conduct of its cybernetic functions. If government is to serve as the central guidance structure, it must be vested with that capability. While we would not rule out the possibility of constitutional overhaul to accomplish this, the more probable path to change will be through a buildup of the presidential capability to govern without undue dependence on the functional bureaucracies. We can expect a continued enlargement of presidential staff and perhaps a reorientation of the executive office to serve a policy development and evaluation role in the interdepartmental and intergovernmental arenas.

Thus, the two lines of development will be at the bottom and at the top, the community and the presidency. Whether these changes can be concordant—most reformers today believe that they are, that the president is more a friend of the ghetto than either the mayor or governor—we do not know. Much depends on which version of the cybernetic state triumphs.

The changes from the political state to the emergent cybernetic state have been linear, with few reversals or zig-zags. There has been a virtually continual closing of the gap between public and private and expansion of the scope of governmental jurisdiction.

But though the changes can be explained, they cannot always be predicted. In retrospect the cybernetic state might turn out to have been fantasy, compounded of fears and hopes. Much of the expectation of the coming cybernetic age is grounded on the capabilities of technology, not on the behavior of humans and organizations. Yet these latter, neglected factors might prove to be decisive. Citizens might resist the cybernetic penetration of their lives. Bureaucracies might refuse to wither away. Indeed, we have no precedent for such a dismantling to occur. President Nixon's new welfare scheme moved toward cybernation of benefits, but it also gave the welfare bureaucracy additional responsibilities for the determination of eligibility.

THE MAN WITH THE AX-HANDLE MIND

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if any of my colleagues are unaware of my attitude concerning Gov. Lester Maddox's conduct in the House dining room last Wednesday. I am quite certain that my anger and disgust were amply reflected in my comments on the House floor shortly after the incident, and in the resolution I am cosponsoring which would make it clear to the Governor that he is no longer welcome in the House dining room.

I was pleased, however, that the Washington Post today published an editorial expressing similar sentiments. I include it in the Record for any of my colleagues who might have missed it:

THE MAN WITH THE AX-HANDLE MIND

No one who has paid any attention to the public career of Governor Lester Maddox of Georgia will experience much surprise at learning that he handed out pick and ax handles to admirers in the restaurant of the House of Representatives. It's about what you would expect of the man. Where there's no feeling as they say there's no sense either. But one does look for a certain level of sensibility in the House of Representatives itself.

To Governor Maddox the ax-handle is a symbol or perhaps more accurately a kind of signature. It carries him back to a day of doughtiness which launched his public career—a day when he defied the authority of the United States Congress and brandishing an ax-handle barred from his restaurant men who chanced to be born with black skins. To black Americans the ax-handle at least in the hands of Lester Maddox, has become a symbol, too—a symbol of racial discrimination, of white "supremacy," of intolerable tyranny.

Rep. Charles C. Diggs, one of the nine Negroes elected to the House of Representatives by their fellow-citizens, felt impelled—doubtless by a simple sense of decency and honor—to tell the Governor of Georgia that the manners of his statehouse are not suited to the United States Capitol. The governor was, of course, incapable of comprehending this.

The boorishness of the Governor of Georgia when he is allowed at large is, to be sure, a problem for Georgians. The meanness and want of imagination that could let a man act with such crude carelessness for the feelings of others is, perhaps, of small importance. "A gentleman will not insult me," Frederick Douglass once said, "and no man not a gentleman can insult me." But what followed in the chamber of the House is troubling indeed. There, in a body supposed to be representative of the American people, men laughed aloud when Congressman John Conyers and Congressman Diggs protested about a slur upon their race. Were there no white men present to resent the slur upon the Congress? Men laughed at pain and humiliation inflicted on their fellow-men by reason of the color of their skins. And such men call each other "gentlemen."

THADDEUS MACHROWICZ

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1970

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to the memory of our former colleague, the Honorable Thaddeus Machrowicz, who passed away on February 17, 1970.

I consider it a privilege to have known Judge Machrowicz and to have been associated with him for a number of years as a member of the Michigan delegation. He was an extremely able Member of Congress and of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ted Machrowicz was fortunate to have lived a useful and honorable life. He served as a Member of this body for 11 years and then became a Federal district judge in 1961.

He was an outstanding Member of Congress and I was delighted to have been able to call him my friend.

ADDRESS OF JOHN W. MACY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John W. Macy, Jr., had a distinguished career here as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. As president of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, he is continuing to render great leadership and outstanding service to the American people.

Mr. Macy recently delivered an outstanding address to a special "Satellite Dinner" in Columbia, sponsored by the South Carolina ETV Network and was transmitted by NASA ATS-1 satellite and ground stations in Rosman, N.C., and Mojave, Calif., to PTV station KCET, Los Angeles. This marked the first public television broadcast via satellite and was part of continuing experiments by NASA and CPB to determine the feasibility of television transmission by satellite within the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues and the American people the superb address delivered by Mr. Macy in Columbia, S.C., on February 17:

REMARKS BY JOHN W. MACY, JR.

Governor McNair, distinguished members of the South Carolina General Assembly, ladies and gentlemen:

It is a great pleasure to be here this evening to join you in this historic meeting.

In effect, we are all on a trip to outer space this moment, and I want you to know that I find it a heady experience, indeed.

Although public or educational television is non-commercial, I think a word is in order at the outset for the "sponsor" who has made this broadcast—the first public television broadcast by satellite between two points in the United States—possible. I refer, of course, to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Compared to some of the other achievements of NASA—our landing on the moon, in particular—this event is small. It is, however, like that mammoth achievement of last July, another small step forward.

We have only begun to glimpse the possibilities offered by the use of satellites for mass communications. Someday a signal beamed skyward may ricochet off a satellite directly to all television stations. This achievement may reduce the cost of television transmission. It may create far greater broadcasting flexibility than we currently possess. It may be feasible by this means, for example, for special mobile transmitting units to cover events in remote areas inaccessible to standard equipment, and by a reverse process, satellites may help bring TV programs to populations in isolated communities. The current tests are enabling NASA to iron out the technical problems involved and to determine the costs of such future operations.

If these tests are successful, the American public will reap a major domestic dividend from the national space effort. And we will have the honor of saying that we were there at the beginning.

This feat is, however, more than a scientific breakthrough. It is also providing the opportunity for a human breakthrough. The distance between the moon and earth is far greater than between Columbia and Los Angeles, but the distance between many of the people in our nation is greater still. We have in this new communications tool which we are testing here tonight the opportunity to lessen the gap between Americans.

How we use this tool is not the province of the scientist. It is rather the responsibility of those of us who fill the airwaves and of you who represent the people. I pray that we will have the wisdom and compassion to use this tool to its greatest human advantage.

It is most appropriate, I believe, that this historic broadcast is emanating from South Carolina, and in the presence of the State's legislators. It is appropriate because the South Carolina ETV Network, your communications creation, has proven itself one of the nation's most innovative and socially constructive public TV systems. It has earned the right to this honor.

This point of origination is symbolic of the fact that public television, like our nation itself, speaks from many centers. The tapestry that is America is woven of threads from 50 States and 50,000 communities. We run a danger when this fact is forgotten. When Walt Whitman heard America singing, it was her "many voices" he heard. We must hear those many voices again. And this broadcast indicates public television's dedication to that goal.

In recent months, there has been a great deal of controversy swirling over our heads concerning the role of the broadcast media. I cannot speak for my counterparts in commercial broadcasting; I also need not, since they speak very ably for themselves. But I would like tonight to speak of the role of public broadcasting.

The basic question to be asked of a broadcasting enterprise is: Is this enterprise acting in the best interests of its audience? Is it informing and enlightening its audience? Is it enabling the many people in that audience to grow?

As these questions concern public television, I believe the answer is a resounding yes!

In fact, I believe (and like a good broadcaster, I admit to my prejudice) that public television is as up to date and relevant to today as the satellite which is carrying my words. I believe it is also one of the most valuable national resources the country has at its disposal—a resource which has only begun to be exploited and one which, before long, will be recognized as indispensable.

That is a bold claim. But I assure you these words are chosen with care and fashioned out of conviction.

Ever since people began huddling around that eight-inch screen, squinting, it has been a popular pastime to talk about the potential of television. We in public television have gone beyond talk, however, we have begun to realize that potential. We have gone about this task quietly—sometimes, too quietly, but with a steadiness of purpose that will not be denied.

We in public television have, I believe, significantly begun to enrich the education of millions of children.

We have inspired millions of others, children and adults alike to reach beyond themselves to a better appreciation and understanding of life.

And we have, as an institution whose roots run deep into the community, contributed to the solution of many social problems.

In the area of education, I need only mention "Sesame Street" to begin to explain the powerful force for the good that public television is.

It is probably safe to say that no television program in years, commercial or otherwise, has caused as much excitement as this one. And this is a program for children three to five! Once again, the word "sesame" has had the magic power to open a door—the door to education.

If you have not seen "Sesame Street", you should. I do not guarantee you will learn anything, but I do guarantee that it will excite you to the prospect of what television can do to help fill a national need. This is a program that put together several relevant facts and came up with a concept that, before it has run its course, may well revolutionize education. The relevant facts were these: One, that half a child's IQ develops before he reaches the age of four. Two, that children aged 3 to 5 watch an average of 25 hours of television a week. And three, that of all the things they watch on television, children particularly enjoy commercials. Putting these facts together, the experts in communication and education at the Children's Television Workshop came up with a program that uplifts rather than downgrades the child and entertains as well as teaches.

Audience research indicates that as many as six million children may be enjoying "Sesame Street." Research of another kind indicates also that these children are learning from the program. After only six weeks, young viewers of the program, this research showed, had made significant learning gains over non-viewers.

The cost of "Sesame Street" for its first two years (the first of which was devoted only to research and development) was \$8 million. This works out to little more than \$1 a child. Is it worth it? You bet it is, and among those who agree is President Nixon. Two weeks ago, the President lauded the program and expressed pride in the fact that the government (through the U.S. Office of Education) is helping to make this project possible.

The worth of this program becomes even more apparent when one considers how many millions of dollars would be required to build the additional classroom space to teach these youngsters in the traditional manner. And how can one place a price-tag on the head-start in learning and life of even one small child?

When one ponders the success of "Sesame Street," he is led to wonder, can't the same systematic approach be applied to make television work as well in meeting other social goals? If television can work this minor miracle, can't it work others?

The answer, I think, must be yes.

In testimony before the House Education Subcommittee in December, I proposed that the same experimentation that preceded the development of "Sesame Street" be tried in other areas. If television can teach preschoolers to think, then it can surely be used effectively to teach both children and illiterate adults to read. And it can be used to train people for jobs and to enable them to earn a high school diploma. These highly desirable social aims can be achieved through television—especially through public television. Freed of the necessity to attract the largest possible audience at all times and endowed by the public with a mandate for public service, these tasks represent natural endeavors for public television. And they represent a natural complement to the services provided by commercial TV.

If there is any doubt about the capacity of public television to serve in a new and exciting way, that doubt was dissipated by the great success that the South Carolina ETV Network has had with "Job Man Caravan".

For those watching from outside South Carolina, "Job Man Caravan" is a weekly series designed to bring unemployed blacks and unfilled jobs together. A mobile TV unit

tours the state, broadcasting from a different town every time. There is entertainment, a personable host and equally personable young ladies called "Jobettes" who talk to people, tell them about jobs and training programs and put them in contact with the state employment agency and prospective employers. This effort has produced over 5,600 requests for job information. Eighty-one percent of these requests have led to job referrals, and of these, 22 percent have resulted in actual job placements. For its efforts, the South Carolina Network last year won an Emmy—but more important, the thanks of thousands of unemployed and underemployed persons. This is a program in which you of South Carolina General Assembly can take deep satisfaction.

You can also take pride—as I do—in other programs by your State ETV Network that serve both the individual and the welfare of the State.

I refer, to cite just one instance, to your "Law Enforcement" series. This program, I understand, is viewed by 90 percent of the officers and other officials in the State responsible for the public safety. By supplying them with instruction on improved techniques and information on new legal interpretations, this program enables them to be better law enforcement officers. And it doubtlessly results in an increase in both public safety and justice.

A similar service is also provided in South Carolina for medical professionals, bringing them up to the minute in advancements in their science. Who can doubt that this series, in addition to saving tax dollars, has also saved lives.

I am told that before long the South Carolina ETV Network will become a contributor, too, to the improvement of business affairs in the State. This will be made possible through a course for persons wishing to earn a Master of Business Administration degree through courses on their public TV channels.

From pre-school to grad school, and even for those who have given up on school, your network—the public network—is providing an opportunity for growth. And in doing so, it is adding to the growth of the State. In this recent State of the Union Message, President Nixon underlined the necessity at this time in our national history when we have achieved so much material wealth for us to improve the quality of our life. There can be no doubt that the South Carolina ETV Network is a valuable contributor to the improvement of the quality of life in South Carolina.

In the end, when one considers public television, I believe he must conclude that penny for penny, a dollar invested in this institution is one of the best investments Americans can make in their future.

Public television not only provides every man's child admission to what may prove to be the nation's finest pre-school, "Sesame Street", it also endows kindness and self-understanding on this child in the person of Fred Rogers, host of "Misterogers Neighborhood". It gives free lessons in how to sew and cook, or play the guitar. It can teach a person American history or mathematics and even help him get a high school diploma or begin work on a college degree.

It brings Americans into the company of their nation's finest minds and into the councils of government. At no cost, it provides the equivalent of a lifetime subscription to a wealth of magazines.

It says, Here's a season's pass to some of the finest performances in drama, music and dance. It not only makes the viewer witness to the heartache and problems of this time, but tells him, Here's what you can do about it, thus bringing government and the people closer together.

It provides a means of speaking for the

silent majority and for all minorities—whether silent or not so silent.

Public television is an invitation to travel, not only across America and the world but into the home of the man across the street and the man across the tracks. It says, Come stand in these shoes and know yourself better. It raises people's sights. And occasionally it raises a good, hearty and healthy belly laugh in affirmation of this wonderful, mysterious thing called life.

Forty-five million people take part in this experience called public television—people of all ages, all races, all income and education levels. And the national cost is about \$1.75 a person.

Compare this to the cost of a single admission to a concert or a good play. Compare it to what it would cost to build the additional school space for the country's 12 million preschoolers. Compare it to the value of finding a man a job or a new skill. Compare it to the priceless achievement of making the life of an individual or a community just a little bit richer—just a little bit better—and you will see that there is no comparison at all.

There are many examples of what public television can do and is doing. But one of my favorites is about a housewife who was advised by her doctor to pursue a new interest through educational television. The woman protested that she was dumb and that she really didn't see the purpose. But one day she did tune in and heard a discussion on the form of the sonnet. As a result, she began writing poetry. That lady was Anne Sexton. In 1967 she won the Pulitzer Prize for poetry.

