

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IMPRESSIONS OF A NEW SPAIN IN  
A NEW EUROPE

## HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, early last month our Ambassador to Spain, Hon. Robert C. Hill—a fellow New Hampshireite—addressed a joint meeting of the Spain-United States Chamber of Commerce and the Spanish Institute in New York City. During the course of his remarks, Ambassador Hill recounted his personal experiences over the first 6 months of his tenure in Spain, and commented on his impressions of that country's movements toward more direct involvement with the other countries of the Western European community.

I ask to insert Ambassador Hill's statement in the RECORD under Extensions of Remarks and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues that they may share his experiences and gain some additional insight on United States-Spain relations and the relations of Spain with her sister nations in Europe.

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

SPEECH BY HON. ROBERT C. HILL, U.S.  
AMBASSADOR TO SPAIN

It is a great pleasure to be here today before an audience that recognizes and so greatly values the importance of Spanish culture and civilization to our own nation and its history.

All of us are aware of the many and major contributions that Spain has made to the development of America.

Our country from Ponce de Leon's Florida to California is a vast montage of Spanish places and names.

Spanish language and culture is a proud heritage of our nation.

We all know of this great Spanish influence on our homeland. We are proud of it and value it highly.

But I wonder how many of us are fully aware of modern Spain, the Spain of today. I wonder how many of us know of the spirit of economic progress of the growing middle class, all of which are hallmarks of Spain today.

The Spain of today, I believe, is of more than considerable significance to the United States, to Europe, and to the rest of the world.

As we present here today realize, Spain is a proud country—and rightly so when one reviews its colorful history of courageous exploration from Columbus to Pizarro, its formidable panoply of cultural delights from the Prado in Madrid to Sevilla's Giralda, and its summertime treat of *toros*, *vino*, *señoritas*, and *fiestas* that delight so many tourists.

In Spain, as in many countries, a man's pride is important.

Cervantes put it well, when he wrote of his fellow countrymen:

"You are a King by your own Fireside, as much as any Monarch in his Throne."

Today, Spain can say proudly that underdevelopment is being overcome.

And I believe that it is this intense pride that Spain possesses as a nation, as a people,

as a culture, and as a power that is bringing about its transition toward a greater modernization and a fuller development of the country's inherent possibilities in the world today.

Let me take you along with me to Spain so that you may experience a bit of what I felt upon being sent to this proud land as President Nixon's personal representative.

Eight months ago on the tenth of June, I arrived at the Mediterranean port of Algeciras with my wife and two sons.

From Algeciras that night, we drove part way to Madrid, stopping over in Torremolinos, a bustling and prosperous sea-side resort for literally tens of thousands of tourists who came from all over the world.

Only fifteen years ago, Torremolinos was a sleepy fishing village, with only a small enclave of tourists.

In those days some 750,000 tourists visited Spain yearly.

In 1969, according to official statistics from the Spanish Ministry of Information and Tourism, a total of 21,678,494 foreign tourists visited Spain, the highest number in Spanish history.

The next day, we drove nine hours through the castle-studded olive groves of Southern Spain and the high plains of Don Quixote's famed La Mancha to Madrid.

On the 12th of June, two days after my arrival in Spain, I presented my credentials to the Spanish Chief of State, General Franco, in a colorful ceremony at the Palacio de Oriente.

After the formal part of the ceremony was ended, General Franco invited me into a nearby room for a private talk. We talked for almost an hour.

He expressed great respect for the United States and admiration for President Nixon, whom he had met some years before.

Spain had, in the previous decade, undertaken a program of rapid economic development, aided in part by the tourist dollars left in the country by Europeans and Americans.

In many respects, the most impressive aspect of the Spanish transition is the vitality of the Spanish economy and the evidence of its rapid development over the past decade.

The development and modernization of the Spanish economy during the past ten years can be classified along with the miracle of Western Europe's economic recovery following World War II.

A decade ago, Spain's Gross National Product was \$8.5 billion. It is now more than \$28 billion.

During the decade of the 1960's, Spain enjoyed a more rapid rate of growth than any other country in Western Europe.

Indeed, according to many measurements, Spain's rate of growth was exceeded in the world only by that of Japan.

During these ten years, Spanish per capita income more than doubled from \$300 in 1959 to \$700 in 1969.

A mere 15 years ago, some 100,000 private cars cruised Madrid's wide avenues. Just the other day, the City of Madrid issued private auto license No. 800,000.

Experts anticipate that, by 1975, Spain's per capita income will be approaching \$1,100 per year. The most conservative estimates project Spain's GNP in 1975 at about \$35 billion.

On the other hand, Spain does face some economic problems.

The rapid growth of the past several years brought with it problems of maladjustment—the problems experienced by any economy undergoing modernization.

For example, Spain has had continuing

balance of payments difficulties and a serious tendency toward price inflation.

In an endeavour to modernize Spanish agriculture, the government is urging farmers to improve methods of production and adjust traditional patterns of cultivation to meet the changing tastes of an increasingly affluent society.

But these are problems which seem to be on the way to solution. Most Spaniards with whom I have talked are optimistic about Spain's long-term economic future and rightly so because they are a people who possess the desire to progress.

Spain is a market of more than 32 million people with yearly income on the rise.

And, perhaps most importantly, Spain has a government today that is firmly committed to rapid economic growth and development.

So what does this outlook for continuing Spanish development and modernization mean for the United States?

It means, first of all, that Spain is acquiring the economic capability to play a more important role in the community of Western nations.

Spain is now the fifth largest economy in terms of GNP in Western Europe.

In terms of U.S. foreign trade, Spain is already one of our largest markets for exports. Our total sales in Spain in 1969 were nearly \$700 million.

We are Spain's largest single supplier of goods and, with the prospect for continued growth of the Spanish economy, there is every reason to expect that our exports to Spain will continue to increase.

At the same time, we are Spain's largest customer for Spanish exports.

Spain sells the U.S. some \$300 million worth of goods each year; and, as Spain's industry becomes more and more productive, we can expect rising Spanish sales in the United States.

As many of you are aware, Spain has a serious problem with regard to its balance of trade.

Because of its needs for large quantities of capital equipment and raw materials to carry out its economic modernization, Spain now imports more than twice as much as it exports. Its trade deficit in 1969 exceeded \$2 billion.

Spain's economic policy makers are acutely concerned about this; and I am confident that, in its attempts to narrow this trade deficit, the Spanish Government will not stray from its commitment to the principles of trade expansion and trade liberalization which have played such important roles in Spain's economic progress of the past ten years.

The vigorous growth of the Spanish economy, past, present and future, also has important implications for American investment.

The United States is one of the most important sources of foreign investment in Spain.

The Spanish government's own figures show that U.S. firms account for some 40 percent of total foreign investment.

There is a grand total of U.S. private investment in Spain of some \$700 million.

Yet, I am frankly puzzled that there is not more American investment in Spain.

I find it difficult to understand why more middle-sized and large American firms are not more actively interested in establishing operations in Spain.

Spain offers skilled and industrious workers, a market of 32 million people, and an Administration that actively seeks and encourages foreign investment.

In my conversations with Spain's economic ministers, they have stressed to me the great

importance they place on seeing continued American investment in Spain.

The Spanish Government recognizes that Spain needs large amounts of foreign capital to supplement domestic savings in financing economic growth and development.

They also recognize that foreign investment brings with it vital modern technology. Moreover, Spain welcomes foreign investors—and particularly American investors—because they bring to Spain the techniques of modern business management so needed for true economic modernization.

However, in all frankness, I must say that I have heard complaints from some American firms about difficulties they have experienced in Spain.

They report, for example, delays in obtaining official approval for investment projects.

There are also complaints that some sectors of Spanish industry are, in effect, closed to foreign investment.

Moreover, while there are no restrictions on the repatriation of dividends, some U.S. firms have complained about difficulty in obtaining permission to make royalty payments and to reimburse parent companies for technical services.

In my personal opinion, these are not major disincentives to foreign investment in Spain when balanced against the many long-range opportunities which exist.

Spain's transition has assumed political aspects, also. General Franco has proposed and the Cortes approved, the designation of Prince Juan Carlos as Prince of Spain and future King.

The official designation of the 32-year-old prince resolved speculation about the succession.

The designation was widely interpreted as a most significant step in clarifying Spain's political transition to the future.

I have had the honor of being a guest of the Prince on a number of occasions.

He is a fine man and has a beautiful wife and three children that add great dignity and stability to his exalted position in Spanish life.

I also attended the Cortes session at which he accepted his title of Prince of Spain and the role of successor-designate to the Chief of State.

In his acceptance speech, Prince Juan Carlos stressed, among other things, the need for greater social justice for workers and for more understanding of the problems and concerns of Spanish youth.

While emphasizing his commitment to the Spanish system as it has evolved over the years, he also added that "the cult of the past" should not be allowed to "slow down the evolution of a society which is being transformed at a dizzying pace."

On another occasion, he added that he would dedicate his efforts to ensure "that the Spanish people live in peace, and day-by-day achieve an increasing social, cultural, and economic advancement."

As many of you will recall, the Prince's most recent visit to the United States was in December to January in 1966 and 1967.

He had made previous visits here in 1958, as a naval cadet, and, with his charming wife, Princess Sophie, on their honeymoon in 1962.

We are hopeful that he will return again so more Americans can meet this fine man.

In my personal conversations with him, I have found that the Prince holds our country in high regard.

Interested and interesting, inquiring and articulate, he is very well-informed and is sensitive to the problems and opportunities of the contemporary world today.

Another major political event in Spain's transition took place late last October when General Franco named a new cabinet which promptly announced its top priority foreign policy objective as Spain's integration with Europe.

As the new Foreign Minister, Señor Lopez Bravo, said shortly after assuming office:

"Since the last part of the Nineteenth Century there have been many calls for the Europeanization of Spain." But, he added, that ideal had never before passed beyond the "rhetorical plane."

The Spanish Government today seems much more determined than ever before to enter into the economic mainstream of Western Europe.

The nation has chosen as its principal vehicle an association with the European Common Market.

A preferential trade agreement, begun by the previous Cabinet, may soon be ratified.

But the new Cabinet has left little doubt that its ultimate goal is full partnership in the Common Market.

This forthright stance has given rise to a certain amount of debate, both within Spain and the six member states of the Common Market.

Answering a question about full association with the "Six," Foreign Minister Lopez Bravo recently stated that Spain's "first consideration of Europeanization is cultural and economic development, until the level of the rest of the continent has been reached."

In a similar vein recently, Spain's Development Plan Minister, Lopez Rodo, stated that "economic development is, in Spain, as everywhere else, the key to political development."

Some other aspects of political evolution in Spain today are bound up in the questions of trade union organization, political groupings, local government reform and the political significance of the Cortes.

This is indicative of some of the more important matters to which the Spanish press, government officials and those in the intellectual community are devoting attention and commentary.

In all frankness, I can add that there is considerable debate and discussion in the press and other forums, as Spaniards seek solutions to their problems. This often comes as a surprise to many foreigners visiting Spain for the first time.

With regard to United States relations with Spain, I can tell you categorically that they are conducted with complete candor, cordiality and mutual respect.

Shortly after presenting my credentials in June, I called on all members of the then Cabinet.

This round of calls was most useful, instructive and helpful to me. I did the calls again when the new Cabinet was appointed.

For my part, I was gratified by the cordiality, the courtesy, the understanding and the desire to have correct relations with our country.

I was impressed by the knowledge, vigor, and determination displayed by the Cabinet members.

They know our country and admire our leadership but they want to work with us as our equal partner.

Incidentally, they are, collectively, one of the youngest groups of men currently forming any European Government.

General Franco, of course, is still very much the leader of Spain and continues to function as Chief of State and President of the Government.

Another major key to Spain's transition to a more modern society is the Spanish government's plans for wider and better education for the youth of tomorrow.

For some of the biggest news in Spain today is about education, about learning, about an opening of intellectual doors.

We witness the Spanish people deeply committed at this very hour to one of the most far-reaching educational reform programs of modern times.

The Ministry of Education has assembled a group of Spain's brightest minds and has turned out a monumental Reform program.

This program outlines the problems of Spanish education and proposes the bases for a total overhaul of Spanish educational institutions and goals.

The proposal embraces all aspects of public and private education, ranging from pre-school training to post-graduate research.

It is nothing less than an educational revolution; and I am greatly honored that we have been approached about helping in the post-graduate education here in United States universities of future professors for Spanish universities.

The proposal can affect the life and intellectual quality of every student for generations to come.

To help in this ambitious program, the Spanish nation seeks counsel and cooperation from other countries that understand the necessity for proper education of the youthful citizen.

The entire program requires a rare meshing of realism and idealism, and it has that, I believe.

It is my own earnest conviction that Spain will gain its hopes and aspirations in this vital field.

The vision seems right and the proposal both realistic and well planned.

There is a grand role to be played here by those far-seeing funds and foundations able to help in a most laudable cause that goes well beyond the bias and bitterness of nearly forty years past.

For we are speaking of the education of the youth of a nation, a nation in transition toward a thoroughgoing modernization of its entire educational program.

And there can be no better long-term investment than the education of the youth of any nation.

Now a word about the military bases in Spain. Since 1953 we have had an agreement with Spain for the joint use of important air and naval facilities.

I have visited all of the bases—the huge air base at Torrejon outside Madrid, the air bases at Zaragoza and Moron, the naval base at Rota where our Polar submarines come for refitting.

At all the bases Spaniards and Americans work side by side in a model of bi-national cooperation. Each base has its Spanish commander and American commander. At each base, the work of one nation's forces complements that of the other.

We have a large number of young Americans stationed in Spain. Both Air Force and Navy personnel welcome the assignment and have an excellent record for good conduct. The Spaniards like and respect our men and have made them part of the community.

If you could see the relationship, I know you would be as proud as I am of our boys and their families serving in Spain.

On the agenda in Washington in coming weeks, as you know, are important negotiations concerning not only our military facilities in Spain, but expanded cultural, educational, and economic cooperation, also. We await these talks with much interest. I am sure that as we enter these parleys we shall do it with the best of good faith on both sides.

While I have been in Spain only eight months and am not an expert on the country like my good friend, Jim Michener, whose book, *Iberia*, is a monument to his knowledge and love of Spain, both Mrs. Hill and I find ourselves enjoying very much the satisfaction of serving our country in this great nation.

It is often a puzzling land with grand passions and formidable character. And it has a cultural and historical *ambiente*, or atmosphere, which is most impressive.

It is a country to see, to experience, to enjoy—as so many of our own tourists do every year.

It is a nation with a memorable past and an extraordinary future.

This is Spain that I know.  
I am both happy and proud to be our Ambassador in Spain during these interesting and challenging times.

**SHIPBUILDING MARKET OF \$50 BILLION FORECAST FOR 1970'S**

**HON. BOB WILSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been pushing during the past decade for a greater commitment of our national resources in the field of oceanography and maritime development are most pleased at the long-needed impetus being given by the Nixon administration to our naval posture and oceanic research. The attached article by Edwin M. Hood, president, Shipbuilders Council of America, is an excellent and concise summary of present administration efforts to modernize our naval and merchant fleets, and I am pleased to share Mr. Hood's comments with my House colleagues:

**SHIPBUILDING MARKET OF \$50 BILLION FORECAST FOR 1970'S**

(By Edwin M. Hood)

The 1960's, which saw this nation successfully culminate a high-priority effort to land men on the moon, can appropriately be termed America's decade of space accomplishments.

There are numerous indications that the 1970's will be referred to as the decade in which America reoriented herself to the importance of the seas.

During the past decade, perhaps because of our Government's occupation with its efforts to beat the Russians to the moon, our naval and merchant fleets were permitted to deteriorate. At the same time, the Government's support of oceanic research and marine science programs was of a reluctant nature characterized by inadequate funding and lack of coordination.

Now, however, it appears that a concerted effort will be initiated this year to correct the obsolescence problems of our naval and merchant fleets and expand and accelerate "inner space" research and development programs. As will be noted, a \$50 billion market for the U.S. shipyards and ship component manufacturers is forecast for the 1970's. This optimistic outlook is reinforced by the strong backing President Nixon and his Administration are giving to a broad spectrum of ocean-oriented activities.

With nearly 60% of the U.S. Naval fleet and approximately 75% of the merchant marine composed of World War II vintage ships—ships which will have to be scrapped within a very few years—the Administration has announced plans to undertake greatly expanded shipbuilding programs in the 1970's. The Congress, aware that the Soviet Union is already challenging the U.S. Navy's control of the seas and will shortly surpass the United States in maritime strength, can be expected to approve and support these programs.

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird forecasts naval shipbuilding and conversion expenditures of \$3 billion annually for the next five years. However, Secretary of the Navy John H. Chafee contends that appropriations of \$3.5 billion per year for the next 10 years are required to correct the fleet's obsolescence problems. This suggests that naval ship expenditures in the 1975-80 period will exceed \$3.5 billion annually. For each

of the past two fiscal years, appropriations of only \$1 billion were provided.

To remedy the deficiencies of the merchant marine, President Nixon on October 23 submitted to the Congress a new maritime program calling for federally assisted construction of 30 high-performance merchant ships annually for a 10-year period. His program, which at this writing was being translated into enabling legislation, would nearly triple the rate of subsidized ship construction experienced in recent years.

The total cost of the 300-ship program is expected to aggregate more than \$6 billion. With a decreasing scale of construction subsidies prescribed by the Government—from the present ceiling of 55% of a ship's cost to 35% beginning July 1, 1975—the shipowner's share of the program costs will exceed the Government's outlays.

To meet the reduced levels of Federal assistance, the American shipyards will be required to make substantial reductions in shipbuilding prices during the next five years.

The shipbuilding industry is confident that it will meet the prescribed goals since the Administration has announced that it will modify procurement procedures to provide the shipyards with long-sought opportunities for cost reductions.

The new program will emphasize series construction of ships of standardized designs. Contracts will be consolidated in lots of as many as 10 or more ships per contract as compared to an average of 3.4 ships per contract in the past.

The prior emphasis on the construction of small numbers of ships of custom designs added measurably to U.S. shipbuilding costs. Under the new program, shipyards also will have a major role in developing the designs of the ships they will build. As a result, many unnecessary, cost-additive design features, which normally are not spotted until a ship is in an advanced state of construction, will be eliminated on the drawing board.

The Nixon program will place major emphasis on the construction of general cargo ships, including container and barge carrying vessels. An average of 25 such vessels plus three dry bulk carriers and two tankers are expected to be built annually during the next 10 years.

The discovery of large oil deposits on the North Slope of Alaska will generate orders for significant numbers of additional tankers. Some estimates predict as many as 40 tankers ranging in sizes up to 250,000 deadweight tons will be built for the domestic fleet during the next decade. The total cost of the tanker program is estimated to be \$2.4 billion.

In addition to new naval and merchant ship construction, ship repair work and auxiliary services totaling \$6 billion are expected to be performed by the shipyard industry during the 1970's.

Putting these separate forecasts together—\$35 billion for naval ships, \$6 billion for merchant ships other than tankers, \$2.4 billion for tankers and \$6 billion for ship repairs—a \$50 billion market for shipyards and American ship component manufacturers is forecast for the 1970's.

**A STEADY EROSION IN THE SENSE OF HUMANITY**

**HON. JEFFERY COHELAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a profound feeling of ill-ease in our Nation at this time. It is at this time that each of us questions the basic structure

of our society. Mr. Max Lerner wrote a very perceptive essay on the steady erosion in the sense of humanity, of the sense of limits within which human beings allow themselves to act, that appears to characterize many of the human events of today. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert Mr. Lerner's article, "A Study Erosion in the Sense of Humanity," which appeared in the Evening Star, February 28, 1970. I would commend the reading of this article to my colleagues and the readers of the Record:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 28, 1970]

**A STEADY EROSION IN THE SENSE OF HUMANITY**

(By Max Lerner)

I had planned a piece on the erosions of law, a followup piece on my last two, in which I discussed the Chicago trial and also the liberal agony over de jure and de facto school desegregation. I meant to point out how the fabric of law and the belief in it is being eroded and with it our sense of being oriented toward something central and firm.

But the mass killings in the air over Switzerland by a little fanatic Arab band have made me broaden and deepen what I had mapped out. What is happening cuts across national and racial dividing lines, and goes beyond law. It isn't only the erosion of law that is involved but the erosion of humanity, of the sense of limits within which human beings allow themselves to act.

Given all this, the hapless president of France was arriving in Washington at the worst possible time, just when people everywhere, heartsick, are asking themselves the meaning of this murder in midair of helpless and innocent human beings. Georges Pompidou is probably no worse than other heads of state, maybe a little more cynical because he is a literary and intellectual fellow. But the Arab terrorist role in the killings—first proudly affirmed, later lamely denied—has exposed the moral nakedness of the French power move in the sale of planes to Libya.

But I am speaking of something that goes well beyond Pompidou and Israel and the Arabs and the Middle East as well. Arab terrorism and Russian and French cynicism are only part of it. The erosion of the sense of humanity takes many diverse forms.

There are the bomb outrages against police in many cities, notably in San Francisco and Berkeley area, and now against the home of Judge Murtaugh who has been presiding over the Black Panther trial in New York. There are the hideous murders of Joseph Yablonski and his family.

There is the moral problem of the Song My killings, no less a moral problem because they were done in the heat of war. There is the haunting specter of the Sharon Tate murders in Los Angeles and the cult of evil linked with them. There is the continuing evil of the drug traffickers and drug pushers, blighting the lives of the young for profit. There is the new and terrifying story of the murder of the family of an Army psychiatrist, presumably by a band on an acid "trip."

I put them together, however random and disparate, because they are fresh in our minds and because there is a common sickening element in them. It is the desensitized mind—desensitized of human feeling for whatever reason: Profit, hatred, political or racial fanaticism, or some sick fantasy of standing above or beyond humanity. Our air is heavy with desensitized element.

Yeats had a foreboding of it, in his great poem, "The Second Coming." "Things fall apart," he wrote, "the center does not hold." The center is not—despite some fervent latter-day prophets—some bright and sweaty

new dispensation. The center is neither revolutionary nor counter-revolutionary, neither radical nor conservative. What is the center if it is not a sense of the human connection, more precious than any fanaticalisms that may seek to override it? The sad fact of our time is that this center is not holding.

"And what rough beast," Yeats asked, "its hour come round at last, slouches toward Bethlehem to be born?" His question must keep haunting us. It haunted Joan Didion when she wrote her book of essays and sketches, "Slouching Toward Bethlehem," about the crumbling of the personality structure and the rise of strange, inchoate new beliefs.

It doesn't haunt those who invoke "the revolution"—at least not as much as it should. What makes the often loose, sometimes foolish and romantic talk about "revolution" so questionable is the evidence we are getting about the potential for violence in how easy and how close it is to the surface and how man to erode that surface and unleash the rough beast.

#### LEGISLATIVE PARDON

### HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, soon a committee of this House will commence its consideration of S. 1520 and several companion House bills which have variously been described as "failing newspaper bills" or "newspaper preservation acts."

This is controversial legislation and involves creating an exemption to the present antitrust statutes in order to permit competing newspapers to combine certain of their facilities.

Within my congressional district I am proud to represent the fiercely independent Fullerton Daily News Tribune. Its thoughtful publisher, Mr. Edgar F. Elfstrom, has written the following editorial concerning this legislation. In view of the general interest of the subject matter and the forceful views expressed by Mr. Elfstrom, I am including the editorial at this point in the RECORD. The editorial follows:

#### LEGISLATIVE PARDON

A damage suit for \$12 million was filed last week against the Tucson Daily Citizen and the Arizona Daily Star, charging the two Tucson newspapers with monopolistic practices. The charges were filed by the Tucson American, a newspaper which for nearly a year battled the other two dailies and their now illegal "Tucson Plan."

The suit should attract national attention because it exemplifies many of the arguments of the opponents of a bill in Congress which would permit antitrust violation by cooperating newspapers.

The bill, S. 1520, called the "Failing Newspaper Bill," or the "Newspaper Preservation Act," has already been passed by the Senate and is now in the House.

The bill was originally conceived by Sen. Carl Hayden of Arizona to apply principally to the Tucson papers and 44 dailies in 22 other cities which operate under the "agency" plan. However, many feel the measure is so loosely and ambiguously contrived that it could have an injurious and fatal effect on independent community newspapers—exactly what happened to the American in Tucson.

The "Tucson Plan," which is basically what the Senate bill would excuse, permits two newspapers to operate their business and mechanical departments through a jointly owned agency to save money. Editorial departments remain separate. Under the agreement, the papers would stay out of the other's field, morning or afternoon.

The federal courts have ruled the Tucson Plan illegal and just last month ordered modification of the agreement between the two Tucson newspapers. The modified plan may provide guidelines for alteration of the agreements in 22 other cities unless S. 1520 grants all existing and future "agency" agreements exemption from antitrust laws.

Under the order the Tucson newspapers must operate independent circulation departments and modify their advertising rate structure. They would continue to operate separate newsrooms.

To many newspaper professionals it is difficult to comprehend how an institution that fights special privilege, as newspapers should and do, can ask for a legislative pardon from antitrust prosecution.

Many of the monopolistic practices which the Tucson plan engenders and which contributed to the death of the Tucson American will become legal under the Failing Newspaper Bill, which is founded on the ill conceived theory that monopolistic practices should be permitted to keep two editorial voices alive in a community.

Ironically, the bill would reward failure, not only by permitting monopolistic practices, but also by practically foreclosing the possibility of success for a competitor. It will remain for the court to decide, but this appears to have been the case in Tucson.

Even if one were to agree that the Senate bill had some merit for the cause of editorial freedom, which is open to argument, should the "failing" newspaper's protection continue ad infinitum? The newspapers in Tucson were recording before-tax profits of \$1,272,000 when the Justice Department stepped into the case five years ago. "Failure" stopped many years before that, obviously.

Weekly, monthly and suburban papers which must vie for a share of the consumer advertising dollar have no chance against two supposedly independent newspapers acting in concert. These joint operators can, and some do, require consumers to advertise in both dailies, leaving no room for the small independent publisher in the consumer advertising budget.

Often the cooperating dailies, offer rates obviously below cost in one of their newspapers, making advertising in both newspapers highly attractive. Obviously, this monopolistic practice drives the competing independent into the ground. The Tucson American very likely can attest to this.

Call it the Failing Newspaper Bill or the Newspaper Preservation Act, it still smacks of special privilege. It is inconceivable that a profession that spends so much of its energies fighting special privilege and government intervention would ask Congress to pardon its past and future violation of the antitrust laws.

Hopefully, S. 1520 will not become law. Certainly Congress and the public must be aware that the great, great majority of American newspapers ask and want no favor from government. And that is as it should be.

#### THE COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FINANCE

### HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a problem which has concerned a number

of us for the past several years has been the matter of school finance. The subject is extremely complex. It involves all 50 States, 20,000 school districts, a dozen different Federal agencies, and thousands of nonpublic institutions which also provide elementary and secondary education. Now, at last, a President has created a Commission on School Finance to study this area in depth.

The President's Commission on School Finance will serve for 2 years and will draw upon experts in the fields of public finance and economics, management, systems analysis, and education. The President has asked the Commission to study—

The implications of the leveling-off in school enrollments for fiscal and educational planning;

The adequacy of the existing tax bases and structure for the support of public schools;

The status of nonpublic schools in the United States;

Possible inequities and disparities in educational expenditures among States and localities, and the effects of present Federal and State aid programs on such disparities.

The implications for educational finance of proposed new Federal revenue sharing and welfare programs; and

Greater efficiencies in the use of educational facilities and personnel.

Our schools have served us well in the past; but we must make every effort to see that they serve even better in the future. Hopefully, the Commission on School Finance will provide a key toward making this dream a reality.

#### AND THEN THERE WERE 50

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, within the crumbling walls of the abandoned Federal prison on Alcatraz Island in San Francisco Bay, some 50 American Indians continue to maintain a vigil for recognition of the tragic plight facing the Indians of this Nation today.

The winter rains have taken their toll and the number of Indians on the island has dropped until today but 50 remain.

But, Mr. Speaker, if only one Indian was on Alcatraz Island there would be enough symbolism to move the emotions of many Americans who are concerned with the treatment being given the Indians in the cities and on the reservations.

The Indian "invasion" of Alcatraz was a symbolic gesture. The Indians have claimed that under treaties entered into years ago, the Federal Government is obligated to return abandoned property to the Indians. Alcatraz is abandoned and the Indians have called for its return in order that a cultural center for the American Indian can be constructed.

While I feel that this center is an excellent use for the island, I am willing to await the decision of Secretary Hickel as to the Government's plans. It has been

indicated that the National Park Service will acquire the site, if so, I would urge the Secretary to take immediate steps to include the Indian center within the overall plans for the island park.

I would also urge the Secretary to take note of the increasing public concern for the treatment of the Indians in this Nation.

A constituent and good friend of mine, Mrs. Patricia Marangoni, recently wrote me a letter describing the Alcatraz "invasion" and the plight of the Indian in the United States.

I think it would be in the interest of my colleagues if I entered her comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Her remarks follow:

DEAR JERRY: After returning from a day on Alcatraz, I was most happy to find a letter from you. In all honesty I must admit I too share your "mixed emotions". Though I am 100% behind them in their effort to start bettering a disgraceful situation I have spent many days on Alcatraz talking, walking, climbing, and acting as substitute nurse for Stella Leach. The island can serve as a cultural Center, but only for a few. What then do we do for the rest, I continually ask myself questions and am finding myself answering my own questions, must be time for a rest!

The dramatic "take-over" of Alcatraz brought tribes from all over the nation, many who had never mingled with other tribes before; they are still getting acquainted. For so many years the "white" factor has caused failure in all their efforts to unite, it is now with great difficulty they take the first steps. As you know even a child taking his first step, will fall. So, with my people. Argument will rise, disension will take hold but this is part of the game. Most of us realize this. They need encouragement and they too will learn to walk tall once more. They have been made to crawl too long. The dignity and pride that held us together as children no longer is a factor in today's youth, the young are lost souls and not knowing why, react with violence. Schools run by the government have been very successful in their conspiracy to strip the children of all their Indian culture. But the success stops there; they now are faced with defiant young men and women who say "Enough." We will no longer trail you in your footsteps we will walk alone and demand all our rights back. They desperately need to run their own lives, starting from birth. Senator Edward Kennedy wrote to me and has endorsed a program whereby they will be able to have some voice in their own education, but I wonder at all these "new" programs. There is never concrete substance in them, as with this program I fear there is only lip service.

Jerry, you need not endorse their "take over" of Alcatraz but you could let them know that you do respond to their struggle to better themselves. Your voice is such a fine one—let it be heard.

Most sincerely,

PAT MARANGONI.

EDUCATIONAL REFORM

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on educational reform calls for the creation of a network

of experimental centers to discover what works best in early childhood education. This early learning program, cooperatively established by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity, will provide a strong base for the \$386 million day-care programs envisioned under the family assistance plan.

Studies have shown the importance of early childhood years in the development of future learning abilities and patterns. What the early learning program can offer is answers to questions of great importance to educators:

How can the needs of the poor be met, so that they can compete on an equal basis with their more affluent classmates?

What compensatory education programs show the most promise in enabling a child to make gains—and keep them?

What early learning experiences are most meaningful to a child—and where can he best experience them?

The implications of these areas of inquiry for our entire educational system are immense. The early learning program proposed by the President can do much to assure the attainment of our goal of equal educational opportunity.

MY HOPES FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Freedoms Foundation recently cited a former resident of my congressional district, Lt. Col. Charles L. Gray, for a letter he wrote about his hopes for this country's future. Colonel Gray is a 20-year veteran of service in the U.S. Army, a graduate of North Carolina A. & T. University in Greensboro, N.C., and a native of High Point. His wife, who is from my home city of Greensboro is a graduate of Bennett College of that city. They have three fine children. This message is an inspiring one deserving the recognition it has received. It follows:

MY HOPES FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

My hopes for America's future must be joined with her past successes and blessings. I hope that America's people will continue to be filled with the determination and individuality of choice to seek the freedom of human alternatives to religious oppression which the Pilgrims sought when they landed at Plymouth, Massachusetts in 1620.