Public television can't lead everyone to a Pulitzer Prize. But it can lead millions to a greater appreciation and understanding of life and each other. And the glory of this system is that it does so by speaking from many centers—that it reflects the diversity of our country through a diversity of talent spread through stations in 190 places in our nation.

In doing my homework for this appearance, I learned that the State of South Carolina has two mottos. They are "While I breathe, I hope" and "Prepared in spirit and resources".

I will leave you by saying that public television, too, provides hope and it is prepared in spirit and resources for the challenges of the years ahead.

Thank you.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. LEONARD FARBEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1970

Mr. FARBEIN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 52d anniversary of the independence of the Lithuanian people. That independence date marked the culmination of a long and determined struggle by a proud people for freedom and the creation of a free and independent State of Lithuania.

Under the banner of Lithuanian sovereignty, the Lithuanian people were able to improve their standard of living as they never had been able to under foreign domination, and were able to reawaken a renewed interest in their great common and historical achievements. Above all, they were able to achieve profound reforms in both the social and economic field that conveyed to every citizen, no matter how lowly, a sense of self-respect.

This progress was, to the regret of all, stifled by the Soviet occupation in 1940 and then the subsequent German presence. With the elimination of the Nazi scourge, Soviet forces once again engulfed Lithuania and have occupied it ever since.

Nearly 30 years have passed since Lithuania's subjugation at the hands of Soviet aggression. But the spirit of Lithuanian freedom has never faded. Even today these brave and courageous people cling to the hope and idea of freedom and independence.

I am privileged to represent American citizens of Lithuanian descent in the 19th Congressional District of New York. In New York City, as elsewhere in this country, they are public-spirited citizens and good neighbors. I am pleased to join with them this week in celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day and to join with them in the hope that one day the freedom of the Lithuanian people and their homeland will again become a reality.

FREEDOM OWES ITS LIFE TO CHRISTIANITY

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John E. Roberts is the very fine editor of the Baptist Courier, South Carolina's weekly Baptist publication. In the issue of February 12, 1970, appears an editorial by Mr. Roberts, entitled "Freedom Owes Its Life to Christianity." Certainly we need to remember our Christian heritage, and I want to take this opportunity to cause Mr. Roberts' words to be available to my colleagues and the country through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

FREEDOM OWES ITS LIFE TO CHRISTIANITY

Freedom is defined differently by different individuals according to their orientation and particular set of values. Last year some students and others seized a building at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and set about destroying records and equipment used by the professors in service of the federal government. The invaders were so determined to accomplish what they wanted to "because it was their right" that they evidently had no regard for what the professors "had a right to do."

Herein the violent protester plays squarely into the hands of Marxism. The Communists demand freedom when other forces are in control, but once they gain control they cut off all freedom. That has been demonstrated time and time again in Russia and its satellite countries, notably in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968.

Freedom is the principal offering of democracy, which affords conditions favorable to the growth of Christianity because it recognizes the dignity of the individual. But democracy is not the father of Christianity; rather Christianity paves the way for democracy. The spread of Christianity across Europe was followed by human rights and self government. Centuries earlier Moses had found it impossible to reason with the Pharaoh that the Israelites were chosen of God to go free. The pagan king could not understand that man was more than an ani-

mal, with rights of his own and a relationship with God that makes all men brothers.

The strength of democracy is directly dependent on the strength of Christianity. If Christianity maintains its vitality and influence, government that respects man's dignity and freedom will maintain comparable strength. If the vitality of Christianity wanes, the strength of democracy will not be far behind as power-mad governments come to the fore.

The anarchist who interprets freedom as license to thwart the freedom of others is only one step removed from the totalitarian ruler who puts down all rights, of which freedom of worship is first.

TRIBUTE TO MARLO THOMAS

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, no State becomes great without the accomplishments and social contributions of its individual citizens, and particularly of its young citizens. Because this is so, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not from time to time make official and public note of those who bring renown and honor to the State of California.

Especially worthy of the attention of all of us at this time is a young woman named Marlo Thomas, whom you and your families undoubtedly know on television as "That Girl." The fact that this show, in the finest of taste, brings entertainment and enjoyment every week to many millions of Americans, young and old, is commendable in itself, but there is much more of which Marlo Thomas can be justifiably proud.

As the daughter of the famed entertainer and leading television producer, Danny Thomas, Marlo could have settled for a well sheltered life with all the advantages her father's position would bring. She chose instead to create a productive life of her own.

It is indicative of Marlo's bent and character that she graduated from the University of Southern California with a degree in teaching. Her primary instinct is for public service, but she determined to enter her father's profession and make good on her own without his advice or consent. When Marlo left for New York to study acting, Danny Thomas shook his head and said she would never make it. Today, he admits that he never made a worse guess in his life.

The child of a famous father works under a tremendous handicap to attain individual recognition. Without the help or sponsorship of her father, Marlo Thomas fought the same battle as every neophyte actress seeking jobs. She started with a small role in a segment of the TV series, "77 Sunset Strip," and found occasional roles in other shows. All the while, she worked hard to perfect her acting. A great moment came when director Mike Nichols chose her to star in the London stage play, "Barefoot in the Park," for which she received high praise from the London critics.

Some 4 years ago, Marlo Thomas determined to have her own television show. She could now have easily asked her father to take this show under the

wing of his successful company, which has many successful series on the air. Instead, Marlo formed her own company to produce the "That Girl" series.

In April of this year, "That Girl" will air its 100th episode over ABC-TV. It is a record of longevity attained by very few series that are launched hopefully every year in this highly competitive industry. And it has further long life ahead of it. The talent of Marlo Thomas and her company has caught the public fancy, and she is once again considered as a top contender for an Emmy award this year.

Miss Thomas has already won five of her industry's highest honors for "That Girl." She previously won two Emmy nominations as "Best Actress." She received the Hollywood Foreign Press' Golden Globe. Both Photoplay and Fame magazines gave her their awards as "Most Promising New Star," and the latter named her in their top 10 of television. As a further extension of her talent, Marlo Thomas has just completed her first motion picture, "Jenny," which promises to broaden her career horizons.

All of this would be enough to rate Marlo Thomas as one of California's outstanding citizens, but it is only half the story. What makes her even more commendable is that she has not forgotten her early interest in public service, and is now using the advantage of her position to further the welfare of the American community.

In spite of her busy professional life, she makes time to serve as a member of the board of the Inner-City Cultural Center, headed by Gregory Peck, a nonprofit organization which brings modern and classical drama to high school students, mostly in underprivileged areas. She is also on the board of "Neighbors of Watts" which is dedicated to building child care centers in that minority community. She is honorary chairman of the annual fund drive for St. Jude Children's Hospital in Memphis, to which her father has also devoted much interest and effort. And, further, Marlo Thomas is a women's chairman of the Christmas Seal drive in California. Last year, she received the Humanitarian Award from the Cedars of Lebanon Chapter of B'nai B'rith.

This display of civic responsibility is citizenship of the highest order. In a woman as young as Marlo Thomas, it becomes one of California's, and this Nation's, greatest assets because she promises many years of continued service to the advancement of our society.

I suggest that, besides my own tribute, Marlo Thomas deserves the commendation of this entire legislative body and of the fellow citizens of her State and country.

OUR NATION'S PRIORITIES

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, in the pursuit of thoughtful consideration of the interests of my own constituents and

their concern for what must take priority on how we spend money on the problems which face the Nation today, I held hearings in Albany and Schenectady, N.Y., on our Nation's priorities. The response to these hearings was not only enthusiastic, but most enlightening, responsible, and representative of highly professional judgments. For this reason I would like to share with my colleagues some of the thoughts expressed at that time by some of the 50 witnesses who did testify:

PRIORITY ON PEOPLE

(Nelson F. Hine, cochairman, Schenectady Community Action Program Welfare Committee)

Our National Priority must be "People". Our purpose must be to serve all the people, and those most in need first. This does not mean doing what we have been doing, only doing it better. Putting our priority on people requires that we honestly face the fact that our present priorities are not devoted to people.

Historically, necessarily, we have made territory, power and wealth our national goals. Today we have achieved all of these. We must not continue to serve goals which are behind us. We are the most powerful nation, and the wealthiest, that has ever existed in the history of mankind. Now, for the first time in that history, a society can afford the minimum needs for housing, food, clothing, and education for all of its members.

Before we can effectively serve those in need we must recognize that enterprise and energy are not enough to achieve independence and security in today's world, nor will they be tomorrow. The overriding importance of position, preference, and fortune (including avoiding misfortune) is more widely appreciated, but everyone must understand that the poor are not responsible for their plight. And we must grow to recognize the corollary. The rich are not responsible for their wealth. There are no new frontiers open to the common man. We all should be heirs in fair measure of the pioneers that were.

We are trying to serve those in need with a patchwork of ill-fitting programs tacked onto a temporary project born of the great depression of forty years ago. We call it Welfare or Social Services, and the only thing everyone agrees on is that it does more harm than good. A system to serve those in need must be based on the principle that no shame should attach to support or benefit received from the government. Ironically, many are benefited today with no sense of guilt or apology. The owner of a private plane is subsidized, tax-free, in airport facilities in an amount estimated at \$8,000 per year. Homeowners are credited with interest on mortgages against income taxes. Highways, parks, and libraries benefit those who have access to them. Some Members of Congress and other farmers receive sizable grants from government subsidy programs. Business and industries get, and work to increase tax credits, contracts, and allowances in great variety. These and others like them are eminently respectable. Grants to ordinary citizens in need should not bring a sense of shame. Recipients of individual, personal help should not be labeled as lazy, or worse. We must, because we can, have a system of supporting ordinary people so that they can live free from the threat of hunger, cold, frustration and misery. It must be a system which does not rob them of personal integrity and dignity.

The term "ordinary people" is used deliberately. A lifeguard who made sinking swimmers prove they had hit the bottom would save few lives. A system which demands proof of continuing degradation as a condition of continuing assistance will save few families. Many hardworking persons

are bitterest against the poor because their own constant hard work just keeps the wolf from their door, but never drives him away. The fear of being sick, widowed, unemployed is always with them. Wages can never provide protection against disaster. The name of the disaster is poverty. The price of it is shame. When so much of wages is withheld for so many reasons (the worst of which is a heavily regressive tax system), the disparity between earnings and take-home pay justifies anger. It is unfortunate that it is misdirected against fellow sufferers, the poor. Middle class America gives generously to community services thru Red-Feather, United Appeals, and then spends most of the money on itself, because it needs to and deserves the benefits. If this is so, how much greater is the need among those with less than average incomes—under \$8,000 yearly.

Solution of the problems of people cannot be piecemeal. It will require a coordinated approach to economic areas—not necessarily political subdivisions, to family planning, home management, crime, education, employment, housing, taxes, transportation, and prices. Only government has the facilities to effectively treat the gamut of wrongs, and the authority to make necessary changes successfully. And as long as it gets the lion's share of the taxes, only the federal government can pay the bill. It is important to distinguish the government of this nation as being the wealthiest and most powerful the world has ever known. Certainly most of her citizens are not wealthy when 20% of them live on 5% of national income—counted by the 5% at the top who get 20% of the income. This government exercises as great a power over its own citizens as it does internationally, commanding their taxes, services, and lives if need be. Only one branch of this government represents the people. That branch, the legislative, was established with rights and powers necessary to a balance and to the preservation of democracy. The importance of a hearing such as this is enormous. The importance of the full exercise of its own powers by the Congress is greater.

I would like to suggest the following more specific items.

People need to participate in their own treatment. Ignorance and poverty are not synonymous. If personal integrity and dignity are destroyed, what is saved is worthless.

Poverty is predictable and preventable. Services of planning and counseling on every phase of family life should be available on a privileged basis, with maximum use of volunteer community resources. Perhaps the government should be in the small loan business to people as well as firms.

Education must serve those best who need it most, in urban and rural pockets; not just those in the suburbs who can afford it most. It should respond to the communities as well as direct them.

Health services must be provided on a clinical, preventive basis, even if this dislocates the present fee-for-service system.

Transportation must be developed for those who need it most—people without cars. We all pay for fire departments, telephones, and police on an "if we need them basis, not 'as' we need them. We can learn to do the same with buses and subways.

Industries should be required to locate factories where people will be served best, with coordinated facilities for shopping, schools, and services in a planned community, not permitted to build where land or labor is cheapest, transportation easiest, or for other reasons giving priority to the product. Our priority should be people. We need a Department of People as great and good as our Department of Defense.

Regressive taxation must be reversed, probably by an income tax without any deduc-

tions. Real estate should be taxed on location, not improvements.

Prices should be controlled by the government. They are now controlled by those who benefit from increasing them. A balancing pressure on behalf of those who must pay them is essential. This should include quantity and quality offered. Foods, for example, packed in fluids should be labeled with drained weight. Transparent containers should be required when possible.

Housing units are desperately needed to end the domination of the landlords. Landlords don't all want to be heartless, but the present situation forces them to be. Without enough housing, all the laws against all the forms of discrimination, or to fix standards of safety and sanitation are worthless.

Laws must protect people before property. The rights of each of us are no greater than the rights of the least of us. One immediate, specific need is for protection of wages from unjust garnishment. Construction eviction by shutting off utilities should require the same court procedure as eviction by landlord.

Putting people first will encounter opposition from vested interests, groups, and areas now enjoying preference. It will involve us in a revolution for change, but one that can be accomplished peacefully. We cannot continue to have peace by suppression of those not favored. Any other revolution must be much more destructive.

It is our national tradition, unique from the founding of this government, that a people can govern themselves, and that there should not, and need not be two classes of people; one superior, one inferior; one having, one needing. We are challenged today to show the world that we still believe this and that we can and will make it work.

Our present system, as it preserves poverty, is producing a generation that is unfit, untrained, and unqualified for anything but a life of degrading dependence. When hope and help are denied, anyone must be hopeless and helpless. Children do not choose their parents, and they are not born equal. With honest concern and hard work they can have equal opportunity.

FOUR NATIONAL PRIORITIES IN EDUCATION

(Frank J. Filippone, superintendent of schools, Ravena-Coeymans-Selkirk Central Schools, Selkirk, N.Y.)

I would like to express my appreciation for the opportunity to present some thoughts on what I consider to be four national priorities in education: race, reading, reordering priorities in our high schools, and money. In the brief time allotted, let me approach them in reverse order.

1. MONEY

The U.S. has long been committed to education for all, not education for the elite, and our citizens have put their money where their mouth is. They have footed the bill for the creation of the world's largest educational enterprise. However, continued pressures exist that demand even greater financial commitment. These pressures are: continually increasing enrollments, a continually broadening range of educational services, rising teacher salaries, inflation and the absolute necessity for special programs to bring the disadvantaged into the mainstream of American society.

These pressures can be met only by lessening the tax burden on the property taxpayer, increasing the share of financial support from the state government, and increasing the share of financial support from the Federal government.

One almost immediate possibility for financial assistance is a proposal by New York State Senator Thomas Laverne who has recommended diverting the 5% of the Federal income tax surcharge due to expire in July of this year for the use of the states in sup-

porting their educational programs. The moneys so raised would be returned to the counties of origin. Albany County alone, for example, would gain \$8 million in funds to support education; other counties in other states, I am sure, would also profit proportionately. The main benefit of Senator Laverne's proposal is the obvious fact that it does not call for an added tax burden, but merely the continuation of an existing one.

In the area of finance, I would suggest also a point of view. Education should be regarded not as a cost but an investment. Our success as a nation is in no small part due to our tremendous commitment to education. A reading of Servan-Schreiber's *American Challenge* will provide corroboration. This hard-headed, practical minded and articulate French writer has stated bluntly: "America is now reaping a staggering profit from the most profitable investment of all—the education of its citizens."

2. REORDERING PRIORITIES WITHIN OUR HIGH SCHOOLS

In the past and even now secondary schools have done an excellent job in preparing students for college. If anything, college as the magic key to success in life has been oversold. Secondary educators, therefore, must do more for our so-called average student in both the vocational education and use of leisure time areas.

Like elementary education, vocational education is not and has not been financially recognized and supported as it should be, but for a different and simple reason: college preparatory education is cheaper than vocational education. The dignity and value of work must be recognized by our high schools as the demand for the skilled worker increases each year.

High schools should also strengthen education for the use of leisure time. Unless American society completely collapses, we face the possibility by the end of this century of a four, or indeed, a three day work week for most of what we call our laboring force. How will our citizens use their leisure time? What will be the quality of their life? Escape into the boob tube, drugs, alcohol, and endless vacationing? Education can and must prepare for this relatively new but rapidly approaching priority. I am not suggesting that schools will turn every citizen into practitioners or even connoisseurs of the arts and letters. Rather I am suggesting that high schools must demonstrate to our young people that there is more to life than earning a living or escaping from one's barren, undeveloped self into a meaningless round of futile exercises in killing the clock. Consequently, we must increase our commitments to education in life time sports and recreational activities, music and art appreciation, understanding and evaluating film and TV programs.

Finally, may I suggest another area to re-examine? How necessary is the 12th year of high school? The freshman year of most colleges and the senior year of high school nowadays are almost indistinguishable from one another. Most colleges require a sequence of only three years in various subject matter fields for acceptance into a program of study. Most academically oriented high school students today have acquired more than enough units for a high school diploma by the end of three years of work than my generation had acquired at the end of four years of high school. The rapid and widespread expansion of the community colleges and increasing interest in an open admission policy are further reasons why I question the need and value of the 12th year of high school. From the financial viewpoint alone, this question deserves investigation.

3. READING

Despite some past successes, American education is faced with two tremendous and

dangerous failures: reading and race. Let me address myself to the first. Solving the reading problem has eluded us because we have neglected the most important level of education—the elementary level. We have poured enormous sums of money into the secondary and college levels and have starved our elementary schools. Education, unfortunately, has maintained and still maintains a kind of pecking order in which the most money, prestige and recognition goes to colleges, then to the high school and finally—and often condescendingly to the elementary. The situation and the money should be reversed. What sense does it make for one high school teacher to be assigned only a dozen seniors in the fourth year of a foreign language course while a first grade teacher struggles with 30 or 35 youngsters taking their first steps toward solving the wonder and mystery of learning what is locked in reading? The eminent Dr. Conant, for example, has analyzed our teachers colleges, our high schools, our junior high schools. Why did he omit a study of the elementary schools?

Reading will not be solved until we reorder our moneys and bring about a massive infusion of money into the elementary level. ESEA is just a beginning and belated recognition of this fact of educational life. We need small class size at kindergarten, Grades 1, 2 and 3 level, parent volunteers, teacher aides, technology, psychologists, reading specialists—a whole support staff. We must recognize a simple fact: the most important teacher is the elementary teacher. Unless they are upgraded, supported, assisted and strengthened, we will continue to face reading problems, dropouts, delinquency and the host of other symptoms that are manifestations and consequence of our failure to accord proper attention to elementary education.

4. RACE

Our public schools in past years achieved a stunning success in educating and Americanizing literally millions of immigrants; conversely, its present inability to help millions of young blacks develop their inherent potential for learning has been and is its most conspicuous and agonizing failure. To compound the problem, the ugly shadow of violence hangs heavy over our schools. A recent survey by the New York Times showed that, in both the New York Metropolitan Area and throughout the majority of our cities having any significant mixture of the races, our schools are becoming battlegrounds resembling more penal institutions than places of learning. An uneasy truce is maintained only by physical force rather than by reason or rational negotiations. No city is immune whether we speak of Watts, Detroit or our own capital City of Albany.

Some steps have been taken to upgrade the quality of education for our disadvantaged—the ESEA, VISTA, the Teacher Corps, but these are only a small beginning. Personnel and funds for VISTA and the Teacher Corps must be vastly increased. The educational potential of both these tools have not been achieved because they have not been adequately financed. I welcome the growing interest in an open admission plan as a means to encourage ambitious blacks with college potential to achieve that potential, but such funds, I submit, are being concentrated at the wrong end of the educational ladder. I call your attention again to my previous contention that the most important teacher is the elementary teacher. There must be a massive increase in VISTA type and Teacher Corps candidates to provide meaningful beginning education for the ghetto child. Head Start benefits wither away unless followed up by equally effective and inspiring primary education. Let's divert all funds possible to make the first four years of a black child's encounter with the schools a solid and successful foundation for acquiring

the tools that he needs to carry him through the rest of his educational career.

This means small class size again, teacher aides, health and psychological services. Start the black child off on a strong footing and he will have little need for elementary remedial reading, secondary remedial reading and college remedial reading.

All this money and all this effort will be useless, however, unless somehow, some way, sensible citizens in both races work together, first, to end the cycle of violence eroding our schools, and second, to restore a sense of trust and confidence between the races. A growing tendency by extremists of both races to rely on hate and violence must be replaced by reliance on a philosophy of brotherly love. Naïve and impractical as these words may seem to the practitioner of hard-headed politics, I see no other sensible alternative.

President Nixon in his address to Congress this year stated that the great question of the seventies is "Shall we surrender to our surroundings?" I disagree. The great question of the seventies is "Shall we find the beginning of the road to solving the racial problem?" No nation is guaranteed survival—and this includes the United States. Unless a means to solve the racial problem is found, we shall surely founder upon the rock of race war.

Or as Martin Luther King stated: "Together we must learn to live as brothers or together we will perish as fools."

THE CRISIS OF MEDICAL SCHOOLS

(Dr. Harold C. Wiggers, executive vice president and dean, Albany Medical College)

On behalf of the Albany Medical College and the medical schools of this nation, I wish to thank you for the opportunity of participating in this National Priorities Hearing and of bringing to the attention of you and your colleagues the extremely critical financial situation which the nation's medical schools are facing. Growth, inflation, new and costly responsibilities for the nation's health needs, increasing wage demands and, in particular, cutbacks rather than increases in federal support, and proportionate reduction in support from private sources, are the major causes of the fiscal illness that pervades all medical schools. Unless financial remedies are immediately forthcoming, some medical schools will close; others will be compelled to reduce rather than expand enrollments, lay off faculty, cutback on some of the newer educational programs and lower the standards of medical education. Such enforced actions will, of course, reduce the supply of physicians and other health personnel already in critically short supply. A large measure of the critical problems facing the nation's medical schools relate to the pittance which the federal government has made available for the support of medical education per se. Since Health is a national problem which crosses all state boundaries and is an area in which public sophistication and demands are increasing at an exponential rate, it seems urgent that the federal government elevate its priority for support of medical schools before rather than after their situation becomes catastrophic. Let me now be specific in outlining what needs to be accomplished promptly at the federal level—even if it requires the elimination of one excursion to the moon.

In order to eliminate the estimated present shortage of 50,000 physicians and to keep pace with a growing population, medical schools will have to increase the size of their entering classes 50 percent by the middle nineteen seventies. With this increased output, the physician shortage will disappear by the early nineteen eighties, but a highly favorable effect on the health crisis will be felt much sooner. From 1960 to 1966, when there was essentially no direct Federal support for undergraduate medical education,

the class size increased by 461 at an average of 92 students per year. In 1965, however, when the Health Manpower Act initiating such support was enacted, there followed a marked acceleration in the growth of class size, and from 1966 to 1970 the first year classes increased by 1,612, or an average of 403 students per year. This represents a more than four-fold rise in the rate of expansion over the earlier period. This dramatic increase could not have occurred without Federal support for student loans and scholarships, for operating budgets of the medical schools, and for matching funds for construction of educational facilities. Full funding of the health manpower program for the current fiscal year, and for the construction of health research facilities and medical library facilities, will provide the resources that are imperative for the required further increase in production of physicians and other health professionals. This will assure the maintenance of high quality educational standards which is essential if present and future knowledge in medicine and the medical sciences are to be applied in achieving an adequate level of health care for the nation.

Federal support for biomedical research has not increased since 1968. Measured in deflated dollars, actually it has decreased at least 10 percent a year. More importantly support has not kept pace with the increase in biomedical and clinical scientists on medical school faculties that could make contributions to advancing knowledge. The average support per faculty member has declined since 1965 in current as well as deflated dollars. The average level of available funding per faculty member, which has never been high, is now at a dangerously low level and the immediate and long term consequences of further dismantling research teams and centers that require years to establish will be catastrophic. The relationship of biomedical research and training to the total effort is indispensable in meeting the Nation's commitments for quality health care and can, in essence, be considered a deferred health service.

The decline in research effort must be checked by the appropriation of funds for the extramural research programs of the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Mental Health in an amount 10 percent over the 1969 level. To maintain the training of faculty required for an increased health manpower output it is recommended that the training grant support for these institutes also be increased 10 percent above the 1969 levels.

INSTITUTIONAL AND SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS

Public Law 90-290 provides mechanisms for Federal support of the operating budgets of health professional schools through institutional support. Existing legislation authorizes appropriations of \$192 million for institutional grants for schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, nursing, optometry, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, podiatry, public health, and allied health professions. The budget amount approved by the House action includes only \$128,900,000 for this program which must serve a large number of schools. It is critical that \$63,100,000 be added to help professional schools substantially increase manpower production.

STUDENT LOANS, SCHOLARSHIPS, AND TRAINEESHIPS

The Health Professions Student Loan and Scholarship Programs were initiated in Fiscal Year 1967. The level of funding has never been adequate, but it has provided badly needed support for students faced with rapidly rising costs and a long period of education and training. The financial assistance provided under the program has not permitted the broadening of the socioeconomic level of students to the extent desired by the schools. Unless the disparity between the needs and the funds available can be reduced, many students may be unable to con-

tinue their medical education and efforts to increase the number of students from minority groups will be seriously hampered. A similar situation exists for the support of the other health professions. The Association of American Medical Colleges joins with scores of other professional and student organizations in recommending the full amount authorized in the Health Manpower Act for student loans, scholarships and traineeships in the amount of \$130,700,000.

CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH FACILITIES

Matching grants for construction of educational facilities for the health professions are essential for:

1. The remodeling and renovation of existing facilities which have become obsolete and do not meet the needs of modern programs in medical education.

2. The construction of facilities to permit new schools to complete their building programs.

3. Additional facilities required by established schools to expand their manpower output.

Since the initiation of the program, \$537 million has been obligated for matching grants to schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, pharmacy, optometry and podiatry. The total value of the facilities for which these Federal funds have provided partial support exceeds \$1 billion. Despite this amount of construction, the backlog remains large. There are \$52,400,000 in Health Facilities Program construction proposals approved, but not funded, and \$93,500,000 of new applications awaiting action. Medical libraries are essential parts of academic medical centers. They serve not only students of medicine, but also interns, residents, and other health professionals. They are important for research activities in the basic sciences and clinical medicine and serve as a regional resource for the practicing physician and help him maintain his knowledge of current advances in medicine. *Medical center libraries are becoming information centers and have extended their service to include self-instructional and audio-visual equipment yet no funds for support of construction of this vital part of the modern medical center were requested by the Administration or included in the House appropriations bill.*

To help provide the facilities required by the health professional schools to meet their responsibilities it is recommended the full authorized amount of \$235 million for the construction of facilities under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the Nurse Training Act, the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act, the Health Research Facilities Construction Act, and the Medical Library Assistance Act be funded. Additionally, because of the increasing difficulty for both public and private schools to obtain the matching funds required by Federal support programs, it is recommended that the Secretary be urged to increase the level of Federal matching funds to the 66 2/3 percent permitted in Section 102 of Public Law 90-490.

TRAINING GRANTS

Training grants administered by the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Mental Health are basic to the preparation of faculty members required to man the expanded educational programs for the output of health professionals. The level of the NIH grant support reached a peak in 1966 and has declined in subsequent years. The House concurred with the budget recommendations of the Administration and reduced the funds for NIH training grants by \$18.7 million and the NIMH training grants by \$1.5 million under the 1969 level. *A greater, not smaller, effort in the training of faculty is required if the medical schools are to supply faculty for the development of new schools and the expansion of established schools.* For these reasons it is urged the Senate increase the appropriations contained

in the House bill by \$19.6 million to a level of \$198.6 million for NIH training grants and by \$10.9 million to \$118.4 million for NIMH training grants, a total of \$317 million. This amount of support will permit maintenance of current levels of effort in these programs, a minimal requirement to meet pressing needs. It is also recommended that funding of other health manpower training programs of the Public Health Service critical to meeting the need for health professionals for teaching and service be increased by 10 percent over the 1969 level to maintain the level of activity in the face of rising costs.

RESEARCH

The level of Federal support for biomedical research has remained essentially constant over the past two years which has resulted in a serious decline in research efforts due to inflationary trends and the higher costs associated with increased sophistication of biomedical investigation. The reduction in the level of research has already had grave consequences for the academic medical centers and teaching hospitals. It has been especially serious for the new medical schools that are attempting to develop an adequate level of investigation essential to their educational and service programs. The loss to the public will be even greater as the flow of new knowledge into medicine is reduced and delayed.

To prevent a further decrease in the level of research effort it is recommended that a 10 percent increase over the 1969 level of appropriations for all of the NIH and the NIMH be allowed in order to permit at least the maintenance of current levels of research activities.