My hope for America's future begs that the foresight, independence, originality, dogged determination and perseverance of the architects of our Bill of Rights and Declaration of Independence will remain as permanent guidelines in helping our national leaders to chart the right course in promoting the business and destinies of this nation's people, when decisions confronting their destiny are at stake.

My hopes for America's future must look back to Abraham Lincoln. The shining light of America's future into the next century may well be tied to a link which extends back through Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, the 13th and 14 Amendments and the Gettysburg Address. For in these illustrious documents the key to this country's

concern for humanity is forever imprinted. My hopes for America's future call for a continuation of this concern for humanity into and beyond the 21st century.

It is my hope for America's future that she will forever possess the spirit of continuing the convention of brotherhood and fellowship of all humanity under the protective umbrella of our God. My hopes call for the realization that one day our weapons can be forged into instruments for peace, health, and tranquility—that this will truly be the era of "Atoms for Peace" and for the benefit of all mankind.

My hopes for America's future include prayer that God will protect my country and give it the right direction to enable it to forever be the greatest country in the world, materially and spiritually. My hopes for America's future call out that no country misinterpret activities in this country as signs of weakness and divisiveness. As former President Johnson once stated, "There is far more that unites us than divides us."

My hopes for America's future, yearn for the continued belief by its 200 million citizens, in the famous words of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, "Duty, Honor, and Country."

ANOTHER MISSION FOR THE DICKEY PROJECT?

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, any fairminded person conversant with the facts will agree that construction of the Dickey Lincoln School hydroelectric power project in northern Maine's Aroostook County is fully justified.

The justification, expressed by a benefit-to-cost ratio of 2 to 1, is based upon production of 1.154 billion kilowatt-hours annually of badly needed base and peaking power, downstream power values available to Canada, flood control, and recreation benefits.

The primary mission of the Dickey project has been and shall continue to be production of low-cost electric power. It is designed to serve as a yardstick for power costs in New England, an area which endures the highest electric rates in the Nation.

Proponents of the project anticipate that Dickey's example will lead to reduction of power costs throughout the Northeast area.

This would result in lower electric bills for area families and area businesses and, I am convinced, lead to further and much-needed industrial development.

I have sponsored and worked for the Dickey project because it would bring greater prosperity to the people I serve in Congress. I shall continue to work toward that end.

Now I have reason to believe that an additional mission may make construction of the Dickey project even more desirable and more imperative.

Aroostook County is an agricultural area famous for its Irish potatoes. Its economy is a potato economy, subject to the vagaries and whims and accidents of nature to which agriculture is always subject.

As a consequence, true stability is not

a characteristic of the county economy. Rather, it is a bust and boom situation and, unfortunately, the lean years have far outnumbered the prosperous ones.

Dickey could help stabilize and increase the potato crop and improve its quality by providing water for irrigation of land.

While the county is designated a humid area, annual rainfall is short of the inch-per-week required for optimum conditions and, too often, needed rain fails to materialize at the critical time.

And so it often happens that crop quality and yield are adversely affected by drought during the growing season.

Irrigation would assure that water is available whenever needed. Conservative estimates are that water from the Dickey reservoir, by increasing yield on the 150,000 acres currently in cultivation and by improving crop quality, could increase the revenues of Maine potato growers by \$20 million annually.

This would almost double the present benefits ascribed to the Dickey project. The new benefits, economic and social, would have profound and lasting beneficial effects on Aroostook County and Maine.

Adding the irrigation benefits to the Dickey project would entail little if any additional cost for the taxpayer. It would have but slight effect on the cost of the project.

I have asked the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to investigate this possibility and to assess any costs, and I shall acquaint my colleagues with their findings.

Always an exemplary project, Dickey holds promise of becoming even more valuable and serving of the public interest. And so I call again for the support of my colleagues to bring about its construction.

The Congress must continually reaffirm that our commitment and primary resolve for the 1970's is to meet the needs of our people. Construction of the Dickey project will be a most appropriate and fitting expression of this concern.

#### THE LATE HON. GLENARD LIPSCOMB

### HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I join my many other colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of our good friend, Glenard Lipscomb.

Very early in my political career I was a volunteer worker for the Democratic candidate who opposed Glen in his first election for Congress. Glen overwhelmed all of his opposition, both Republicans and Democrats. I never quite understood why this was so until I had the opportunity to know Glen and to work with him—his fortunate constituents knew a good man. The entire country has lost a fine friend and a very dedicated Congressman.

It has been an honor to have worked closely with Glen on those issues affect-

ing our State, and I have long appreciated the expertise which he developed in the area of the Federal budget and defense appropriations.

A speech such as this is the most difficult to give because words cannot convey the depth of feeling we have over the untimely death of our colleague.

My deepest sympathy to Virginia Lipscomb and family.

#### THE BOWS AND ARROWS WAR

### HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when oil was considered in the light of a very wonderful and highly necessary lubricant for the moving parts of the vast array of machinery that contributes to America's great productivity. Today, however, it is receiving attention as something of a hazard to our coastlines and off-coast waters as a result of oil spills from tankers and oil leaks from offshore wells.

The March 3, 1970, issue of the Christian Science Monitor carried an interesting article entitled "The Bows and Arrows War," an article dealing with this matter of oil pollution of our waters. Because of its timeliness, I am inserting it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Interestingly enough, this article has application to an accidental spillage of oil that recently occurred on Kiwanis Lake in my congressional district. This lake, located in the city of York, is frequented by many swans and ducks, which are greatly enjoyed, as well as fed, by young and old alike. The oil slick concerned had a devastating effect on some of these winged creatures, causing some to die. These unfortunate creatures might well have been saved had we been able to heed the plea of this article when it said, "Let's get out of the Robin Hood era, and apportion some moon-age technology to moon-age—and might I say present-day—problems."

The article follows:

#### THE BOWS AND ARROWS WAR

Ever since the tanker Torrey Canyon split in two off the English coast in 1967, oil slicks have been staining shorelines with tragic regularity.

Recently some 1,000 seabirds—their feathers cemented with black ooze—were smothered in an oily tide off Martha's Vineyard, or had to be killed by the humane society.

The time has surely come when clearcut lines of responsibility must be laid down and enforced by Washington. The federal government has a two-pronged responsibility: to delegate authority in (1) policing oil tankers, and (2) detecting and dispensing oil slicks once they are spotted.

Many ideas have been put forward to combat tankers' surreptitious flushing of raw pollution into coastal waters: ideas ranging from the enforced charting of each tanker's movements, to a mandatory "hull within a hull" or a false bottom to be built into all tankers using United States ports. But these have barely reached the government's pending tray.

Research scientists must turn their attention to the at-present almost insoluble prob-

lem of effectively dispersing crude oil once it is in the water. A Coast Guard official described their battle as fighting "a modern war with bows and arrows."

Let's get out of the Robin Hood era, and apportion some moon-age technology to moon-age problems.

#### PROFITEERING BY BIG STEEL COMPANIES

### HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, our so-called economic experts, including big business, newspapers, magazines, commentators, and so forth, write volumes concerning inflation, high prices, and the high cost of living but very seldom condemn the profiteers who are reaping a financial bonanza during these days of inflation.

I am including a letter I received from Mr. Isadore Zweig of Philip Zweig & Sons, Inc., structural steel and miscellaneous iron fabricators and erectors, concerning the unreasonable and frequent increase in prices by the large steel combines. Everybody would agree that 11.5 percent increase in steel prices over a period of 7½ months is unrealistic. Mr. Zweig's comments are as follows:

PHILIP ZWIG & SONS, INC.,  
Gary, Ind.

HON. RAY J. MADDEN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MADDEN: I am writing you with reference to the recent steel increase announced by the major steel producers of the United States, particularly where it affects our industry in the purchase of structural sections and plates.

On July 14, 1969, the steel industry announced a \$7.00 per ton increase on the above items which our industry had expected, although not this large of an increase, due to the terms of their contract with the United Steelworkers of America which had an automatic wage increase in August, 1969. Over the last two weeks the same steel producers have announced another price increase in the same amount to become effective March 1, 1970. This makes a total increase in cost of \$14.00 per ton in the last seven and a half months, or approximately 11.5%. We see no reason why this further increase should be imposed. We are assuming that a further increase will be imposed again in July or August, 1970, because the United Steelworkers contract again includes an automatic wage increase at that time and it will be a good excuse for the steel producers to raise their prices.

Most of the fabricators in our industry are forced to enter into firm contracts for the supply of Structural Steel. These imposed price increases affect us to a point that we can see chaos in the very near future. Although we are aware of the inflationary trend in our economy, we feel that an 11.5% increase over a period of seven and a half months is entirely unrealistic. These increases do not reflect some of the additional increases which have been imposed under the heading "extras."

It is our opinion that unless these steel producers and, for that matter, all manufacturers and employees are not forced to follow certain "indexed guide lines," that we will enter into a period of inflation and de-

pression at the same time from which it will take many years to recover. We urge you to do whatever you can to prevent these excessive price increases with whatever means you have.

We wish to thank you for your interest and trust that we may hear from you concerning these problems.

Yours very truly,

ISADORE ZWEIF.

THE NOMINATIONS OF JUDGE  
G. HARROLD CARSWELL

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of the Senate to confirm members of the Supreme Court, but the membership of that Court is of vital concern to Members of this House and the Nation. I would like to bring to your attention a statement issued by four distinguished members of the New York bar: Bruce Bromley, former judge of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York; Francis T. P. Plimpton, president of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; Samuel I. Rosenman, former president of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; and Bethuel M. Webster, former president of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, who have raised serious questions about the qualifications of Judge G. Harrold Carswell. Their statement follows:

The undersigned members of the Bar, in various sections of the United States, and of differing political affiliations, are deeply concerned about the evidence in the hearings of the United States Senate Judiciary Committee on the confirmation of Judge G. Harrold Carswell as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The testimony indicates quite clearly that the nominee possesses a mental attitude which would deny to the black citizens of the United States—and to their lawyers, black or white—the privileges and immunities which the Constitution guarantees. It has shown, also, that quite apart from any ideas of white supremacy and ugly racism, he does not have the legal or mental qualifications essential for service on the Supreme Court or on any high court in the land, including the one where he now sits.

The testimony has shown no express or implied repudiation of his 1948 campaign declarations in favor of "white supremacy" and of his expressed belief that "segregation of the races is proper and the only correct way of life in our State"—until his confirmation of the United States Supreme Court was put in jeopardy by their disclosure. On the contrary, it shows a continuing pattern of reassertion of his early prejudices.

That pattern is most clearly indicated by his activities in 1956 in connection with the leasing of a public golf course in his city to a private club, for the purpose of evading the Constitution of the United States and excluding blacks from its golf course.

We are most deeply concerned about this part of the testimony. He was then no longer the youthful, enthusiastic campaign orator of 1948 running on a platform of "white supremacy" and "segregation as a way of life." He was then a mature man, holding high Federal office.

Unfortunately, insufficient public attention has been paid by the media of public information and by the public in general to this episode.

The testimony as to the golf club is particularly devastating, not only because of the nominee's lack of candor and frankness before the Senate Committee in attempting to explain it, but because his explanation, if true, shows him to be lacking the intelligence of a reasonable man and to be utterly callous to the implications of the scheme to which he was lending himself.

The circumstances surrounding this golf club incident are extremely important, and should be made clear. By 1955, the Supreme Court of the United States had declared that it was unconstitutional for a city or state to segregate any of its public recreational facilities, such as golf courses. As a result of this decision, a common and well-publicized practice had grown up in the South, in order to keep blacks off municipal golf courses, by which the cities would transfer or lease the public facilities to a private corporation, which would then establish rules for exclusive use by whites. This was, of course, a palpable evasion—and universally understood so to be.

By 1956, many cases had already been filed in various cities of the South to invalidate these obvious subterfuges. Several lower United States Courts had already struck them down as unconstitutional. These cases were well publicized at the time when United States Attorney Carswell, who had been, of course, sworn as a United States Attorney to uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States, became involved in the matter of the municipal golf club in Tallahassee, Florida, where he lived.

By the date the Tallahassee incident occurred, five lawsuits had already been started in different cities in the State of Florida to desegregate municipal recreation facilities, including, among others, golf clubs; and it was clearly evident that Tallahassee and its municipal golf club would soon be the target of such a suit.

Therefore, to circumvent the results of such a suit, some white citizens of Tallahassee incorporated a private club, to which the municipal golf course was thereupon leased for a nominal consideration. Affidavits, dated in February 1970, were submitted and read to the Senate Committee, signed by both blacks and whites who were residents of Tallahassee at the time, showing that it was generally understood that this transfer was being made solely for the purpose of keeping black citizens off the course.

One of these affidavits (TR 610)<sup>1</sup> was by a Negro lady, a public high school teacher for ten years, the business manager of Tallahassee's A & M Hospital for one-half year, and presently an Educational Specialist at the Federal Correctional Institution in Tallahassee. It said in part:

"Tallahassee was in a racial uproar over the bus boycott and other protests—bringing a reaction of fear to the white community. The word 'private' had increasingly become a code name for segregation.

"The Capital City Country Club incorporation proceedings were well-publicized and the racial overtones were necessarily clear to every knowledgeable citizen in the area, and it would have been surprising to me if an intelligent man, particularly an incorporator was not aware of the repeatedly emphasized racial aspects of this case.

"We did discuss this corporation widely at the time; had we not been so preoccupied with other protests, we would have undoubtedly moved against the Corporation in civil suit."

<sup>1</sup>References are to the transcript of the hearings on the nomination before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Another affidavit (TR 611) was signed by a white lady, "a life-long resident of Tallahassee whose family has been domiciled in the city for several generations," "the wife of the chairman of Florida's oldest bank, the Lewis State Bank of Tallahassee." It stated that: (1) the golf course had been developed and improved by a grant of \$35,000 of WPA funds; (2) she refused to join in the new club "because we wanted no part in converting public property to private use without just compensation to the public, and because of the obvious racial subterfuge which was evident to the general public"; (3) that she had discussions at the time of the lease "with a variety of parties during that period on the subject of a golf course, the issue being a wide civic concern." She stated:

"I would have been surprised if there was any knowledgeable member of the community who was unaware of the racial aspect of the golf course transaction. The controversy appeared in the local newspaper of the time and a city commissioner was known to have raised questions about the racial implications involved."

There was then received in evidence (TR 613) a clipping from page 1 of the local newspaper referred to, the Tallahassee Democrat, for February 15, 1956. This contemporaneous clipping corroborated the affidavits in showing the community discussion of the racial purpose of the lease. Reporting the fact that the lease had been entered into by the City Commission with the private club, it stated:

"The action came after a two-month cooling off period following the proposal's first introduction. At that time former City Commissioner H. G. Easterwood, now a county commissioner, blasted the lease agreement. "He said racial factors were hinted as the reason for the move.

"Under the arrangement, the country club group would take over the operation of the course September 1. The lease is for 99 years, running through 2055, and calls for a \$1.00 a year payment.

The then United States Attorney, now seeking to become an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, became an incorporator and director of that private club to which the golf club was to be leased. Here was a high Federal public official, thoroughly cognizant of the decisions of the Federal courts, participating in a scheme to evade the Constitution.

The answer of Judge Carswell to the disclosure of this was that: (1) he thought that the papers he signed (with a subscription of \$100) were for the purpose of fixing up the old golf club house; (2) that he at no time discussed the matter with anyone; and (3) that he never believed that the purpose of this transaction had anything to do with racial discrimination or keeping blacks off the course.

Some of the Senators at the hearings were as incredulous as we are. We think that a few short extracts of the Judge's testimony on this matter will give a clearer picture of the man who now seeks a seat on the Supreme Court of the United States—the final guardian of the individual rights of all of us:

Judge CARSWELL (in answer to a question by Senator KENNEDY as to whether the Judge was testifying that the transaction was principally an effort to build a club house). "That is my sole connection with that. I have never had any discussion or never heard anyone discuss anything that this might be an effort to take public lands and turn them into private lands for a discriminatory purpose. I have not been privy to it in any manner whatsoever." (TR 65)

Senator KENNEDY (TR 149). Mr. Nominee, I think the document speaks for itself in terms of the incorporation of a club, a private club . . . I think, given the set of circumstances, the fact that they were closing down all recreational facilities in that com-

munity at that time because of various integration orders, I suppose the point that Senator Bayh is getting to and some of us asked you about yesterday is whether the formation of this club had it in its own purpose to be a private club which would, in fact, exclude blacks. The point that I think he was mentioning and driving at, and Senator Hart talked to, and I did in terms of questions, is whether, in fact, you were just contributing some \$100 to repair of a wooden house, club house, or whether, in fact, this was an incorporation of a private club, the purpose of which was to avoid the various court orders which had required integration of municipal facilities . . .

"Now, I think this is really what, I suppose is one of the basic questions which is of some interest to some of the members and that we are looking for some response on."

Judge CARSWELL. "Yes sir, and I hope I have responded, Senator Kennedy. I state again unequivocally and as flatly as I can, that I have never had any discussions with anyone, I never heard any discussions about this."

Senator BAYH. "You had no personal knowledge that some of the incorporators might have had an intention to use this for that purpose?" (TR 150)

Judge CARSWELL. "I certainly could not speak for what anybody might have thought, Senator. I know that I positively didn't have any discussions about it at all. It was never mentioned to me, I didn't have it in my mind, that is for sure. I can speak for that." (TR 150)

Senator Bayh then asked whether there were then any problems in Florida relating to the use of public facilities and having them moved into private corporations. Judge Carswell answered:

"As far as I know, there were none there and then in this particular property."

Senator Bayh then asked whether Judge Carswell was not aware of other cases in Florida?

Judge CARSWELL. "Oh, certainly, certainly. There were cases all over the country at that time, everywhere. Certainly I was aware of the problems, yes. But I am telling you that I had no discussions about it, it was never mentioned to me in this context and the \$100 I put in for that was not for any purpose of taking property for racial purposes or discriminatory purposes." (TR 151)

Senator KENNEDY. "Did you have any idea that that private club was going to be opened or closed?"

Judge CARSWELL. "The matter was never discussed."

Senator KENNEDY. "What did you assume?"

Judge CARSWELL. "I didn't assume anything. I assumed that they wanted the \$100 to build a club house and related facilities if we could do it. . . ." (TR 153)

Senator KENNEDY. "When you sent this and you put up the money, and you became a subscriber, did you think it was possible for blacks to use that club or become a member?"

Judge CARSWELL. "Sir, the matter was never discussed at all."

Senator KENNEDY. "What did you assume, not what was discussed?"

Judge CARSWELL. "I didn't assume anything. I didn't assume anything at all. It was never mentioned."

Senator KENNEDY. "Did you in fact sign the letter of incorporation?"

Judge CARSWELL. "Yes sir, I recall that. . . ."

Senator KENNEDY. "Did you generally read the nature of your business or incorporation before you signed the notes of incorporation?"

Judge CARSWELL. "Certainly I read it, Senator. I'm sure I must have. I would read anything before I put my signature on it, I think [sic]."

We cannot escape the conclusion that a man, in the context of what was publicly happening in Florida and in many parts of the South—which the nominee says he knew—

and what was being discussed locally about this very golf club, would have to be rather dull not to recognize this evasion at once; and also fundamentally callous not to appreciate and reject the implications of becoming a moving factor in it. Certainly it shows more clearly than anything else the pattern of the Judge's thinking from his early avowal of "white supremacy" down to the present.

Particularly telling—as showing the continuing pattern of his mind which by the time of the golf club incident, if not before, had become clearly frozen—are the testimony and discussion of fifteen specific decisions in civil and individual rights cases by the nominee as a United States District Judge (TR 629, et seq.). These fifteen were, of course, only a few of the decisions by the nominee. A study of a much fuller record of his opinions led two eminent legal scholars and law professors to testify before the Senate Committee that they could find therein no indication that the nominee was qualified—by standards of pure legal capacity and scholarship, as distinguished from any consideration of racial prejudices—to be a Supreme Court Justice.

These specific fifteen cases are all of similar pattern: they involved eight strictly civil rights cases on behalf of blacks which were all decided by him against the blacks and all *unanimously* reversed by the appellate courts; and seven proceedings based on alleged violations of other legal rights of defendants which were all decided by him against the defendants and all *unanimously* reversed by the appellate court. Eight of these fifteen occurred in one year—1968.

These fifteen cases indicate to us a closed mind on the subject—a mind impervious to repeated appellate rebuke. In some of the fifteen he was reversed more than once. In many of them he was reversed because he decided the cases without even granting a hearing, although judicial precedents clearly required a hearing.

We do not dispute the Constitutional power or right of any President to nominate, if he chooses, a racist or segregationist to the Supreme Court—or anyone else who fills the bare legal requirements. All that we urge is that the nominee reveal himself, or be revealed by others, for what he actually is. Only in this way can the Senate fulfill its own Constitutional power to confirm or reject; only in this way can the people of the United States—the ultimate authority—exercise an informed judgment. That is the basic reason for our signing this statement, as lawyers, who have a somewhat special duty to inform the community of the facts.

We agree with Judge Carswell that a nominee for the Court should not ordinarily be compelled to impair his judicial independence by explaining his decisions to a Senate Committee. But this was no ordinary situation. It involved a consistent and persistent course of judicial conduct in the fact of continual reversals, showing a well-defined and deeply ingrained pattern of thought.

We believe that—at the very least—the hearings should be reopened so that an official investigation can be made by independent counsel for the Committee, empowered as it is to subpoena all pertinent records, including the files of the Department of Justice and the records of Judge Carswell's court. So far, the evidence in opposition—compelling as it is—has been dug up solely by the energy and efforts of private citizens or groups, without power of subpoena. For example, the episodes of the 1948 pledge to "white supremacy" and the country club lease were both dug up by independent reporters.

Are there any other incidents like the golf club, or other public or private statements about "white supremacy"? Are there additional, but unreported, decisions in the files of Judge Carswell's court, not readily available to lawyers who can search only through

the law books for cases which have been formally reported and printed? What information can be found in the files of the Department of Justice, unavailable, of course, to the opposition but readily subject to a Committee subpoena?

One vote out of nine on the Supreme Court is too important to rely on a volunteer investigation, on the efforts of private, public-spirited lawyers and reporters, although they have already uncovered evidence clearly indicating, in the absence of a more credible explanation, rejection of the nomination.

The future decisions of the Supreme Court will affect the lives, welfare and happiness of every man, woman and child in the United States, the effectiveness of every institution of education or health or research, the prosperity of every trade, profession and industry. Those decisions will continue to be a decisive factor in determining whether or not ours will, in the days to come, truly be "a more perfect Union," where we can "establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility . . . promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity."

We urge that the present record clearly calls for a refusal to confirm by the Senate of the United States.

Signed:<sup>2</sup>

BRUCE BROMLEY,  
Former Judge, Court of Appeals, State of New York.

FRANCIS T. P. PLIMPTON,  
President, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

SAMUEL I. ROSENMAN,  
Former President, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

BETHUEL M. WEBSTER,  
Former President, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposal for the creation of the National Institute of Education is a positive step toward guaranteeing that resources for education will be well spent. In the past, there has been a hit-or-miss philosophy operating in this area. The time has come systematically to develop educational programs with a higher probability of success before they are put on an operating basis into the schools. The National Institute will provide an environment for educational experimentation and a central focus for research in the field of education.

The Federal Government has sponsored educational research for many years. Much has been useful, but it has lacked a clear sense of national priorities. The hard questions plaguing American education have not been answered. The need for direction in the research is clear, and I have great hopes that the National Institute of Education will be able to provide that research. I support this effort to take a hard look at the area of educational assistance, and urge my colleagues to join in this effort.

<sup>2</sup> Mention of an organization is purely for descriptive purposes, and not to indicate an expression of the views of the organization.

## SURVIVAL ON THE PRAIRIE

## HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the very great pleasure of witnessing a most timely and interesting television program, "Survival on the Prairie."

This program was presented by NBC News and was produced by Craig Fisher, in cooperation with the National Academy of Sciences.

I was so taken by the production that I acquired a copy of the script so that it might be available to others.

I should also like to commend the American Dairy Association for sponsoring the program and making it available to the vast NBC audience.

The script follows:

## SURVIVAL ON THE PRAIRIE

(By Craig Fisher)

At times savage and harsh, but more often placid and beautiful; a living link with the past thrives by its primitive rules for survival. Now it is beset by the demands of man.

## ACT 1

This is the prairie, sometimes called the American Grassland, or the Great Plains. It's an open, rolling land, uniquely American in its look and its animals, yet its richness and productivity reach past our borders to touch the corners of the world.

Kipling said of the Prairie, "It makes you weep for sheer loneliness, and there is no getting away from it."

But Walt Whitman saw the prairie differently . . . "A vast something, stretching out on its own unbounded scale, combining the real, and the ideal, and as beautiful as dreams."

The awesome grandness that so impressed the poets is embodied in the winter wind. Relentless and penetrating, it seems to test the ability of the land and the animals to survive the cold and feel the soft warmth of another spring.

And they will survive, for over uncounted generations, they have learned to adapt to the wind and to endure the seasonal patterns of the prairie. But the prairie and its tenants are changing.

Our buffalo-strewn prairie is gone now—only a few fence-constricted herds remain. Cattle have replaced the buffalo on this western part of the prairie, while in the eastern part of the grassland, corn and wheat now grow where big bluestem and Indian grass were once as tall as a man on horseback. But the character of the land can't be destroyed.

The enveloping, penetrating thrust of a sudden snowstorm. The soil sucking in each particle of moisture to nourish whatever kind of green plant is quietly awaiting the first warmth of spring. The tenacity of these patient grasses to survive the cruel cold, the crueler heat, and the cruellest master of all—man.

The weather can temporarily alter the balance of the prairie. Man can totally change it.

The grasslands have survived countless storms—. The winter moisture is necessary for the grasses, but, even with the wind, winter is the quiet time on the plains.

Willa Cather, an eloquent spokeswoman of the prairie, wrote this about the season:

"Winter has settled down again; the season in which Nature recuperates, in which she sinks to sleep between the fruitfulness of Autumn and the passion of Spring. The birds have gone. The teeming life that goes

on down in the long grass is exterminated. The ground is frozen so hard that it bruises the foot to walk in the ploughed fields. It is like an iron country; and the spirit is oppressed by its rigor and melancholy. One could easily believe that in that dead landscape the germs of life and fruitfulness were extinct forever."

Not really extinct, just changed. The plants under the snow are not dead—but dormant, as are most of the animals, deep in their burrows.

For plants and animals it is a waiting period—to be endured. Unlike cattle, the native buffalo can move the snow aside to graze, but it's a more difficult time to get food (Pause), and to find shelter.

Some animals, like the prairie dog, can live off their own fat.

The coyote must still live off the fat of others.

The winter patterns are continually changing—sometimes the land is open, sometimes snow or ice covered.

Eventually, the days lengthen—the sun upon the earth grows warmer. The snows melt and winter's cold grip upon the landscape is vanquished for another year. Spring comes again to the prairie.

## ACT 2—SPRING

The Great American Prairie is an ancient land . . . created perhaps 50 million years ago when the Rocky Mountains were thrust up, shedding the sedimentary material which was to become the prairie soil. And the mountains also created the climatic conditions necessary for this vast inland sea of grass.

The earlier forests and swamps declined and the grasslands spread. Then the glaciers came . . . retreated . . . came and retreated again, and the grass crept back as the ice receded.

Over millions of years the rich earth was layered deeper by water and wind . . . and the grasslands grew and flourished. New plants . . . animals . . . insects were introduced, and some survived . . . adapting to the wind . . . the moisture . . . the changes in temperature.

Finally that land, which we think of today as The Great Plains, the largest prairie land in America, stretched from Saskatchewan in the north to Texas in the south. And it was Michigan to Montana wide. But how tall or how short the grasses depended on the moisture.

The Eastern half of the prairie generally has more than 20" of precipitation a year, producing lush, tall grass prairie . . . some ecologists call it the true prairie.

The Western grasslands, stretching clear to the Rockies, receive less than 20", resulting in a mixed and short grass prairie.

At its Western edge, the plains are as much as a mile high . . . then moving eastward, there is a gentle downward slope to the land, carrying the river waters and their sediments . . . shaping the land across the Great Plains.

The "true" prairie—the tall grass—has nearly vanished today. These species have been replaced by a domesticated grass—corn. What was once the true prairie is today's corn belt. So even today we should think of the prairie as a grassland—though not all grasses are native—as these are.

The mixed grasses—which covered parts of Nebraska and Oklahoma and Kansas needed less rainfall—as does another grass, wheat, their replacement today. This native grass is called Needle and Thread.

But there is no replacement for the short grasses—growing only a few inches high. These grasses hold the dry soil in place when the hungry winds sweep over the plains—bearing names like Buffalo-grass (pause) and

Blue Gramma, the most predominant of the short grasses, found throughout the

plains and rightly called, The Queen of the Prairie.

Interwoven through the grasses are the myriad varieties of prairie flowers, lending color to the green mantle of Spring.

And living on the flowers and grasses are the seemingly infinite varieties of insect life.

Even the floor of the prairie seems to move with the new life of Spring.

This is the one time of year when an excess of food exists—the vegetation grows faster than the grazing animals can eat it . . . with sometimes an insect thrown in for variety.

Plenty of food exists for the far-ranging carnivores too.

There are many inexperienced, slower young animals for the predator to choose from—and the Golden Eagle is never far from food.

By the time the grasses have lost their growing spurt, the grazing population has been decreased to its proper level.

After witnessing predation, most of us think about the harshness of nature . . . but, perhaps, we should think instead of its orderly balance. Too many rabbits could result in overgrazing and eventually destroy the habitat for all animals, and the predator will nearly always make his meal on the animal slowed by age or disease, or the one who has not learned how best to hide . . . that is the individual animal that is physically or mentally inferior . . . and thus leave the fittest to continue the species.

The continuation of the species is assured in Spring. These voracious Golden Eagle chicks will take advantage of the clement spring and summer months to mature and prepare for the bitter cold of winter.

Young pronghorns are able to run just hours after they are born, and soon forsake parental care to forage independently on the tender young grasses.

For all the grazers this is the most comfortable season, between the merciless winter and the oppressive prairie summer, ample time for each animal to find his place in the cycle of life of the grassland.

For the plants, the reproductive cycle extends from Spring to Autumn—The seeds being spread by the wind across the rich prairie soil.

This soil, aerated by insects and small animals burrowing through it, may be nearly half airspace, which during rainy periods, will soak up and store water for the dry summer. Some roots go as deep as 20 feet into the soil.

Actually, more of the plant lives below ground than above, to absorb every available drop of moisture. But despite its stern rules for survival, there is a tranquil beauty to be seen on the grassland.

"These are the gardens of the desert . . . These, the unshorn fields, boundless and beautiful, for which the speech of England has no name . . . the prairies."

So said William Cullen Bryant . . . The prairies . . . born, developed and grown to maturity over thousands of years, by trial and error . . . which grasses will live, be reborn over and over again . . . Which will quietly die out and be lost forever.

They seem to be indifferently scattered about . . . but there is a history-old pattern . . . depending on moisture . . . soil . . . sun and shade . . . perhaps the influence of man. A pattern predictable to those who can read the secrets of the grasslands.

This is the challenge that faces today's prairie ecologists. The ancient order of life that is the basis for survival on the prairie may one day reveal to man the secrets necessary for his own survival.

## ACT 3

Not even the heart of a beautiful young girl is as capricious as summer rain on the prairie. Yet, the necessity of an occasional rainfall looms as large as the very thunder-

heads from which the waters come. The wind, whipping through the grasses, is the diligent forerunner of the rapidly approaching rain-storm.