DELIVERY OF HEALTH SERVICES

The academic medical centers and the teaching hospitals are rapidly assuming an important role in innovation and demonstration in health care delivery. Adequate support for health manpower output, training programs, construction and research will allow the medical centers to undertake additional tasks if additional funding is made available. For this reason, the Association of American Medical Colleges recommends that in addition to the programs in NIH and NIMH, the budgets for other health related programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be increased 10 percent above the levels contained in the House-passed appropriations bill.

The returns from the proposed increases in appropriations over the levels approved in H.R. 13111 will be great in terms of better health for our people. With adequate support, the medical schools and teaching hospitals can move forward to increase the supply of health professionals, to increase their effectiveness, and to provide them with new knowledge and approaches for helping meet society's expectations for a healthier and fuller life.

In closing, I reiterate my appreciation for the opportunity to underscore the urgent, critical funding needs of the nation's medical schools. Their survival and effective productivity rests in the hands of the legislative and executive branches of the federal government.

MEDICAL INSURANCE AND MEDICARE

(Richard S. Arthur, president, board of directors visiting Nurse Service Association of Schenectady County)

It was our understanding that Medicare was intended to provide a means of payment for health-care services to patients over 65—most of whom would be afflicted with the chronic, long-term conditions associated with aging. These debilitating conditions are the very factors which prevent the aged from adding to their income—they also create the need for financial help.

Payment for services at home was intended

to be an alternative to expensive hospital and nursing-home care if the patient's condition warranted it. There was no indication that payment would be *only* for acute illnesses or conditions at home (a reasonable criteria for assuring good utilization of expensive hospital space.)

Under the new interpretation now being made by Medicare, these very patients, whose conditions are chronic and not subject to cure, are finding themselves considered "maintenance" cases—thus, not eligible to have their care-costs paid by Medicare. Since the health insurance available to this over-65 age group is supplementary to Medicare, they find this source of financial assistance lacking. To compound the insult, the costs of service have been forced upward by the very program that was intended to help them—now leaving them stranded.

If it is the intent of the program to eliminate help to this large segment of the elderly, a statement indicating the exclusive features of Medicare should be presented to the recipients of Social Security along with the request for authorization to withhold the \$4 (soon \$5) a month for the Medical Insurance. This is the responsibility of the Social Security Administration; it should *not* be the responsibility of agencies providing purchased services to interpret insurance coverage to the client. How do we answer an older person who asks us "what am I getting for the \$4 withheld when my "condition" doesn't qualify me for payment for care?"

The other factor presenting many problems to the less affluent retiree is the \$50 deductible. If the purpose of this factor is to prevent abuse of the program, it is a failure. It provides no obstacle to the retiree who has no financial need; however, it becomes a major deterrent to the retiree who *needs* the service most.

If the intent of the new interpretation is to assist in cutting back the cost of the program, it seems again, that the most needy person is being penalized. A much more effective, equitable (but less popular with the more affluent) method would be eligibility established by need.

We don't know the solution to this problem but feel that the aged person afflicted with chronic long-term illness with its associated financial, social and personal problems should be as entitled to financial assistance as those persons with more acute conditions. Their need is certainly greater because there is no end to the situation.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES AND THE ECONOMY

(By Thomas R. Kershner, Department of Economics, Union College)

It is a great privilege to testify at the National Priorities Hearings. I am glad you are taking a fresh, hard look at America's priorities and I am grateful for the opportunity to comment in a personal capacity on the ability of the economy to undertake substantial new commitments.

Each year the President and the Congress consider a range of governmental programs in response to both military and civilian needs. Funding is quite clearly constrained and related to tax revenues, so that resources committed to one program will inhibit potential activities in others. It follows that the nation must set priorities. It is my hope that the hearings such as this will lead to increased public discussion and participation in the setting of future priorities.

I will argue today that while it may be theoretically possible to reorder national priorities, at least in long-range terms, it must be recognized at the outset that the consequence of past policy decisions—past judgments of our society's priorities—and recent economic policies will unfortunately render this discussion quite theoretical for the near future. There simply will not be sufficient government revenues available to finance expanded programs in even a portion of the

activities being discussed here. Until we overcome the constraints imposed by past decisions, it will be difficult to move in new directions.

Nearly 70 per cent of the proposed budget is made up of uncontrollable items, a proportion that has been growing in recent years. Much of the budget currently is allocated to defense-related activities, and since the testimony here and elsewhere is not likely to admonish the government for under-financing the military, it is important to examine the implications of these earlier decisions before considering new programs. As a case in point, I would like to examine the economic consequences that followed our decision to intervene in Vietnam and then suggest several lessons from that decision that will be relevant to the discussion this morning.

With your permission, I would like to begin by making a few basic points about Vietnam and its effect on the American economy. First, I believe that the published cost estimates of the Vietnamese war overstate the economic costs to the country. Economists are particularly concerned with marginal, or incremental, cost, which is the additional cost incurred, in this case, by our presence in Vietnam. The war probably adds about 20 billion dollars annually to defense spending; the other resources we use in Vietnam would have been spent anyway, on training flights and naval exercises, for example, and represents no re-direction of resources. As a rough check, pre-Vietnam military activities were budgeted at 50 billion dollars; in today's dollars, adding increasing costs due to higher salaries and rising prices and noting a decline in some non-war expenditures, the adjusted total falls about 20 billion dollars short of current spending levels. The imputed costs of Vietnam, therefore, represent about 2 per cent of our Gross National Product, although the social and political costs, and the alienation of so many of the young, though difficult to measure, are substantial.

Secondly, it should be noted that the war-time spending associated with Vietnam was a part of the general expansionist economic policy of the mid-1960's and served as a major stimulus to the American economy. The economy enjoyed high and sustained rates of growth and moved steadily closer to full employment. We registered record wage and profit levels. Several millions of people moved out of our classification of poverty. The economy was growing in quite satisfactory fashion. The New Economics worked.

Only one major problem loomed for the domestic economy and that, of course, was inflation. From fairly stable prices, inflation grew more rapidly each year, to the current annual level of 7 per cent. Even worse, it has become apparent that inflationary expectations have been so closely built into the behavior of businessmen and labor that the recently announced wage and price settlements will do little to restore price stability. It is not at all clear the anti-inflationary policies are working, although their undesirable side effects of rising unemployment and declining production are becoming evident.

In retrospect, it seems clear that the exceptionally rapid rise in federal spending, in the absence of a corresponding increase in government revenue, was a major factor in the excess demand that fueled the inflation. The obvious remedy was to increase taxes; it was first proposed in 1966, but not enacted until the tax surcharge in mid-1968. I suspect that the delay owed something to fears that the surcharge would be regarded as a 'war' tax that would erode support from a war facing growing unpopularity. To that extent, at least, we were willing to accept future inflation as another cost of the war.

Let me now return to the question of financing the newly-emerging priorities, since the size of the appropriations is crucial for

the quality of the job. In general, let me briefly consider three alternative sources of funds, which I will take up in turn.

The first, and seemingly most promising alternative, is that, following the announced American withdrawal from Vietnam, the 20 billion dollar annual expenditure there, minus whatever forces remain behind, can be redirected to peace-time uses—for the environment, for housing, for education, for revenue sharing with state and local governments.

Yet the prospects of relief from the 'peace dividend' are not promising. While a detailed examination of future military programs is not properly a part of today's hearings, it must be noted that the estimated funds required for major new weapons systems already approved, of which the Anti-Ballistic Missile with MIRV warheads is the most complex and promises to be extraordinarily expensive, coupled with the potential weapons under development and the projected military pay increases, will place great pressures on military spending even in the absence of Vietnam. The massive cost overruns show no signs of diminishing, especially in view of the increasingly more sophisticated requirements for future weapons systems.

And even these rather pessimistic conclusions are predicated on an early end to our involvement in Vietnam, and no subsequent involvement in Laos—things for which I am not at all optimistic.

The second alternative would have us finance both the expanded military programs under discussion today. While I will return to this later, let me suggest that no meaningful expansion of both programs will be possible without increased taxes, and, taking as evidence the so-called Tax Reform Act of 1969—really more tax reduction than reform—and the President's declared intention to let the tax surcharge expire this summer, the likelihood of increasing tax schedules does not appear to be great.

There is a last alternative. With a rising Gross National Product, federal tax revenues, being moderately progressive, normally grow even faster. Thus, a strong and growing economy could provide increasing resources for both military and domestic needs—precisely what occurred in the mid-1960's. We could afford both guns and butter.

But this prospect is also foreclosed. By identifying the end of inflation as their highest economic priority, the Nixon administration has deliberately undertaken policies which will stifle and end economic growth and sharply increase unemployment at least for the next 9 to 12 months. The absence of any economic growth in that short term, coupled with projections of below potential output until, at least, 1972, indicate that the rapidly expanding government revenues of the past will be unavailable in the future. Consequently, even an expressed desire to undertake new priorities will not be followed by sufficient money to effect a sizable impact.

I would like to spell out this last implication very clearly: the major cost—the opportunity cost—that Vietnam will impose on our economy lies, not so much in the past, following the suspension of bombing and decline in fighting, as it does in the future, in the opportunities that this country must forego due to the slow down of revenue growth at the very time that demands for these funds are increasing. It follows that the imaginative, but preliminary steps we have taken in expanding health care, improving the environment, constructing housing, and the like, will be difficult to sustain at present levels, let alone to encourage and finance other bold and creative programs that could increase the quality of American life.

If we attempted to draw any lessons from our recent experiences—the implications of Vietnam as it bears on our national priori-

ties—it seems to me that the following inferences are in order:

The first is that society can find the resources for the priorities that we deem important. The great economic lesson of Vietnam was that we were willing to pay the price, not only in terms of lives, and dollars, and political conflict, but in terms of inflation and unemployment and lost opportunities for growth. In Vietnam we were willing to commit more than 20 billion dollars annually virtually overnight. The message to others speaking today is clear—what must be supplied is the will to undertake projects. If the priorities are important enough to us, the money can be found.

Secondly, following the analysis of past trends and future prospects, it is difficult to imagine, under our current priorities, significant funds freed from the military budgets. It should be noted, parenthetically, that inflationary pressures have sharply affected military procurement, and continued inflation would be magnified in military purchases. Thus, the likelihood of realizing any 'peace dividend' in the future is quite small.

The final irony is that just when our needs become the clearest, just when our judgment on the priorities becomes the most sharp, the most critical, just when we think we have identified a set of programs that will address themselves to the country's domestic needs, our financial resources and our ability, let alone our will, to undertake these programs becomes the most constrained.

HIGHER EDUCATION'S NEEDS

(Allan A. Kuusisto, acting president, SUNY at Albany)

I appreciate the opportunity to be heard on behalf of a high national priority for higher education. My thesis is that despite the great and growing expenditure for higher education by the states there is a need for a substantial role by the Federal Government if our colleges and universities are to meet the country's needs for an educated citizenry.

The Federal Government's particular role must be stepped up to cope with the truly national scope of our educational needs. Educational opportunity programs are necessary for residents of slums in urban and rural settings. Problems such as environmental pollution, urban decay, and illegal traffic in drugs require national attention. Students themselves are highly mobile, and our graduates rarely serve only their "own" State or city. Engineers, teachers, lab technicians, graphic artists, accountants, and political scientists are employed throughout the country, and the costs of developing these assets must increasingly turn to the national level.

The costs of educating students cannot help but increase. Libraries and laboratories require constant renewal. Computers have become a necessary part of our operations in management, teaching, and research. New large-group instruction areas do not fulfill their value only by being built: they require imaginative staffs working with dedicated teachers to be productive. The student body itself is not only growing but also becoming more heterogeneous. Whole segments of the population—heretofore educationally ignored—are to be enrolled. The percent of students requiring financial aid grows sharply. For many students tutoring in basic skills is needed to stimulate motivation. And federally-supported grants and loans are to many students the difference between a static existence and valuable contributions to society.

What are, then, some of the specific ways in which we look to the Federal government for support?

First of all, financial aid programs need improvement. Regarding the National De-

fense Student Loan Program, I note that President Nixon's budget requests only \$136 million for fiscal 1970. Only \$155 million was appropriated for fiscal 1969, when \$190 million was needed to maintain the fiscal 1968 level. The program should be funded one year in advance to assist in reasonable administration. Forgiveness clauses could be abolished since they don't seem to encourage teachers while reducing considerably monies to be reloaned. To meet growing costs, the maximum should be increased to \$1500 or \$2000 per year for undergraduates while retaining the 3% interest level and emphasis on financial need for eligibility. The Federal Educational Opportunity Program also needs advanced funding to permit advanced commitments to "disadvantaged" students with up to 5 years of eligibility. Funds must be allocated primarily to those institutions with a demonstrated record of actual enrollment of disadvantaged students. To help cover additional costs which these students incur, institutional "cost of education" grants should be made on the undergraduate level. The College Work-study Program should be funded on the basis of the Federal Fiscal year also with advanced funding. The Federally-guaranteed Loan Program should allow a 5 year eligibility with the maximum loan increased to \$2000 and decreased to \$1000 as family income rises from \$8000 to \$15,000. In general, the state formula method now employed for distributions under these programs should be dropped and, of course, the overall level of funding increased.

Secondly, in the area of research conducted at Universities it is imperative that the appropriations of funds for that research formerly carried on under the aegis of NASA and the Department of Defense be transferred to such agencies as the NSF, HEW, and U.S.O.E. Hopefully at least the \$40 million proposed for the National Endowment for the Humanities will be appropriated. Research into the prevention of further despoiling of our environment should be supported at Universities where significant research in this area is already being conducted because the talent and equipment is largely on hand.

Research into the goals and procedures of Higher Education becomes increasingly crucial as it is expected to educate a growing percent of the population. University-related research centers must consider ways of involving legislative bodies in long- and medium-range planning for Higher Education both to allow for efficient development and to anticipate problems and their solutions before they become crises. These centers need to consider plans for expanding enrollments with almost static resources. They need to propose a viable series of post-secondary educational opportunities as alternatives to our traditional curricula. One such program might combine the last years of High School with the first two years of college in an integrated package to stimulate into highly useful careers those students who are often "turned off" in High School. Guidance procedures for handling the heterogeneous mass of students need development. We need research into ways of making better use of technology in the teaching process, into steps to be taken to improve the student/teacher relationship, and into new approaches to the preparation of highly-motivated teachers for the post-secondary level—such as the proposed Doctor of Arts in Teaching program.

Thirdly, direct support may take the form of additional funding for two-year colleges as proposed by Senator Harrison Williams (S. 1033). I urge, however, that while most of the funds might be channelled through State agencies, provision be made in this and other proposals for support directly to consortia of institutions—public and private—with specific programs which may cross State borders. Such programs might also include clusters of computerized, multi-access libraries and regional programs for disadvantaged students.

Fourth, one matter affecting many mem-

bers of our faculties throughout the country is the need for assuring the continued integrity of TIAA/CREF to be chartered under the proposed College Retirement Benefit System (S. 1290, H.R. 9010). At present the judiciary committees of both houses are delaying action as a result of pressure from the private insurance industry.

If I have to this point made suggestions for the positive participation by the national government in Higher Education, then I must also list areas where Federal influence is not desirable. The well-meant temptation to establish guidelines for what is taught and how—and by whom—must continue to be resisted. In addition, the government must avoid seducing the University into the performance of a vast array of "services" as a condition of support which would dilute the long-term accrual of benefits to society from teaching and research. But perhaps the greatest need for continued legislative restraint is in the area of repression of campus unrest. I wish that I could assure everyone that the worse disruptions are entirely a thing of the past and that respect for our institutions would increase. Such respect should not, of course, be equated with a docile, uncritical acceptance of the status-quo. The path is neither easy nor obvious, and the University is vulnerable and open. Academic leaders should be encouraged to carry on their difficult task responsibly rather than be limited by even well-intentioned requirements and restrictions.

In sum, the changes in our nation's social and educational patterns will place increasing responsibility at the door of our Federal Government. Your sympathy to such a viewpoint has been noted and is appreciated by the educational community.

ECONOMIC POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT

(By Jesse L. Michaelson)

I appreciate the opportunity to submit a statement on the economic policy of the Federal Government.

Such a vast and difficult subject is, of course, impossible to treat within the scope of these few pages. One can, however, appraise some of the philosophy pertinent to many actions of recent Congress and past administrations.

The growing socialistic tendencies of Congress, apparently based on the belief that the Federal Government has the prime responsibility for the economic well being of the individual, is I believe the basic evil that besets us. In the pursuit of this false, and unattainable goal within the framework of our freedom, the past Congresses and administrations have:

Taken from us much of our economic freedom in the form of taxes and have in return saddled us with a ponderous overlapping and confused bureaucracy.

They have created a federal deficit of 57 billion dollars in 10 years and have thus fed the fires of inflation, which has in turn robbed us of more and more of our earnings through the escalation of prices.

They have upset the operations of the free market by establishing unfair restrictions against business in the form of taxation and excessive regulation, while refusing to tax or sufficiently regulate organized labor which now enjoys an unprecedented monopoly in the market place and frightening influence over Congress itself.

They, by the support of the minimum wage laws, have further interfered with the free market thus forcing higher cost of production with its resulting inflation, and increased unemployment of marginal workers for whom Congress has shed so many crocodile tears.

They have continued to operate a socialistic and inefficient post office as a captive political plum of Congress and continued to squander more billions of the people's resources in the annual postal deficit.

The Congress and past administrations have wasted billions of the people's resources on many of the more than 1000 "do good" programs which have continued to proliferate to the extent that an accurate count or listing is not even feasible.

The fact that many of these programs have dramatically failed to accomplish their objectives has not deterred Congress from continuing to commit more of the people's good money after bad. Congressman Pucinski speaking of Mr. Nixon's proposed educational changes said "the federal aid program has been a colossal flop and I say that with heavy heart." I refer to such programs as Head Start, Job Corps, and Compensatory Education all of which have either completely failed or represent very inefficient use of the people's resources. Roger Freeman, Stanford University Economist and now special assistant to our President, says, "all these billions we have spent on Compensatory Education have been, in my opinion, about as effective as the incantations of an African witch doctor."

I recognize that these "do good" programs often have popular appeal since many, including myself, support the broad objectives they postulate. However, good objectives do not guarantee good programs regardless of how much public money is committed. Adequate information has been available to the Congress demonstrating the inadequate performance of some of these programs and I suggest it is the responsibility of Congress to respond to this information, as well as to help correct through their leadership, the often popular but uninformed view still prevalent in some sectors. Some justification can be made for innovating approaches to our social problems but there can be no justification for continuing an experimental failure by investing good money after bad which is so often the common characteristic of socialistic programs. Since these expenditures have grown so large in the last decade, the time for critical re-examination is long over due. Senator Mansfield called for such a review three years ago but his call has gone unheeded. Arthur F. Burns told the Tax Foundation on December 2, 1969, that, "the explosive increase of federal spending during this decade is commonly attributed to the defense establishment, or more simply to the war in Viet Nam. The fact is, however, that civilian programs are the preponderant cause of the growth of the Federal budget."

These fiscal failures when combined with similar irresponsibility on the state and local level are a major factor in the growth of government now taking 36% of our income in taxes and have burdened us with hundreds of volumes of confusing regulations and controls.

We hear much today about pollution and I submit that one of the more obnoxious forms of pollution is that of political promises and public protests for free government hand-outs.

These actions are fast destroying the quality of our freedom. I would remind us that all our freedoms are a package deal including economic freedom. If any one of our major freedoms fall the others are in jeopardy; especially is this true of economic freedom which is the cornerstone of all the others.

I believe these thoughts are more eloquently expressed by Walter R. Youngquist's modern version of the Golden Calf.

"And the people of America murmured because life was so hard, and they pined for security. And the bureaucrats, hearing of their sad plight contrived to make the people secure. So they said to the people: 'Put your trust in us and we shall open unto you the bottomless money bags of government. They shall be your Golden God who will care for you and your children from the cradle to the grave. Your beds shall be soft; your bellies shall be filled with good things to eat; your labor shall be easy and

your wages shall be great. There shall be long seasons of time-and-a-half and double-time. You shall generously share the fruits of labor of others and much time for ease shall be your lot." And the people said: "Hurrah, verily shall the money bags of government be our Golden God and upon these leaders shall we trust our security." Thus did the people of America deliver themselves into bondage."

I agree with the President when he recently said "only a free economy provides maximum scope for knowledge, innovativeness and creative power for each individual and that the nation needs more economy in government and less government in the economy."

I recommend that the Congress control the expenditure explosion of the Federal Government and urge it to differentiate between national and nation-wide problems. The latter should be left to the local units of government. I urge Congress also to recognize that good intentions braced by good objectives do not in themselves guarantee good programs—and furthermore that the nation should not be forced to pay for massive national effort until the program in question has demonstrated its effectiveness on a pilot scale.

I cite, for instance, the city of Washington, D.C., as a prime example of acute social decay and remind you that the city is under the complete control of the Federal Government. If and when the Federal Government has demonstrated that it has solved the social problems of Washington, D.C., then, and then only, it is justified in recommending the cure on a national basis.

OUR POSITION IN VIETNAM (By Michael R. McNulty)

I speak today as a young American citizen who is deeply concerned about the future of mankind.

A firm believer in the ideals of Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy, I entered politics in the hope that I might help—in my own small way—to make our world a place where all countries and peoples might live in friendship, peace, and freedom.

I believe it is the duty of the leaders of this country to move toward that goal, and I have come here today to express my feeling that the present administration is failing in this effort by continuing to pursue a policy of war in Southeast Asia which is void of all moral justification and which is slaughtering the youth of America and Vietnam.

The tragic flaw in our policy in Vietnam is that our leaders have failed to realize that we have intruded in a civil war which we do not understand, which we cannot—for all our wealth and power—win, and which we have magnified one hundred fold by our very presence.

What could possibly justify our military activity in that country?

According to the President, our goal is to see to it that the people of Vietnam are given the chance to decide for themselves how they shall be governed. To that end we supported what was called a national election during the administration of Lyndon Johnson. As we all are aware, that election was neither free nor democratic, and the military dictators who ruled before 1967 continued in power after that hoax.

The election of a national assembly at that time brought some hope that the absolute power of the generals would at least be questioned on occasion. But those few who were not elected in the same corrupt and fraudulent manner as were Mr. Thieu and Mr. Ky, soon learned that cooperation with the military was the only alternative to extinction. Some of the candidates who ran in opposition to the military dictatorship in 1967 are still in prison. And those who sought to expose Mr. Thieu by way of the press suddenly disappeared and were never heard from again.

This is the kind of government we are supporting in the name of democracy! And this is the cause of which some feel we are justified in having given 40,000 American lives!

What have we accomplished by our military activities in that country?

After all the American lives we have lost, after the hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese people we have killed, after the countless number of casualties both countries have sustained, after the millions of tons of bombs we have dropped and the thousands of aircraft we have lost, how many of us can honestly say that we feel our country has accomplished anything good—that we have made any real contribution to the people we say we are helping? Who among us feels more secure because of our activities in this part of the world?

I say to you that we are murdering innocent people every day in Southeast Asia and that unless we stop this insane war we are going to tear apart the very foundations upon which our forefathers built this great democracy.

Today, in our own country, people are still starving, children are being bitten by rats in slum housing, our black brothers are still being deprived of much of what white America has always enjoyed, our young people are giving up on the political system and tripping out on drugs, and our air and water is polluted. This is the state of our union—the richest country in the world.

And yet Mr. Nixon can feel justified in continuing to pour countless billions of dollars into a war which no one can explain, and into such defense fiascos as the ABM.

Can anyone justify the fact that we spend more money each year to kill and to prepare for killing than we do to alleviate the suffering of those who live and to maintain their dignity as human beings?

In his campaign for the presidency, Richard Nixon promised the American people that if he were elected, he would end the war in Vietnam. And in an election as close as the one in 1968, I believe that it was on the strength of that pledge that he became the leader of this country and the commander-in-chief of our armed forces.

Mr. Nixon has now been in office for nearly thirteen months, and he has made it very apparent that he has no idea when our intrusion into the affairs of the Vietnamese people will end.

The formation of Mr. Nixon's policy in Vietnam is based on the same criterion which is used in the formation of all his policies: He follows the course which he feels will be most appealing to most of the electorate.

I say to you that Richard Nixon has no more of a plan today to end the war in Vietnam than he did when he made his promise to the American people in 1968.

The simple truth is this: Richard Nixon is playing a game of politics with the lives of young Americans and he must be stopped.

No sooner had he raised the hopes of the people of our country for an end to the war, when he flew to Vietnam, put his arm around a cruel dictator named Thieu, pledged his support for this man, and renewed the commitment of this country to the support of his military effort.

Such contradictory commitments can only be explained in terms of political expediency.

We cannot wait any longer in dealing with this tragic situation. We cannot allow senseless slaughter to continue day by day because Richard Nixon says he has a secret plan. The 1964 Gulf of Tonkin resolution must be repealed, and our Senators and Congressmen must regain control over the course of our actions in southeast Asia.

The blood of the people of Vietnam, and the blood of the Americans who died in that country, will always be on our hands. Nothing can ever change that. But if we

are truly the great nation we claim to be, we will admit our monumental error before the world community by withdrawing all of our troops from Vietnam. And I truly believe that if this is done, the event will be recorded not as the moment in history when America was brought to her knees by a tiny nation of primitive people, but rather as the time when the United States showed her true greatness—as a peacemaker in the world and as a protector of precious human life.

If, on the other hand, Congress allows President Nixon to continue to prosecute this war in the hope that his secret plan really exists, we are going to experience a continued deterioration in every phase of our national life. And the end result of such a course of action will be the closing chapter in an episode of history entitled "The Rise and Fall of the United States of America."

And so I call upon our Congressman, Mr. Button, and our two United States Senators, Mr. Javits and Mr. Goodell, to continue to express their opposition to the continuation of this war.

And I call upon all the Members of Congress to put an end to this immoral episode of mass human slaughter—not within the next few years, but in the year 1970.

THE IMPACT OF THE HOUSING SHORTAGE

(Mrs. Melvin Urofsky, chairman, Human Resources Committee, Albany County League of Women Voters)

Members of the League of Women Voters of the United States believe the federal government shares with other levels of government responsibility to provide equality of opportunity for education, employment, and housing. We are confining our remarks to the subject of housing this afternoon, because this is a high priority item on our program and the focus of our current study in Development of Human Resources.

In his State of the Union message, President Nixon has given urgent priority to adopting reforms "which will expand the range of opportunities for all Americans." He has also stated that "in order to be secure in their human rights, people need access to property rights." Equality of access to housing, however, cannot and will not be meaningful until there is an adequate supply of decent homes for all Americans. The housing problems faced by the City of Albany are not atypical of those of the nation. There is an extremely critical shortage of housing, particularly for those of low and moderate income. A Community Improvement Survey conducted in 1967 found only 56 per cent of the housing in the City of Albany to be standard. An estimated 2,000 new housing units are needed, a need compounded by rapid deterioration of old buildings, 88 per cent of which were built prior to 1940, and by displacement of over 4,000 families by urban renewal in the last ten years. As in most cities, many white families with school-aged children have left for the suburbs, leaving the young, the poor, and the elderly—many of whom are black—in the core sections of the city, and many of these people are paying a disproportionate amount of their incomes for housing that is sadly inadequate. The national need, according to the Kaiser Committee, is for production of at least 26 million new or rehabilitated housing units, including six to eight million federally subsidized dwellings for families in need of housing assistance.

Obstacles to be overcome in securing sufficient housing, both nationally and in this city, include:

- (1) Land costs which can represent up to 20 per cent of a unit's price.
- (2) Building costs too high for private builders to provide low-cost housing.
- (3) Old-fashioned construction methods.

- (4) Union regulations which increase the price of housing.
- (5) Out-of-date building codes.
- (6) Seemingly unsolvable red tape to get federal and state subsidies.
- (7) Exclusionary zoning ordinances.
- (8) The high cost of money.
- (9) Active legislative opposition to providing money for this purpose.

There are tools at hand to begin to meet this intensely critical problem. The President has requested continuation of the programs of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. This innovative act contains many far-sighted programs, among them a wider range of choices for Public Housing, below-market interest rates, programs to aid limited- and non-profit sponsors in the building of low and moderate income housing, and an improved rent subsidy program. In his budget message the President has requested authority to help provide almost 600,000 additional housing units for low and moderate income families in 1971. This figure is in line with the annual goal set by the Kaiser Committee. The President also spoke of basic reforms needed to solve the underlying obstacles listed before to increased production, and also of the new experimental program, Operation Breakthrough.

It must be pointed out, however, that the usefulness of new programs can be severely limited by the gap between goals and appropriations. Congress is sometimes generous with programs, but Congress does not always appropriate what it has authorized. For example, let us examine the figures for the innovative HUD Act of 1968, which received strong bipartisan support when it was conceived. The following figures are excerpted from *The Ill Housed*, a report on national housing policy prepared for the League of Women Voters of the United States:

HOUSING ACT OF 1968—LEGISLATIVE REQUESTS V.
FUNDS APPROPRIATED

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Request	Appropriation
Tenant services under public housing...	15	0
1 percent interest rate programs for housing sales	75	25
Rental housing	75	25
Model cities supplementary grants	500	312.5
Urban renewal add-on	500	312.5
Rent supplements	65	30

All of the programs were drastically slashed when the time came for meaningful appropriations. This is not the way to achieve a high-priority goal.