Although it may be a temporary discomfort for some of the animals, the rain sustains life in the plants, and the plants shield the land. For when the storm-driven rain pelts into the grasses, it dissipates harmlessly in the prairie's spongy blanket of vegetation and is absorbed. But when the plant cover is weakened by overgrazing or destroyed by the plow, the soil is exposed to the erosive damage of the elements.

As quickly as it begins, the rain ceases—is absorbed, or lies in pools to evaporate, and the powerful summer sun, again, bakes the grassland into tones of buff and brown. Prairie life returns to normal.

I've never thought of prairie dogs as being terribly efficient; nor very well organized—but after a rain they do seem to be eager workers. Their task now is to clear their burrows of rain-sodden dirt, and to clean their digging tools, too.

The prairie dog town is a fascinating example of the inter-relationships contained in the whole prairie. The grazing buffalo eat the grasses quite short—permitting the prairie dog to see more easily the approach of a hawk or coyote.

But seemingly in return for favors rendered—the buffalo uses the prairie dog's mound to wallow in—dusting himself to protect against the bothersome summer flies.

And with the grass cropped carpet-short by tenant and visitor alike—it's a nice place just to rest.

The lives of two prairie grazers, though far different in size, are interwoven in a harmonious way.

But not all visitors are so peaceful. The rattlesnake, too, is a regular visitor of the prairie dog town. Being a cold blooded animal and having no other means to regulate his body temperature, he finds the shady burrows a welcome and necessary relief from the burning sun.

And he will occasionally make a meal of a young prairie dog.

On the grassland not every confrontation ends in violence. The snake seemed to sense that this adult prairie dog presented no threat and perhaps was too large to be consumed. So he didn't molest him.

With another visitor the prairie dog doesn't fare so well.

This is survival in its simplest form. Survival for the coyote is assured at the cost of a prairie dog's life.

It is the speed and cunning of the weasel that allows him to thrive in this rigid life system.

And the coyote himself is probably the most versatile animal on the plains. If the prairie dog population should dwindle, his flexibility permits him to take rabbits or even field mice.

In the delicate balance of the grassland's web of life, some animals are eaten—and some are eaters. Some killed and some killers. But in this violent drama, no species is completely destroyed, at least not until the arrival of man.

Man is the most efficient killer on earth . . . for food . . . for territory . . . for what are believed to be moral reasons . . . by accident and by design.

We're a more efficient killer than the coyote and the weasel, the eagle and the snake. In the past we slaughtered 60 million buffalo and all of the passenger pigeons.

We shot them for food, and sport. Today, through the use of certain insecticides, we're destroying thousands of songbirds . . . and owls, and hawks and eagles. We've poisoned hundreds of millions of prairie dogs. In each prairie state right now, you can get free poison from the government to kill more prairie dogs . . . Most prairie states still have a bounty on coyotes. All this despite the fact

that we now know there must be small animals on this grassland to add nutrients to the soil; to churn through it and enrich it, and there must be predators to keep the small animals in proper balance. What is to control the grasshoppers when the birds are gone. Too much of the thinking about predators and varmints is as sterile as DDT is making the eagle.

This is a prairie dog town that stretched for 25 miles—home for perhaps 2 million animals. Not one is alive today, because they were all killed to clear the land for beef-producing cattle.

Our American bison—the buffalo—was nearly exterminated, partly for food and hides, but more for political reasons—by destroying the buffalo, the Indians were subdued.

Today's politics state that wheat should grow where Indian grass flourished; that the land should give life to sheep and cattle instead of antelope. So the natural prairie is swallowed up and changed.

Perhaps it's time to re-examine our priorities. And what will be the long term impact of man's manipulation of the prairie.

## ACT 4

Whenever I see a buffalo today, my mind somehow takes an easy journey back to more than a century ago when these massive creatures dotted the plains by the millions . . . some estimates suggest as many as 60 million . . . and if I squint, my imagination permits me to almost see, stalking the buffalo through the tall grasses, a Sioux, Cheyenne, or Blackfoot.

Everywhere I look on today's prairie, contemporary patterns remind me of the people who once lived on this land.

But reality reminds me that these are merely shadows of a people whose time on the prairie has passed.

At first, the rolling hills were scarred only by narrow buffalo trails—then Conestoga wagon wheels cut deep ruts into the grassland soil.

Before long, railroad tracks crossed the prairie, and with the tracks came the demise of the buffalo—and the Indians who were dependent upon them.

The tepee gave way to the white man's sod house, a crude but sturdy home, made from chunks of the grassland itself.

And up from Texas came the cowboy—driving his longhorn cattle to prairie towns like Abilene and Dodge City.

This was the era of sprawling ranches and open rangeland, which would last until the bitterly contested coming of barbed wire; some 700 different varieties, strung out to permanently change the look and the life of the prairie.

In 1862, the Homestead Act became law, giving 160 acres free to any family that would farm the land. And now man came to the prairie in earnest, bringing with him his work animals, his iron, his passion for plowed ground, and all too often, his lust for quick profits, taking from the rich soil all it had to offer, and giving nothing in return.

When seven years of drought came to the land, the original prairie grasses had been plowed under and destroyed. So the wind whipped across the vulnerable fields and lifted the exposed topsoil into smothering, black clouds.

The fine dirt sifted through everything, and piled up like snowdrifts, choking the spirit of the people, and for a while severing the ties of man to the land.

This abandonment of the land, begun in the days of the Dust bowl, continues even to the present.

The deserted houses on the prairie today seem silent reminders of battles fought with the land, and lost.

What is there more melancholy than an old, abandoned farmhouse. I can imagine milk cows lowing in the early morning, can

still see children racing through the yard. But the fact is, all that's left is failure. A family has left the soil. It used to be that it was sometimes because of an act of God—a death—a drought. But much more often, through our own folly. Through ignorance, or greed. We destroyed the land that was giving us life. That is sometimes still true today. But the most powerful cause for this abandonment now, is that a small farm or a small ranch, is no longer economically practical. The abandonment now is because of success. Yesterday's farmer, working his land by the strength of his back, has given way to the timeless efficiency of giant machines—plowing, planting, harvesting, vast areas. And thus, the era of the small farmer is gone.

This is the era of mechanization. We produce much more per acre, and with fewer people, than ever before—but it takes 10 times more horse power to do it. Directly or indirectly, today's farmer and rancher are dependent upon Dallas oil, Detroit steel and Washington money. They're caught more in the web of technology, than the web of the prairie.

Whether corn or cattle—the prairie is big business today.

But the small prairie towns are dying. Fewer people are needed on the land, and many of the young no longer cherish the simple life of rural America.

For those who do stay, it is a rigorous and isolated life. But that life and even the look of the broad, rolling country can bring true fulfillment and comfort to many.

When you stand here on the prairie in the late afternoon . . . the middle of Nebraska, or the Dakotas, Colorado, or maybe Kansas . . . and hear, even feel the grasses shimmering all about you . . . then you can begin to understand how a man can love the countryside.

It is sometimes harsh . . . bitter cold and searing heat. There are times when the dust blows that Dakota earth covers the floor of houses in Minneapolis . . . even Chicago. And it's the birthplace of slashing hailstones and pounding rain that can drown a whole country in minutes. But usually the grasslands are like this . . . proclaiming a beauty and peacefulness I've never experienced anywhere else. I'm from this land . . . and can truly feel the words of Sandburg . . .

"I was born on the prairie and the milk of its wheat, the red of its clover, the eyes of its women, gave me a song and a slogan. The prairie sings to me in the forenoon and I know in the night I rest easy in the prairie arms, on the prairie heart."

In the last hundred years we have indeed taken the prairie heart to our own, and man has made himself a true native of the grassland. But in the wake of such violent former encounters, will we now be able to thrive in partnership with the land, cherishing its legacy and protecting its vitality?

The energy of life on the prairie is particularly visible in the golden sunlight and ripening grasses of Fall—the plants and grasses absorb solar energy, convert it to usable energy, and lock it tightly within their leaves and stems.

The animal and insect grazers, the next link in the conversion chain, get their energy from the plants.

They may digest and use about half of what they eat—the remainder passing back to enrich the soil.

These primary consumers themselves become the energy source for the secondary users.

But this hawk and the other predators cannot increase the number of prey available, so both are controlled—and balanced within the prairie's natural limits.

Like the rabbit, man too is a primary consumer—but we replace the native grasses with our specialized pampered grasses—corn and wheat.

We also pamper our specialized grazing

rey. For like the hawk, man is a carnivorous animal. But we have altered the prairie's balance by replacing the *wandering* large grazer—the buffalo—with cattle . . . which we sometimes confine to limited pastures and overgraze—destroying the native grasses and sometimes the soil for generations.

Our cultivated, or grazed plainsland is then governed not by the natural system—but by commercial needs, outside the grasslands' balanced environment.

Besides disturbing the balance, we also deplete the land by removing its nutrients—the chemical elements essential for plant life. We do this by permanently removing the cattle from the grasses which provided them energy.

In the natural system, through the actions of decomposed organisms and the elements, the nutrients of dead plants and animals are returned to the soil, thus completing the natural cycle.

The seasonal cycle changes the look of the prairie once more in Autumn, as the now dry grasses mat down to protect the land.

It is the time some animals change their coats from brown to white in anticipation of snow covered fields—Animals like the weasel, who possess the cunning and agility to endure the winter above ground.

Other animals burrow into the earth to escape the cold—sinking into a deep sleep. As many as 50 rattlesnakes might form a living ball deep in their den, to share body warmth.

Most birds, like these blackbirds, are not able to survive freezing prairie winters so they leave the land . . . thus linking other wild areas to the prairie.

So the life on the prairie comes, inexorably, full circle. The rhythms of the land are constant. The great activity of feeding at first light—for grazers and predators alike. The lazy, drowsy midday and quiet afternoon. Then another flurry of excitement at dusk as the day creatures eat dinner and the nocturnal ones begin their foraging. There is, too, the constancy of the seasonal patterns—that first day in March when the sun gets warm enough for you to remember last year's spring.

And, now, November, the crisp bite in the air demands you think of winter's coming and cold and changing sun's patterns, demands the wildlife think of hibernation or migration. For, if we're to live successfully, all of us, we must do so in harmony with the natural laws of this land.

As we are aware that the Great Plains are a food source for nations, we must also recognize that we now have the technology to destroy the prairie—as well as the knowledge to preserve it. Each time we drain a prairie pond or plow up virgin grassland, we are shrinking the ancient prairie. And as the natural haven for millions of animals vanishes, so do our chances of escaping the pressures of an urban society to feel once more the peace and freedom of the open prairie. We are, after all, temporary guardians of the land and must protect it for our grandsons and their grandsons to come.

I'd like to think that the prairie will survive, and that my grandsons will walk this land as I have, and still feel the heroic words of John J. Ingalls, a Kansas Senator in 1873. "Next in importance to the profusion of water, light and air, those three great physical facts which render existence, possible, may be reckoned the universal beneficence of grass.

"Its tenacious fibres hold the earth in its place, and prevent its soluble components from washing into the wasting sea. It invades the solitude of deserts, climbs the inaccessible slopes and forbidding pinnacles of mountains, modifies climates, and determines the history, character, and destiny of nations.

"Banished from the thoroughfare and the field, it bides its time to return and when

the dynasty has perished, it silently resumes the throne from which it has been expelled, but which it never abdicated. It yields no fruit in earth or air, and yet should its harvest fall for a single year, famine would depopulate the world."

"Grass is the forgiveness of nature—her constant benediction. Fields trampled with battle, saturated with blood, torn with the ruts of cannon, grow green again with grass, and carnage is forgotten. Streets abandoned by traffic become grass grown like rural lanes and are obliterated. Forests decay, harvests perish, flowers vanish; but grass is immortal."

A REBUILT JAPAN NOW HELPS OTHERS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, nearly 25 years ago Japan was a defeated, wartorn nation. The country had been devastated by World War II and was in desperate need of financial assistance to rebuild its shattered economy.

Today Japan is one of the world's industrial giants and is a leader in world commerce and trade. This growth attests to the willingness and ability of the people of Japan to literally begin from the ashes and to successfully regain their proud world status.

Japan and its people, however, have not forgotten the nations, the organizations, and the people who assisted their development. The willingness of Japan to return the favor was most recently demonstrated on February 12, 1970, when the Bank of Japan loaned the World Bank 36,000,000,000 yen, the equivalent of \$100 million.

The loan is especially significant since Japan's postwar development was largely made possible through the economic assistance received from other nations and the World Bank. Now, our Pacific neighbor is endeavoring to insure that other nations will have the same development opportunities that she herself had, and is helping to strengthen and encourage international fiscal cooperation.

I take pride in citing this one example of Japan's good will and salute the nation and its people for their remarkable achievements. So that others may read of Japan's commendable action, I submit the following release from the World Bank for the RECORD:

YEN LOAN TO WORLD BANK

The Bank of Japan and the World Bank signed an agreement today, February 12, in Tokyo for the loan to the World Bank of Yen 36,000,000,000 (U.S. \$100,000,000 equivalent). This loan, carrying interest at the rate of 7.14% per annum, will be repaid in five equal installments from February 1973 to February 1975.

The Bank of Japan, in announcing the loan to the World Bank, noted:

"In view of the recent developments of Japan's balance of payments, The Bank of Japan has decided to extend the above loan to the World Bank, which has made a great contribution toward the development of the Japanese economy for many years, in order to help the World Bank's activities and

thereby strengthen international monetary cooperation."

In commenting on the transaction Robert S. McNamara, the President of the World Bank, said:

"I am particularly pleased at this first Yen loan from Japan, a country with which we have had a long partnership in the development process. It is most gratifying that at this stage Japan is able and willing to make its resources available to help others in this same development process.

"I would also like to express my warm thanks to the Japanese Government, and to The Bank of Japan who have helped us so generously in completing this notable transaction."

MEASURES DESIGNED TO ACHIEVE LAW AND ORDER

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Mayor John Lindsay's recent remarks before the Association of the Bar of the City of New York raises very important questions concerning repressive measures designed to achieve law and order that whittle away at the bill of rights of our Constitution. I believe that the text of his remarks which follows contains a message for all of us:

FINAL REVISED TEXT OF REMARKS BY MAYOR JOHN V. LINDSAY AT CENTENNIAL PROGRAM OF ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, PHILHARMONIC HALL, LINCOLN CENTER, MANHATTAN, FEBRUARY 17

This is a landmark for New York. For 100 years, the Association of the Bar has had a single client—the people of this city. And you have served them well.

From its birth, the Bar Association has fought the good fight for judicial reform—for an end to municipal corruption—and for a legal system that reaches to the least as well as to the highest among us. This city can be thankful for your determination and your achievement.

This is, unhappily, a time when another obligation of the legal world is growing increasingly important. I say unhappily because it is time to remind ourselves of our obligation as lawyers to protect our citizens' rights and liberties from threats and infringements.

The blunt, hard fact is that we in this nation headed for a new period of repression—more dangerous than at any time in years. The frenzy, the bitterness, the tumult of the last few years have led many people—including many in positions of power—to expect peace and order to come by whittling away at the Bill of Rights of our Constitution.

And this new threat of repression imposes on all of us an obligation to stand and be heard.

Think back to last year at this time—when dozens of colleges were being hit by student disorders and disruptions. Few denied that there were real grievances. But all of us were shocked at the means of pressing those grievances—most especially the smothering of free speech by shouting down speakers with unpopular views on the campus. All across public life, we rightfully heard angry attacks on such repressive means to achieve ends, however important those ends might be.

Now look at events of recent weeks. Not long ago, the Senate passed a drug law. It

would permit federal agents to enter the home of a private citizen with no warning whatsoever. This is at least a sharp extension of traditional fourth amendment limits. Not one Senator voted against that bill.

At almost the same time, the Senate passed a crime bill which drastically limited a defendant's right to examine possibly illegal sources of evidence; which imposed a statute of limitations on the right to be free of illegal searches. Only one man stood up against that bill.

And a week later, the House passed a "Defense Facilities Bill"—which would extend to private industry broad government investigatory powers. It would authorize federal agents to examine the political associations and acts of people in private industry—and it would permit these private citizens to be fired from their jobs without even being told the basis for that dismissal. It passed by an overwhelming margin.

And while this bill was being passed, the Justice Department issued—then retracted—a startling series of subpoenas, asking for the notes and tapes of newsmen—a step which could basically endanger the traditional independence of our news media.

All of this has happened within the last few weeks. Yet where are the declarations of opposition? Where are the leaders, in politics, the Bar, and academic life, speaking out against these new threats to our constitutional freedoms?

Of course these are controversial areas. The most dangerous threats to freedom always are. When government intrudes in a trivial field, we all enjoy laughter aimed at the clumsy workings of bureaucrats.

But—it is precisely when government treats real dangers—like crime, drugs, and security—with dangerous means that government is most likely to endanger our freedoms by increasing repression. And it is at this point that the defense of freedoms must be made.

There is a similar duty, too, to speak out in defense of the judicial process itself. We all know the danger of using courtrooms as political forums. And it is important to oppose political extremists who make illegitimate use of our courts.

But that is exactly why we must speak out when officials and when governments do the same thing.

All of us, I think, see the recent Chicago trial as a defeat for the integrity of the judicial process. All of us, I think, see in that trial a tawdry parody of our judicial system.

But it is important to understand the roots of this disaster. When you try political activists under a conspiracy charge—long considered to be the most dubious kind of criminal charge—difficult to define or to limit—and when a trial becomes fundamentally an examination of political acts and beliefs—then guilt or innocence becomes almost irrelevant. The process becomes a matter of political opinion instead of legal judgment, and the sense of a courtroom as an independent, open and judicious tribunal becomes lost.

And we lost something else, too. Whatever the ultimate verdicts, who has really won in this case? Think of yourself as a young man or woman, emerging into political concern. If you had witnessed what happened in Chicago, which of you would believe that our system was open, fair-minded, and humane? Which of you would come away from this trial with a renewed faith in our judicial system?

With this matter now on us—with the range of new laws of dubious value or legitimacy—what must concern us all as lawyers is this growing evidence of encroachment on our most cherished rights and liberties. And this concern must remain, whether the threat comes from our executive, legislative

or judicial branches of government—or from individual citizens under the false notion that violence, disruption, and repression of their own is the way to a better society.

This Association has always had the courage to stand up for its beliefs, even at great cost. Exactly 50 years ago, led by Charles Evans Hughes, this very Association spoke out against the unseating of five Socialist Legislators by the State Assembly. The men who led this fight had nothing in common politically with the victims of that repression. But they did have a faith in freedom—and they acted on that faith.

Today, when the turmoil of the last few years has made repression a politically popular step, it is our obligation as lawyers to stand against it—in whatever form it takes.

It is time again to put our faith in the system of open and free debate—and in full constitutional protection for those accused of crimes. It is time again to speak out in defense of these precious barriers between tyranny and liberty.

This is not an easy task. But there is none more vital today. And there is none more noble to begin your second century of life.

## STATE OF THE WORLD MESSAGE

### HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most significant attribute of President Nixon's recent "state of the world message" is its flexibility and ability to adapt to meet changing world conditions.

This fact is seen clearly by examining editorial reaction to the message. Naturally, different newspaper editors see the world situation and possibilities for the future in different ways. But despite their rather diverse views, the great majority of them seem to feel that President Nixon's innovative, straightforward approach to foreign policy offers great hope for the United States.

A sampling of editorials from around the Nation shows the different emphasis placed on various aspects of the message by different editors, but their common support of the President's goals and basic policies.

While the Wall Street Journal sees as most significant the "more limited military and political role for America in the world," the Cleveland Plain Dealer sees the message as "a very firm version of the foreign policy of the United States"—one which tells the Soviet Union to "quit its worldwide proselytizing, to quit believing that a worldwide Socialist triumph is historically inevitable, to begin accepting coexistence with capitalist democracy."

Business Week magazine feels that "This, at last, is clear recognition of a fundamental truth on which U.S. foreign policy must rest. This Nation cannot police the world or assume the burden of solving its problems singlehandedly," while the Chicago Daily News see it as "a more comprehensive guide to foreign policy than any President has attempted," that "pulls together in one package a set of principles that too often can be seen only in fragmented form."

All of these editorials, however, say in one way or another that the President has brought a much-needed change to U.S. foreign policy, and that our Nation will be better off because of it. I insert these editorials in the RECORD:

[From the Business Week Magazine, Feb. 21 1970]

#### HELP WHERE IT MAKES A DIFFERENCE

The massive 119-page report on foreign policy that President Nixon delivered to Congress and the nation this week is something new in American government. For the first time in history, the President has attempted to look at the complexity of U.S. international interests in the round, to relate them to each other, and to weigh them systematically against domestic claims on the nation's resources.

Much of such a summary inevitably is a restatement of familiar themes. But the President's message demonstrates that foreign policy has changed significantly—both in style and substance—during the first year of the new Administration.

The change of style from that of his predecessors in the White House is most striking. The message is carefully structured, businesslike, comprehensive. Its tone is coolly impersonal.

The change in style reflects an important change in substance. At no point has President Nixon made an abrupt departure from the policies that he inherited from previous Administrations, but he has made significant shifts in emphasis. In the message, he identifies three guiding principles of U.S. foreign policy: international partnership, strength, and negotiation. From here on, it is evident that the U.S. will be putting the emphasis on the first and third, although it will not neglect the second.

This is reassuring. So is the description of the elaborate decision-making machinery within the National Security Council painstakingly put together by Dr. Henry Kissinger, the President's indefatigable assistant. This is designed to steady control over events by anticipating them in a systematic way. If it will improve the chances that the President will make the right decisions at critical moments by assuring that he has considered all the real options. At the same time, it provides a permanent mechanism—in the Defense Program Review Committee, for continuously measuring domestic needs against national security imperatives.

All this is no guarantee that the Nixon Administration will not make mistakes in particular programs and policies. But it offers the hope that mistakes will be identified and corrected before they have become irretrievable. The very practice of putting together an annual foreign policy review will help to highlight weak spots and inconsistencies just as the annual State of the Union message serves to coordinate domestic policies.

Perhaps the most encouraging thing of all is the way the President summarizes the fundamental thinking that lies behind his foreign policy:

"Its central thesis is that the United States will participate in the defense and development of allies and friends, but that America cannot—and will not—conceive all the plans, design all the programs, execute all the decisions, and undertake all the defense of the free nations of the world. We will help where it makes a real difference and is considered in our interest."

This, at last, is clear recognition of a fundamental truth on which U.S. foreign policy must rest. This nation cannot police the world or assume the burden of solving its problems singlehandedly. Like any other country, it must assess its resources, identify its vital interests and see that its policies relate the one to the other.

Many bitter disappointments and bitter frustrations of the past might have been avoided if U.S. policy had been based on this simple principle. As the President rightly says, "It is a way—the only way—we can carry out our responsibilities."

[From the Plain Dealer, Feb. 19, 1970]  
NIXON'S FIRM WORLD POLICY

President Nixon spelled out a very firm version of the foreign policy of the United States, in his state of the world message.

He made it plain that the United States is ready to put the Cold War behind, and to enter an era of negotiation, but will remain an active power, ready to defend its principles, as well as its interests in the world.

He gave notice to the Soviet Union that it is America's policy to match the current ambitious Soviet nuclear weapon program, with its multiple warheads and widening deployment.

He warned that this country "would view any effort by the Soviet Union to seek predominance in the Middle East as a matter of grave concern."

In fact, he said, no major power should attempt to win selfish advantage out of the conflicts of nations in Africa or Asia.

Mr. Nixon also rejected flatly the Brezhnev Doctrine—by which Moscow justified its invasion of Czechoslovakia as a move for the good of "the Socialist community."

"The United States views the countries of East Europe as sovereign, not as parts of a monolith," said the President. "We can accept no doctrine that abridges that sovereignty."

The President invited the Kremlin leaders to "abandon 19th century perceptions hardly relevant to the new era," and to join America in building a lasting peace.

Such an invitation to quit its worldwide proselytizing, to quit believing that a worldwide Socialist triumph is historically inevitable, to begin accepting coexistence with capitalist democracy, hardly can win enthusiastic agreement in Moscow. But it does give the Soviets an American position to which they can adapt gracefully for this present risky period at least.

Mr. Nixon gave this country room to maneuver forward or to the rear wherever there is a threat of subversion. As he said at Guam, other nations must work out their personal or regional defense, but the United States will stand by its friends—to degrees varying from mere economic help to minor military assistance.

But if insurgency "shades" into external aggression, the United States will decide how much further it would go. Mr. Nixon gave up no U.S. options.

Mr. Nixon made no change in the American posture. He was not trying to sound new—only to be comprehensive and tough.

[From the Washington Daily News,  
Feb. 19, 1970]

#### THE FOREIGN POLICY MESSAGE

President Nixon should be congratulated for starting the practice of sending an annual report to Congress on U.S. foreign policy.

The largest item in our budget—defense—and the sharpest tragedy of recent years—young men dying in Vietnam—are directly linked to foreign affairs. Thus a report on the subject, along the lines of the President's traditional budget and economic messages, is more than justified.

An important point that emerges from the wide-ranging, 40,000-word report is that Mr. Nixon is probably a better administrator than his immediate predecessors. With the help of his brainy adviser for national security, Henry A. Kissinger, he has put together an improved system of getting facts, intelli-

gence, analysis and options before making a foreign-policy decision.

All this, of course, is no guarantee the President will be right, and he recognizes it. Administration policies "will be judged on their results," he says, "not on how methodically they were made." But insofar as better procedure leads to better policy, he is on the right track.

The message contained one new element: a public warning to Russia not to exploit the Arab-Israeli conflict to seek "predominance" or "a special position" in the Middle East.

Presumably, this warning had been given to the Kremlin earlier thru diplomatic channels. It is good that the United States is now on record that it will resist losing its interests in the area. Hopefully, Russia will reconsider its dangerous practice of fishing for oil and power with high explosives.

Some people will be disturbed by Mr. Nixon's report that the Russians have caught up with us in nuclear weapons and are ahead in some categories. The fact remains, tho, that both countries possess vast overkill, and this may make it possible to reach arms control agreements.

In a hopeful phrase, the President reported "certain successes . . . in negotiations" with Russia and "cause for cautious optimism that others will follow." However, he quite rightly warned the public against euphoria or expecting a quick and easy understanding with the Kremlin.

On Vietnam, the message claimed continued progress. For instance, Viet Cong control over the rural population "has dropped sharply to less than 10 per cent." At the same time Mr. Nixon candidly wondered "whether the Vietnamization program will succeed."

Underpinning the report was what the President has decided to call the "Nixon Doctrine"—that the United States will keep its commitments and stand by its allies, but that they will have to do more for themselves and carry the brunt of ground fighting that may occur.

More clearly than before, the President defined his formula for a peace that is "more than the absence of war." It requires a partnership with friendly nations, strength to discourage would-be aggressors, and the willingness to negotiate, patiently and persistently.

Mr. Nixon did not say so, but his formula for peace also requires a willingness on the part of the Soviet Union to reach an accommodation with us. We should know more about that after another annual report or two.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Feb. 19, 1970]

#### NIXON'S VIEW OF THE WORLD

President Nixon's book-length message to Congress on the "state of the world" is a more comprehensive guide to American foreign policy than any President has attempted. If it contains little that is new or startling, it pulls together in one package a set of principles that too often can be seen only in fragmented form, and expresses the philosophy that undergrids the whole. It is a document that will bear much study.

Like his predecessors, Mr. Nixon seeks peace—a durable and just peace—and he has been around long enough to know that the goal is distant and the road is hard. His view is realistic without being fatalistic. Cooperation and partnership have their place, but so does defensive strength. Negotiation with the Soviets and new overtures in such hard-rock areas as Communist China and the Middle East must be diligently pursued, but in many areas only change that comes with time can begin to resolve the tangles.

Indeed, change is the theme that recurs again and again in the message. His own views of the preferred approaches to peace

have obviously undergone much change since the days when he was vice president and John Foster Dulles was masterminding foreign policy. He speaks of the inability to look far into the future in a "world of onrushing change."

The President and his policy advisers—Henry Kissinger doubtless shares the credit for this document—see the United States adapting to change faster than many of the nations it must deal with. And while this may be debatable, there is surely merit in his direct challenge to the Soviet Union to "transcend the past."

"The Soviet Union shares with other countries the overwhelming temptation to continue to base its policies at home and abroad on old and familiar concepts," Mr. Nixon said. "But perceptions framed in the 19th Century are hardly relevant to the new era we are now entering."

True, but that concept was slow in arriving in Washington and by no means has been universally adopted there. The tendency all too often is to do business in the same old way, ignoring the rapid pace of change in technology and human relationships.

It isn't likely that Mr. Nixon's message will budge the Kremlin or penetrate the Bamboo Curtain. But if his recognition of the need to adopt to change can penetrate the halls of Congress, and, indeed, the nether reaches of the State Department, something will be gained.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 20, 1970]

#### MR. NIXON'S WORLD

"The United States will participate in the defense and development of allies and friends, but . . . America cannot—and will not—conceive all the plans, design all the programs, execute all the decisions and undertake all the defense of the free nations of the world. We will help where it makes a real difference and is considered in our interest."

That is the central thesis of the Nixon Doctrine as elaborated by the President in his "state of the world" message to Congress this week. It is not a policy of isolationism, Mr. Nixon emphasizes, but it is a breaking away from the policy of global interventionism that has prevailed since World War II.

Not that past policy was wholly unjustifiable, or that the present Administration is saying it was. America emerged from World War II to face the enormous threat of an aggressive, belligerent Soviet Union and, soon, a China gone Communist. It was only right and natural that the U.S. should try to protect freedom where it could in the world.

The fault—a not untypically American one—was in carrying the policy to extremes. It seemed gradually to be assumed that we were so rich and powerful we could resist aggression just about anywhere and raise up a mostly poverty-stricken world. This inaction led the Government into the mire of Vietnam, and especially to the Americanization of the war under President Johnson.

Vietnam, plainly, has been a great albeit grim teacher. It graphically demonstrated the paradox of the limitations of American power despite the application of tremendous force. If at all possible, the nation and the Administration would like not to repeat the lesson.

Yet it is a little unfair to the Administration to imply that Vietnam alone brought forth its new approach to world affairs. Even without Vietnam, something like the new policy would probably be emerging. The U.S. could not go on attempting, however beneficently, to order the world.

Moreover, while it is necessary to be extremely wary of Communist duplicity, it is increasingly necessary to at least try to work out some better way of living with the Com-

munists; the gravity of the arms race by itself requires it.

So the Nixon policy envisions, in line with the actual limitations of power, a more limited military and political role for America in the world. It will leave more to the initiative and responsibility of its friends, at the same time endeavoring to work out practical arrangements with its enemies.

Obviously the policy cannot guarantee peace of a trouble-free world. But after the overheated interventions of the past quarter-century, it holds the promise of fresh and cool diplomatic air.

**SUPPORT FROM THE NATION'S PRESS FOR PRESIDENT NIXON'S RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING NATIONWIDE TRANSPORTATION STRIKES**

**HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, today this Congress may be called upon for the third time since 1963 to pass legislation to compel operation of the Nation's railroads.

Regardless of where the merits lie, Members are increasingly indignant that our labor laws are so ineffective that these crippling nationwide transportation strikes can occur in the absence of congressional intervention.

This week the President has presented to the Congress proposals which may lead us out of this jungle. As chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Labor Law Reform, I have been personally pleased by the support which the President has received from a majority of the Nation's press. I have previously inserted editorials in the RECORD from the New York Times, Washington Star, and Washington Post. Today, I am pleased to submit the editorial from my hometown paper, the Salt Lake Tribune:

**NIXON'S LABOR PROPOSALS**

No major change in federal labor law has been made in more than 20 years. And while the subject was raised almost every time a crippling nationwide strike occurred, presidents and Congress were reluctant to act.

Now, however, with a threatened shutdown of the nation's railroads in the background, President Nixon has asked Congress to approve sweeping revisions of the labor laws. His plan is both bold and novel since it would partially dismantle the Railway Labor Act of 1926 and give the President new weapons for settling major strikes by amending the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947.