Twenty years from now will we once again have to admit, as Congress did in 1968, that we have once again failed to reach our national housing goal which was set forth in the Housing Act of 1949. "A decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family"? Will housing inadequacy continue to be a prime contributor to urban unrest, as stressed by the Kerner Commission on Civil Disorders? Will the remedy come too late? Or are we as a nation prepared to undertake now the tremendous task of supplying the 26 million homes that are needed to house our expanding population and replace the shamefully substandard dwellings that are now inhabited by more than 20 million American citizens? Surely this is an area for top national priority and commitment. When our League study is complete, we will be ready to make public more specific recommendations in this area.

PRIORITIES AND THE POOR

(The Reverend Robert L. Pierce, urban agent, the Schenectady Inner City Ministry)

As a group of fourteen downtown churches in Schenectady we operate under the as-

sumption that when the churches in a city focus their energy and resources on the critical needs of people and the community it can make a difference. It is from a vantage point of churches so involved that I would like to submit for consideration some indication of the way our efforts speak to the matter of priorities.

1. A major share of our work deals with early childhood services. It is clear that the job of educating the younger generation, especially those in the city, is in crisis, and despite evidence of a growing segregation in our school systems and the attendant evils of such a system, the drift is not being checked in any substantial way. If we are to take the Dr. James Coleman study of '68 seriously when it asserts that the only variable that seemed to improve the achievement of a lower-class child was to place him in a classroom with children of a higher socio-economic level we have the outline of what is called for. According to Dr. Coleman, nothing else—smaller classes, better buildings, not even better teaching—seemed to affect the dark statistics of failure and underachievement. The only policy recommendation possible to draw from such a conclusion is that schools must be desegregated—now, before further generations are damaged, without waiting for a change in racial-residential patterns—although we know that such a policy is easier to mandate than to achieve. The desegregation programs so far have been "small interim steps," only "giant steps" with help and encouragement from the federal and state government will have any chance of success. And, in the meantime, our city schools must be improved. We are encouraging every effort to move in that direction including the compensatory programs; parent and community participation in the classroom; and the greater participation in managing the school program and system. What is called for is a generous commitment of resources and imagination to improve the quality of life in our cities.

2. For example, here as elsewhere in the country, we are experiencing the critical problem of the lack of rental units for city residents. Other statements today have already elaborated on that. Suffice it to say that this comes close to being at the very center of the swirl of frustration about the city and its resources. We sense that there is no shortage of ideas to guide an all-out attack on housing and the misery of the slum environment. Professionals generally agree as to just how present programs would or could be expanded and reformed: build better public housing and in smaller units; lift the crippling restrictions from rent supplements; make model cities an across-the-board program available to all rather than a competition; and so on through the technicalities of mortgage finance, tax incentives, and advanced building technology. We support and encourage that all out effort and plead for the evidence of good faith, will and fiscal support for such an effort.

3. Our experience leads us to believe that adequate means for support must be found for all poor people. We have been involved first hand with enough welfare cases to be deeply concerned over the present program and administration of welfare and its effect upon the poor. Alternatives must be found. We also believe that it is not simply a matter of providing jobs: it must also involve such things as more child centers, better education, and improved public transportation, as well as being paid a living wage for doing real work. We are immediately concerned with the extension of day care facilities—year round, day long services—but understand that to be only a small part of the total effort.

The President's suggestions and the programs for reform must be implemented. For there are a growing number of us who be-

lieve that the despair of poverty should not exist in the midst of our growing affluence.

4. Central to the analysis we make of the situation is that more careful attention must be paid to the development of urban resources. We anticipate the time when there will be an Urban Aid program as part of the national budget. Concomitant to that there must be a genuine streamlining of the way the government transacts its affairs with the cities. It is my understanding, for example, that there are at least eight standing committees that share jurisdiction over urban affairs in the House. Such a proliferation of structure makes it difficult if not impossible to consider the interrelationships between housing and education, let us say, whether to spend a billion for low cost housing against a billion for supersonic transport. The conclusion is obvious. A new way must be found to structure the response on the part of Government to the city so that the effort will be more realistic and helpful.

If that is a problem at the national level, it has its consequence in local communities where there has been no energetic effort to see that local governments and agencies know what is available to them. That issue deserves special attention in a day when the government expounds the need for reform in our institutions and programs.

Perhaps these suggestions may be useful in the long run, but the need is immediate. The private sector, especially business and industry, must be encouraged to be involved more extensively in urban problems. Any effort you could personally initiate or encourage would add weight to the community effort and it may even enliven the hope and possibility of checking the drift of further isolation and alienation in our midst.

A NECESSARY COMMITMENT

(Mrs. Charles Bean, legislative chairman, Planned Parenthood League of Schenectady County)

As a member of the Board of The Planned Parenthood League of Schenectady County, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss and spotlight a national priority which has an impact on many others; it is Family Planning. Neglected in the past, this problem has only recently been recognized as a concern of government. This apathy which has contributed to our present population explosion must be replaced by a determined effort to place family planning high on our list of national priorities.

Just how real this explosion is becomes apparent when we consider that it took millions of years for the earth's population to reach 1 billion in 1830, but in just the fifteen years between 1965 and 1980 another billion increase over the existing 3 billion will take place. One billion is equal to all the people now living in North and South America and the 55 countries of Europe. The rate of increase will be somewhat lower in the United States, but it is projected that we will have 140 million more people by the end of the century. Think what this will mean to our already frantic efforts to ease the congestion in our courts, on our highways, and in our schools! What will we do with the 5 pounds of waste which the average person throws away (it is estimated that the wealthy produce 8 pounds—old boats and freezers and such) per day. Will we have any chance of purifying our waters or of achieving peace in a world where the developing nations least able to cope with larger populations will be growing the most rapidly?

One of the most alarming aspects of the population explosion is that a significant portion of births are unplanned and in many cases unwanted. Recent studies at Princeton University indicate that in this country 42% of the births among the poor and near poor are unwanted by at least one parent, and the figure for unwanted births among the upper and middle economic groups is about half of this. The freedom of choice

which means so much to us in this country is clearly not available to everyone in this very personal matter of the number of children they would like to have. The Office of Economic Opportunity surveys show that among those women eligible for public assistance and medical aid only 15% in the nation have access to Family Planning facilities. In the State of New York the figure is 30% and in this congressional district 18%.

The human costs of unwanted children are staggering—the high incidence of infant mortality and material death among the poor, the battered children, the frequency of maladjustment in school, alcoholism, mental illness, and the increasing number of unmarried teen-age births which frequently start the miserable cycle all over again. The cost to society is also great when we consider the numbers of unwanted children who end up in jail where it costs anywhere from \$2,486 to \$9,965 for one person a year, or the cost of supporting a child in a foster home which is usually close to \$1,000, but can go much higher if the child is emotionally disturbed. By comparison the cost of fertility control is minimal—our Planned Parenthood organization's budget is \$26,000 a year for providing services to over 600 women, and information to several hundred more people. I am not suggesting that we begrudge the assistance given to many people whose need arises out of their rejection and neglect, but rather, that our society could be more humane and responsible if it provided the means for fertility control to those desiring it to prevent the birth of a child they are not prepared to care for.

To accomplish this purpose of universal availability of adequate information and services to all in need of family planning, the existing hodge podge of private and public agencies is clearly not enough—President Nixon has admirably issued the call to action, but his program does not go far enough in reorganizing the myriads of piecemeal federal programs administered by a variety of offices such as A.I.D., O.E.O., the Armed Forces, and the Department of H.E.W. In addition, the Administration program fails to make a clear commitment to adequate funding for population and family planning research. Currently the National Institutes of Health spends less than 1% of its budget—about \$10 million, for such research; at a time when the demand for improved techniques for fertility control is of such great concern to many of our people, this would seem to be a small expenditure indeed.

Congress, which has traditionally been the leader in establishing Government-subsidized family planning programs, must take the initiative now by supporting the vigorous program advocated by Senator Tydings and Representative Scheuer. Their bills, S. 2108 and H.R. 11550, receive non-partisan support, and would provide a unified, comprehensive program administered by a single agency, a national center for population and family planning, under the Assistant Secretary of Health and Scientific Affairs in the Department of H.E.W. They would provide a minimal but adequate financial assistance to States, grants for training and research and projects, and would submit a plan to Congress for extension of services to all persons in need, for research programs and for training. Senator Tydings' bill is now in Senator Yarborough's Labor and Public Welfare Health Subcommittee.

Thomas Paine, Chairman of NASA, has said that the significance of the moon landing was the proof it provided that man can overcome any of his problems if he is willing to make the necessary commitment of money, and skilled manpower. We should be willing to make that kind of commitment to this very urgent need of family planning—the Tydings-Scheuer Bill offers us the opportunity to take a giant step in this direction—please do what you can to support it.

LEGISLATING BEFORE THE FACT

(Dr. Carl J. George, Department of Biological Sciences, Union College)

It seems fitting and proper at this time of environmental crisis and in this land of dutchmen to recall the story of a little Dutch boy who on detecting a hole in the dyke used a finger to stem an irregular flow of water thus saving his home and his community of Haarlem. The little Dutch boy spent little effort in bailing out the water but rather directed his attention to the source—a kind of problem-solving insight and efficiency of action which seems to have almost escaped us in our attack on environmental difficulties which confront us today. We seem to be running wildly in every direction with our mops and buckets attempting to dry up the waters of environmental disaster which grow ever deeper about us.

We shall legislate the aluminum can out of existence only to allow some other troublesome device to appear. We shall insist that every car carry pollution control apparatus of one design or another only to learn that we should have done something else instead. We shall ban DDT and phosphate-rich detergents only to find another innovation coming upon the scene to cause other kinds of disorder. We allow vested interests to grow almost beyond control to eventually learn that they are indeed the swollen fountainheads of disaster.

If we are to succeed, if we are to survive, we must learn how to legislate before the fact rather than to our serious disadvantage after. We do have experience in this kind of thing. Consider the role of the food and drug administration. Consider the consequences if every manufacturer of drugs were allowed to market every product without first showing to an unbiased observer-referee the safety and efficacy of the product before it is spread across the land. We must extend this concept to other sectors of our society. We must legislate the idea that we depend upon the health of our environment just as much as we depend upon the health of our bodies.

A continued failure to provide governmental guidance relating to the environmental impact of the multitude of products issuing from our vast innovative, manufacturing and marketing system will without fail drive us to revolt against this very source of the finer qualities of life that we have come to know and to depend upon.

GIVE PEACE A CHANCE

(Rev. James Murphy of St. Columbia's Church, Schenectady)

Speaking of World War II, Pope Pius XII said "The savagery of this war is but the seed for the next conflict." I am afraid that his judgment was correct. I am afraid that our century has largely been an exercise in savagery and since World War II, a new and more sophisticated savagery is being prepared for and in some cases tried.

In World War I and World War II, 50-600,000 were killed. Since that war there has been a major conflict every 6 months. They have not all involved the U.S. and we generally consider them minor, but it is only because the atomic age has set new standards. In the 6-day war of 1967 there were more tanks in use than in the Battle of El Alamein during the 2nd world war. There have been more bombs dropped in Vietnam than during all of World War II. All of us have become casualties of war as national wealth has been squandered in military causes and the national spirit profoundly disturbed by the brutalization which war and its preparation brings. Once in war, total war becomes acceptable and Dresden, Tokyo, Nagasaki and Hiroshima become logical answers to London, Liverpool and Pearl Harbor. For most Americans, Hiroshima and Nagasaki became unfortunate but necessary and we make

peace with the brutal slaughter of innocent people—victims of war machines. Along with the application of modern weapons, there has been the increase in civilian deaths. The moral defeat implicit in the one, causes the slaughter of the others. "In World War I the total number of killed was approximately 10 million, 96 percent of whom were soldiers, 4 percent civilians. In World War II over 50 million were killed comprising almost equal numbers of soldiers and civilians (52 percent to 48 percent). During the war in Korea of the 9 million dead, 94 percent were civilians only 16 percent soldiers." (Max Born, "What Is Left to Hope." Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, April 1964.)

Once accept the cold war logic and its strategy of nuclear deterrence, and a President could not hesitate in pushing the button that would kill hundreds of millions of people and such savagery becomes "realistic" and "Rational." It is also sophisticated and the language neutral. In 1967 then Secretary of Defense McNamara said "The cornerstone of our strategic policy continues to be to deter deliberate nuclear attack upon the United States or its allies. We do this by maintaining a highly reliable ability to inflict unacceptable damage upon any single aggressor or combination of aggressors at any time during the course of a strategic nuclear exchange, even after absorbing a surprise first attack. This can be defined as our assured destruction capability . . . Our alert forces alone carry more than 2,200 weapons each averaging more than the explosive equivalent of one megaton of TNT. 400 of those delivered on the Soviet Union would be sufficient to destroy over one third of her population and one-half of her industry."

This apparently "Rational" and "Modern" point of view if acted upon would dwarf all the barbarism and savagery of the past even if its architects had college degrees and were considered civilized men.

How curious it is that such a policy is called rational. It appears to be madness. If we ever use the weapons we have prepared we would completely destroy everything we are trying to save. Put into the context of an average houseowner, it would be like setting off dynamite to get rid of a robber. I am not calling former defense Secretary McNamara mad or our national leaders insane. I am saying that the policies we and most nations follow do not make sense and are extensions of the savagery of the wars of this century.

By defining security narrowly in military terms we have become confused and neglected the really important work of life to create opportunities where men can live and enjoy their lives. I think it accurate to say that our defense policy, and that of most nations as well, operate at the expense of people. In truth we serve it rather than it serving us. I would like to make several quotes from the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency 1968 report to illustrate the situation has not changed in the 4 years since. "The size of the world's public education budget is about two-thirds the budget for military programs. Half the governments in the world spend more on defense than on education. The average annual expenditure per soldier world wide is \$7,800 per year. For the one billion young people in the world age population (ages 5-18), public expenditures for education average \$100 a year. . . . The world's public health budget is \$52 Billion or one-third the size of its military budget. Only 36 countries out of 120 spend as much on public health programs as on military programs."