Both laws operate on the principle that if a strike by labor or a lockout by management can be delayed for a specific period of time, then there is a good chance of working out a solution. But if the time limit expires and nothing is accomplished, the strike or lockout is perfectly legal. That has happened quite frequently in recent years.

Under the railway act, the President can delay a work stoppage for 60 days by appointing an emergency board to study the issues and recommend a solution. In his message to Congress, Mr. Nixon argued that these procedures actually delayed meaningful negotiation because the principals tend to wait until the board intervenes. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, the President can ob-

tain an injunction halting a strike for an 80-day cooling off period. Thus, in Mr. Nixon's opinion, the T-H Law suffers from the same deficiency as the railway act. If a strike is resumed after the cooling off period, the President can either try to wait it out or seek special legislation authorizing a compulsory settlement.

Mr. Nixon wants Congress to take the railroads and airlines out from under the labor act's compulsory provisions and make them subject to the emergency provisions of T-H. He also wants T-H amended to give him three options for use after the cooling-off period ends.

The first option would allow the President to extend the cooling-off period for another 30 days if he felt the disputants were near a settlement. The second would authorize the President to require partial operation of the stricken industry in order to minimize the danger to the nation's health and safety. The third would allow the President to invoke what Mr. Nixon called the "final offer selection procedure."

This is a fairly complex system. First, deadlocked labor and management are required to submit one or two "final" offers to the secretary of labor. Next, they bargain between themselves on these offers. Should they fail to agree, a neutral panel chosen by the disputants—or the President if necessary—selects one of the "final" offers as the settlement.

Former President Johnson was pledged to ask Congress for similar powers but never did so. President Nixon, long an advocate of a "hands off" policy in labor, negotiations, now feels that legislative action is necessary to ward off crippling strikes in the transportation industry. "Our highly interdependent economy is extraordinarily vulnerable to any major interruption in the flow of goods," he said.

Some labor leaders have already told President Nixon that they regard his plan as compulsory arbitration in disguise. (Management has also opposed such arbitration.) However, the proposed law is compulsory only as a last resort and would apply only in major strikes endangering health and safety. More important, the very possibility of such action might produce a solution through collective bargaining long before the final stage was reached.

The labor laws obviously need overhauling. President Nixon has taken the lead. And Congress should give his proposals the most careful consideration. Although they may not be the correct answer, they certainly could be the basis of legislation the country desperately needs.

**ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK**

**HON. CHESTER L. MIZE**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, the Asian Development Bank, which has now completed its third full year in operation, is a truly Asian institution. It was founded on Asian initiative and 64 percent of its stock is held by Asian members.

The Bank has already demonstrated its ability to contribute significantly to Asian economic development.

Six of its loans have been to industrial development banks in Korea, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand, providing funds for relending to private borrowers for industrial development.

These loans will help to enlist the talent and initiative of private enterprise in the development of these countries. The Bank has also responded to the need for strengthening the management of the national development banks of the region through such activities as sponsoring a Conference of Development Banks of Asia and providing consultant services to individual national development banks.

It is expected that the Bank's lending activities will continue to increase, especially in those areas which require concessional lending. I believe the United States should support this essential aspect of the Bank's activities by joining with other donors in contributing to the Bank's special funds.

The present proposal will permit the Bank to enlarge its activities, at the same time ensuring that other donors provide their fair share of concessional aid to Asia.

**ABM SYSTEM**

**HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, though some of his critics would have us believe otherwise, President Nixon's backing of the second phase of the ABM system is in accord with his defense spending cuts and his desire to reach a strategic arms agreement with the Soviet Union—thus it is in accord with the hopes for peace of the whole world.

The need for this system is discussed in a recent editorial from the Los Angeles Times. Particularly significant is their emphasis on the Soviet missile buildup, and the consequent need for the United States to retain its strength in this field, thus preventing a "tilt in the nuclear balance of power" and furthering hopes for success in the arms talks. I urge my colleagues' careful consideration of the following editorial:

**ABM CASE LOOKS PERSUASIVE**

*Issue.*—Would we improve or reduce the chances of arms control by going ahead with another Safeguard ABM complex?

Congress has the right and the obligation to inquire closely into the need for going ahead with a second increment of the Safeguard antiballistic missile system. As of now, however, the Nixon Administration has made a persuasive case.

According to the overall blueprint submitted to Congress a year ago, the total Safeguard system—when and if completed—will include ABM complexes at 12 sites around the country. Last year, congressional approval was sought only for the first two.

What the Administration seeks now is money to go forward with construction of a third ABM complex and with site surveys (but no actual construction) of five more.

The battle lines are drawn, and it is clear that we face a repetition of last year's bitter, highly emotional ABM debate. There is room for honest disagreement on the issue. But one thing should be clear:

Notwithstanding objections by the critics to the contrary, President Nixon's current ABM proposal is consistent both with the effort to hold down military spending, and with American hopes for an agreement with the Soviet Union to end the missile race.

Mr. Nixon has already engineered a sharp change in the nation's priorities toward more emphasis on domestic problems.

Since he took office 13 months ago, spending for defense, space and foreign aid has gone substantially down, while the share of the budget devoted to housing, welfare, job training and other "human" concerns is up.

So far, defense spending cuts are being achieved mostly through reductions in military manpower, de-escalation in Vietnam, and closing of military installations. The Administration hopes to be able to slice spending for strategic weapons systems, too—but this depends upon Russian cooperation on mutual arms limitation.

Great hopes are being placed on the so-called SALT negotiations, or strategic arms limitation talks, which get under way in April. Meanwhile, however, the continuing Soviet missile buildup has to be viewed as a menacing and discouraging development.

In every year since 1965, Soviet missile construction and deployment has exceeded U.S. intelligence estimates. The buildup has been especially marked in the past year.

By the end of 1970, the United States will still lead in submarine-fired, Polaris-type missiles and in long-range bombers. But the Soviet Union will be substantially ahead in land-based ICBMs.

Defense Secretary Melvin Laird is not worried as long as this situation of relative parity exists. But by 1975 our aging bombers will be on the way to the scrap heap. And if the Soviets continue at the present rate, they will by that time enjoy superiority in Polaris-type missiles as well as ICBMs.

That big a tilt in the nuclear balance of power cannot be tolerated.

This country could react by deploying more offensive missiles to offset the Soviet buildup. But this would be costly, and might complicate the chances of success in the SALT talks.

By moving ahead with ABM protection of our Minuteman missiles, however, we can buy another year of time in which to persuade the Soviets to join us in stopping the arms race.

## EDUCATION REFORM

### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, a child's early years are the most important. As much of his intellectual development takes place in a child's first 5 years as in the next 13—when he is enrolled in the formal educational system.

It is for this reason that the President's message on education reform puts such stress on early learning programs. Creation of the Office of Child Development in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was a first step toward coordinating Federal efforts in the area of early childhood education. The network of experimental centers called for in the President's message, to be jointly established by HEW and the Office of Economic Opportunity, will offer an unparalleled opportunity to discover what works best in early childhood education.

For those reasons, I will support legislation needed to establish this program.

## IMPACT AID REFORM ACT OF 1970

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the Impact Aid Reform Act of 1970, which is designed to save the taxpayers of this Nation almost \$400 million a year in impact aid.

This legislation has been proposed by President Nixon, and I am introducing it today so we can start immediate hearings.

It is my hope that we can accommodate the President and have this legislation acted on in sufficient time for the Appropriations Committee to have the authorization to include the \$400 million saving in the 1971 budget.

Mr. Speaker, I shall include at the conclusion of my remarks an analysis of this legislation as prepared by the President in his message of February 26 when he proposed a series of budget reductions in Federal spending.

The legislation I have introduced today was included in the President's message. As chairman of the Subcommittee on General Education, which has jurisdiction over impact legislation, I have introduced the legislation exactly as proposed by the administration. I shall, at the appropriate time, offer an amendment which will provide Federal aid to communities which provide public education to children living on non-tax-producing public housing constructed by the Federal Government. This proposal has previously been adopted by the House and the Senate and is now awaiting final approval by the conferees.

I believe communities with a large concentration of children living in non-tax-producing public housing experience the same difficulties as those having a large population of school students living on Federal installations which likewise produce no revenue to the community.

But we shall address ourselves to this problem when the committee takes final action on the bill I have introduced today. Mr. Speaker, the President's analysis of the Impact Aid Reform Act of 1970 follows:

1. I propose that we reform assistance to schools in Federally-impacted areas to meet more equitably the actual burden of Federal installations.

In origin this program made good sense: Where a Federal installation such as an Army base existed in an area, and the children of families living on that installation went to a local school; and when the parents made no contribution to the tax base of the local school district, the Federal government agreed to reimburse the local district for the cost of educating the extra children.

But this impacted aid program, in its twenty years of existence, has been twisted out of shape. No longer is it limited to payments to schools serving children of parents who live on Federal property; 70 percent of the Federal payments to schools are now for children of Federal employees who live off base and pay local property taxes. In ad-

dition, the presence of a Federal installation (most sought-after by many communities) lifts the entire economy of a district. As a result, additional school aid is poured into relatively wealthy communities, when much poorer communities have far greater need for assistance.

One stark fact underscores this inequity: Nearly twice as much Federal money goes into the nation's wealthiest county through this program as goes into the one hundred poorest counties combined.

The new Impact Aid legislation will tighten eligibility requirements, eliminating payments to districts where Federal impact is small. As it reduces payments to the wealthier districts, it will reallocate funds to accord more with the financial needs of eligible districts. Children whose parents live on Federal property would be given greater weight than children whose parents only work on Federal property.

While saving money for the nation's taxpayers, the new plan would direct Federal funds to the school districts in greatest need—considering both their income level and the Federal impact upon their schools.

Reform of this program—which would make it fair once again to all the American people—would save \$392 million in fiscal year 1971 appropriations.

## POLLUTION IMPROVEMENT

### HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the concern over the degradation of our environment has reached immense proportion in the past few months. The Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population of which I am chairman, is now concentrating its efforts on the research of environmental problems. We have discovered that the situation is indeed serious, but with concentrated and dedicated efforts, we can obviate these destructive problems. The task force desires to be more than passively involved in this issue. We are aware that the problems of pollution call for action, and not mere words of interest. It is our intention to become participants in the quest for a solution, and not merely join the ranks of the critics.

Most of what we hear about the environment is pessimistic, and rightly so. However, there are signs of improvements, and the task force is eager to make these known to the public. One particular sign is the manpower training programs started under the Nixon administration to aid in the war against pollution. A recent news release from the U.S. Department of Labor mentions that under this program—

Some 941 underskilled persons are being upgraded in their work as waste treatment plant operators in 20 States under a program sponsored by three Cabinet-level agencies.

By means of this consorted effort, the administration has provided the means to deal with labor as well as pollution problems.

This program is currently operating in 28 waste treatment plants, and my home

State of Texas presently is involved in two of these projects. For the benefit of my colleagues, I insert this news release:

**920 POLLUTED-WATER CLEANERS IN TRAINING IN 20 STATES**

One of the first manpower training programs started under the Nixon Administration last year is quietly aiding the war against pollution.

Some 941 underskilled persons are being upgraded in their work as waste treatment plant operators in 20 States under a program sponsored by three Cabinet-level agencies.

Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz announced today that the original contract signed in February, 1969, for 800 workers in 11 States was expanded to 920 in 20 States.

The program is currently operating in 28 plants in county and municipally operated waste treatment facilities with 21 more trainees than the program goal.

Cooperating with the Labor Department are the Department of Interior, the Depart-

ment of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

All 28 programs will be completed between May and October of this year.

As of the first of this month, training was being conducted in:

Arkansas, 20 trainees; California, 120; Colorado, 24; Florida, 43; Illinois, 80; Indiana, 103; Iowa, 19; Kentucky, 40; Louisiana, 20; Maryland, 60; Michigan, 59; Missouri, 18; Nebraska, 18; New York, 36; Ohio, 26; Oregon, 40; Pennsylvania, 71; Texas, 75; Washington, 20; and West Virginia, 49.

The training plan has three phases. The first two are directed toward improving the skills of present employees who will receive three weeks of full-time instruction, followed by 22 weeks of combined classroom and on-the-job training.

The third phase is devoted to newly hired trainees who will be given 20 weeks of remedial education, classroom instruction, and on-the-job training.

The Water Pollution Control Administration negotiated the 28 subcontracts with local sponsors who are administering the skill upgrading programs. They will enable presently employed trainees to move up to better paying jobs and open up new employment opportunities for about 90 new workers.

About \$1,031,000 has been allocated to the program by the Labor Department under the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA). A total of \$800,000 will be devoted to on-the-job training costs and supplemental classroom instruction. The balance is being used to purchase technical equipment to help in the training program.

Under MDTA, employers sponsoring on-the-job training programs are reimbursed only for instructor fees and instruction materials. Trainees receive wages paid by the employer during the course of on-the-job training.

Detailed information on the 28 subcontracts in force follows:

State and local sponsor	Trainee goal	Trainees in program	Funds allocated	State and local sponsor	Trainee goal	Trainees in program	Funds allocated
Arkansas: Northwest Arkansas Regional Planning Commission, Post Office Box 402, Springdale, Ark.	20	20	\$18,224	Maryland: Environmental Health Services, Maryland State Department of Health, 2305 North Charles St., Baltimore, Md.	60	60	\$49,740
California: State Water Resources Control Board, 1416 9th St., Sacramento, Calif.	100	120	85,000	Michigan: City of Detroit, Detroit Metro Water Services, 735 Randolph St., Detroit, Mich.	40	36	33,048
Colorado: Metro Denver Sewage Disposal District No. 1, 3100 East 60th Ave., Commerce City, Colo.	20	24	17,056	Washtenaw Community College, Post Office Box 345, Ann Arbor, Mich.	20	23	17,664
Florida: City of Fort Lauderdale, Post Office Drawer 1181, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.	20	15	17,924	Missouri: Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District, 200 Hampton Ave., St. Louis, Mo.	20	18	16,920
City of Pensacola, Post Office Box 1471, Pensacola, Fla.	20	28	17,875	Nebraska: City of Omaha, Interim City Hall, Omaha, Nebr.	20	18	17,000
Illinois: Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, Ill.	20	20	19,494	New York: Department of Water Resources, 40 Worth St., New York, N.Y.	20	20	20,074
Metro Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, 100 East Erie St., Chicago, Ill.	60	60	51,972	Rockland County Sewer District No. 1, 18 New Hempstead Rd., New City, N.Y.	20	16	20,074
Indiana: Mallory Technical Institute, 1315 East Washington St., Indianapolis, Ind.	20	19	16,924	Ohio: City of Cleveland, 1825 Lakeside, Cleveland, Ohio.	20	26	16,774
St. Joseph Valley Regional Institute, 1534 West Sample St., South Bend, Ind.	20	20	16,924	Oregon: City of Portland, 220 Southwest 5th Ave., Portland, Ore.	40	40	39,459
Tippewa Regional Institute, 2316 South St., Lafayette, Ind.	40	40	33,848	Pennsylvania: Department of Public Instruction, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Box 911, Harrisburg, Pa.	80	71	69,880
Northwest Technical Institute, Indiana Vocational Technical College, 1440 East 35th Ave., Gary, Ind.	20	24	16,774	Texas: North Central Texas Council of Government, Post Office Box 888, Arlington, Tex.	40	35	34,840
Iowa: City of Des Moines, City Hall, East 1st and Locust Sts., Des Moines, Iowa.	20	19	16,924	University of Houston, 3801 Cullen Blvd., Houston, Tex.	40	40	35,248
Kentucky: University of Kentucky Research Foundation, Bowman Hall, Sec. E., Lexington, Ky.	40	40	33,548	Washington: Municipality of Metro Seattle, 410 West Harrison St., Seattle, Wash.	20	20	19,696
Louisiana: State of Louisiana, Department of Health, Post Office Box 60630, New Orleans, La.	20	20	17,624	West Virginia: West Virginia Board of Regents, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.	40	49	36,848

**TRIBUTE TO HONORABLE  
JAMES B. UTT**

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the passing of our colleague and friend, James B. Utt, of California. I want to take this means of joining with members of the California delegation and others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to his memory.

Jim Utt was a friendly, genial, personable Congressman who was highly respected and regarded—not only because he was a Member of Congress but because he was also a great human being.

He was an able, vital, and important member of the Committee on Ways and Means. He rendered an outstanding service to his district, State, and Nation and will be greatly missed.

I want to extend to Mrs. Utt and other members of his family an expression of my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

**MILITARY PAY INCREASES**

**HON. JEROME R. WALDIE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the administration to postpone military pay increases for 6 months strikes a hard blow at the many men and women in our armed services who are attempting to serve a career in the Nation's service and yet live a dignified and relatively comfortable life.

Mr. Speaker, present military pay levels make these objectives difficult, if at all possible.

A constituent of mine, Mr. K. C. Holm of Walnut Creek, Calif., recently wrote me of his views on this action and I would like to take this opportunity to enter his remarks in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

DEAR MR. WALDIE: I find the Administration's recent stand on delaying a pay raise to the military from 1 July 70 to 1 January 1971 almost inconceivable.

Hundreds of young servicemen in your District are on welfare or receiving assistance from the Navy Relief Society because their income cannot support their families. (\$145) a month for a married serviceman.

Please use your good office to do everything possible to reverse this sorry situation. How does one justify a \$100,000 salary increase for the President on one hand against a delayed 6% raise for the military?

**MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?**

**HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 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?

**KIRCHNER IS SPOKESMAN FOR FARMERS**

**HON. FRED SCHWENDEL**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Don Kirchner, president of the Peoples Trust & Savings Bank in Riverside, Iowa, is the chairman of the Agriculture-Rural America Committee of the Independent Bankers Association of America. In this position, he has become a real spokesman for farmers throughout the Nation. Mr. Kirchner set fully his views on farm programs in a recent article in the Cedar Rapids Gazette:

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette, Feb. 22, 1970]

**PROBLEM WITH FARM PROGRAMS: "PEOPLE DON'T UNDERSTAND FARM PLANS"**

(By Al Swegle)

RIVERSIDE.—Don Kirchner, agricultural observers claim, was the first person to call Orville Freeman's 1965 feed grain program a "cheap food policy".

"It was at Freeman's grassroots conference at Ames in 1967," Kirchner recalled.

"I said it then, and I've heard it several times since then. I really believe, despite the so-called high beef prices, that rural America is subsidizing the consumer and the manufacturer."

Kirchner is a small town banker who now would like to see the extension of the 1965 act that he called a "cheap food policy" three years ago.

"The No. 1 problem with the present farm law is that John Q. Public doesn't understand it," Kirchner, president of Peoples Trust and Savings Bank at Riverside, said in an interview last week.

"Several weeks ago I went into Washington, urging ASCS officials to restore advance payments and the old CCC grain facility loan programs.

"I was with two state senators from Nebraska and a farmer from Illinois, and we were meeting with Kenneth Frick, the head of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

"Frick said he didn't like welfare, and Frick said he was tired of farmers crawling to Washington for a handout.

"I told Frick that if the farmer ever heard him call the feed grain program a 'welfare program', he wouldn't get a farmer within ten miles of an ASCS office."

Kirchner says farmers are the last of the "individualists in this country," and he quarrels with economists who project that only 500,000 farmers are needed in agriculture.

"The economist has to work with the statistics he has," Kirchner reasons, "and the economist sees the trend to larger farms.

"He looks at the 1,500 acre farmer and disregards the 120 acre man. But the economist is only using the statistics he has.

"What he can't obtain—and what I contend is more important—is the statistics on whether the farmer is fully employed."

For the last two years, Kirchner has served as chairman of the agriculture committee of the Independent Bankers Association. Despite his concern that the feed grain program is a "cheap food policy," Kirchner said the law "has done the job it was intended to do."

"The only problem occurred in 1967 when fears of a worldwide grain shortage built surpluses again. I think it has worked beautifully for the farmer."

Kirchner was in Washington when Hardin announced his "set-aside" farm bill. He

noted that the farm coalition criticized the bill for "giving the secretary of agriculture more power than any other in the history of the nation."

In particular, Kirchner was critical of the dropping of price support minimums and the feed grain bases proposed under the bill.

"When Hardin talks about reducing price supports to compete on the world market, you have to realize you're talking about the world dumping prices," he added.

"The only way our farmers should accept world prices for their products is if our country lives on the same standard of living as the rest of the world."

His committee is also working on a master plan for small community development, which small town bankers could use to find out what their community needed, the priorities, and how to get development started.

"There are 900 programs of federal assistance in the USDA and HUD," Kirchner said. "Before we started this project, I didn't know HUD had an office of small town services."

Kirchner cited the lack of loan money available from the Farmers Home Administration as a case where priorities were mixed.

"I had a young farmer in my office that I would have liked to have made a loan to," he explained. "I called in our FHA supervisor and suggested that he consider him for a possible loan.

"The supervisor told me he didn't have any funds available, but a couple of weeks later he came in asking if I knew of anyone who wanted to build a subdivision in Riverside. He said he had money available to finance a housing project."

"We need these other programs, but let's get our priorities right. If not, these other programs won't be of much value."

Kirchner also believes legislation is needed to control non-family corporate farming and vertical coordination contracts.

"Right now these aren't major problems, but if we wait until they become problems, then it will be too late," he said.

The Independent Bankers Association has 6,600 member banks, mainly in rural sectors.

**POSTAL REFORM—WHO'S MIXED UP?**

**HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent the following telegram to Messrs. Lawrence F. O'Brien and Thruston B. Morton, cochairmen of the Citizens Committee on Postal Reform.

The telegram speaks for itself:

Your expensive half-page advertisement in today's Washington Post is quite intriguing and makes clear the fact you are paying no attention to what our Committee is doing in its executive sessions, despite regular announcements of progress.

You state that "any true postal reform bill should contain four key elements as envisioned in the bipartisan Kappel Report."

Would you believe—and it is fact—that our Committee already has approved three of the four elements you cite as essential? As for the fourth (labor-management), it is a later section in the bill which we expect to reach in the next meeting or two.

I am for true postal reform and have been right along. My record is clear. So is the belief and record of our Committee, as evidenced by the way in which we have proceeded to mark up a postal reform bill.

Your opposition to H.R. 4 in its present

form is in direct conflict to the "key elements" you cite as vital.

Any citizens committee leadership that masquerades as supporting postal reform covering certain areas and then misrepresents the simple facts so blatantly should be censured severely by its membership which has contributed thousands of dollars to a misrepresented cause.

Your advertisement claims are a fraud not only upon the general public but also upon your membership—members whom, incidentally, are beginning to see the light on this issue.

**RHODESIA**

**HON. THOMAS M. PELLY**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, Rhodesia became a republic last Monday, March 2, when her new constitution came into effect. This gave rise to renewed pressure by the British Government on the U.S. Government to close its consulate in Salisbury. British Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart informed the House of Commons on Monday that this pressure had been unsuccessful and he added that "we have to accept there is no United Nations mandatory requirement to this effect." He also pointed out that the British Government maintain consular missions with regimes that it does not recognize, including North Vietnam.

The British have now taken an initiative in calling for an urgent meeting of the Security Council. This may take place on Friday. The British are offering a draft resolution which condemns Rhodesia's "purported assumption of republican status" and "again requires all states not to recognize this illegal regime and to refrain from rendering any assistance to it."

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new in this resolution apart from the reference to Rhodesia's republican status and it is difficult to understand what the British motive can be in offering it unless it is to open up a debate in which further pressure will be put upon the United States and others to withdraw their consular missions from Salisbury. Whatever the intention, this is certain to be the effect of the debate. It is more than likely that the Afro/Asian members of the Council, with Communist backing, will offer a resolution calling for the mandatory withdrawal of consulates. My guess is that they will also call for organized support for anti-Rhodesian terrorist movements.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I have little or no confidence in what attitude our Department of State will take, but I can say that a consensus of opinion of the people of the United States is that this country should oppose the British position and any anti-Rhodesian resolution in the United Nations. England has not supported us and has insisted on dealing with Communist Cuba and North Vietnam.

I hope we show some freedom of action and restore full trade and political relations with Rhodesia.

**AMERICAN RED CROSS CALLS FOR  
WORLDWIDE ACTION ON POW  
ISSUE**

**HON. E. ROSS ADAIR**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the American Red Cross, as it should be, is in the forefront of the struggle to convince North Vietnam that it should adhere to the standards of the Geneva Convention in the treatment of our prisoners of war. Recently, the American Red Cross issued a statement summarizing their recent efforts and calling upon the world's Red Cross societies to form a solid front in order to secure action on this matter from Hanoi. I commend this statement to the attention of my colleagues:

**AMERICAN RED CROSS BOARD URGES WORLD  
RED CROSS UNITE ON POW ISSUE**

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 27.—In an unusual action, the American Red Cross has called on the world's Red Cross societies to form a solid front in demanding that the North Vietnamese meet humanitarian standards in the treatment of Americans they hold as prisoners of war.

"The continued confidence of the world in the integrity and solidarity of the Red Cross as an instrument committed to the cause of humanity requires that the Red Cross speak as a single voice on this subject", the American society's Board of Governors declared in a resolution which has been sent to all Red Cross, Red Crescent and Red Lion and Sun societies throughout the world, as well as to the International Committee of the Red Cross and the League of Red Cross Societies in Geneva, Switzerland.

The action was taken by the American Red Cross governing body at its regular quarterly meeting on February 16, but the announcement was delayed until today to make sure that Red Cross leaders in other nations had received mail copies of the resolution, which calls on other Red Cross societies to report on their efforts to help U.S. military men held captive in North Vietnam.

The resolution also pledged that the American Red Cross would "pursue without interruption or abatement every effort to bring about humane treatment of prisoners of war to which they are entitled under the statutes of international law and the dictates of moral decency."

The Red Cross Board noted that five months had passed since the International Conference of the Red Cross met in Istanbul and five years had elapsed since the capture of the first American in the Vietnam conflict and yet North Vietnam continues its refusal to adhere to the Geneva Conventions to which it is a signatory.

The Istanbul conference adopted without dissent a resolution that called upon all nations to adhere to the Geneva Prisoner of War Convention. The action was considered particularly significant since the conference was attended by delegations representing nearly all nations, including the Soviet Union and other communist countries.

Following this meeting, the American Red Cross contacted some 25 national Red Cross societies asking that they and their respective governments intercede with Hanoi in behalf of the American prisoners.

Earlier, the U.S. society also launched a "Write Hanoi" campaign that has resulted in thousands of Americans writing letters direct to the president of North Vietnam, demanding that his government stand by its Geneva Convention pledge.

Also in line with this action, the U.S. Senate last week adopted a resolution protesting the treatment of U.S. prisoners of war and calling on the North Vietnamese to comply with the Geneva Conventions on the treatment of prisoners. The U.S. House of Representatives already had passed the resolution which endorses the action of the International Conference of the Red Cross in Istanbul "to obtain humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war."

The new American Red Cross resolution underlined that all Red Cross societies "are committed to ensure, by all means in their power, adherence to and scrupulous respect for the Prisoner of War Convention" and "that such commitment is applicable without regard to political considerations involved in armed conflicts giving rise to the capture and detention of prisoners of war."

It asked that American Red Cross Chairman E. Roland Harriman "communicate the text of this resolution to each member of the International Red Cross, to seek from each member advice as to the efforts made on behalf of the prisoners of war held by the Government of North Vietnam, and to report the substance of each reply to the next meeting of the Board of Governors," which will be in May.

The Red Cross Board of Governors is made up of 50 outstanding Americans who serve as volunteers.

**KEEPING ORDER IN THE COURT**

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I directed the attention of the Members to the controversy in court procedures in the so-called Chicago "7" conspiracy trial. Also related to the proper judicial procedure is the Black Panthers trial in New York City. An editorial very properly commenting on the judge's action in maintaining order in that court was carried in the Friday, February 27 Chicago Today which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

**KEEPING ORDER IN COURT**

We're impressed with the way Justice John M. Murtagh of the New York Supreme Court handled unruly defendants in the pre-trial hearings of 13 Black Panthers accused of a bomb conspiracy. Announcing that he had been called a "racist pig" once too often, Murtagh simply recessed the hearings until the Panthers promise—in writing—to behave.

That should have a salutary effect. High bond is keeping 12 of the Panthers in jail, and there they will stay until they sign a pledge that they won't disrupt proceedings in court. The beauty of this treatment is that it doesn't bend anyone's civil liberties. Bond has not been denied. Requiring the pledge isn't asking too much, because orderly conduct can only help preserve the defendants' own rights to a fair trial. A raucous sideshow isn't fair to either side.

It became clear during Chicago's conspiracy trial that something must be done to muzzle defendants who insist on interfering with their own due process by rioting in court. It's also pretty clear that the cure doesn't lie in autocratic measures like denying bail and imposing long contempt sentences. Judge Murtagh's strategy may be the answer.

**ATOMIC ENERGY AND THE  
ENVIRONMENT**

**HON. OGDEN R. REID**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues will remember, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) and I cosponsored a public hearing on atomic energy and the environment on February 6. I would like to include in today's RECORD the statements of three of the witnesses at that hearing. The statements of Marvin Kalkstein of the State University of New York at Stony Brook, Mary Hays Weik of the Committee To End Radiological Hazards, and Mr. Alan Katzenstein of Larchmont, N.Y., follow:

**ATOMIC ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT**

(By Marvin Kalkstein)

**INTRODUCTION**

If we are to arrive at a rational policy for the production of power consistent with maintaining the quality of our environment we must eventually consider our power needs, the possible energy sources for providing this power, and the consequences of generating power by a given energy source. Until recently, the major factor considered in power generation was the economic cost, but now we have become cognizant of the social costs as well. In particular, there is great concern about the effect upon the environment.

In recent years, attention has been focused upon nuclear energy as a means of augmenting existing power capacity. It is important, therefore, that we consider the interaction of nuclear power generation with the environment.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS**

In the production of power by nuclear means there are two major areas of concern. The first relates to the consequences of an accident occurring, with the potential of an explosion of major proportions and also the release of very large quantities of highly dangerous radio-active waste products. While the safety record with respect to the operation of nuclear reactors has been reasonably good, there are a number of qualifications that must be taken into account. Many of these facilities have been of an experimental nature and therefore have received more than what might be regarded as usual attention and care. Even so, there have been a number of accidents. Once the use of nuclear reactors for energy becomes widespread the level of competence and attention devoted to their operation may drop. Since part of the danger of accident is due to human failure one might expect a greater rather than lesser likelihood of this occurring with time. Furthermore, most of the power reactors presently under construction or projected for the future are much larger than any that have been in operation so far. We are therefore faced with a situation for which we have as yet no comparable experience. In addition, because of the size of these reactors the consequences of any accident involving them could be much greater.

The other major area of concern is with the consequences of the normal operation of nuclear power plants. One result of production of nuclear power is the production of radio-active waste products. These have the potential of being released to the environment during reactor operation as air or water pollutants. In addition, they may be released from the processing plants to which the nuclear fuels are sent for reprocessing after

they have been used for power production. Further, the radio-active waste separated in the processing stage must then be stored or disposed of with the possibility, again, of further introduction of this waste into the environment.

The two types of nuclear reactors presently in use are the boiling water reactors (BWR) and pressurized water reactors (PWR). They both present particular pollution problems, with the BWR putting out much more gaseous radio-active waste, while the PWR produces more liquid radio-active waste. Comparisons of the radio-active emissions into the air from a modern coal-fired plant and from the BWR and PWR show that the BWR are several orders of magnitude higher than the others with the emissions of the PWR being least of all.

Monitoring of wild-life in the vicinity of the Western New York Nuclear Fuel Center from 1964 to the present has detected radio-activity in fish as much as several hundred times higher than background levels. Three deer taken within the confines of the Center in December 1967 also showed radio-activity several hundred times background. Continued contamination at these levels might well exceed the established permissible limits. Presumably, steps are being taken at that facility to reduce the radio-active wastes in the liquid effluent.

The other major concern with regard to the normal operations of a nuclear power production facility is with regard to thermal pollution. Nuclear power plants produce power by the heating of water. This water is usually cooled by dumping the heat into a nearby water source, thereby raising its temperature. Too high a rise in temperature can have an adverse effect upon aquatic life and can also lead to the conditions that can breed various other types of water pollution. While most conventional sources of energy also contribute thermal pollution, the nuclear power plant may be of greater concern for two reasons. The first is that thus far the conversion of thermal to electric energy is less efficient for a nuclear power plant than for most conventional plants. Secondly, for reasons of economy, nuclear power plants tend to operate at very high power levels, thereby dumping more heat into the local environment than most conventional power plants.

#### GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

As indicated earlier, our experiences with practical nuclear reactors for power production purposes is very limited and ought to be expanded upon with great caution. The expectations of economic power from nuclear reactors still have not been firmly established. Without artificial price supports or subsidization of one sort or another, it may still be many years before economic considerations become a compelling reason for going to nuclear power. While acknowledging that the probability of an accident of major catastrophic proportions is very remote, its probability must be kept in mind in considering the siting of nuclear reactors with respect to areas of large population density. The development in recent years of methods for power transmission with little loss over distance now makes it technically feasible to have large power facilities well removed from population centers.

In dealing with the problems of our environment in the 1970's, consideration will have to be given to a limitation upon economic growth. Parallel to this might be limitations upon the amount of power used and therefore upon the amount of power produced. One of the things we must do is to examine our power needs and to attempt to establish some limits. We then must more fully explore the different energy sources that might be utilized to meet these needs. To reduce the pollution effects of power pro-

duction, we should seek the most efficient means of production with the least by-products of a pollution nature. If we were to devote as much attention, man-power and money to the research and development of alternate power sources, such as solar energy and magneto-hydrodynamics, as we have to nuclear power, there is a high likelihood that impressive gains could be made.

To the extent that we utilize nuclear power, greater care must be taken to effectively minimize the radiation pollution. It was suggested by Drs. John W. Gofman and Arthur R. Tamplin, of the University of California Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, in testimony presented before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works on November 18, 1969 that the allowable radiation discharge to the population from peaceful atomic energy activities be revised downward by at least a factor of tenfold. Furthermore, it should be kept in mind that allowable radiation exposures to the population are meant to apply for the total exposure of the population. Under circumstances where there may be many contributing sources to that total, the limitations to be imposed upon the individual contributors, be they nuclear power reactors, processing plants, or whatever, must be set at much lower levels. It would be wise if this were done before these facilities were installed so that they could be planned for and accommodated in advance rather than facing the probability of costly and difficult modification afterwards should it prove necessary.

#### POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Here again Congress must take the role of guardian of the public interest. The government agencies responsible for the protection of the public with regard to such activities as nuclear power have often served the conflicting interests of promoting such activities without sufficient concern for the public welfare. I believe such has been the case with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The right to set radiation standards is now being contested in the courts. The Minnesota Pollution Control Administration has granted a permit for a nuclear power plant about 30 miles from Minneapolis setting a limit on stock release at about 2 percent of that allowed by AEC regulations. The power company, the Northern States Power Company, has brought suit challenging the state's authority to set more rigid restrictions. Other states are petitioning to file *amicus curiae* briefs supporting Minnesota's position.

New York is one of about twenty states that have entered into agreement with the AEC for licensing purposes which commits the state to AEC standards. This agreement should be examined to determine if New York can impose stricter standards and whether New York can also support Minnesota's position.

I would recommend that new limits, at least a factor of 10 below the present limits, be adopted and furthermore that adoption of more stringent limits be allowed on a local basis.

#### WITHOUT CONSENT OF THE PEOPLE: THE IRRESPONSIBLE SITING, STANDARDS, AND WASTES OF ATOMIC POWER

(By Mary Hays Weik)

I am going to discuss the unsolved problems of nuclear power—its siting, its standards and its wastes, as they affect the lives of our citizens and their environment. Until now, such discussions have been a 3-cornered dialog between science, industry and government. I believe the time has come when the citizen himself must take a leading part in these discussions. For after all, it is he who is paying the extravagant costs

of nuclear development—directly and indirectly, in his taxes and living expenses and the health of himself and his family.

We live in a country that prides itself on the balanced powers of its federal government. Yet today, by our negligence as citizens, we are subjected to the unbridled power, not of that government—which rests on the support and will of the people—but of a hastily created *executive agency*, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. The decisions of this agency, which have never been properly tested in court, are regarded by many Americans as final. The results of these decisions, too long accepted without question, are beginning to damage the living environment of many sections of our continent. I have visited some of these sections, as in western Colorado and Canada, where the more dangerous types of atomic industry are carried on—uranium mining, underground testing, and nuclear fuel reprocessing. I have seen the barren landscapes that surround them, the leafless trees and blackened grass that a few years of these undertakings leave behind. You will find little mention of such damage in our daily papers, or on the air; but if you trace the statistical records of the United States and Canada, you will find around these plants, after a few years' operation, a steady rise in leukemia, bone cancer and other cancers, miscarriages and birth deformities—all long associated with radiation damage.

Of these same lethal substances—refined and enriched uranium, and its deadly by-product, plutonium—the fuel of nuclear power reactors is made. Hundreds of tons of such material are contained in today's reactors; and though elaborate precautions are taken to guard their safety, a really serious disaster could wreck their safety controls and send their contents pouring out of the plant.

Why has there been, until recently, little or no public protest of these dangerous plants, even when they are proposed for sites within or close to major cities? Well, the truth is, people know little about them. When such a plant is proposed for an area, our public media—our newspapers and broadcasts—supply no factual information on their dangers of accident and lasting pollution, but only echo the reassuring statements of those promoting them. In America, economic progress has been based on business promotion. But there still exist certain limits—human limits—to such a policy, which must be kept in mind if society is to survive; and in the hasty development of this damaging industry, we have overstepped those limits.

The rise of civil use of atomic power, here and in other countries, has been a mixture of national ambitions and financial pressures. In 1955 such plans in America were first announced, but it was not until the summer of '65 when full support was given to the Price-Anderson Liability Act—to protect private atomic development by federal insurance against major nuclear disasters—that wide promotion of nuclear plants began to appear. More than a hundred large atomic power plants have been proposed since then, in many parts of our country, at enormous costs running into many hundreds of millions of dollars. Many of these plants, quietly located in areas where little was known of their dangers, are now built or in process of construction. Six of these big atomic plants, built at fantastic cost, have already proved defective and been abandoned.<sup>1</sup> Less than 15 plants are in use, and these intermittently, with frequent shutdowns for repair.

Every government hearing on a proposed

<sup>1</sup> The *Fermi* plant near Detroit; the *Bonus* plant in Puerto Rico; the *Piqua, Ohio* plant; the *Parr, S.C.* plant; the *Stoupe City, So. Dak.* plant; the *Hallam, Neb.* plant (See AEC pub'n, "Nuclear Reactors Built, Being Built or Planned," Dec. 31/68)

new nuclear power plant brings out the enormous problems of designing and maintenance such a project involves. Why, then, is the electrical industry so eager to build these inefficient and dangerous plants? The answer is a simple one. It is often forgotten that, where the electrical industry is concerned, nuclear development is a very profitable two-way street. To the reactor designers and builders it offers of course an immense and rewarding market. But for the nation's electric utilities, now interlocked in a vast continental power grid, it also creates a new and enormously profitable consumer market; for at every stage of the production of its massive plants and their complex nuclear fuel—all through its mining, refining, enrichment, processing and reprocessing—tremendous amounts of electricity are required. As long ago as 1955, when most atomic production was still in government hands, the largest consumer of electricity in the United States, the nation's biggest electric customer, was the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission—which was buying and using as much electric power as was then being used to heat and light  $\frac{1}{4}$  of all America's 50 million homes. Now consider the enormous growth of all kinds of atomic development since then—all powered by electricity—and you will realize why the utilities are so eager to increase the use of atomic power, while continually crying the need for more electricity.

A strong incentive for placing the proposed Shoreham, Long Island nuclear power plant on the coast just north of the big Brookhaven Lab reservation is to tap the enormous electrical needs of the big testing-plant. This ignores the obvious fact that this double siting would also double local wastes to the area, and create a pollution situation against all common sense.

#### SITING

As their promoters' ambitions have grown, so has the size of the nuclear plants proposed. Those of today run into billions of watts—thousands of megawatts (million-watt units), 10 to 40 times the size of the plants first built. Why? Because planning of these plants today is based on cost accounting, the system that holds that the bigger the project the more can be saved in manpower and detail—and, sadly enough, one of the details subject to cutting may well be backup safety devices. In other words, business "economy" has superseded scientific caution in these enormous new plants, with their fuel loads of hundreds of tons of the most dangerous materials ever known. These are the giant atomic plants, with which no previous actual experience has been had, which are being located in or near our greatest metropolitan areas today.

The siting of these enormous plants is capricious and often politically dictated, to provide a showpiece for a local area. It has usually little regard for the region's physical nature or for the wishes of its more intelligent citizens. At the first International Conference on "Atoms For Peace" at Geneva in 1955, careful standards were set up for the siting of nuclear power plants. The head of the British atomic agency, then the largest in the world, advised that an open space of 18 miles, cleared of all human occupants, be required around every such plant. This was advice from a country, England, where space was at a minimum, a country smaller than one of our states, California.

In March, 1957 the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission released the famous "Brookhaven Report" by a board of American nuclear scientists, on the amount of damage to be expected from a maximum nuclear accident, in a metropolitan area, to what was

then considered a very large atomic power plant of about 150 electric megawatts (today's plants are 10 to 40 times that size). The damages forecast—5,400 persons killed, up to 43,000 injured, property damage up to \$7 billion (existing government liability is for only \$560 million), and an agricultural area of 10,000 to 150,000 sq. miles made barren—certainly startled the few citizens who saw it. I say "few" because the Brookhaven Report was soon quietly withdrawn from general circulation.

Almost exactly 2 years later, in March 1962, a second major government report appeared<sup>2</sup> which calculated the distance regulations to be observed in the siting of American atomic plants—how many miles from populated areas, etc. they should be. This is still in official standing, but unfortunately is little observed in actual practice. The completely unpopulated "exclusion area" of early plans has now practically vanished, shrunk to the size of a couple of city lots. Where are these mammoth plants located today? Directly on the shores of our most important rivers—the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Columbia, the Hudson, the Connecticut; around our greatest fresh-water lakes; within the metropolitan limits and suburbs of our leading American cities—New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Boston, Los Angeles, Detroit, Kansas City, Cincinnati. Seven of these tremendous plants will pollute the waters of Lake Michigan; five are planned by the U.S. and Canada on Lake Ontario; with others emptying their poisonous wastes into Lake Erie and Lake Huron. Peaceful Long Island Sound now faces the prospect of nearly 20 huge atomic plants, located on its shores or pouring their wastes into its waters.

What are the siting habits in actual practice today? They can be summed up in 3 short rules tacitly observed by those who locate the plants:

- (1) Pick a quiet, conservative spot, as close as possible to city markets.
- (2) Soften up the public—and local officials—with a pro-atomic public relations campaign before you bring in the reactor.
- (3) If the community accepts one atomic plant without protest, later add 2 or 3 (or 4 or 5) more.

Thus Chicago's suburban "Dresden I" has been followed by Dresden II and III, plus a nuclear wastes burial ground and a nuclear fuels reprocessing plant. And "Indian Point I" on the Hudson near the New York City suburb of Peekskill has been followed by Indian Point II and III—with IV and V planned to follow. And Philadelphia, with one big nuclear plant proposed upstream on the Delaware, and a second big plant now planned (also upstream) on its other river the Schuylkill—and a third such plant down Delaware Bay, on the Salem County, N.J. shore, whose wastes will travel up to Philadelphia on the tides. And Detroit—where a 1966 disaster to the dangerous "Fermi" plant was narrowly averted (it could have destroyed the whole city)—is now to have another atomic plant 20 times bigger, the "Fermi II."

#### Wastes

What about the atomic wastes from these enormous plants—the dangerous radioactive elements released in such fantastic volume to the air, water and vegetation of their environment? It is amazing to find that no government regulation requires any report to the public by the plants' owners<sup>4</sup> on air and water monitoring around the plant. Yet it is on this uninformed public that the damag-

<sup>2</sup> Calculation of Distance Factors For Power & Test Reactor Sites, (TID-14844), U.S. AEC, Div. of Technical Information (Washington, D.C. March 25/62)

<sup>4</sup> The Public Health Service Role in Reactor Safety Evaluation (p. 20), by Chas. L. Weaver, Bur. of Radiological Health, U.S. Public Health Service, Phila., Nov. 13/69.

ing emanations from such a plant are destined to fall—especially on those so unfortunate as to live anywhere within its radius. And this radius increases as the plants increase in size.

It is not generally known that the radioactivity of these invisible plant wastes increases enormously with every year of the plant's life. At the present relatively small Indian Point I plant, these wastes are charted in the AEC's Oak Ridge monthly, Nuclear Safety of Oct/68, as increased in the plant's first 6 years by 1,000 times—from .5 of a curie in its first year, 1962, to 500 curies in its sixth year, 1968.

Evidence of this fact was shown at a recent hearing on California's great "San Onofre" atomic plant at San Clemente (now due for an increase to 4 times its present size), when its utility owners requested an end to all plant monitoring at the end of its first year. It is here that President Nixon's vacation "White House" stands, just 2 miles away from the plant, in what, according to the figures in a recent government publication<sup>5</sup> is the most dangerous spot for such a plant's escaping fumes. (I wonder if the President knows?)

#### STANDARDS

What about the limits to the radiation to which the citizen—without his consent and often without his knowledge—can be exposed? These limits vary, I regret to say, with the area and the number and size of its installations. They are neither open nor fair, and in practice they are often ignored. And they are purposely expressed in terms the average citizen cannot understand.

The 0.5 of a rem a year (a rem amounts to one X-Ray unit) is allowed by the regulations of the AEC's General Licensing Provisions for the residents of "unrestricted public areas." Yet the Aug/69 "Initial Decision" on the big Indian Point Reactor III below Peekskill cites as allowable for the surrounding population a "300-rem limit" which could on "necessity" be expanded to "ten times" that amount, or 3,000 rems. (450 to 750 rems can be fatal.)

In other words, for the unfortunate citizens who happen to live near a major plant site, the .5 of a rem normally allowed in Commission regulations could be extended to any fantastic amount the occasion (and its liability) dictates!

In another example: In 1961, U.S. public health authorities warned that if Strontium 90 in milk exceeded 20 picocuries (trillionths of a curie) per liter, official decontamination must begin. In June/63, hardly 2 years later, in New York City, Strontium 90 in milk was recorded at 59 picocuries, nearly 3 times the limit proclaimed in '61. I was here in New York that summer and I can testify that no public warning of any kind was issued, no milk kept anywhere from public sale.

Three years later, in Oct/66, the Springville Dam on Cattaraugus River, downstream from the big Nuclear Fuels reprocessing plant SE of Buffalo, N.Y., Strontium 90 (after an unpublished plant accident) was recorded in the NY State "Radiological Bulletin" at 264 picocuries per liter. (Remember, the caution limit was 20.) I visited that area afterwards, and none of the local people I talked with, no one at the local paper, recalled any public notice whatever of any emergency. No milk was withdrawn from circulation. In November of 1969, last fall, Strontium 90 in the same stream was recorded at 1,111 picocuries. This massive pollution of course reached the dairy herds so plentiful in this area, since they drink local

<sup>5</sup> Considerations Affecting Steam Power Plant Site Selection: US Science & Technology Office, with other cooperating government agencies, including the AEC (See Figure 22 on Page 126, showing descending fumes at one-half to 2 miles away—text at bottom p. 102).

<sup>2</sup> Theoretical Possibilities and Consequences of Major Accidents in Large Nuclear Power Plants (Brookhaven, N.Y. Lab, March/57).

water and graze in local fields. What happened to their milk (which is sent out for sale all over the state)? What happened to the people who drank it?

In the same month, October, fish taken from the creek above, just outside the plant area and regarded as "restricted" property, registered 12,230 picocuries per kilogram (about 2 pounds). 8 months later, in June/37, the figure had risen to 15,300 picocuries. Was the fish publicly condemned for eating by animals or humans? No, the fence around the area was merely mended, and property notices posted were not even marked with an atomic warning sign. This is the enormous plant of which New York State is so proud, and which its new owner, Getty Oil, expected to increase to 3 times its present size. *What will its wastes be then?*

#### CONCLUSION

Never before in our nation's history have we given such uninhibited powers to any government agency as we have given to the Atomic Energy Commission—functioning under rules and regulations it has itself made, and answerable, for practical purposes, to no other authority than its own. To allot to it such absolute power to hazard the citizen's life and property—unimpeded by any constitutional controls—amounts to something new in our national system—*government by executive agency*, which is only one step removed from government by edict.

Much of the confusion in Commission policy derives from its own ambiguous structure—the double mission it was given at the start, to be both promoter and regulator of atomic power: a kind of Siamese Twins arrangement that allows no independent movement in any direction. Just as with the original Siamese Twins, the one with the strongest will determined the direction the twins would go, so today the policy of the AEC has come to be dominated by the promoter role in its makeup—the side most favored by the strong-willed atomic industry and those who finance it.

At a recent Commission hearing, one of the AEC's regulatory staff remarked that its hearing boards "had never turned down an application for a nuclear plant." This is a dangerous record. For it shows all too clearly the prevailing mood of the Commission's divided structure.

What must the citizen keep in mind, faced with a local proposal for one of these huge atomic plants?

(1) There is no emergency need for this new, insufficiently tested type of power, since ample supplies of other, conventional fuels are available for use.

(2) Nuclear power plants are inefficient, wasteful and enormously costly in practice.

(3) There is no safety device on earth that can guarantee absolute safety in these plants or completely prevent the dangerous invisible pollution they release. Costly cooling towers, and underground or offshore island siting offer no solution to their human damage.

Asking the citizen to support atomic development is asking him to endanger his own and his family's health; to poison the water and food he needs for his existence; to ruin the natural environment around him; the rivers, lakes and oceans and all the life they contain . . . and to pay for it all in heavier taxes and boosted living costs.

Can any citizen of intelligence accept this incredible burden? Only a 10-year moratorium on all atomic development, that will give our people time to stop and think, can produce a reasonable answer to this problem.

#### BIOGRAPHICAL

Mary Hays Weik grew up in a small mid-western town, but has lived and worked in New York for many years. She has written for newspapers and magazines, and spent several years as an Observer at the United

Nations for the Fellowship of World Citizens, of which she was a founder. She is the mother of a son and a daughter, and the author of four books.

In 1962, concerned by Consolidated Edison's proposal to build a giant nuclear power plant, the "Ravenswood," at the heart of New York City, she organized the citizens' *Committee To End Radiological Hazards*, and presented the facts of the undisclosed dangers involved in the project before a Public Hearing held by the New York City Council. Later, Con-Edison withdrew its proposal.

Since the defeat of the Ravenswood project, Mrs. Weik has continued her work of informing the public of the formidable wastes and hazards of such atomic projects—which a prominent British economist has called "the most serious agent of pollution of our environment and the greatest threat to man's survival on earth."

Mrs. Weik is the author of nine research studies issued by the Committee in its "Nuclear Information Series"—the most extensive of which, *"The Story Nobody Prints: Health Conditions Around U.S. Atomic Plants,"* has appeared in a second enlarged edition and in French and German translations in Europe. Much of her material was gathered at first hand in travels through the United States, Canada, and several countries of Europe.

#### STATEMENT BY ALAN W. KATZENSTEIN

Congressman Reid, Congressman Wolff and Congressman Addabbo. Thank you for the invitation to appear here today.

My name is Alan W. Katzenstein. My home is in Larchmont, New York.

I am a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and of the N.Y.U. Graduate School of Business Administration. I am currently Vice President and Director of Technical Research for Lennen & Newell, Inc., the 17th largest advertising agency in the United States. To the best of my knowledge none of our agency's clients is involved directly or indirectly in the matter of radiation and thermal pollution, which is the subject of your inquiry here today.

My remarks reflect entirely my own professional opinion. I appear solely as a private citizen, concerned with deterioration in the quality of our environment and hopeful that we can take adequate measures to reduce the threat that such deterioration will continue.

My concern over the threat of environmental pollution has been considerably increased by the announced plans for constructing and operating a large, nuclear fueled power plant on David's Island, New Rochelle, New York, in Western Long Island Sound and only a mile or two from the edge of New York City. But my concern is not confined to that particular installation or to Long Island Sound alone. Any threat to the quality of our environment, anywhere in the United States, should be a matter of concern by all thoughtful citizens.

And the principal point I hope to make to you today is that it is not necessary to resign ourselves to environmental deterioration as a condition for assuring the power supplies needed to live and work and produce in this country.

We know that the needs for power keep increasing every year. There can be no argument against the desirability of assuring adequate power for the population at all times.

Nor can there be an argument against the right or privilege of industry to meet its obligations to supply adequate power at a suitable return to its stockholders.

But assuring adequate power and the privilege of operating profitably need not and must not be accommodated without regard for other considerations, not the least of which is the need to keep the environ-

ment fit, safe and comfortable for all aspects of life.

Keeping the environment fit would pose no problem to us and it would not be a matter of such concern if there were already sufficient practical experience and technical knowledge to assure the prevention of pollution or to nullify its effects. I have followed much of the current literature seeking just this kind of information. Unfortunately, I find a consistent pattern that indicates a grave lack of technical know-how. It is evident that much more study is needed before we will have the answers.

There seems to be practically no knowledge of the real effects of thermal pollution on the environment. We do not yet know enough about the distribution and dissipation of waste energy in bodies of water, particularly in tidal and estuarial waters.

Less than a year ago, *Chemical & Engineering News*, a journal of the American Chemical Society, reported that the Federal Government had not yet approved water quality standards for the nuclear power plants because of a lack of data for setting temperature criteria and that ". . . the technical baselines for thermal pollution control . . ." were just then being developed. I find no evidence that those technical baselines have yet been established. As recently as last December, this was the subject of a symposium panel at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Boston.

Not only do we lack sufficient knowledge of the physical effects of thermal pollution, we also lack knowledge of the biological effects of temperature increases. And while there have been and continue to be studies of the effects of temperature increases on fish and shellfish, there is a dearth of knowledge on the effects of elevated temperatures on aquatic plant life.

We have all seen the publicity on the unhappy effects of chemical pollution on the quality of the environment in such places as the communities bordering Lake Erie, particularly Toledo and Cleveland, Ohio, and the communities surrounding San Francisco Bay. There is every reason to be concerned about the strong possibility of similarly adverse effects from thermal pollution on bodies like Long Island Sound.

While the effects of thermal pollution on the quality of the environment are not fully understood, engineers can calculate the quantities of heat energy which must be dissipated from power plants of any particular design. And it seems generally agreed that nuclear fueled generating plants waste 50-60% more energy—i.e., heat—than fossil-fueled plants.

At the moment, then, we know (or can determine) how much waste heat will be thrown off by a power generating plant, even though we lack the know-how for significantly reducing the excess of energy wastage. It is not in the public interest to permit energy dumping merely because we need the power but don't know how to prevent the pollution.

Fortunately, I think there is an alternative. When adequately motivated, industry can usually find a way to overcome problems of the type we are now concerned with. And, I think we should now examine the ways of motivating power generating companies to prevent thermal pollution of our waters.

The problem of controlling heat output from power plants seems exactly analogous to the problem of jet engine noise faced by the aviation industry. We read today that the engines for the Boeing 747 are more powerful than those used on earlier jet aircraft. Had the earlier trend of noise-to-power ratios been maintained, the more powerful 747 would have been a much noisier plane than the 707, DC-8 and other large jets. But public concern over noise pollution around airports raised the threat that 747's would

not be permitted to operate from some airports. Fear of restriction motivated the aircraft and engine industries to develop improved technology, so that today the 747 is not only not noisier than the smaller jets, it is reported to be somewhat quieter on takeoff than the earlier models.

I do not pretend that there are easy solutions to the problems of controlling thermal pollution from power plants, whether nuclear or fossil fueled. There is no question that it will be costly to develop and design power plants that utilize energy more efficiently.

Yet there is reason to believe that a creative approach to handling the heat waste problem will bring dividends to the utilities. We would expect that a plant engineered for greater efficiency can be more economical in the long run. But if it is not more economical, then it will still be less expensive for all of us if tax or other incentives are granted to offset the added expense of safeguarding the environment.

Regardless of which approach is followed, it is urgent that the resources of the country be protected and the quality of the environment be preserved. The dollar cost of preventing thermal pollution will be less than the cost of overcoming the problem if it is allowed to occur. In fact, we must be realistic and recognize that once pollution is permitted to occur, it is practically impossible to reverse. One does not shut down a power plant during an August heat wave—at the time that demands for power are at a peak—at a time when bodies of water are already at their warmest and when the warm atmosphere is least able to remove added heat.

I urge that Congress prevent deterioration of our environment through thermal pollution by assuring adequate steps taken in time. The appropriate steps for positive control must, I believe, include establishing standards, licensing, inspection and penalty systems to motivate compliance. The risk of suffering loss of quality in our environment is sufficiently great to call for action before it is too late. With appropriate safeguards now, I am confident we can have our power and still protect our environment.

#### MIDDLE EAST KEY TO WORLD PEACE

**HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.**  
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, a just and lasting peace in the Middle East is essential to world peace.

The parties to the conflict must be parties to the peace achieved by means of direct, unhampered negotiations.

I commend the democratic State of Israel which has demonstrated its willingness to participate seriously in such negotiations.

And I urge the Arab States to match that willingness in order that the death and destruction of war might cease at the earliest possible moment.

It is not in the interest of world peace and therefore not in the interest of the United States that the balance of military power be thrown against Israel by the continuing flow of sophisticated offensive armaments from the Soviet Union and other sources.

To the extent that such flow does impair the military balance which existed at the time of the 1967 truce in the Mid-

dle East, the United States has little choice but to respond by future supplies of arms to Israel.

How much safer and more economical it would be if all powers foreign to the Middle East would agree to cease the shipment of arms to that area and encourage all parties to the conflict to participate in direct negotiations among themselves.

THANK YOU DR. BRUMBAUGH: FOR OVER 50 YEARS OF CARE

**HON. GILBERT GUDE**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding example of what one person can do, especially if that person is dedicated to his chosen profession, has been demonstrated by 80-year-old Dr. Bruce Brumbaugh of Elkridge, Md., who has been treating patients in Howard, Anne Arundel, and Baltimore Counties for over 50 years. Dr. Brumbaugh has thrived on long hours and frequent inconveniences in carrying out his responsibility to keep his town of 5,000 people in good health since the day he came to the aid of a country doctor who had suffered a stroke in 1919.

In recognition of his zeal and of a man who is the epitome of humaneness, the people of his community through the efforts of the Elkridge Rotary and the president of the local bank, Howard Smith, among other leaders of the community, erected two huge billboards, north and south along Route 1 in Elkridge, Md., reading, "Thank you Dr. Brumbaugh for over 50 years of care."

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following item written by William Taaffe, staff writer for the Sunday Star, which appeared on the front page of that paper Sunday, March 1, 1970:

SIGN OF AFFECTION FOR DOCTOR—50-YEAR PRACTICE HONORED  
(By William Taaffe)

ELKRIDGE, Md.—Eighty-year-old Dr. Bruce Brumbaugh, who has made it his practice to keep his town of 5,000 people in good health since 1919, thought he knew his patients pretty well.

But last month they put up two huge billboards along Route 1 here, reading: "Thank You Dr. Brumbaugh for Over 50 Years of Care." He was never more surprised in his life.

"I've just had a run of general practice like any other doctor," said the spry octogenarian who has delivered three generations of babies and recalls making house calls on horseback. He still works a 60-hour week.

"Like anyone else I've had my ups and downs. But I've gone along just the same."

Brumbaugh has practiced medicine in the same green clapboard house near an old railroad line here since the end of World War I.

"Those days," he said, "started out with the old Model T Ford, you know. We'd have those big snows and I'd use an old horse to get up to see my patients." Now he uses a new sedan, but he still makes house calls four hours every day.

"It seems like the older I get the harder they work me," he said. "I think they come here from everywhere. Anyone's practiced as

long as I have, you know they're going to come to you even though they've moved away."

Brumbaugh, who treats patients in Howard, Anne Arundel and Baltimore Counties, begins office hours six days a week at 8 a.m. He works to noon, skips lunch, and then visits hospitals and homes all afternoon. He has evening office hours four days a week from 8 to 10 p.m.

"We need more general practitioners," he said. "That's why my practice is like it is—I take on anything that comes along, then refer them to my other doctor friends."

Born on Maryland's Eastern Shore, Brumbaugh came to Elkridge to aid a country doctor who had suffered a stroke. The doctor died, and Brumbaugh decided to stay.

"I'm just as busy now as I ever was in my life, I guess," he said. He takes a three-week vacation each year, but is on call 24 hours a day.

"People would knock the door down if I didn't answer," he said. "They know I live here and they would come just the same."

The billboards—which are north and south along Route 1—were the idea of the Elkridge Rotary.

The president of the local bank, Howard Smith, who helped put them up, said the doctor is known for leaving his bed at 3 a.m. to sit beside patients through the night. The banker, his wife and three children were all delivered by Brumbaugh, who is a childless widower.

"I'm not delivering near as many babies now as I used to," Brumbaugh said. "None of the doctors are now, you know. I don't know how many I've delivered. I'm not going to count them up. But I've delivered my share, I guess." Townspeople give estimates in the thousands.

Brumbaugh's greatest satisfaction in 50 years of practice is "my little people—the children. I have very few children who are scared of me. Once I treat them I have very little trouble with them."

"I try to come to their level and don't wear a white coat that scares most of them half to death. I approach them like a human being."

Brumbaugh also fits conferences on up-to-date medical techniques into his week. But he says he has never aspired to be anything but a country doctor.

"My practice is my hobby. That's what makes it easier for me even though I have those long hours. I'm going to work here until they put me under the sod."

#### MADDOX OUTRAGE

**HON. LOUIS STOKES**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that yet another major newspaper has spoken out against the incredibly insensitive and obtuse actions of Gov. Lester Maddox in the House dining room last week. This time it is doubly gratifying for me, since the editorial appeared in one of my hometown papers, the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

I wish to thank the Plain Dealer for their forthright condemnation of Governor Maddox's racist shenanigans, and include that editorial in the RECORD at this point:

#### MADDOX OUTRAGE

Gov. Lester Maddox of Georgia had no business distributing symbolic ax handles in the U.S. Capitol. This was an offense to citizens of goodwill of any color.

When Maddox was a restaurant owner in

Atlanta he insisted on segregation, despite federal law. He met groups of Negroes at the door with a pick handle to keep them out. Later he equipped several white friends with ax handles when Negroes came demanding service.

So when Maddox passed out autographed pick and ax handles in the House restaurant—he had brought along his customary box of them—it was proper for U.S. Rep. Charles C. Diggs Jr., D-Mich., one of the nine Negroes in the House, to put Maddox in his place—which was that of a guest of the House members in the House restaurant.

Maddox's response was to call Diggs derogatory names.

The House dining room is reserved for congressmen but governors have been welcomed because they enjoy special privileges.

It is an outrage that Maddox provoked this insulting incident. He should not be allowed to return as a guest in the House restaurant.

### INFLATION: NEW SOLUTIONS NEEDED

## HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, classical economists tell us that inflation will occur in a country when the total demand for goods and services exceeds the available supply. The competition for resources created by such a condition drives prices upward. The conventional view of public finance has dictated a resort to restraints on Federal spending and a tightening of credit availability through the Federal Reserve System as the means for dealing with inflation. These approaches are termed fiscal and monetary measures. The labels are somewhat presumptuous since they imply a far broader array of policy actions than have been brought to bear on inflation over the last 2 years.