It has been widely reported that two-thirds of the world's population is between hunger and starvation—that there is an inadequate calorie and protein intake to support life. Development programs, although having some very real possibilities, (the miracle grains being one) are afterthoughts and rate fairly low on the level of priorities. It has

been estimated and generally agreed upon that the underdeveloped nations need around \$20-30 Billion per year wisely invested to start them on the road to development and eventual healthy status. Presently the flow from developed nations to underdeveloped nations is around \$8 Billion and a great part of this is set up to serve the developed nation.

The real horrifying fact is that there is not enough food for people in the world. Yet for every man, woman and child on the face of the earth there is the equivalent of the Bomb, dropped on Hiroshima—that's about 20,000 tons of TNT. I have been curious if a person would consume more than 20,000 tons of food material in his lifetime. Yet we are not choosing food over weapons.

To limit our discussion to America, our defense cost since World War II has been over 1 Trillion dollars. President Nixon's recent cuts represent no change of direction. In fact if he continues with ABM and MIRV we can expect increasing cost. I know that those who support defense budgets do so because they believe national security is essential and without that everything else falls. But I believe they've made serious mistakes. It is precisely because of military costs that we are unable to adequately fund and carry through on the essential programs of communities—health, welfare—business—education. It was only last week that the mayors of the 6 cities in New York State marched on the Capitol in Albany looking for money. We have spent over \$100 Billion in Vietnam and what has been accomplished. We are getting out and we are not sure what will happen.

"For the cost of one month of the Vietnam war we could provide 4 years of training for 169,000 school teachers, 125,000 nurses and 50,000 doctors as well as college education for 100,000 students who could not otherwise afford it. (Figures provided by the Friends committee on National Legislation.)

The cost of Defense is enormous and the results are minimal. Every new weapons development prepares for the next. It's like cutting the grass, there's a new crop next week. The results become comic in an absurd sense. We are spending billions to defend ourselves from missile attacks. What happens if an enemy does not strike by air? What if he builds atomic bombs in cellars of homes in major cities of the U.S. or, in ships in port? It is technically possible. It is cheaper than developing a missile system. It is safer for an enemy and after the smoke clears who do you attack? The whole reliance on missiles and defense establishment is absurd.

At this point I reach Vietnam, it particularly stands as a sign of the failure of a narrowly militaristic defense policy. We are told that might does not make right—but the only thing we have stood for in Vietnam is armed might. It is our armed might that has protected a disliked and unrepresentative government from its people.

Why are we there. We are told it is for freedom but when it is mentioned that we're supporting and are in fact the mainstay of a dictatorship. We are told that freedom in Vietnam needs dictatorship. Furthermore we are protecting the people of Vietnam. Although millions have died, although millions have been forced out of their homes and farms by our bombing, although the economy and society has been terribly upset, although we destroy villages to save them, we are protecting the people of Vietnam. How many want that kind of protection. I am not saying that the U.S. alone is responsible nor that the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese are any better. I am saying that we are party to destruction and killing for no good reason.

Vietnam represents the worst in America—a righteousness and crusader spirit that forces innocent people to be the victims of

our dogmas. In Vietnam we have entered into a complex civil strife and treated it as an extension of our cold war dogma—freedom vs communism. The policy does not appreciate the history or the aspirations of the people not does it really care about their freedom. It cares about our interest. In fact Vietnam becomes important only as our current battle field against Communism. Throughout the world we have let our anti-communism blind us to the real concerns of people.

I guess that all I am saying is give peace a chance. We must stop funding deaths and devote our energies to help people live. We must end Vietnam and stop the possibilities for more Vietnams in Laos, South America, Thailand. We must cut military spending. We must work for disarmament and for some other way to solve international spending. We must work for world justice and development.

These choices are challenging but are possible if we change and work for them.

PRIORITIES IN FOREIGN POLICY

(Vernon Ferwerda, member of the board of the Albany chapter, United Nations Association of the U.S.A.)

The Albany Chapter of the United Nations Association wishes to congratulate Congressman Button for his initiative in holding these hearings, and to express its appreciation for being invited to participate. Our current President, Miss Margaret Barnard, regrets being unable to be present on this occasion. She is in Bangkok, Thailand, attending the Triennial Conference of the International Council of Women, of which she is an officer.

We wish to bring to your attention certain policy positions of the United Nations Association of the U.S.A. which we hope might receive attention from a Congress and President engaged in reviewing our national priorities. In summary, these would urge stronger United States participation in the work of the United Nations, and in making improvements in its operations. These concern an early solution of its membership problems, greater capabilities to continue the important work of peacekeeping and peacemaking, and greater use of United Nations agencies to carry out U.S. assistance to the developing countries.

The last Biennial Convention of the UNA USA went on record as "troubled by the absence from United Nations membership of states now divided as a result of either national or international conflict", and emphasized that "In particular, we believe that new arrangements should be worked out whereby both the Republic of China and the People's Republic of China are represented in the General Assembly—with larger political unit, that on the mainland, then taking its place in the Security Council." It was here concurring in the wise judgment, shared by increasing numbers of Americans, of the late John Foster Dulles when he said that "the United Nations will best serve the cause of peace if its Assembly is representative of what the world is actually like, and not merely representative of the parts which we like."

We in the United Nations Association, both locally and nationally, rejoice in the knowledge that you have been joined by a considerable number of Representatives and Senators, of both parties, in urging Secretary of State Rogers to support the UNA Policy Panel proposals calling for the creation of a UN Standby Force and Peace Fund to finance and carry out future peacekeeping operations. Americans have learned at terrible cost in recent years that overreliance on unilateral intervention with national forces in dealing with disruptions of the peace can prolong war and even bring the world closer to the brink of disaster. The United States originated the idea of national forces being earmarked for United Nations

service, and it is not encouraging to realize that in the twenty years that have elapsed since then, not one single U.S. component has been so earmarked. The number and variety of forces already pledged for UN peacekeeping by Canada, the Scandinavian countries, and others is impressive.

Finally, we would commend to your attention the UNA support for increased U.S. awareness of the advantages to be derived from multilateral programs of economic and technical assistance to the developing world. Under the effective leadership of a distinguished American, Paul Hoffman, the United Nations Development Program has come to represent the best effort that can be mounted in helping people to help themselves.

More U.S. funds for development assistance should be routed through the United Nations and its specialized agencies. There undoubtedly will be programs which in the judgment of Congress can be better handled by a U.S. Government aid agency, but these programs should eventually be the exception, not the rule.

This comes close to the general theme running through the UNA studies, findings, and recommendations. The United States should shift from a posture in which we use the United Nations only when we are persuaded it is best for us, to a more enlightened posture in which access to the UN, and increasing support for its programs, becomes the expected procedure, with exceptions only when there are compelling reasons for such departure. Such a realignment of U.S. priorities in the conduct of foreign affairs would move us all closer to the stated goal of the United Nations Association, "the creation of a more just, stable and rational international order, in which the United Nations, its agencies, and other multilateral organizations must play an increasingly important part in maintaining peace, and in formulating and administering programs in the common interest."

PRIORITIES: PEACE, POVERTY, POLLUTION

(Otto Honegger, for the Albany County New Democratic Coalition)

The Albany County New Democratic Coalition welcomes this opportunity to present its views. We strongly believe that this type of presentation and communication is necessary to make our political system meaningful. Our recommendations are based on the urgent necessity for the reordering of our national priorities. We believe that peace, poverty, and pollution are three major items that need to be emphasized. While it is evident to us that the Nixon administration has given rhetorical prominence to these items, we have seen little action and are uneasy about the lack of urgency with which problems are being attacked. Our military and military-related spending now totals more than 80 billion dollars annually and consumes a tenth of the Gross National Product. Almost one-half of the proposed 1971 budget is committed to defense or \$400 for every American. It seems obvious to us that the United States cannot afford a foreign war costing 28 billion dollars a year, an irrational arms race and the maintenance of a world-wide garrison without sacrificing the quality of American life; too many Americans are living in poverty and despair; our cities are suffering from neglect and exploitation; life itself is threatened by a strained and increasingly menacing environment. To quote Senator Proxmire, "The record is clear. Our priorities as a nation need to be restructured, and the place to start is with the bloated defense budget. Only when Congress is again in control of the entire budget can we make progress on the domestic front."

PEACE

Americans have spent almost 3 trillion dollars on armaments since World War II. This year the defense budget will support a mili-

tary establishment which includes the following foreign commitments:

One-half million men in Vietnam.

One-quarter million men in other Asian countries.

One-third million men in West Germany.

10,000 military personnel in the Middle East.

One-quarter million foreign national employees.

One-third million military dependents.

Maintenance of these Americans in over 2200 bases around the world.

In addition, the defense budget will provide 3.3 billion dollars for the ABM and MIRV weapon systems, the total cost of which could exceed 30 billion dollars in the next few years; the remainder of the defense budget will be spent on domestic operations, other weapon systems and military hardware, and the research and development of new weapon systems, the ultimate cost of which is estimated at over 140 billion dollars. To put a brake on defense spending, we support the following recommendations: an immediate end to the fighting in Vietnam; this is of the utmost importance and ranks as first in our order of priorities; the commitment to withdraw all United States forces from Vietnam as soon as possible, following the cessation of fighting, and in accordance with a pre-announced, publicly-announced time-table; withdrawal of support for the Thieu government and support for the concept of a popularly elected and popularly supported government in Saigon. Furthermore, Congress should rescind the Tonkin Gulf Resolution and regain its traditional role as a check against the Executive in the allocation of funds; Congress should curb the arms race and give active support to the SALT talks by opposing continued expansion of ABM and MIRV; we support the suggestion of the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Priorities to evaluate competing priorities and think that the membership of the Armed Services Committees should be more reflective of the opinions of the members of Congress and that the terms of membership on the committees be limited; we commend the efforts of such groups as the Fund for New Priorities in America, the Democratic Study Group, Members of Congress for Peace Through Law in their efforts to develop a "people policy", both domestic and foreign; and lastly, while we commend the President in his ordering restrictions on the development of biological weapons, we urge the complete ban on the development, stockpiling, storage and use of all biological and chemical agents, including defoliates and anti-personnel gases of all types.

POVERTY

Surely one of the most arresting ironies adhering to the current American political and economic system is the persistence of conditions of extreme poverty in the midst of the most affluent society the world has ever known. It is a tragic paradox that the nation which possesses the nuclear capacity to destroy the world several times over and has sent men to walk on the moon can still harbor pockets of poverty in which able-bodied men are unable to find gainful employment and mothers put hungry children to bed at night. Hunger and malnutrition must be recognized as a national emergency and emergency measures must be adopted to meet the situation. We recommended greatly expanded food-supplement programs which will be designed to meet the needs equally and adequately in all geographic areas of our nation and to reach all segments of the population, urban and rural, black and white, the young, the disabled and the elderly; we recommend transfer of all nutritional programs from the Department of Agriculture, which represents the interests of the agricultural industry, to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The national welfare system must be redesigned to

eliminate the stigma of poverty; a system of social support must be created based on society's acceptance of the obligation to provide for a life of reasonable comfort and dignity for all of its members, regardless of their ability to work, choice of ancestors, or the social circumstances into which they happen to be born. We are happy to note that Mr. Nixon has accepted the concept of a minimum, federally-guaranteed annual income, both for those who have no other incomes and for those whose incomes are inadequate, but the proposals in the 1971 budget are in themselves wholly inadequate and do not begin to meet the needs, especially in a state like New York. Furthermore, poverty in America is inexorably tied to racism and to crime. Black racism is a product of white racism and both thrive on and further contribute to poverty and this is true also of crime. Thus it is essential to eliminate racism in order to eliminate poverty. One of the most pressing needs of black men is for jobs and the government must accept the responsibility of providing the opportunity for gainful and meaningful employment to all those who are able to work. This implies the adoption of the concept of the government as the employer of the last, or even, the first resort. One example of the immediate potential for government to accept this responsibility would be the restoration of twice-daily mail delivery throughout the country which would both confer the dignity of productive employment on hundreds of thousands of individuals and effect an immediate improvement in a government service which has been subject to great criticism in recent years. We support the adoption of nationwide educational standards, ensuring equal opportunity for quality education, nationwide job-placement, on-the-job training, and the immediate elimination of job discrimination because of sex, race, religion and age. Quality health care should be available as a right, not a privilege, of all Americans. To this end, low cost comprehensive health insurance should be available to all families. Quality community health centers should be established in those areas currently without them. Medicare and Medicaid payments should provide full financial coverage for all services provided; attempts should be made to guarantee the quality of the medical and ancillary care provided under these plans. We support the concepts of broad scale planning which recruits and subsidizes prospective health personnel to serve in those areas currently without adequate quality medical care to ensure that modern health advances will reach all Americans, living in rural as well as urban areas; generous subsidies for the training of physicians, nurses and other health-related personnel, recruited from all economic levels and all areas of the country; continued, sustained vigorous governmental support of applied and basic research to provide long-range solutions for the still incurable ills of humanity. Lastly, and most emphatically, it is our contention that environmental pollution, malnutrition, inadequate sanitation and inadequate, crowded, decaying and decayed housing all contribute indirect but inexcusable and avoidable threats to public health and should be treated with the utmost urgency.

POLLUTION

Ecologists are saying that unless immediate remedies are instituted for our present pollution of air, water and the despoiling of land, life on this planet can last only until the end of this century. Every year the United States covers over with cement one million acres of oxygen-producing trees, produces 50% of the world's industrial pollution; every year discards 165 million tons of solid wastes and releases into the air 172 million tons of smoke and fumes; our nation's 83 million cars cause 60% of the air pollution in cities, vaporize 16 million rubber tires and contribute unmeasured, invisible

but deadly, asbestos particles from brake linings into the atmosphere and the death rate from emphysema and other respiratory diseases is growing at an alarming rate. Funds for research on pollution are inadequate on the national level and inadequate or non-existent on the state and local level. We support the following actions: the immediate presidential declaration of a "State of Environmental Emergency"; immediate implementation and vigorous enforcement of the Air Quality Act of 1967; the creation of commissions, at state or regional levels, to investigate all evidence of pollution and environmental damage, with powers to subpoena, hold hearings and take action against industries, municipalities and individuals who continue to commit actions incompatible with the public interest; furthermore such a commission should have the backing of laws which define pollution and make pollution a criminal offense with stiff penalties for corporation managers; we urge the acceptance of the policy that industrial polluters should bear the total cost of all action to eliminate damage to the environment and as far as is possible to pay for restoration of the environment from despoliation in the past. Most emphatically, we do not feel that tax-payers should bear the costs of eliminating private and industrial pollution. However, we suggest that the government make substantial and long range loans to industries to enable all polluters to eliminate pollution entirely and immediately. Special attention must be given to ending the pollution and destruction of the environment resulting from activities of the federal government; included in this category are air and water pollution by federal agencies and installations, pollution and destruction from federal leases, such as off-shore oil drillings, which may have catastrophic effects on the natural environment, radioactive pollution from test explosions and the pollution connected with the continued development, production, transportation and disposal of biological-chemical warfare agents, which in themselves pose an incalculable danger to the environment and to human life, *per se*, and reflect most clearly the distortion of priorities in both human and financial terms. Furthermore, all highway construction, the building of dams, airports, defense facilities and other major governmental construction should be subjected to the most careful scrutiny to minimize environmental damage; the use of DDT and other long-term insecticides should be outlawed immediately as well as gasoline containing lead; automobile, truck and bus manufacturers should be mandated to develop non-internal combustion engines in a reasonable length of time and all vehicles with internal-combustion engines should be banned entirely in five years; in the meantime, all vehicles should be equipped with anti-pollution devices. The federal government should now encourage and foster the development of massive, efficient and convenient public transportation facilities which should be designed to minimize pollution and the destruction of the natural environment.