If recent experience has taught us any lesson it is that the traditional attitudes and approaches to inflation are not entirely pertinent to the problem of inflation as it manifests itself in our advanced economy. The shortcomings of these approaches are several. The emphasis placed on demand in the market for goods and services is no longer appropriate. Today, we witness a demand for the medium of exchange which is separate and apart from the demand for goods and services. An increasing share of the total calls for capital originate with those who seek funds for the purpose of financial empire building. Those calls for capital add nothing to the national wealth; they are totally inflationary because they result in a bidding up of the monetary values of existing business and industry, thereby requiring of many sectors higher product prices to justify the inflated value placed on the means of production.

One of the pillars of the conventional wisdom teaches us that if steps are taken to increase the cost of money by restricting its supply, demand for the money will diminish. Only to a limited extent does this accurately portray the consumption-related instincts of either the

corporation or the consumer. The corporation is not greatly influenced by high interest rates for at least four reasons.

First, many corporations have sufficient internal financial resources to be able to bypass the money market altogether. Second, even if a corporation must borrow in the money market, it can effectively reduce the cost of that borrowing through tax writeoffs. Corporations can deduct from their income calculations the interest cost of loans, which cuts the effective interest rate in half. Third, a corporation competing in the oligopolistic climate extant in America is generally able to pass on its costs to the consumer. To the extent that the corporation can because of the absence of effective price competition, pass on to the consumer the increased cost of money, its decisions to borrow are not influenced by actions aimed at making credit more dear.

The fourth factor which puts to lie the effectiveness of the application of credit restraint is the buy-now psychology which is a part of the mentality of both corporate management and the consumer. Both groups, conditioned by an extended period of increasing prices, prefer to purchase goods—even if credit is more dear—because of the belief that the price will only be higher later when the purchase is ultimately made. The proof of the existence of this psychology is the skepticism with which the public regards the effectiveness of conventional approaches to inflation.

Conventional public-finance approaches to inflation are no more realistic than are the traditional economic theories on which they rest. Experience has taught us that the application of Federal spending and tax adjustments take too long to be truly effective anti-inflationary tools. The passage of H.R. 15091, giving the President standby powers to deal with inflation, signals a recognition of the need to have authority to deal rapidly with inflation. Regrettably, the President has not only failed to use the existing authorities, but has also not asked for other desirable standby powers. Further, he has substituted budget-gimmickry and press-agentry for credible fiscal restraint. Apparently, the President, too, is wedded to the old ways.

The application of Federal Reserve System restraint to the money supply has proven to be a singularly bankrupt approach to dealing with inflation in a smooth way. The Federal Reserve System no longer effectively regulates the supply of capital available in the economy. Big borrowers have circumvented the Fed's restraints by borrowing through funds and institutions immune from effective control by the Federal Reserve Board. Corporate borrowers have resorted to Eurodollar markets, direct offerings of corporate notes, and borrowing from pension plans.

Combined, these fund resources represent well over \$300 billion. In addition, retail stores can circumvent the credit shortage for their direct customers by lending to their consumers through the use of credit cards. However, such credit costs the consumer an annual interest

rate of up to 18 percent, a very dear way for the consumer to participate in the credit access of big business. This large source of unregulated credit is very costly to the consumer.

The availability of this pool of credit which is invulnerable to restraints by the central credit agency, the Federal Reserve Board, dictates that the agency's policies will be confined—in their effective application—to those who must deal through the institutions regulated by the Fed. This means that the small businessman, the home purchaser, the consumer who needs to finance a new car, is the object of monetary restraint while the high-flying corporate financier who can borrow from the aforementioned sources escapes the impact of Federal credit stringency. This is indeed inequitable and unjust. The Government's policies act only as a penalty on the little man, while doing nothing to affect those whose actions are the very cause of the inflation's persistence.

The old doctrines and approaches have failed because they could not adapt to the realities of a highly centralized and capital-intensive economy. The inability of these doctrines to either describe or deal with the current problem of inflation suggests the need for a new set of policies and approaches able to deal with the real causes of credit scarcity and to take the steps to effectively allocate capital into those areas of activity which are productive of real economic growth and genuine social enrichment.

Let us examine three important areas which illustrate the results of the failure of the Nixon administration to deal with inflation effectively.

#### HOUSING

In no area is the need for a reorientation of resource allocation more apparent than in housing. We now have a large backlog of people needing housing, and cannot even maintain previous levels of housing construction, let alone increase that rate to meet the rate of increasing family formation and population.

Why, in spite of Federal policies to build and to facilitate the building of housing, is this the case? The answers are not easy, and the problems they describe do not lend themselves to facile solutions. But one thing is clear: that the solutions to date have not been adequate, either in degree, quality, or approach.

Historically speaking, in a time of credit stringency, the housing industry is the first to be affected and the present time is no exception. As the Federal Reserve has maintained a tight money policy in an attempt to control inflation, interest rates have risen steadily, with a concomitant decline in the supply of funds available for home finance. The reduction in mortgage money supply is attributable to the Federal interest rate ceilings on savings deposits which have caused savings accounts to lose attractiveness to savers who can obtain substantially higher rates on other investments. In fact, during December and January, savings and loan institutions suffered massive withdrawals as people shifted to higher yield sources such as Treasury bills paying 6.8 percent an-

nually. Interest rate ceilings have a laudable purpose—to facilitate home mortgage financing—but have been doing more harm than good in the extremely tight money market where they discourage the inflow of funds to the chief suppliers of mortgage credit.

The Federal Government has approached the problem of mortgage money shortage through a number of programs to guarantee and insure home loan financing, to provide an interest subsidy, to provide direct loans or their equivalent, or in a combination of these programs. Ideally, this approach makes credit accessible to the purchaser of the housing, either by making credit available directly to him or by making it possible for him to obtain credit in the money market. However, the vision of the Congress which led to enactment of this legislation has been largely lost because of slipshod administration and inadequate budgeting by the current administration.

To increase the supply of mortgage money, HUD has just begun an effort to encourage other financial intermediaries such as insurance companies and pension funds to put more of their funds into mortgage-type investments. The Housing and Urban Development Secretary has said that only after proving that voluntary persuasion does not work will he recommend legislation to achieve this end. Again the administration has refused to recognize the urgency of the situation, since it is willing to spend precious time talking about getting more money into the housing market rather than doing something about it.

In some ways such administration efforts to ease the housing money crisis have been counteracted by its own monetary policy in other areas. The large outflow of funds from savings and loan institutions in the last few months was caused largely by the high rate of return obtainable with Treasury bills, which attracted the funds away from savings and loans. On the one hand the administration cajoles intermediaries to channel funds into the housing market, and on the other it takes money out of that market through high interest rates on Treasury bills.

On the fiscal side, the President resorted to budget gimmickry and slight of hand to achieve an announced surplus in his fiscal 1971 budget. All of the budget documents make much of the importance of such a surplus to redirecting money into the housing market. A number of experts have already pointed out that the estimated budget surplus of \$1.3 billion is contrived. Treasury Secretary Kennedy, himself, has conceded under questioning that using former budget concepts, the fiscal 1971 budget would have a \$7.3 billion deficit. Clearly, the credit shortage problem will not be solved with the President's proposed budget. Greater measures are needed to bring inflation and high interest rates under control, since Federal spending policies will not be adding greatly to their amelioration.

The administration is very well aware of the fact that the fiscal pie is only so large, and that the important question is

how to cut up that pie. The basic problem boils down to one of distributing resources in such a way as to channel more money into productive areas. In housing, the first order of business is to bring inflation under control and consequently to reduce interest rates, by far the major cause of inadequate home financing. Then the Government demand for physical resources should be rechanneled into housing construction.

#### JOBS

The administration has also fallen down badly in the area of employment policy. Unemployment has been growing rapidly in the last few months, and is predicted to keep on growing until inflation is brought under control. The administration's failure to control inflation through its insistence on tight money is bringing the economy into a recession characterized by increasing unemployment. In the Orange County-Long Beach area alone, 15,000 people in the aerospace industry were fired in 1969. In the area I represent, unemployment has reached 22 percent among skilled construction workers, and it is estimated that it will climb to 30 percent by the end of March. These construction workers would be employed building houses if the administration were coming to grips with the true causes of inflation and tight money.

In attempting to balance Federal spending, the administration is cutting expenditures in its 1971 budget, but many of those cuts are being made in an illogical and inconsistent way. The 1971 budget cuts defense requests by \$5.3 billion below the estimated 1970 expenditures. However, the cut is coming largely in manpower, and very little in expensive resource-consuming programs. In a time of growing unemployment, it makes no sense to create further unemployment.

Defense spending is also being cut by eliminating valuable research and development laboratories. With a little foresight and planning, these laboratories could be turned to other known areas of research need, such as the problems of environmental pollution. One such laboratory in the San Francisco Bay area was recently disbanded, dissolving a highly skilled nucleus of scientists and administrators in a well-functioning organization. In a wave of false and rash economy moves, the Defense Department is wiping out facilities which will be very expensive to reconstitute, and which have extremely valuable alternative uses. The administration should establish an inter-agency committee to coordinate such alternative use of military facilities by other agencies.

#### PRICES

The Consumer Price Index rose again in January to a level of 131.8, using 1957-59 prices as the base of 100. That is a one-third increase in prices in 10 years, most of it coming within the last year. The index rose from 124.1 to 131.8, or 7.7 percent, between January 1969, and January 1970. In other words, since the Nixon administration took office the cost of living to the middle-income family has increased \$792 a year. This was by far the fastest rate of increase in the 10-year period. While people are being put

on the unemployment rolls with less than ever to spend, skyrocketing consumer prices are eating away at the amount their money will buy in the first place.

To allow such a rise and the concomitant hardship on the middle- and low-income person is unconscionable. The administration refuses to use the most direct, immediate, and effective means of price control at its disposal, namely the open soliciting of promises from management to hold down prices and from labor to hold down its wage demands. This simple technique was used most effectively by President Johnson. President Nixon has refrained from using his personal moral suasion. Apparently, he is more concerned about business getting its price rises and labor its wage increases than he is about arresting this impetus to spiral.

Inflation, housing crisis, unemployment, skyrocketing consumer prices, an impressive list of failures. These problems will not be alleviated until we come to grips with their real causes. Old solutions to old, no-longer relevant problem definitions will get us nowhere. We need new, imaginative solutions aimed at the root causes of today's problems, not the false targets of yesterday's causes. The problem manifestations may be the same, such as inflation, but the causes and therefore the solutions are very different.

#### KNOW-NOTHINGS ATTACKS CENSUS

#### HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that a number of groups have organized for the purpose of subverting the will of Congress by attempting, willfully, to sabotage the 1970 census.

As you and my colleagues know, I am chairman of the Census and Statistics Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Our subcommittee explored, in depth, the issues surrounding the 1970 census in an extensive series of hearings which covered all phases of the census controversy. Our conclusion was that, in large part, the public was being misguided and that the accusation of "invasion of privacy" simply did not make much sense when applied to the census.

Nevertheless, recognizing both the importance of the issue and the genuine validity of the public's concern, the subcommittee developed legislation, H.R. 12884, which, first, substantially strengthens these provisions of census law which guarantee the rights and privacy of our citizens, and second, recognizes the vital need for census statistics and does not, therefore, curtail the right of the Government to gather, in the census, information necessary for the benefit of all.

The House, I am pleased to say, supported the recommendations of the subcommittee and on September 25, 1969,

passed H.R. 12884 unanimously. Yet, this clear intent of the House, notwithstanding, certain individuals continue to propagandize the 1970 census as some type of bureaucratic plot designed to deprive us of our privacy; and, if you listen to the propaganda, of our right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" as well. These individuals have organized demonstrations at various Federal buildings, including the Department of Commerce, of which the Census Bureau is a part, in their efforts to encourage good American citizens to refuse to cooperate with the Government in the taking of the 1970 census. These individuals, obviously desirous of preventing the Government from obtaining any information, hope to deny to the Congress and to all levels of government—State, local, and Federal—the facts needed to deal intelligently with the great problems of our time.

These individuals maintain that the census is nothing more than a ruse under which a small group of Government officials are gathering information for some nefarious—but carefully unspecified—use. By clever references to computer control and Government dossiers, to fears of "Big Brother" and invasions of privacy, they hope to cause our citizens to reject the census.

These individuals, through distorted and twisted processes of reasoning, raise the false specter of the census being unconstitutional and, in fact, by implying that Congress may—in some distant future—pass laws which will force confidential census information to be made public, impugn the integrity of the Congress itself.

All of these assertions are knowingly and maliciously false for they stem from the same individuals and groups that encourage others to break laws of which they do not personally approve while they, themselves, masquerade behind a front of law and order.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, am I alone in these conclusions. A column on this same subject by the eminently conservative Mr. James J. Kilpatrick, which appeared in the February 22 issue of the Washington Star agrees 100 percent with my views. Mr. Kilpatrick, who does not hesitate to attack the Government when he feels it to be necessary, categorically repudiates the arguments of, as I call them, the "Twentieth Century Know-Nothings" as a "mélange of sound principles, so unhappily misapplied." It is so lucid an exposition of what is wrong with the position of those who attack the census that I not only request permission that it be placed in the RECORD but also urge that it be carefully read by each of my colleagues.

I have spoken many times of the uses to which census data are put and of the statutes which require the use of census data for the administration of programs or as a basis for the allocation of Federal funds. It is not necessary to repeat them here. I will note only that much of the billions of dollars in funds, goods, and services which the Federal Government distributes each year to State and local governments is allocated according to data provided by the census.

Mr. Speaker, the products of the census, like the oxygen in the air, are consumed so widely that they are accepted as a matter of course and their use, all too frequently, goes unrecognized. Yet, intuitively, our citizens know that census information is produced for their benefit. And I know, that they will reject the false arguments of those who wish to prevent our country from having the facts it needs to remain a great and dynamic nation.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 22, 1970]

SOME REFLECTIONS OF PRIVACY AND PARANOIA  
(By James J. Kilpatrick)

NEW ORLEANS.—A troublesome invitation turned up in my mail, just before I left on this road trip. The thing troubles me because it comes from a group of young conservatives whom I greatly admire, and I have been thinking about it in the long jumps from Akron to Cleveland to Chicago to Las Vegas, and now to a hotel room here in the French Quarter.

My friends want me to join in a massive refusal to answer the "personal questions" on the 1970 Census. This is what they say:

"We feel that the questions asked in the 1970 Census Form violate our rights under the First, Fourth, Fifth and Ninth Amendments to the Constitution. The citizen's right of privacy is directly violated when the federal government attempts to force us to answer questions that are none of the government's business.

"The Constitution clearly provides for a count of the population every 10 years. Counting is one thing; it is quite another to compel answers to questions regarding your personal life and habits.

"The point is not what questions are being asked, but that a federal agency dares to institute a process that will pry into the core of our individual lives. Once the bureaucrats begin the process, where will future usurpations of our rights end?

"We also fear that the answers to the questions posed in the Census will be turned over to other government agencies in order to better harass the citizenry. It is not improbable that the answers will be included in the newly created National Data Bank and later used to compile a dossier on every citizen in this nation. The frightening potential posed by the 1970 Census could well lead us down the road to a virtual 1984."

How does one tackle this mélange of sound principles, so unhappily misapplied? The young conservatives are defending a strict construction of the Constitution; they are standing firmly by rights of privacy and rights of property dear to our hearts; and they are taking a position that, in other areas, needs to be taken against abuses of power by Big Brother.

But their manifesto, alas, is one part bunk and two parts paranoia. They are seeing spooks that may lurk elsewhere, but do not dwell in the supplementary Census questionnaires. I decline.

They are wrong at the outset, or so it seems to me, in seeing all this as unconstitutional. The basic grant of power is quite broad. Under the Constitution, the Congress is to provide for an enumeration of the people every ten years "in such manner as they—the Congress—shall by law direct." The Congress also has power to regulate commerce among the States, to establish uniform rules of nationalization, to establish post roads, and so forth.

Nothing in the Constitution prohibits the Congress from combining its powers in useful ways. Thus a Census question on the houses we own, and the plumbing and heat-

ing in them, may not relate narrowly to "enumeration," but it relates reasonably to commerce—and it scarcely reaches "the core of our individual lives." The same thing is true of questions relating to our jobs and how we get to them.

Is it true that such information is "none of the government's business"? On the contrary, such information is of the first importance to government. How else can public policies be fashioned wisely? Where should schools be built, and water lines laid, and parks established? How many persons will be using what highways and airports when? The economic and demographic information compiled from confidential Census reports—and the Bureau of the Census never in history has breached its security—is vital to every public and private undertaking that rests upon a knowledge of what our country is.

This is a broad land, restless, mobile, swiftly changing. Yet the concerns of Akron and Denver are the concerns of New Orleans also. We are all bound up together, skating randomly on the same ice. It constitutes no serious intrusion upon our private lives—less of an intrusion, in fact, than we accept in tax forms and credit reports—for the census takers to count something more than mere noses. Collectively, we have to know who we are, how we live, where the plane is going. If we are doomed to an ant-hill life, and most of us are, let us at least seek an orderly ant-hill.

CHICAGO'S PROPOSED LAKE AIRPORT—III

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the Air Line Pilots Association has informed me of their objections to Chicago's proposed lake airport site. Their objections are based on the possible weather safety factors presented by the Lake Michigan site. According to Charles H. Ruby, president, ALPA:

Smoke, haze and fog combine to reduce visibilities near the lake shore during bad weather conditions and the high moisture content over the lake makes icing more prevalent. Precipitation, rain, snow or sleet, because of the lake site could increase the hazards and cause more runway closings due to poor runway surface conditions. Radar altimetry is required for low visibility approaches and will not work over calm water which is often associated with fog. Further, fog settles in lowest places, and will remain in this "bowl-like" terrain for the maximum relative time.

The ALPA Chicago third airport advisory committee has prepared an interim report which describes several of these major weather safety problems. I would like at this time to include this report in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues who have requested more information on the lake airport proposal. The report follows:

INTERIM POSITION OF THE AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION CONCERNING THE CHICAGO THIRD AIRPORT LOCATION

The air line pilots agree that a new major airport for Chicago must be developed as rapidly as possible. All projections of future airline travel clearly indicate the need for a substantial expansion of capacities beyond the limits of O'Hare and Midway. Regardless

of the location chosen for the new airport, the primary concern of the air line pilot is with safety of operations. Two factors with which the pilot has direct experience and which affect both the capacity and the safety of operations of any airport are (1) air traffic control; and (2) weather conditions. It is significant that in the planning for Chicago's third airport these are the very factors which have received the least attention at the present time. This is particularly critical in regard to the proposed lake site in that it is closer to O'Hare than the potential land sites and actual weather conditions at the lake site that might affect flight operations are questionable.

Observations by air line pilots prompt the following thoughts and questions with regard to air safety in the two major areas of air traffic control and weather conditions:

**I-1. Runway Orientation and Air Traffic Control Considerations.**—Because of prevailing winds in the summer and winter, it is recommended that runways be oriented NE-SW and NW-SE. At least four runways in each direction would probably be ultimately needed because of expected density of the traffic and the design capability of the airport.

A NAFEC Air Traffic Control Evaluation is needed to determine the effects of this type of runway orientation in connection with airspace needed to continue operation at O'Hare, Midway and Meigs Airports.

Present analysis has indicated that the present lake site airport proposal will not have the same traffic handling capability as the land site southwest of Chicago under adverse weather conditions and/or heavy traffic due to the interaction between O'Hare Airport and the lake site. Since presently all operations into O'Hare are conducted on an IFR procedure basis, we cannot envision any different situation when the next Chicago airport is constructed. We therefore strongly recommend that any new Chicago airport be located so as to provide a maximum capacity under IFR conditions and that its location be such that no existing major Chicago airport facility would be seriously reduced in capacity.

**I-2. Approach and Takeoff Patterns Affect on ILS Installation and Airport Neighbors.**—With the recommended runway directions, approach and takeoff patterns would indicate an approach altitude at 5 miles from the runway end of about 1500 feet. Departure altitudes would vary but should be at least 1500 feet at that distance. ILS outer marker equipment which is about 4.5 miles from the end of the runway would be required in the case of a lake airport to be firmly constructed on the lake bottom. This could represent a maintenance and operational problem if not an actual deficiency item.

If properly zoned for industrial or recreational development, the approach to a land airport could be just as free from obstructions and not be a noise sensitive area as would be the case of a lake airport. The high density living areas along the lake front would be a noise sensitive area. In addition, the location of navigation aids and their maintenance would be much easier at a land based location.

**I-3. General Aviation and STOL Traffic.**—The growth of general aviation and STOL type operations in the future will demand additional "close in" air traffic capability that will increase the need for Meigs Airport as a "close in" downtown facility and should not be lost from its 90% VFR capability and possibly 100% operation capability with newer and more precise IFR approach aids. Therefore, if an airport is proposed to be constructed in any location for the City of Chicago, one of the prime considerations should be that no facility as large and as valuable as Meigs Airport should be sacrificed with a resultant loss of air traffic capability to the downtown area.

**II. Weather Safety Factors—II-1.** An investigation of actual weather conditions at the proposed site should be made throughout one year before a statement could be made concerning the percentages of times less favorable conditions would be present at a lake airport site compared with a land site; however, pilot opinion based on flying over the lake areas leads toward the general statement that visibility is usually less over the lake, fog conditions are more prevalent, ice conditions occur more frequently, and probably water, ice, or snow would be more prevalent on the runways than on a nearby land site.

**II-2.** In the pilots' opinion, the potential for fog formation is greater over a depressed area such as a lake airport polder. This would affect aircraft operations not only during takeoff and landings, but also during ground taxiing. Fog would also affect the efficient movement of ground and water based emergency equipment.

**II-3.** Icing of engines and aircraft aerodynamic parts does occur more in the vicinity of bodies of water when the temperature approaches freezing. Engine and aircraft icing can be a problem even on jet aircraft. Smaller reciprocating engine aircraft are not as capable of handling this condition. All pilots would encounter difficulty in this regard.

**II-4.** Instrument guidance systems over water probably can be made to work effectively; however, the installation, maintenance and associated problems with water based equipment, especially during winter icing conditions, may prove to be more of a problem than just a nuisance.

**II-5.** The effect of water on pilots' perception, especially in hazy operating conditions, is known to make for a difficult VFR type operation, day or night. Hopefully, circling approaches will be a thing of the past at such a major airport; however, if an emergency should occur requiring the aircraft to immediately return to the airport, then an overwater VFR circling approach would occur.

**II-6.** The danger of lake birds fouling engines is more than it would be at a ground airport. The problem should be corrected satisfactorily for all operations.

**II-7.** Obstruction hazards concerned with shore line high rise construction undoubtedly would be a consideration for pilot operations at such an airport. Unless an emergency arose we would expect air line pilots to be able to avoid City of Chicago buildings. The dike wall around the airport that might be as much as 70 feet above the surface of the runway should not be a major problem providing the dike wall was at least 7500 feet from the end of the runway. However, this dike wall would affect the wind currents, creating such a wind shear as to be an operational factor that must be carefully evaluated. Winds over the lake will ordinarily be at a higher velocity than over the land because of lack of land friction resulting in higher crosswind components that do affect minimums.

**II-8.** Sloping runways, if kept to a very moderate number (say under .5%) should not be a major problem except that if the drainage is toward the halfway point of the runway, the rain, snow and other precipitation will create problems of drainage at the mid-point to avoid standing water. Flooded runways can create aircraft damage because of hydraulic effects on the aircraft parts; also, hydroplaning could result in loss of directional control.

The questions suggested above can only be resolved by the gathering of further information.

In a preliminary evaluation of the potential lake site and three potential land sites, the Federal Aviation Administration determined that, "under adverse weather condi-

tions and/or heavy traffic the [total] capacity of the lake site and O'Hare Airport would be reduced below the [total] capacity and [land] Site A (southwest of Chicago) and O'Hare Airport due to the interaction between O'Hare and the lake site." The FAA is conducting further studies on potential air traffic problems at each of the potential sites but little is being done to determine if actual weather conditions at the lake site are conducive to safe flight operations on a "round-the-clock" basis.

The air line pilots feel that it is highly desirable that a minimum of one year's observations on a daily basis be gathered from the lake site in order to determine actual weather conditions. Until such information is available and can be used to confirm the effects of weather at the lake site upon safety and dependability of operations, the air line pilots feel that any decision to utilize the lake site would be premature.

Prepared by ALPA Chicago Third Airport Advisory Committee: Klete Rood, Chairman, Lee Imbrie, Wood Lockhart, Fred Rakunas, Forest Dines. O'Hare Joint Council Office, 2200 East Devon Avenue, Suite 314, Des Plaines, Illinois 60018.

#### A LETTER FROM THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. HOGAN, Mr. Speaker, I was the recipient, as I am sure my colleagues were, of a letter from the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade. This letter is well-reasoned and forceful in its plea for urgency in crime legislation for the District of Columbia. In very direct language, it presents the crime picture as it is and makes it unmistakably clear why it is needed. This plea is made not only on behalf of the Board of Trade, but also represents a plea from all citizens who live and work in this city and to those who visit their Capital City.

I am bringing this letter to the attention of my colleagues. I also want to include an article from the Wall Street Journal of February 11, 1970, which is self-explanatory. The crime crisis in Washington is so serious I hope my colleagues will support the District Committee's omnibus crime bill which President Nixon has requested and which is due on the floor in the near future.

The letter and article follow:

THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE,

Washington, D.C., February 19, 1970.

To the Members of the Congress of the United States:

The National Capital—Our Federal City—needs your help. And needs it now.

This city is not a safe place in which to live, work and play. In spite of the dedicated efforts of many people, the situation is steadily deteriorating, and we are truly faced with a crisis in public order and safety which simply cannot be permitted to continue. Our streets, parks, libraries, schools, and educational centers are not safe places anymore. Our population is being degraded by the open distribution and use of narcotics. Community activities are permeated by flagrant disrespect for public order and the ordinary rights of fellow citizens. Crime weighs heav-

by in the decision taken when businesses move to the suburbs. Employees refuse to work in many locations and some employers provide escorts for them to their cars which are parked less than one block from their front doors.

An even deeper tragedy than the crime we read about every day, is the insidious ways in which it is transforming our way of life. This is typified in the enclosed article from the *Wall Street Journal*.

Congress has exclusive legislative jurisdiction in the Federal City. Therefore it is to you we turn for help. There are two principle actions you can take which are basic to reducing crime in Washington.

First, enact the anti-crime legislation pending in the House which will remove known criminal offenders from our streets and which will substantially improve the whole process of the administration of justice, from investigation and arrest to rehabilitation of the convicted.

Second, and equally important, ensure that legislation enacted is promptly and adequately funded. Frankly, we are not greatly concerned about what it will cost to make the National Capital safe again. If it is necessary to put a policeman on every corner—let's do it.

Crime continues to flourish in our National Capital in spite of the best efforts of law enforcement agencies. Obviously, their legal and financial resources are inadequate. This city is experiencing an economic and social disintegration which, if permitted to continue could threaten its very life as a useful institution.

Therefore, I ask you on behalf of the business community, our employees, and law-abiding citizens of Washington—to promptly enact and fully fund whatever measures you believe are necessary to make the Federal City a safe and attractive city again.

The Board of Trade has endorsed, in principle, the following pending legislation:

- H.R. 12854—Court Reorganization.
- H.R. 13690—Bail Agency Act.
- H.R. 14378—Penalties for Armed Crime.
- H.R. 14053—Policemen and Firemen Salary Increases.
- S. 2689—Revision of Criminal Law.
- S. 3034—Pretrial Detention.
- S. 2981—Juvenile Courts.

Respectfully,  
THOMAS M. WALSH.

**LIVING SCARED: SURGING CRIME FORCES WASHINGTON RESIDENTS TO CHANGE WAY OF LIFE—CABBIES, MERCHANTS STRIVE TO FOIL ROBBERS; SECURITY BOLSTERED FOR APARTMENTS—A STIMULUS TO NATIONAL ACTION.**

(By Monroe W. Karmin)

WASHINGTON.—John D. Holland is afraid. For 40 years he has been selling packaged liquor at his Maryland Beverage Mart in this city's southeast sector. Four years ago he installed a burglar alarm system. Three years ago he put iron bars on his windows. Two years ago he began arming. Now on his desk on a platform overlooking the sales floor are a black Italian-made pistol, a silver German-made pistol, a Winchester rifle and an L. C. Smith shotgun. "I've never been held up," Mr. Holland declares, "and I don't intend to be." Since mid-1967, intruders have murdered seven local liquor dealers in the course of an estimated 700 robberies of such stores.

Leroy R. Bailey Jr. is afraid.

He drives a taxi. Last year he paid \$20 to install an emergency flasher in his cab. If he's threatened, Mr. Bailey steps on a button that sets off a flashing signal for police aid in his front grille and rear bumper. At night, he says, "nine out of 10 cabs won't pick up a man alone." The number of Washington cab drivers has dropped to about 11,000 from 13,000 two years ago. Says James E. Jewell, president of the Independent Taxi Owners Association: "This is a very dangerous town to

drive in. Many men won't work after the sun goes down."

The people at the Mexican embassy are afraid.

Last September, during an independence day celebration, two guests were robbed. Female employes have been accosted. Vandals have struck repeatedly. Now all embassy doors are kept locked. A fence has been erected around the property, located two miles north of the White House. "We live in fear," says a spokesman. So does much of the crime-plagued diplomatic community. President Nixon is asking Congress to expand the 250-man White House police force to offer additional protection for Embassy Row.

THE NO. 1 ISSUE

Most of Washington is afraid of crime.

Fear has changed the way of life of residents of the nation's capital and its environs, affecting everyone from cab-driver to Senator. It has also changed the way institutions, from schools to embassies, operate. While race relations continue to be a major problem for this city, whose 850,000 residents are more than 70% black, there is no doubt that today's No. 1 public concern is personal safety.

"A couple of years ago the city's tension was seen in terms of white police versus the natives," says an aide to Mayor Walter Washington. "Now it's seen as criminals versus victims. It's more crime and less racial."

Mayor Washington, himself a Negro, says that black as well as white neighborhoods are demanding more foot patrolmen, even though the cop on the beat was viewed as "a Gestapo agent" by many blacks not long ago. The mayor finds ground for optimism in the change. "Never before have I seen such an attitude on the part of the people of the city, both black and white, to work together on a problem," he says.

A TRAGIC EXAMPLE

The nation's capital is by no means alone in its fear of crime; rather, as Mr. Nixon pointed out in his State of the Union Message, it is a "tragic example" of the way crime and violence "increasingly threaten our cities, our homes and our lives." But Washington is suffering more than most cities. In the nine months through September, according to District of Columbia Police Chief Jerry Wilson, reported crime in Washington jumped 26% over a year earlier, compared with an average national increase of 11%. Cleveland, San Francisco and Baltimore also topped the national average.

Chief Wilson, who was appointed last summer, hopes to come to grips with the rising crime rate here this year, if he gets enough help. President Nixon has proposed a new \$12.4 million crime-fighting package for the district to supplement the city's regular budget, which emphasizes public safety measures. And Congress is at work on other anticrime legislation for Washington.

"This war on crime focuses on several trouble spots. It aims to break the local court bottleneck (it now takes an average of nine months for a criminal case to go to trial and some wait as long as 20 months); to curb the freedom of those awaiting trial through a controversial preventive detention measure (an estimated 35% of those arrested for armed robbery and released on bail commit another crime before they come to trial); and to crack down on drug traffic and use (50% of those arrested here are drug addicts).

EXPANDING THE POLICE FORCE

But this year's main thrust, Mayor Washington says, is to put more policemen on the streets. The mayor hopes to beef up the force to 5,100 men by June 30 from 3,868 on Jan. 1. Also planned are expanded criminal rehabilitation and social-welfare programs that the mayor hopes can be meshed into a comprehensive criminal justice system.

Because Washington is the seat of the

Federal Government, the crime surge here is an important stimulus to action on both district and national anticrime legislation. Among the victims of local crime have been Sen. Frank Church of Idaho, White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler, Mr. Nixon's personal secretary, Rose Mary Woods and Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard, to name just a few. Political partisanship is diminishing as liberal Democrats feel the impact of crime and join the President in his anticrime crusade.

Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield recently expressed outrage over the "senseless" slaying of a fellow-Montanian and friend in the streets of Washington. He took the Senate floor to demand "new and better ways to fight crime, to cut down the inordinate rate of violence." Another liberal Democrat, Rep. Frank Thompson Jr. of New Jersey, warned the other day that "things may get worse if the Administration and Congress do not put crime control on the front burner."

But until this campaign begins to make headway, life in the District of Columbia will reflect fear, especially after dark.

Cruise through downtown Washington in a police car on a Saturday night and the mood can be felt. On F Street, the main downtown shopping street, merchants lock their doors at 6 p.m. Many put up iron grillwork nightly to protect their windows. Shoppers and employees hurry to the bus stops. Many employees who fear the lonely walk at the end of the bus ride wait in the stores until their spouses drive by to take them home. At 7 p.m. F Street is almost deserted.

The relatively small number of people out for an evening of entertainment arrive a bit later. Some go to the National Theater, which now raises its curtain at 7:30 p.m. instead of 8:30 so patrons can get home early. Some head for downtown movie theaters. The servicemen's crowd patronizes the rock joints along 14th Street. Fashionable Georgetown, more than a mile from downtown, is still lively, as are some of the posh restaurants and clubs. But that's about it. Much of Washington is dark, and scared.

"Watch the people," advises a seasoned policeman. "See how they walk quickly and with a purpose. There's no casual strolling. People don't come into this town at night unless they have a specific destination in mind. They go straight to it and then go home as fast as possible."

RESTAURANTS CLOSE

The effects are evident. The Ceres restaurant next to the National Theater is closed, nearby Caruso's restaurant is gone and neighboring Bassin's has lost 50% of its night business. The Commerce Department, a block away, was robbed recently. Fumes Bassin's angry manager, Ed Hodges:

"There isn't a waitress, cashier, busboy or anyone who works here who hasn't been robbed, mugged or attacked in some way. And there isn't a place in this block that hasn't been robbed, and most have been hit more than once."

A few blocks away, on 9th Street, the Gateway Theater is showing "Man and Wife," an intimate film "for adults over 21." Even an attraction of this nature fails to draw the audience it once did. "Business is very bad, way off," says Robert Morris, the ticket seller. "People are afraid to come downtown. We've had lots of purse-snatchings, pockets cut out and all sorts of other things."

Fear inhibits daytime activity as well. A survey taken last summer by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments discovered that 65% of the city's largely white suburban residents visit the downtown area less than once a month, and 15% come downtown less than once a year. Asked their chief worry, the large majority of those surveyed responded: "Crime."

Actually, crime is spreading in the sub-

urbs as well as in the city. Three brutal slayings of young women, one in Alexandria, Va., and two in Bethesda, Md., have occurred within the past few weeks. While these crimes remain unsolved, many suburbanites tend to view crime in their neighborhoods as a spillover from the city, and they still feel downtown is more dangerous.

Crime continues to speed the flight of Washingtonians to the suburbs. Though many single people and childless couples remain in the city, Joseph Murray of the big Shannon & Luchs real estate firm reports: "Families are leaving at an accelerated rate; this includes both black and white." (In neighboring Prince Georges County, Md., Negro arrivals have recently outnumbered white newcomers.)

#### NO CASH

Sales of downtown department stores dropped by 4% in the first 11 months of last year from a year earlier, while sales throughout the metropolitan area, including those of suburban stores, were rising 8%. A recent Commerce Department survey of 10 central-city areas showed that the District of Columbia suffered the steepest loss of business of all. Shoppers who do venture downtown are continually reminded of the risk. D.C. Transit bus drivers use scrip instead of cash to make change. Delivery trucks bear signs proclaiming, "This Vehicle Carries No Cash."

There are bright spots. New office buildings are sprouting in some parts of town. Convention business continues to grow and tourists arrive in record throngs. Lane Bryant has opened a new store on F Street, and the downtown Woodward & Lothrop department store is remodeling. But the merchants know safety must be assured before enough suburban shoppers will come downtown again to make business snap back.

The big department stores are bolstering their protection. Harold Melnicove, an executive of Hecht's, says his organization now has a security force "big enough to protect some small cities"; he won't give details.

Smaller stores do the best they can. Frank Rich, president of both Rich's shoe stores and the D.C. Urban Coalition, is a downtown optimist. But in his F Street store he no longer displays shoes in pairs, just singles; all display cases are locked; key employees carry electronic devices in their pockets to summon help in the event of danger.

High's dairy stores, which stay open nights and Sundays, have been robbed so many times, says General Manager William Darnell, "we don't like to talk about it." The chain's 37 D.C. stores were held up "hundreds of times" last year, Mr. Darnell sighs, and several had to be closed. Money in all stores is kept to a minimum by frequent armored car pickups.

#### GETTING OUT

A survey by the mayor's Economic Development Committee of small businessmen found that one out of seven contacted "wanted to close down, relocate or simply stop doing business in the city."

One who wants to get out is E. N. Hampton, president of the Hampton Maintenance Engineering Co. His firm has been robbed, his trucks have been vandalized and his employees have been threatened. "It's disgusting," Mr. Hampton snarls. "Now we ride armed guard in the trucks with shotguns. As soon as I can find somebody to buy this I'm getting out."

Nor is black business immune. Berkeley Burrell's four dry cleaning stores have suffered 17 holdups in 10 months. Now the front door of each is locked; a customer can't get in "without a ticket or pair of pants in his hand," says Mr. Burrell. Employees are armed, and the proprietor is trying to replace females with males. "I may sound like Barry Goldwater," he says, "but we've got to get the community back to where it's safe to live in."

Banks have been a favorite target for bandits. Though these attacks have slackened lately, Francis Addison, president of the D.C. Bankers Association, says a "very high percentage" of local banks are robbed every year. The National Bank of Washington recently closed one branch because of the danger. All banks have tightened security, but the most extreme case is a Security Bank branch in the northeast section.

In 1968 the branch was held up three times within 55 days. Now the bank has put all employees behind plexiglas.

Tellers receive any payout money through scoops beneath the plexiglas. "The personnel were all shook up and couldn't work," President Frank A. Gunther says, "so we bullet-proofed the whole place." The bank has not been held up since.

#### INSURANCE HARD TO GET

Faced with the cost of crime in Washington, insurance companies have turned cautious. "Lots of companies have stopped writing fire and casualty insurance," says Thornton W. Owen, president of the Perpetual Building Association, the city's biggest savings and loan outfit. "And lots of investors will abandon properties rather than maintain them." Hilliard Schulberg of the local liquor dealers association says that for his members "the cost of crime insurance is extremely high, and many companies won't write it." Proposed legislation would permit the Government to offer crime insurance where private insurers won't.

Office building managers, both Government and private, are attempting to cope with the danger. James Sykes, manager of the William J. Burns Detective Agency here, reports many buildings have posted guards at their front doors and says, "We're providing lots more escort service for female employees working late at night." The local chapter of the American Federation of Government Employees has advised its members to buy, at \$5 apiece, antimugger aerosol spray devices.

Security is a prime concern of apartment dwellers. The 670-unit Marberry Plaza, open three years ago in southeast Washington, exemplifies what a new building must offer to reassure nervous tenants. On weekends the project is patrolled by four armed guards with two dogs. All exterior doors are locked. A tenant who has invited a guest for dinner must present an "admit slip" with the guest's name to the desk clerk during the day. When the guest arrives, he must identify himself to the clerk and sign the register. "All of this is at the request of the tenants," says Sidney Glassman of the Charles E. Smith Property Management Company.

#### SCHOOL VIOLENCE

In some neighborhoods, newsboys no longer collect for their papers for fear of being robbed; subscribers must mail in payments. One cabbie drives with self-addressed envelopes; whenever he accumulates \$10 he mails it home. Some maids require their employers to drive them home. An outbreak of violence including the shooting of a junior high school student has prompted Mayor Washington to post policemen throughout the city school system. Many schools have stopped dealing in cash, requiring students to pay for supplies and other items costing more than a dollar by check or money order.

"It used to be that holdup students would use their fists; then came knives; now it's guns," says George Rhodes, a member of the D.C. school board. "Not that there have been that many incidents, but it's the fear that parents and teachers must live under that is most troublesome."

School principals, anxious to protect the reputations of their institutions, tend to minimize the problem. William J. Saunders, principal at Eastern High School (2,400 students including just three whites), says violence is "not a major problem" in the school. Yet several thousand dollars worth of foot-

ball equipment has been stolen, and police officer Sherman Smart says there have been three alleged rapes in and around the school since September. As Officer Smart talks to a reporter, a photographer's agent joins in to complain that he has visited the school twice to take orders for class pictures and has been robbed of his receipts both times.

Not even the churches are spared. At the Vermont Avenue Baptist Church, the collection plate was stolen by intruders in full view of the parishioners. Says Charles Warren, executive director of the Greater Washington Council of Churches:

"Some churches have begun to lock their doors at 11 a.m. on Sundays for the worship service. Some have policemen at the service during the offering. Some have canceled evening activities or rescheduled them for the afternoons."

The National Presbyterian Church has moved from its 60-year location about half a mile from the White House to a new site three miles farther out. The Rev. Edward L. R. Elson calls the new location "the quietest zone in Washington," but vandalism is as bad at the new church as at the old one. According to Mr. Elson, the vandalism has included "obscenity on chapel pillars, destruction in the church hall and lights pilfered and broken."

#### A WAR ON POLLUTION

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Record an excellent editorial appearing in the Detroit, Mich., News of Sunday, December 27, 1969, entitled "No. 1 Priority for 1970's: A War on Pollution."

I am pleased to see the Detroit News, a distinguished newspaper of general circulation in the Detroit metropolitan area, join in this urgent recognition of a great national need.

The editorial follows:

#### NO. 1 PRIORITY FOR 1970'S: A WAR ON POLLUTION

With survival itself in the balance, can there be any doubt that the first item on the list of national priorities for the 1970's must be the protection of our air against poisonous clouds of pollution?

As important as they are, such goals as the prevention of crime, the elimination of poverty and the halting of inflation cannot rank in urgency with the preservation of the air we breathe. When, then, will the country become at least as excited about fighting air pollution as about what happens, say, to the food stamp program?

Perhaps the warning issued this week by scientists of the Atmospheric Sciences Research Center, which is studying air pollution under federal grants, will excite a positive public response.

The scientists predict that if pollution continues at its present rate, 10,000 persons will die in 1980 in a single metropolitan area inundated by air pollution; that within 10 to 15 years everyone will have to wear a special breathing mask to survive outdoors and most animal life will have died; that within 20 years man will be forced to live in domed cities.

If you think it might be possible to escape the problem by moving to some pollution-free area of the country, forget it. The whole nation has finally run out of clean air. Alfred Hulstrunk, assistant director of the research center, notes that the last pocket of clear air, located near Flagstaff, Ariz., van-

ished six years ago when California's pollution finally reached there.

Can we do something?

That is not the real question. The nation that virtually wiped out polio, built the atomic bomb and landed men on the moon has long since proved it can do what it puts its money and its mind to. The real question is:

Will we do as much as necessary in time?

Since 1967 when former President Johnson signed the Air Quality Act with the warning that we could become "a nation in gas masks, groping our way through dying cities and a wilderness of ghost towns," there has been no perceptible progress in the war against the poisoning of the atmosphere.

Governments, national, state and local, talk about fighting pollution but no agency really assumes the role of leadership necessary to a full-scale and concerted attack. Since half the nation's air pollution is believed to come from automobiles, some encouragement can be found in the recent expressions of concern and pledges of cooperation from within the auto industry.

The fact remains that there is at present no substantial encouragement that poisonous fumes from the gasoline engine will be eliminated soon, that alternatives such as the electric car will be developed or that rapid transit systems will be built to reduce automobile traffic.

The nation has not brought its celebrated ingenuity to bear upon the problem. Is it possible that American society will watch the clouds of poison billow thicker, and at last fatally, around its head and fail to act?

Director Hulstrunk sees no improvement in the near future. In fact, he sees further "degradation ahead for our entire environment." But with a display of trust in the inherent good sense of man, he says he believes a solution will be found—somehow, someday.

Let us pray that his trust is well-placed.

#### SUCCESSFULLY MANAGING OUR ENVIRONMENT

**HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in the offices of Connecticut Gov. John Dempsey, the Travelers Insurance Co. announced its intention to place the resources and personnel of its wholly owned subsidiary, the Travelers Research Corp., under the trusteeship of the University of Connecticut to be operated as part of the nonprofit Center for the Environment and Man, Inc., of Hartford, Conn. The center will be funded in part by grants from the National Science Foundation, and will conduct an expanded program of scientific research into the environment.

The creation of the expanded center is an example of the cooperation between private enterprise, Federal and State Governments, and our universities so long sought by those attempting to cope with the problems of our environment and so very rarely found. For myself, the creation of the expanded center represents not only a significant contribution to our effort to grapple with the problems of our environment, but also another great contribution by Dr. Thomas F. Malone, formerly chairman of

the board of the Travelers Research Corp., and vice president of the Travelers Insurance Co., who will now join the staff of the University of Connecticut as special consultant to the president of the university on environmental problems and professor of physics. Dr. Malone's career is, in itself, an illustration of the interface between Government, private business and academe so badly needed if we are to meet the challenges to our environment. After teaching at several colleges and universities, Dr. Malone joined the Travelers Insurance Co. in 1955 and successively became director of research and vice president of the Travelers companies for research. Despite his executive duties he continued to be active in his field of applied meteorology and synoptic climatology.

My own professional association with Dr. Malone began shortly after my election to the Congress in 1958. In 1959 the House Committee on Science and Astronautics was formed and the following year a 14-man panel of distinguished American scientists was formed to meet annually to advise the committee. In 1960 Dr. Malone was appointed to the Advisory Panel on Science and Technology and has made a significant contribution to the direction taken by the Science and Astronautics Committee. In addition, he has devoted countless hours as an advisory to the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of which I am chairman. I, and all the members of the Science and Astronautics Committee and the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, are grateful for his dedicated past services, and applaud this new development in Dr. Malone's career as a distinguished scientist, educator, and public servant. We look forward to the continuation of his valuable services from his new position.

As a member of the board of trustees for the university corporation which operates the National Science Foundation's Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colo., and principal architect of that center's program of global atmospheric research he has acquired an all encompassing grasp of the problems of our global environment. His appointment to the faculty of the University of Connecticut may represent a loss to Travelers Research Corp. but it is a great contribution to the university.

The expanded Center for the Environment and Man, Inc., will continue much of the work initiated at the Travelers Research Center under Dr. Malone's guidance. Included will be the study of the problems caused by uncoordinated urban sprawl, such as pollution of the air and water, noise pollution and exhaustion of natural resources such as open areas, trees, and recreational spaces as well as overcrowding and congestion. In addition, the center will concern itself with social aspects of the human environment, including the delivery of health services and development of new systems of education. In its expanded form, initially, the center will have research grants, including those of the National Science Foundation, and contracts totaling about \$2,250,000, a staff of about 125 and assets of

some three-quarters of a million dollars. Under the proposed agreement the University of Connecticut board of trustees will appoint the board of directors of the Center for the Environment and Man, Inc.

As Dr. Malone said at the announcement of the "agreement in principal" to merge Travelers Research into the center:

Much more than a mere organizational realignment is involved in the circumstances which bring us together today. We have reached a time in the history of our land when the words of "America the Beautiful" have become a prod to our conscience and a challenge to our wisdom and imagination, rather than a song describing the country in which we live . . . The "agreement in principal" announced today is just the beginning of a long and winding road beset with many headaches and—probably—a few heartaches. Let us make that beginning, however, secure in our conviction that the quest for quality in our human environment can be successfully pursued.

Little needs to be added to Dr. Malone's eloquent remarks save to say that with the efforts of men like Tom Malone and cooperative efforts such as the Center for the Environment and Man, Inc., I think we will learn to successfully manage our environment.

THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

**HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1970

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to hear of the recent passing of our friend and former colleague, Hon. Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, of Michigan.

Judge Machrowicz was a warm personal friend of mine and proved very helpful to me when I first came to the House. In fact I met Judge Machrowicz even before I came to Congress, when I was mayor of Schenectady and a candidate for Congress. Judge Machrowicz, then a Member of the House, was addressing a meeting of Polish Americans in the nearby city of Cohoes. I attended that meeting, and as mayor extended my greetings to the group, with one brief statement in the Polish language. When Congressman Machrowicz rose to speak he complimented my brief and hesitant Polish and said some further generous words that proved very helpful to me in getting elected to Congress later that year.

I was always deeply grateful to Ted Machrowicz for his help, and I learned quickly just how tremendously well regarded he was by Polish Americans all around the country. He also became my friend and counselor when I arrived here in Washington the next year.

Ted Machrowicz was a great legislator, a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, and an outstanding U.S. district judge. He served his country well, and all of us who had the privilege of knowing him and serving with him will miss him very keenly.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE  
SEVENTH OHIO DISTRICT

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my report to the people of the Seventh Ohio District on the first session of the 91st Congress and my voting record during that session, as follows:

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE SEVENTH  
OHIO DISTRICT

The first session of the 91st Congress was both rewarding and frustrating.

The reward came from the innovative pieces of legislation recommended by the new Nixon Administration to deal with welfare, tax reform, revenue sharing, postal reform and draft reform.

The frustration stemmed from the sluggishness with which Democrat-controlled Congress took up the President's proposals for consideration and action.

The House of Representatives acted on very few of the major pieces of legislation introduced on behalf of the Administration. The two areas in which the House did enact significant legislation—tax reform and draft reform—were becoming such sore points with the public that the House had little alternative but to act.

Although the Administration's tax reform proposal was heavily amended, the final Tax Reform Bill of 1969 was a desirable piece of legislation. Needed relief measures for millions were retained in the compromise bill, and at a rate and on a deferred time schedule acceptable to Mr. Nixon's critical fight against the ravages of inflation which have cruelly victimized nearly all Americans for four straight years. I supported this legislation as I did the extension and termination of the surtax.

As a member of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee, to which I was appointed on June 18, I am pleased that these bills will help balance the federal budget by producing a net federal revenue gain of \$2.2 billion during 1970, and will reduce 1971 revenue losses to a tolerable \$500 million. But members of the House and Senate must be willing to hold down future spending in order to assure a balanced federal budget in the years ahead when the most significant tax reductions are scheduled to take effect.

The draft reform bill, which authorized a lottery for the first time since World War II, was passed by Congress only after the President said he would change the draft system by executive order if legislative action was not taken. The random selection method provided for in the bill, which I urged early in 1968, has two distinct advantages over the old system: it limits a young man's eligibility for the draft to one year and drafts 19-year-olds first.

The new system frees America's youth from the continuing pressure imposed by the old system under which they were eligible until the age of 26. The former system prevented the rational planning of a young man's life during the time when he most needs to establish life and career goals. In my opinion some inequities still exist in the area of deferments and administration of the system. Hopefully the Congress will make further reforms this year to insure a more equitable national policy in this area.

Also approved by the House was the Administration's Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system designed to protect our offensive missile sites. I voted in favor of the Safeguard system, which passed the House hand-

ily. After a long fight in the Senate, it was approved there by one vote and signed by the President.

Social Security benefits were increased significantly during the last session of the Congress. President Nixon early recommended a 10% increase in Social Security benefits and proposed that the votes of future benefits and taxes be tied to the cost-of-living index in order to remove the decisions in this program from the political arena, where decisions often have been delayed by partisan struggles.

The House raised the President's 10% figure to 15%, but did not tie the future benefits and taxes to living costs. April checks will reflect the new benefits retroactive to January 1, 1970.

The President's proposals to take the program out of politics by linking Social Security benefits and taxes to the cost of living demonstrates the Nixon approach of trying to do what is right instead of what is political. I supported the President's original proposal but voted in favor of the legislation as finally amended.

People living on fixed incomes, such as those on Social Security, are experiencing extreme hardships making their dollars stretch to cover the costs of mounting inflation. The raise in benefits was a necessity. Here again, however, Congress put off a study of broader reforms in the Social Security system until the second session of the 91st Congress. Hopefully, in 1970 it will act on the other recommendations President Nixon made, and I supported, in 1969. Among them are an increase in the amount beneficiaries can earn annually without reduction in benefits, an increase in the contribution base from \$7,800 to \$9,000 in order to keep the system sound, and liberalization of the benefits to widows, disabled children and aged parents of retired or disabled workers.

Other continuing programs have also been improved by recommendations of the Nixon Administration. These include the food stamp program, extension of rent supplements and urban renewal, new safety standards for mines, and incentive payments to lenders to encourage college student loans. All these improved programs passed the House with my support.

Although this legislation is significant, the Congress did not begin to consider the other far-reaching reforms of domestic programs recommended by the Nixon Administration. The President's welfare reform proposal, which the Congress failed to take up during the first session, entails a total overhaul of the nation's archaic and inefficient welfare system. Called the Family Assistance Act of 1969, the plan would place a floor under the income of all Americans, provided they are willing to work. The bill would set \$1,600 as the minimum income for a family of four and provide the incentive for welfare recipients to earn their way off the relief rolls. I am a cosponsor of this Administration bill.

Another significant reform innovation offered by the Nixon Administration is federal-state revenue sharing. I cosponsored the bill which would make available approximately \$500 million to state and local governments during the first half of 1971 to be spent on whatever needs local and state governments deem most pressing. This amount would increase over the next five years to 1% of the nation's total taxable personal income, providing an estimated \$5 billion in federal revenue to be shared with local governments. The one percent would provide a total that would rise with the expansion of personal income.

The money would be distributed to the states on the basis of population and their local tax effort, compared with other states. State governments would retain one half of the amount. The rest would be distributed to the local units of government on the basis of local tax dollars collected by each governmental unit compared with the total local

taxes collected by all local governmental units in that state. The local tax effort provision for distributing the money is intended as an incentive to state and local governments to increase tax revenue and deal with governmental problems locally rather than sending them all to Washington for solution.

This legislation, on which the Democrat-controlled Congress has yet to hold hearings, offers a clear-cut alternative to the continuing concentration of enormous powers in the nation's capital. Past tax demands of the federal government on all taxpayers have made it almost impossible for the states and local governments to raise the revenue for services they must provide. But recent history also proves the federal government does an ineffective and wasteful job spending the money, administering programs and solving problems.

A federal revenue sharing program will allow the federal government to do what it does most efficiently and economically—raise money—but lets the states and local governments do what they do better—administer the money and programs efficiently and economically. Thus, both money and political power will be returned to the local level where they belong to solve actual problems the way people want them solved locally rather than the way Washington says they should be solved based on what it thinks the problems are.

Electoral college reform was studied by the House during the last session, and a bill authorizing direct popular election of the President was passed. So far the Senate has held hearings on the bill, but has not acted on it.

Election of the President by popular national vote would be an improvement over the present system of electors selected by each state on a state-wide, winner-take-all basis. Under the present system a bare majority of voters in the eleven largest states can select a President regardless of his national popular support. The direct national popular election system redresses some of that imbalance.

Although I finally voted for the "national" popular vote system, I preferred the "district" popular vote which would have authorized the election of one elector for President and Vice President from each Congressional district and two electors at large from each state. This would spread political power more evenly geographically while retaining the principle of majority rule. The state proportional plan had some of the same advantages, but received little attention in the House.

The House passed the Water Quality Improvement Act, endorsed by the President, during the last session. I supported this bill which would tighten federal regulation of oil drilling, require well and vessel operators to pay the cost of cleanup in oil leaks, and establish a \$50,000,000 fund for buying tax-exempt waste treatment bonds. The Senate passed a slightly different bill, and the measure has been referred to a joint Senate-House conference committee.

I have been aggressively concerned for many years about the deterioration of our environment and the upsetting of our ecological balance. Last year I reintroduced for the third consecutive session of Congress a bill to give tax incentives to industry for the installation of pollution control equipment. The bill had wide bipartisan support in both House and Senate. The principle embodied in my legislation was embraced in the tax reform bill passed last year, as well as the temporary 7% investment tax credit suspension of two years ago. I am proud of this initiative which has come to legislative fulfillment.

This critical problem now has become a nationwide cause, and the Nixon Administration's bold initiatives reflect this concern. Last year the House also passed legislation, of which I was a cosponsor, creating the

Council on Environmental Quality to advise the President on such matters. This year the Congress will demonstrate whether it is primarily concerned about narrow partisanship or the future welfare of the nation as President Nixon presents for approval his program for environmental improvement.

Legislation which would extend unemployment insurance coverage to 4.5 million of the 16.6 million workers currently not covered was passed by the House last year. President Nixon had requested coverage of 4.8 billion uncovered workers. The Senate has yet to act on the House-passed bill, which I supported.

The Administration sent many crime bills to the Congress last year. Among them are authorization of extended wire-tapping authority to fight organized crime, a bill making payoff of local police by gamblers a federal crime, and a measure to tighten federal laws against the mailing of obscene material. A bill to revise criminal laws and procedures in the District of Columbia was passed by the Senate, but has yet to be acted upon by the House.

Until Congress is prepared to speed up its consideration of legislation designed to curb crime here in Washington where Congress works, it can hardly hope to control the continuing spiral of that crime rate elsewhere in the nation.

The recent crisis resulting from the critical overloading of the capacity of many metropolitan airports, has focused attention on the problems confronted by the growing aviation industry. The House passed the Administration plan to raise \$10 billion over the next 10 years to partially finance a program of airport and airways improvement. The Senate has held hearings on the bill and reported it, but no final action has been taken in that body.

Although foreign policy is the responsibility of the President, his handling of this vital area warrants some comment. I was pleased to see President Nixon take positive steps to reverse the trend in Vietnam by his Vietnamization policy and the withdrawal of American troops. The mounting death toll with no dramatic achievements to show for it made the American people war-weary. The orderly replacement of American troops by Vietnamese forces will remove the burden of the war from the United States while preserving the right of the South Vietnamese to determine their own future.

The President has also achieved an encouraging breakthrough by arranging the strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union.

But, perhaps the most productive endeavor the Nixon Administration has engaged in has been its gallant fight against the inflation which has threatened the stability of our economy. This unhealthy wage and price spiral is the result of the prodigal fiscal policies of the past two Democratic Administrations. In the long run, an Administration victory in its anti-inflationary struggle could be the most far-reaching of President Nixon's many departures from time-worn and irresponsible policies of the past.

I have supported the Nixon Administration in its belt-tightening reductions in military and other expenditures. I voted against foreign aid appropriations for fiscal year 1970 because I do not approve direct grants to other nations during a time when our own national needs are so critical.

In the area of appropriations the House has been irresponsibly lackadaisical. The Democratic leadership has been unable or unwilling to bring the appropriations bills to a vote in an orderly fashion so that the funds may be spent most efficiently and effectively. As a result of this failure to perform its normal housekeeping chores the Congress has only increased administrative expenditures in

the executive branch by upsetting routine and creating extra work.

The one issue on which I have differed notably with the President has been the HEW-Labor appropriations veto. Although Congress appropriated for education more than the President requested, the funds which the Administration wanted to cut were vital to insuring education quality for the children of federal employees at government installations in the Congressional District I represent. These "impacted schools" near Wright-Patterson Air Force Base would qualify for funds under the plan President Nixon has indicated he would support for fiscal year 1971.

My appointment during the last session to the Joint Economic Committee (made up of Members of the House and Senate) has increased my committee assignments considerably. I also serve on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the House Government Operations Committee, and as one of three Republicans who review all private claims and special immigration legislation. While it is unusual for a Member of Congress to be given four such prestigious assignments, it is highly flattering. Service on these committees provides perhaps the biggest source of self-satisfaction to me as a Congressman, because it is in the committees and subcommittees where the real work of the Congress is done.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported 23 bills to the House last year with the recommendation that they be passed. Nine have become public law. The committee and its subcommittees held 41 hearings during the session, covering 182 bills.

Among the nine bills reported by the committee which became law was a measure amending the Communications Satellite Act of 1962. The bill changed provisions governing the makeup of the Comsat board of directors, and broadened the board's authority to enact bylaws. The legislation was handled by the Communications and Power subcommittee on which I sit.

The committee also reported the Child Protection Act of 1969, which amends the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other products for children which present electrical, mechanical or thermal hazards.

A measure extending for three years the matching grant programs for the construction of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting facilities was reported by the committee and became public law. The bill also authorized appropriations for the program and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Our committee did not wait for the recent public awakening about pollution to consider legislation in this vital area. It reported a bill to extend the research and development authority in the area of fuel combustion contained in the Clean Air Act.

Legislation in the area of mental health and drug addiction was considered by the committee. It reported a bill authorizing a 3-year extension of the existing programs of matching grants for construction and initial staffing of community health centers and specialized community services for alcoholism and narcotics addiction.

The Committee on Government Operations reported eight bills during the past session, of which five were enacted into law. The committee also submitted 19 investigative reports to the House, including four on the environment issue which has so recently galvanized many citizens' groups into action.

In my judgment the most significant piece of legislation referred to this committee—and perhaps one of the most significant pieces of legislation with which we will deal in the 91st Congress—is the Intergovern-

mental Cooperation Act. This bill, which has been extensively studied by the Intergovernmental Relations subcommittee on which I serve, is still under consideration by the subcommittee.

The objectives of the bill are to improve the financial management of federal assistance programs, to remove obstacles to the consolidation of such programs and to facilitate the processing of grant applications which draw upon more than one federal assistance program. The bill would amend the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968.

Two other significant bills referred to the Government Operations Committee are based on provisions of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act. The Grant Consolidation Act, requested by the Nixon Administration, would authorize the consolidation of Federal assistance programs. This would help eliminate some of the program duplication which has created considerable confusion on the local level. The Intergovernmental Relations subcommittee held hearings on the bill, but it has not been reported to the full committee.

The Joint Funding Simplification Act is also based on a provision of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, incorporating the concept of coordinated Federal assistance. The bill would authorize single-agency administration of Federal assistance projects involving more than one Federal agency. This would enable local governments and other recipients of Federal assistance to adapt such aid more effectively to specific local needs through wider use of projects drawing on more than one Federal agency. The bill passed the House on Dec. 1, but has yet to be acted on by the Senate.

I have been the principal sponsor of two other pieces of legislation designed to improve the administration of social programs. Both have been referred to the Executive and Legislative Reorganization subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee.

One, the Program Information Act, would create a catalog of Federal assistance programs to provide a sourcebook for state and local government officials seeking Federal aid.

The other, a bill to create a Department of Health, would transfer as many existing health programs as possible to a new executive department administered by a secretary solely responsible for the health needs of the nation. I think it is intolerable to continue all of the many vital social programs enacted in the last two decades under one bureaucratic roof, at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

These bills are of the utmost importance. Our enthusiasm has led us to pass so many specialized social programs that successfully making use of them has been very difficult for local communities, particularly smaller communities which don't have the funds or the personnel required to deal effectively with Federal agencies administering the programs.

If we are to achieve the objectives of our social programs, we must turn our attention to the effective administration of such programs. For too long the watchword has been administrative paralysis rather than performance.