The only ultimate defense that democracy has against the encroachment of totalitarianism, whether from the right or from the left, is its demonstrable ability to effectively solve the critical social, economic problems of human society. So far, the United States has failed to show that it has this ability. Only through a massive redirection of our fiscal resources and technical ability away from militarism and the gratification of private desires and the maintenance of the *status quo* toward the creation of an economically and socially fair society can we achieve the only sound basis for the continuance of our democratic way of life. Of all projects and proposals for action by government on all levels must we raise the question: does this enhance the quality of life for all people everywhere?

"SCOOPS" RETIRING

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1970

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to present a recent article from the Cincinnati Post and Times Star by Si Cornell. I am sure that all Members of the House of Representatives will enjoy reading about the retirement of "the expeditor"—Edward John Donnellon. Eddie is a well-known and beloved person in the community and has the respect and admiration of not only his colleagues but everyone who was fortunate enough to work with him. His contributions to the field of journalism and public service have been outstanding. We wish him many years of health, happiness, and prosperity.

"SCOOPS" RETIRING

(By Si Cornell)

In a crowd, you would pass him without notice, because he's old and small. But he would notice you. One glance, and he would know whether you're sad or happy, and how long it has been since your last shoeshine. Probably, he could come close to naming your income, your suburb; whether you're Mason or KC, and whether you're looking for a building permit to improve your home or a judge who might provide free lodging.

"It's my time to quit," said Edward John Donnellon, alias Scoops, alias Tarzan.

Eddie, 66, is retiring from the county auditor's office. Fred Morr, the boss, calls him "the expeditor." Anything built around here in recent years had Eddie checking blueprints.

But that's just the fadeout, the last act. Eddie was a reporter. You know like the Front Page, with bow ties and trench coats and a real cop's badge. He wasn't above bawling out a police chief or telling off a mayor—the story, the eternal story every reporter's after, was the thing.

Oh, reporting was great when Eddie did it. Card games were continuous in City Hall's police press room. Characters with strange names and stranger records continually brought replenishment (some of it illegal) for reporters' depleted cups. With the night cops, you took target practice on rats which then came through headquarters' wooden floor, and the public never fretted over erratic gunfire in City Hall.

Eddie was 16 when he first had a look at things like that.

It sounds unlikely, but Eddie says "Mom and Dad always insisted on politeness, and that's how I got into the newspaper business."

His father, also Eddie, a cabinetmaker, and his mother, known as "Smiling Bridget" Donnellon, nee Murray, had Eddie as the 13th of 14 children. When Eddie was out of the eighth grade, the parents permitted the boy to meet streetcars at Reading road and Milsh and tote packages home for tired and elderly passengers. Among those passengers was an Associated Press telegrapher.

"I took a job in a laundry shaking handkerchiefs to dry, and was promoted to ironing butchers' aprons within two hours by a woman boss who chewed tobacco," said Eddie. "When I came home that night the family cleaned me up and sent me to the Times-Star—the AP had called."

It was 1920 and \$11 a week. Copy boys ran wire stories from the Times-Star afternoons and the Enquirer at night. The stories had to go to the Commercial Tribune, the Volksblatt, and the Frie Presse, and to the C.H.&D. station at Sixth and Baymiller for a

train which rushed them to the Dayton Herald. Only The Post, with its own wire, didn't have to be serviced.

"I made reporter on the Commercial at 17 for \$30 a week," said Eddie. "They called me 'Tarzan of the AP' because I always ran with the stories when I did the swing run among all the news offices. I got my first big story (a train wreck with many dead and a couple of hundred injured) because I bought a new suit and came into the office early to hang it up."

The city editor who entrusted the boy with that big job must have been satisfied, because he put the lad to covering all the city's hospitals. There, Eddie came up with a young English doctor, serving as an intern, whispered he suspected Jamaica ginger and bad home brew as the cause of the virulent "Jakeleg," killing people nationwide. It was so bad General Hospital's grounds had victims in tents, like an army camp.

"The Commercial let me hire a chemist, and we tested ginger and home brew from where victims said they got it, and the young doctor proved to be right," said Eddie. "I busted that story and it went everywhere on the wire."

Another was the fact less babies seemed to die at General. Eddie discovered a doctor had set up the city's first pre-natal clinic to catch difficulties before birth, but it was all hush-hush and nobody could get in. Eddie got in simply by donning a white jacket and stethoscope, and came out with the story.

Soon, such a wise youngster was downtown with the City Hall and Courthouse cynics, and he held his own or more. Dick Bray, the retired broadcaster, called Eddie "Scoops," and that stuck. Like the time every reporter knew the Bijou Theater had a minor fire, but only Eddie discovered the projectionist, dealing with the highly flammable film of the first talkies, had died in the blaze.

"The press room fellows didn't speak to me for four months," said Eddie. "There was a card game going when the fire gong rang, and I ran for Fifth and Walnut, and all the other guys yelled at me was to let them know if a traffic jam resulted. Traffic was no problem and I didn't feel obliged to tell them about anybody being killed."

It wasn't all fun and games. The Commercial folded in the early '30s, and the unemployed reporters celebrated the event by renting the Gibson Roof Garden, where they got drunk and actually played football, knocking each other all over the dance floor.

"For a while, I did everything—put in coal, washed kitchens, did a little song and dance act, repaired autos, worked on weeklies," said Eddie. "I was editing four weeklies at once when I noticed we had a pretty bookkeeper named Marie."

"All the weeklies folded and I was selling carpet sweepers door to door when Marie and I got married," said Eddie.

WLW took away the sweepers and put him back on news, and then he did a big stint as news director at WCKY, where he was the only guy small enough to wear the late L. B. Wilson's expensive suits and shoes, which L. B. quite often wore only once, or not at all, before giving them away.

Eddie was on The Post when I came back from WWII, and he once invited me to lunch—which we never ate. So many people stopped him to talk on the street the lunch hour simply ran out.

Besides Courthouse tasks in recent years, Eddie also has been president of the St. Bernard Eagles, which now has asked him to quit working and help run their aerie a few hours here and there. It's only a block walk from Eddie's home, and he has agreed.

"I'm leaving the Courthouse on Friday the 13th, the bad luck day," said Eddie. "But I'm a 13th child, and that ought to make it right."

Only thing wrong is the little guy will leave a big hole among the people who know what's going on downtown.

LAST TRIBUTE TO BALTIMORE'S OUTSTANDING NEGRO CITIZEN—DR. FURMAN TEMPLETON

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, one of Baltimore's great television broadcasting stations is WJZ-TV 13, a Group W station of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. Its general manager is Mr. John Rohrbach who on February 12, 1970, presented a TV editorial about a truly great and good man—the late Dr. Furman Templeton.

The fact that this distinguished man was a member of a minority race only adds to the importance of this excellent editorial. There is no doubt that we have come a long way in the matter of better race relations, but it is equally true that we still have much to accomplish.

I personally know few men that have enjoyed the esteem and respect of all citizens, black and white, more than this late civic leader, educator, and dedicated citizen to the cause of making this a better world. It was my pleasure to know and work with him over the years and I am proud that he was my friend. I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the words of Mr. John Rohrbach in praise of "the leadership of Furman Templeton" because he says what should be said far more eloquently than I can.

THE LEADERSHIP OF FURMAN TEMPLETON

If, within the last few years, Baltimoreans had been asked to vote for their city's outstanding black citizen, there would not have been any unanimous choice. Our guess, however, is that the leader would have been Dr. Furman L. Templeton, whose dedicated career ended with his death this week.

Furman Templeton, director of the Baltimore Urban League for nineteen years, started his fight for minority rights when the struggle was lonely and discouraging. He never despaired, though, and little by little his own zeal enlisted the support of the people of Baltimore, black and white together.

Under Dr. Templeton's leadership, the Baltimore Urban League was conducting a war on poverty long before the Federal government joined the campaign. Although limited by a very modest budget, he directed the Urban League in campaigns for job training, job finding, leadership development, consumer education and for better family life.

He was a man of almost inexhaustible energy, with a zeal and force that made many find him almost dictatorial, while conceding that his relentless drive stirred and motivated those around him. And yet, in his rare quiet and contemplative moments, Furman Templeton revealed himself as a man of intense compassion and pervading faith.

It was inevitable that a man of such talent could not be confined to Baltimore alone. While serving in an almost unbelievable number of civic causes, he acquired national stature as vice chairman of the Commission on Religion and Race of the United Presbyterian Church of the United States.

Those of us who still hold firmly to the belief that black and white citizens must work as a team, can draw strength from his example. Furman Templeton is gone, but the zeal of this great and gifted man has infused a host of Baltimoreans with the will to wage his struggle to a successful conclusion.

We all extend to his family our heartfelt condolences.

ESTONIANS CELEBRATE 52D ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Estonian descent celebrated the 52d anniversary of the Declaration of the Republic of Estonia on Tuesday, February 24.

Unfortunately, the Estonian people were able to enjoy their freedom and national independence for merely two decades. The Soviet Union, with the aid of Red Army, overran Estonia during World War II and occupies the country to this day.

The United States has never recognized the forcible incorporation of Estonia into the territory of the Soviet Union, and continues to recognize Estonian diplomatic and consular representatives in this country.

Through the Communist aggression and violence Estonia lost her independence and her people were deprived of their liberty. Through Soviet military occupation and unlawful Communist expropriation they have lost their personal property and the wealth created by industrious Estonians during many generations. Thousands of American-Estonians who have been lucky enough to find refuge in this country, have personally suffered from Communist cruelty and terror. Most of them have lost members of their families and close relatives through arrests, deportations to Siberian slave labor camps or by outright murder, committed by the Communist oppressors.

For 30 years now the expropriation, pauperization, slave labor, suppression of basic human rights and freedoms, Russification, terror, mass deportations, and murder have been the marks of the Soviet occupation in Estonia and the other Baltic States of Latvia and Lithuania.

However, the Estonian people have never lost hope to regain their freedom and independence.

The 89th Congress, after extensive hearings, adopted unanimously the House Concurrent Resolution 416, where it is stated, that the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of the right to self-determination by the Government of the Soviet Union and urged the President of the United States:

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to

bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I support these principles just as strongly today as I did in the 89th Congress.

REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON EARTH RESOURCES AND POPULATION RESUMES HEARINGS

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, of which I am chairman, spent most of last year studying the problem of population growth. Through our research, and the testimony of experts at our hearings, we assembled and published our family planning report, "Federal Government Family Planning Programs—Domestic and International," which was released December 22, 1969.

This year, we intend to concentrate our efforts on a related and equally serious problem—the problem of the Nation's threatened mineral supply. In tune with last year's procedure, we plan to conduct frequent hearings on our subject of interest. The task force has held two introductory hearings to kick off our quest into this subject area, and we have already been confronted with some of the serious problems that must be dealt with in order to achieve a stable domestic mineral supply. In the past few months, a great deal of attention has been focused on the problems of pollution and environmental degradation. However, in the midst of this concern, there appears to be far too little attention paid to the problems impinging upon our mineral resources.

On February 4, 1970, the task force began hearings on the mineral supply problem. At this hearing we heard from Dr. Harold L. James, Chief Geologist for the U.S. Geological Survey. Dr. James was accompanied by Dr. E. V. McKelvey, Mr. Thor Kilsgaard, Mr. David Davidson, and Mr. Harold Kirkemo. Last week, February 19, we conducted our second introductory hearing. At this hearing we heard from Mr. Hollis Dole, Assistant Secretary (Mineral Research) of the Department of the Interior. Mr. Dole was accompanied by Mr. Gene Morrell, Deputy Assistant to the Secretary, and Mr. Jack Rigg, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary. These two hearings proved most interesting and enlightening, and will be extremely valuable in directing our approach to this subject in the weeks to come.

We have learned from our hearings that by the year 2000, the United States will probably have over 300 million people who will desire and expect higher levels of living than exist today. It is the use of our mineral resources that enable us to advance. They are of basic importance to national economic growth, and to our individual well-being. Despite great and continuing gains in knowledge of how to locate and utilize natural resources, we must still work within the limits of the earth's natural environment. The use of

lower grades of raw materials, recycling present resources, substituting plentiful materials for scarce ones, and making multiple use of land and water resources are some of the possibilities for dealing with a mineral shortage. However, our present research into these methods is not adequate to meet the growing demand for mineral supplies.

We have learned that in many less-developed countries the population presses hard on existing natural resources. This problem may have detrimental repercussions on world trade. The current demand in the United States for certain mineral resources surpasses our domestic supply, and our access to foreign supplies has increased in importance. The United States has become a fairly large net importer of such items as crude oil and iron ore; and has increased its imports of copper, lead, zinc, and certain other metals.

Domestic requirements for the major metals are expected to grow much faster than population during the remainder of the century. According to projections, the smallest rise, for lead, would be slightly over 100 percent by the year 2000. Aluminum requirements are projected to rise by 800 percent, and steel by 200 percent. Domestic reserves of manganese, a metal that is indispensable to steel production, are just about equivalent to 1 year's consumption at present rates of steel production. This is further complicated by the fact that we have a mining labor shortage. Only 17 mining schools remain active in the United States, and these schools produced only 103 graduates in the year 1969. The average coal miner is approximately 50 years of age, and a projected 25,000 of them will retire in the next 2 years.

Another problem that was brought to our attention was that of an energy shortage. The total demand for energy to supply the many forms of heat and power that modern America requires is expected to triple by the end of the century. We do not have sufficient energy resources at present to keep up with our increase in population. It is predicted that we will have a possible natural gas shortage in only 3 years.

These are only some of the more obvious problems that came to the attention of our task force during these two hearings. We plan to study this situation more thoroughly in the weeks to come, and I will continue to publish the results of our task force in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,400 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?