Following is my voting record for the 1st session of the 91st Congress. The description of the bills and the amendments or motions in the report are for the purpose of identification only. No attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. The descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bills, which do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. However, upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill and the reasons for my vote:

		Yes—For	No—Against	NV—Not voting	NVA—Not voting, paired against			NVF—Not voting, paired for		
Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result			Vote	Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result		Vote
2	Jan. 3	To elect the Speaker. (McCormack 241; G. Ford 187; "Present" 2)			FORD	69	May 27	H.R. 11582: On passage: to appropriate fiscal 1970 funds to the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and Independent Agencies. (Passed 326 to 6)		YES
3	Jan. 3	H. Res. 1: Previous question: to permit Mr. Powell to take the oath of office. (Failed 176 to 248)			NO	72	June 2	H.R. 753: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to provide for a study of State laws and regulations governing the operation of youth camps. (Failed 151 to 152)		NO
4	Jan. 3	H. Res. 1: Second attempt to order the previous question. (Failed 172 to 252)			NO	73	June 2	H.R. 693: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to provide VA hospital care for veterans 72 or older without their having to declare inability to pay, and for other purposes. (Passed 302 to 3)		YES
5	Jan. 3	H. Res. 1: MacGregor amendment to establish a special committee to investigate Mr. Powell's right to take the oath and to his seat. (Failed 131 to 291)			NO	76	June 4	H.R. 11102: On passage: to amend the Public Health Service Act relating to construction and modernization of hospitals and other facilities. (Passed 351 to 0; "Present" 1)		NV
6	Jan. 3	H. Res. 2: Previous question: that Mr. Powell take the oath, be fined \$25,000 and that his seniority begin as of the 91st Congress. (Passed 249 to 171)			YES	78	June 10	H.R. 11271: On passage: to authorize appropriations for N.A.S.A. for research and development, construction of facilities, research and program management, and other purposes. (Passed 330 to 52)		NV
7	Jan. 3	H. Res. 2: On passage: that Mr. Powell take the oath, be fined \$25,000 and that his seniority begin as of the 91st Congress. (Passed 254 to 158; "Present" 6)			YES	80	June 11	H.R. 1035: On passage: to prohibit encampments, sit-ins, or overnight use of parks or other public property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. (Passed 327 to 51)		YES
9	Jan. 6	Counting electoral votes. Objection to N.C. vote for George Wallace and Curtis LeMay in that they did not win a plurality in that state. (Failed 170 to 228)			NO	85	June 18	H.R. 6543: Recombittal motion: to extend public health protection regarding cigarette smoking. (Failed 138 to 252; "Present" 3)		NO
14	Feb. 5	H. Con. Res. 124: To adjourn until February 17, 1969. (Passed 240 to 125)			NO	87	June 24	H.R. 12167: On passage: to authorize fiscal 1970 appropriations for Atomic Energy Commission. (Passed 406 to 3)		YES
16	Feb. 18	H. Res. 89: Previous question: to change name of Committee on Un-American Activities to Committee on Internal Security. (Passed 262 to 123)			YES	89	June 24	H.R. 12307: On passage: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations for independent offices and for H.U.D. (Passed 388 to 6)		YES
17	Feb. 18	H. Res. 89: On passage: to change name of Committee on Un-American Activities to Committee on Internal Security. (Passed 307 to 80)			YES	91	June 25	H. Res. 357: On passage: to provide an additional clerk for all Members. (Passed 204 to 195)		NO
20	Mar. 12	H. R. 33: Recombittal motion: to increase U.S. participation in the International Development Association. (Failed 155 to 241)			YES	93	June 25	H.R. 7906: On passage: to foster and regulate interstate commerce by providing system for taxation thereof. (Passed 311 to 87)		YES
21	Mar. 12	H.R. 33: On passage: to increase U.S. participation in the International Development Association. (Passed 247 to 150)			YES	95	June 27	H.R. 8644: Adoption of conference report to make permanent temporary suspension of duty on chicory roots, and to relax limitations on aid to families with dependent children. (Passed 269 to 65)		YES
23	Mar. 18	S. 1058: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to extend authority of the President to submit reorganization plans. (Passed 335 to 44)			YES	97	June 30	H.R. 12290: On passage: to continue the surtax and excise taxes on automobiles and communication services temporarily; to terminate investment credit; to provide low-income allowances. (Passed 210 to 205; "Present" 2)		YES
25	Mar. 18	H.R. 2171: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to establish a Commission on National Observances and Holidays. (Failed 164 to 213)			NO	99	July 8	H.R. 11249: Recombittal motion: to amend John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize additional funds. (Failed 162 to 217)		NO
27	Mar. 19	H.R. 8508: On passage: to increase the public debt limit. (Passed 313 to 93)			YES	100	July 8	H.R. 11249: On passage: to amend John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize additional funds. (Passed 210 to 163)		YES
31	Mar. 27	H. R. 7757: On passage: to authorize fiscal 1969 supplemental military appropriations for aircraft procurement and modification. (Passed 341 to 21)			YES	102	July 9	H.R. 11400: Adoption of conference report to make supplemental fiscal 1969 appropriations. (Passed 348 to 49)		YES
33	Apr. 1	H. Res. 270: Recombittal motion: to authorize expenditure of certain funds by the Committee on Internal Security. (Failed 74 to 283)			NO	103	July 10	H.R. 11702: On passage: to extend and improve provisions relating to medical libraries and related instrumentalities assistance in the Public Health Service Act. (Passed 370 to 3)		YES
34	Apr. 1	H. Res. 270: On passage: to authorize expenditure of certain funds by the Committee on Internal Security. (Passed 305 to 51)			YES	104	July 10	H.R. 4284: On passage: to authorize appropriations for the Standard Reference Data Act. (Passed 365 to 2)		YES
37	Apr. 16	H. R. 4148: On passage: to amend Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. (Passed 392 to 1)			YES	106	July 15	H.R. 4018: On passage: to renew and extend certain sections of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. (Passed 273 to 103)		YES
46	Apr. 23	H. R. 514: Green substitute amendment, as amended: to extend the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act for two years, to consolidate Titles II and III of ESEA and III(a) and IV(a) of NDEA. (Passed 235 to 184)			YES	109	July 17	H.R. 7491: Recombittal motion: to clarify tax liability of national banks. (Failed 123 to 227; "Present" 7)		NV
47	Apr. 23	H. R. 514: On passage: to extend programs of elementary and secondary education assistance, and for other purposes. (Passed 400 to 17; "Present" 1)			YES	110	July 17	H.R. 7491: On passage: to clarify tax liability of national banks. (Passed 345 to 4; "Present" 7)		NV
51	Apr. 29	H. R. 4153: On passage: to authorize fiscal 1970 appropriations for Coast Guard vessels, aircraft, and construction of shore and off-shore establishments. (Passed 384 to 2)			YES	112	July 21	H.R. 11609: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to amend act of Sept. 9, 1963, authorizing entrance road to Great Smoky Mountains National Park. (Passed 341 to 3)		YES
53	May 1	H. Res. 17: On passage: creating a select committee to investigate all aspects of crime in the U.S. (Passed 345 to 18)			YES	113	July 21	H.R. 11651: Motion to suspend rules and pass: to amend National School Lunch Act to provide free and reduced-priced meals to needy children not being reached. (Passed 352 to 5)		YES
55	May 6	H. R. 5554: On passage: to extend indefinitely the special milk program of the Child Nutrition Act. (Passed 384 to 2)			YES	115	July 22	H.R. 12781: On passage: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations for Department of Interior and related agencies, as amended. (Passed 399 to 6)		YES
58	May 21	H. Res. 414: On passage: waiving all points of order against H.R. 11400 to make supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1969, and other purposes. (Passed 326 to 53)			YES	119	July 23	H.R. 9825: Derivinski recommitment motion with instructions: to eliminate provision that benefits be calculated on basis of high-three-year average salary and that provision liberalizing benefits for Congressional employees. (Failed 129 to 281; "Present" 1)		YES
59	May 21	H. R. 11400: Scherle amendment: to prohibit the use of funds in the bill for subsidizing interest on college construction loans to any institution not complying with the law which directs institutions to deny federal aid to students found guilty of participating in campus disorders. (Passed 329 to 61; "Present" 2)			YES	120	July 23	H.R. 9825: On passage: to strengthen the financing of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund and liberalize some of its benefits. (Passed 359 to 48)		YES
60	May 21	H. R. 11400: On passage: fiscal 1969 supplemental appropriations. (Passed 349 to 40)			YES	122	July 24	H.R. 12964: On passage: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations to Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies, as amended to provide additional funds for E.E.O.C. (Passed 366 to 31)		YES
64	May 27	H.R. 11612: Conte amendment: to prohibit crop support payments in excess of \$20,000 per annum to any producer, except for a sugar producer. (Passed 225 to 142)			YES	124	July 28	H.R. 9553: On passage: to amend D.C. Minimum Wage Act to authorize computation of overtime for hospital employees on a 14-day work period. (Passed 220 to 141)		YES
65	May 27	H.R. 11612: On passage: to make fiscal 1970 appropriations to the Department of Agriculture and related agencies. (Passed 322 to 50)			YES	125	July 28	H.R. 255: Recombittal motion: to authorize banks and other regulated lenders in D.C. to charge or deduct interest in advance on installment loans. (Passed 356 to 14; "Present" 2)		YES
66	May 27	H. Res. 424: On passage: to waive all points of order against section 502 (suspending the employment ceiling specified in P.L. 90-364) of H.R. 11582 making fiscal 1970 appropriations to the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and Independent Agencies. (Passed 345 to 12)			YES	126	July 28	H.R. 2: On passage: to amend Federal Credit Union Act to provide for independent agency to supervise federally chartered credit unions. (Passed 357 to 10)		YES
68	May 27	H.R. 11582: On Smith of Iowa amendment: to limit to \$20,000 the total cost, exceeding revenues to the P.O. Dept., for providing postal service to any distributor of second-class mail. (Failed 100 to 239)			NO					





NAVY LEAGUE SYMPOSIUM  
PRAISED

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia Council of the Navy League of the United States recently performed a signal service to the Nation by sponsoring an ocean-maritime symposium here to focus attention on the challenge of the world oceans for the future betterment of mankind.

President Nixon summed up the enthusiasm which all of us who are concerned about this challenge felt for this Navy League symposium in a February 10, 1970, letter to the president of the council, Mr. W. L. Flinn. The text of the President's letter is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, February 10, 1970.

Mr. W. L. FLINN

President, District of Columbia Council,  
Navy League of the United States,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLINN: The economic prosperity and security of our nation and the well-being of our people rest heavily on the future use we make of the world's oceans.

Recognizing this, my Administration is seeking to provide new incentives to assure our success as a great maritime nation, and to gain from the ocean a greater harvest of minerals and food for the benefit of our citizens.

The Navy League of the United States has for over half a century consistently sought to alert our citizens to the challenge of the oceans as a means of advancing our commerce and maintaining our defense posture.

Your 1970 Ocean-Maritime Symposium promises to provide fresh insights into the benefits of the oceans for all mankind. My congratulations for the initiatives you have taken in this important endeavor, and my best wishes for the success of your deliberations.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

One of the outstanding presentations at the symposium was made by our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD) who is the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Another outstanding speech was made by the new chairman of the Maritime Commission, Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, and it appears on page 5270 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1970. I am delighted to insert here the text of Mr. MAILLIARD's farsighted remarks, and commend them to my colleagues in the Congress:

REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

President Flynn, Chairman Slonim, and fellow panelists:

I regret that I will be unable to join you until later today because of the schedule of the House Merchant Marine Committee. The Committee presently is holding public hearings on H.R. 15424, the President's legislative recommendations for a new maritime program. These recommendations are a significant step toward the fulfillment of the goals established by President Nixon at Seattle, Washington, in September 1968. As you recall, the President stated that we must increase the volume of U.S. trade carried aboard American ships from the present rate

of 5.6% to over 30% by the mid-seventies. We all know that this is a tall order indeed, and that in order to achieve it, significant changes must take place within the American maritime industry and within the American business community as a whole.

We are meeting here this morning to discuss the steps which must be taken to achieve a significant increase in our merchant marine and the carriage of goods in American ships and to place the achievement of these goals in perspective from the standpoint of the economic and political well-being of the nation.

The President's Message to Congress on the merchant marine of October 1969 spoke in terms of a challenge and an opportunity. The challenge is great and must not be glossed over. In order for this program to realize the 300 ships contemplated, the shipbuilding industry must face the realities of inflation and must apply every bit of ingenuity it can muster to achieve economies in those areas of production which it can control. The ship operators must face a challenge and must accept the fact that we cannot build custom-designed ships economically. Where a standard design will do the job, a standard design will have to be agreed to with a bare minimum of change to meet the particular needs of the trade. The bickering between shipbuilders and shipowners over who is responsible for a particular change in design and who should bear the cost will have to be minimized. Unless all parties are willing to assume their fair share of the challenge, this program will not succeed.

The Maritime Administration under the leadership of Andrew Gibson has come forward with a number of innovations for the administration of our shipbuilding program. Not all of them are new, but for the first time in a long time, changes which have been talked about but never acted upon are being given a chance to work. The testimony which the Merchant Marine Committee has received so far from the maritime industry indicates that much of the legislative package has been accepted, and that the shipbuilding industry and the operators are willing to give the new system a chance. There is, however, an unfortunate tendency—perhaps even a compulsion—to use these hearings as an opportunity to rehash every shortcoming, whether real or imagined, of the past 35-odd years' experience with the Merchant Marine Act. As with any new ship, we are going to go through a shaking-down period, once this legislation is enacted. Not all past failings of the Maritime Administration or the maritime industry will be cured overnight. In the final analysis, the success of this program does not rest upon legislative language but upon the hard work and dedication of the people who will be working with it.

We all know that H.R. 15424 will not increase the carriage of U.S. trade in American ships to the 30+% level. What it will do, however, is change the climate within the maritime industry from one of general lassitude and indifference to one of eagerness to grasp the opportunities which are now available. I believe we are embarking upon a new course for our merchant marine—a course whose ultimate destination may not be clearly foreseen at this time, but one which we should proceed upon with a sense of enthusiasm and optimism rather than the cynicism of the past.

If the shipbuilding industry and the ship operators meet this challenge, as I know they can, a chain reaction will take place. In basic economic courses, the concept of the multiplier effect is taught to illustrate the impact of a given amount of credit within the economy. A variety of forces are at work today in addition to the President's legislative initiatives which, coupled with that program, will produce this multiplier effect upon our merchant marine. The potential oil ship-

ments from the Alaskan North Slope, regardless of the ultimate success of the Northwest Passage, will require a significant expansion of our tanker fleet. The demands upon our shipyards to meet that expansion will pose a considerable challenge in itself.

Of the 300 ships contemplated in our maritime program, a number of dry bulk carriers will be constructed. These, in all honesty, probably will not be sufficient to carry enough of our bulk requirements to meet that 30% goal, and it is, of course, in the dry and liquid bulk area where our carriage is now negligible as contrasted with the liner segment of our trade, but we will be doing something whereas heretofore we were doing nothing. The construction and operation of modern bulk carriers will enable American-flag operators to develop expertise in this highly specialized field. Their success will undoubtedly stimulate others to follow. The construction of bulk carriers, coupled with the tanker construction for the Alaskan trade, may indeed give us the capacity to reach that 30% goal. So far as the liner portion of our trade is concerned, I have no doubt that the American-flag operators who have made such great technological strides in the last five years will continue to increase their share in these high-value trades.

The challenge and the opportunity are there. The economic benefits of increased American-flag carriage are all too obvious. In terms of our balance of payments alone, the American-flag merchant marine now makes a tremendous contribution estimated at over \$700 million a year by one research organization—Hareldge House. That, of course, is based upon our present level of activity. It is not difficult to imagine this figure exceeding a billion dollars a year during this decade.

The economic benefits of this expanded merchant marine, in terms of our balance-of-payments and in terms of a reliable transportation system for this nation, rests ultimately on the actual carriage of cargo by American ships. There is, unfortunately, a general lack of awareness on the part of Americans of the desirability for a strong American-flag fleet. Too many exporters and importers fail to appreciate the fact that their individual business judgments, when combined determine the fate of our merchant marine. This lack of awareness is natural but must be overcome. Here the government plays a significant role, the ship operators must pursue an aggressive program of attracting customers, and organizations such as the Navy League must carry the Ship-American message to the country. That message will fall on deaf ears if our shippers cannot be given reasonable assurance of stability within the maritime industry. The opportunity of the 70's for the maritime industry will depend in great measure upon achieving a high degree of stability.

I recently received a letter from a constituent in my District, a substantial exporter from the west coast, who stated that he would never again ship on an American-flag vessel as a result of his recent experience with a west coast strike. I responded to his letter, attempting to assure him that this type of situation will be the exception rather than the rule in the future. It isn't easy to answer that kind of a letter, and if we are to have a merchant marine of any significance whatsoever, the circumstances which give rise to communications such as this must be a thing of the past.

An expanded American merchant marine will yield tremendous economic benefit to this country, while at the same time contributing substantially to the political security of the nation.

The Merchant Marine Committee will conclude its hearings on the President's maritime proposals sometime in March, and after a period of evaluation the Committee will

report out the legislation. There undoubtedly may be some amendments, as I am sure the Maritime Administration has now had more time to reflect on its proposals and can see where they may be strengthened or clarified in a number of respects. I do not anticipate, however, that there will be any radical revision of the bill.

Today draft legislation was forwarded to Congress to authorize appropriations for the shipbuilding, ship operation and research activities of the Maritime Administration. This bill calls for \$199.5 million for ship construction in fiscal year 1971. This is nearly double the level of funding for fiscal 1970 and substantially greater than the appropriation level for any recent year. At this time, when every aspect of the budget is receiving close scrutiny in order to achieve the maximum degree of economy, this commitment of funds to the shipbuilding program is clear and convincing evidence that the federal government is now willing to carry out its part of this challenge.

From the standpoint of the national interest, we see the opportunity. The industry must now place its commitment on the line, and together we must convince the American people that this commitment is justified, and that this program deserves the high priority which the government has given it. Only by our action in the years to come will we achieve this.

#### THE MOYNIHAN MEMORANDUM

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, after reading the text of the memorandum to President Nixon from Dr. Daniel P. Moynihan, Counselor to the President, printed in the March 1, New York Times, I was moved to write Attorney General John N. Mitchell concerning Dr. Moynihan's assessment of the Nixon administration's progress in combating crime.

I agree with Dr. Moynihan's candid analysis that although the Nixon administration "came to office committed to doing something about crime in the streets," in the year that the administration has been in office it has not advanced either its "understanding of the problem or that of the public at large."

Dr. Moynihan is equally frank in judging the administration's progress in civil rights, stating that while the administration has spent as much or more time and energy on the black population than any other administration, "little has come of it" due to the ineptness of some of the departments. While I concur in his observation that the 1960's saw the great economic breakthrough for the American Negro, I take exception to his conclusion that the ultimate loser in the administration's inept approach to problems confronting the black population is the administration itself. The real loser is the American Negro, and the ultimate loser is the Nation. I also have serious and deep reservations about Dr. Moynihan's suggestion that the "race issue" can benefit from a period of benign neglect. This is hardly a time for the administration to approach the race issue with an indifferent attitude. What the problem needs and the Nation de-

mands is determination, leadership, and resolve, and resolve to implement the necessary solutions.

In my letter to Attorney General Mitchell I stated my firm belief that the problem of crime in the streets is one of the problems which most deeply concerns the people of this country today and asked that he, as the chief law officer of the United States, expand the crime control and law-enforcement activities of the United States to the degree required for the control which our people demand.

The text of Dr. Moynihan's memorandum as it appeared in the New York Times, and my letter to Attorney General Mitchell follow:

[From the New York Times, March 1, 1970]

#### TEXT OF THE MOYNIHAN MEMORANDUM ON THE STATUS OF NEGROES

As the new year begins, it occurs to me that you might find useful a general assessment of the position of Negroes at the end of the first year of your Administration, and of the decade in which their position has been the central domestic political issue.

In quantitative terms, which are reliable, the American Negro is making extraordinary progress. In political terms, somewhat less reliable, this would also appear to be true. In each case, however, there would seem to be countercurrents that pose a serious threat to the welfare of the blacks and the stability of the society, white and black.

##### 1. EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME

The nineteen-sixties saw the great breakthrough for blacks. A third (32 per cent) of all families of Negro and other races earned \$8,000 or more in 1968 compared, in constant dollars, with 15 per cent in 1960.

The South is still a problem. Slightly more than half (52 per cent) of the Negro population lived in the South in 1969. There, only 19 per cent of families of Negro and other races earned over \$8,000.

Young Negro families are achieving parity with young white families. Outside the South, young husband-wife Negro families have 99 per cent of the income of whites! For families headed by a male age 25 to 34, the proportion was 87 per cent. Thus, it may be this ancient gap is finally closing.

Income reflects employment, and this changed dramatically in the nineteen-sixties. Blacks continued to have twice the unemployment rates of whites, but these were down for both groups. In 1969, the rate of married men of Negro and other races was only 2.5 per cent. Teen-agers, on the other hand, continued their appalling rates: 24.4 per cent in 1969.

Black occupations improved dramatically. The number of professional and technical employees doubled in the period 1960-68. This was two and a half times the increase for whites. In 1969, Negro and other races provided 10 per cent of the other-than-college teachers. This is roughly their proportion of the population (11 per cent).

##### 2. EDUCATION

In 1968, 19 per cent of Negro children 3 and 4 years old were enrolled in school, compared to 15 per cent of white children. Forty-five per cent of Negroes 18 and 19 years old were in school, almost the equal of the white proportion of 51 per cent. Negro college enrollment rose 85 per cent between 1964 and 1968, by which time there were 434,000 Negro college students. (The total full-time university population of Great Britain is 200,000.)

Educational achievement should not be exaggerated. Only 16 per cent of Negro high school seniors have verbal test scores at or above grade level. But blacks are staying in school.

##### 3. FEMALE-HEADED FAMILIES

This problem does not get better, it gets worse. In 1969, the proportion of husband-wife families of Negro and other races declined once again, this time to 68.7 per cent. The illegitimacy ratio rose once again, this time to 29.4 per cent of all live births. (The white ratio rose more sharply, but was still only 4.9 per cent.)

Increasingly, the problem of Negro poverty is the problem of the female-headed family. In 1968, 56 per cent of Negro families with income under \$3,000 were female-headed. In 1968, for the first time, the number of poor Negro children in female-headed families (2,241,000) was greater than the number in male-headed families (1,947,000).

##### 4. SOCIAL PATHOLOGY

The incidence of anti-social behavior among young black males continues to be extraordinarily high. Apart from white racial attitudes, this is the biggest problem black Americans face, and in part it helps shape white racial attitudes. Black Americans injure one another. Because blacks live in de facto segregated neighborhoods and go to de facto segregated schools, the socially stable elements of the black population cannot escape the socially pathological ones. Routinely, their children get caught up in the antisocial patterns of the others.

You are familiar with the problem of crime. Let me draw your attention to another phenomenon, exactly parallel, and originating exactly the same social circumstances: Fire. Unless I mistake the trends, we are heading for a genuinely serious fire problem in American cities. In New York, for example, between 1956 and 1969 the over-all fire alarm rate more than tripled, from 69,000 alarms to 240,000. These alarms are concentrated in slum neighborhoods, primarily black. In 1968, one slum area had an alarm rate per square mile 13 times that of the city as a whole. In another, the number of alarms has, on an average, increased 44 per cent per year for seven years.

Many of these fires are the result of population density. But a great many are more or less deliberately set. (Thus, on Monday, welfare protestors set two fires in the New York State Capitol.) Fires are in fact a "leading indicator" of social pathology for a neighborhood. They come first. Crime, and the rest, follows. The psychiatric interpretation of fire-setting is complex, but it relates to the types of personalities which slums produce. (A point of possible interest: Fires in the black slums peak in July and August. The urban riots of 1964-1968 could be thought of as epidemic conditions of an endemic situation.)

##### 5. SOCIAL ALIENATION

With no real evidence, I would nonetheless suggest that a great deal of the crime, the fire-setting, the rampant school violence and other such phenomenon in the black community have become quasi-politicized. Hatred—revenge—against whites is now an acceptable excuse for doing what might have been done anyway. This is bad news for any society, especially when it takes forms which the Black Panthers seem to have adopted.

This social alienation among the black lower classes is matched and probably enhanced, by a virulent form of anti-white feeling among portions of the large and prosperous black middle class. It would be difficult to overestimate the degree to which young, well-educated blacks detest white America.

##### 6. THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION

As you have candidly acknowledged, the relation of the Administration to the black population is a problem. I think it ought also to be acknowledged that we are a long way from solving it. During the past year,

intense efforts have been made by the Administration to develop programs that will be of help to the blacks. I dare say, as much or more time and attention goes into this effort in this Administration than any in history. But little has come of it. There has been a great deal of political ineptness in some departments, and you have been the loser.

I don't know what you can do about this. Perhaps nothing. But I do have four suggestions.

First. Sometime early in the year, I would gather together the Administration officials who are most involved with these matters and talk out the subject a bit. There really is a need for a more coherent Administration approach to a number of issues. (Which I can list for you, if you like.)

Second. The time may have come when the issue of race could benefit from a period of "benign neglect." The subject has been too much talked about. The forum has been too much taken over to hysterics, paranoids and boodlers on all sides. We may need a period in which Negro progress continues and racial rhetoric fades. The Administration can help bring this about by paying close attention to such progress—as we are doing—while seeking to avoid situations in which extremists of either race are given opportunities for martyrdom, heroics, histrionics or whatever. Greater attention to Indians, Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans would be useful. A tendency to ignore provocations from groups such as the Black Panthers might also be useful. (The Panthers were apparently almost defunct until the Chicago police raided one of their headquarters and transformed them into culture heroes for the white—and black—middle class. You perhaps did not note on the society page of yesterday's Times that Mrs. Leonard Bernstein gave a cocktail party on Wednesday to raise money for the Panthers. Mrs. W. Vincent Astor was among the guests. Mrs. Peter Duchin, "the rich blonde wife of the orchestra leader," was thrilled. "I've never met a Panther," she said. This is a first for me.)

Third. We really ought to be getting on with research on crime. We just don't know enough. It is a year now since the Administration came to office committed to doing something about crime in the streets. But frankly, in that year I don't see that we have advanced either our understanding of the problem, or that of the public at large. (This of course may only reveal my ignorance of what is going on.)

At the risk of indiscretion, may I put it that lawyers are not professionally well-equipped to do much to prevent crime. Lawyers are not managers, and they are not researchers. The logistics, the ecology, the strategy and tactics of reducing the incidence of certain types of behavior in large urban populations simply are not things lawyers think about often.

We are never going to "learn" about crime in a laboratory sense. But we almost certainly could profit from limited, carefully done studies. I don't think these will be done unless you express a personal interest.

Fourth. There is a silent black majority as well as a white one. It is mostly working class, as against lower middle class. It is politically moderate (on issues other than racial equality) and shares most of the concerns of its white counterpart. This group has been generally ignored by the Government and the media. The more recognition we can give to it, the better off we shall all be. (I would take it, for example that Ambassador [Jerome H.] Holland is a natural leader of this segment of the black community. There are others like him.)

HON. JOHN N. MITCHELL,  
Attorney General,  
Department of Justice,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have read with great interest and partial agreement the memorandum on various subjects which Counsellor to the President Daniel P. Moynihan sent recently to President Nixon.

I was particularly impressed with his reference to "crime in the streets" and his dubious appraisal of the record of the present Administration in this area, because in my judgment this is one of the problems which most deeply concerns the people of this country at the present time.

Dr. Moynihan stated that "the Administration came to office committed to doing something about crime in the streets," but added that "I don't see that we have advanced either our understanding of the problem or that of the public at large."

He concluded by earnestly bespeaking the personal interest of President Nixon.

There is no need to repeat here the deeds of violence from New York to California which chill the hearts of the American people. It is clear that words cannot substitute for action in this critical situation and I am pleased to see that a high Counsellor of the Administration has placed this matter at a top level of priority.

Certainly this problem requires the personal attention of the President and I hope that attention will be forthcoming. I trust also that something of Dr. Moynihan's feeling of urgency will be transmitted to the Justice Department and that you, as chief law officer of the United States, will emphasize and expand the crime control and law enforcement activities of the United States to the degree required for the control which our people demand.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,  
Member of Congress.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, LEWIS  
DESCHLER

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the birthday of one of the most able and distinguished men I have had the privilege of working with in this body. I refer, of course, to Lewis Deschler, who for 43 years has advised the Speaker and the various chairmen of the Committee of the Whole on what the rules and procedures have been in this body.

It is difficult to overemphasize what Lew Deschler has contributed to the operations of the House. In so doing, he has won the admiration and deep respect of all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He has served with distinction for all of us and for the Nation.

On more occasions than I can recall, Lew has helped me out, and I know he has been similarly helpful to my colleagues. With deep respect for his ability and his work over these many years, I wish this great citizen, Lew Deschler, a belated, but very happy birthday.

MARCH 2, 1970.

ABM: THE FAR SIDE OF MADNESS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in the continuing debate over the proposed ABM system, I feel it is essential that we present as much information and as many viewpoints as possible. Only in this way can we reach a realistic and responsible decision with regards to the future of this program.

With this in mind, I would like to extend my remarks today to include an excellent editorial which recently appeared in the fine Long Island newspaper Newsday. It is a cogent discussion of why we cannot permit this system to be initiated as part of our defense program.

The ABM is a colossal waste of money. Should we make the mistake of including it as part of our national security program, we will be doing little more than grossly increasing our fiscal burden.

This system does not enhance our defense program. Instead, it badly threatens our hopes of ever achieving world peace since it steps up our arms race with the Soviet Union.

The Newsday article will demonstrate in more detail why we cannot permit this project to be undertaken by our Defense Department:

ABM: THE FAR SIDE OF MADNESS

"In my view, the President's decision to go forward with a modified Phase II of the defensive Safeguard program will, in the long run, enhance the prospects for the success of SALT because, in the short run, it allows us to exercise greater restraint in matching a continued Soviet buildup of offensive systems with actions involving our own offensive systems . . ."

"Communist China has continued to test nuclear weapons in the megaton range and could test its first ICBM within the next year. However, the earliest estimated date that they could have an operational ICBM capability now appears to be 1973, or about one year later than last year's projection."—Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird in his annual defense report to Congress

Heaven help us, it is here again: the perennial missile madness, with its exquisitely wrought doublethink ("will, in the long run, enhance the prospects for the success of SALT because, in the short run . . ."), its methodical alternation of the Soviet and Chinese threats, its automatically updated estimates of enemy potential (" . . . about one year later than last year's projection"). Soon we will have those familiar learned debates in the political journals, bandying terms like "first strike capacity," "weapons sufficiency," "number of kills," and the rest of that second rate sports argot so dear to the ABM aficionados.

For over a decade the scenario has replayed itself with little variation—ABM decisions marked by shifting rationales, outright duplicity, swiftly obsolescent "CIA intelligence estimates," overt and covert political pressures. The result has been a self-canceling multi-billion dollar collection of heroic project names—Nike-Ajax, Nike-Hercules, Nike-X, Bomarc, Nike-Zeus, Sentinel, Safeguard—some of which inadvertently suggested the mythic aspects of the whole program and none of which, evidently, has

brought us measurably closer to the promised land of "weapons sufficiency."

From the beginning, the defense establishment and its congressional allies have lobbied fiercely for deployment of a sophisticated ABM system on the seductive premise that ultimate security from enemy attack lay just beyond the next missile silo. The apparatus of persuasion has been trundled out so often that it has begun to creak: the scare stories leaked to certain newspapers, in which "high Pentagon sources" reveal some startling new development in Soviet or Chinese strength; the closed-door testimony of Defense Dept. officials informing a congressional committee of the newest "grave new threat" to the nation's defenses; and so forth. (The Chinese threat, or "yellow peril" as it was once known, is the Pentagon's ace in the hole these days; it can loosen appropriations committee pockets almost without a question being asked.)

#### RESISTANCE COLLAPSES

Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy resisted the pressure for deployment, first of a Nike-Zeus and then of a Nike-X system. President Johnson, heeding his scientific advisers, resisted until September, 1967, when Defense Secretary McNamara reluctantly announced the administration's decision to deploy an ABM system. At the time, McNamara took pains to acknowledge the fallacies of an ABM defense, but then added that it would be "marginally useful" against the Red Chinese threat of 20 to 30 ICBMs expected to materialize by the mid-1970s.

And so Sentinel was born, a 17-site system designed to protect major U.S. cities from obliteration by Red Chinese missiles yet unborn. Unfortunately, the city fathers whose legions had thereby been spared not only failed to express any gratitude but were distinctly hostile to the notion of accommodating missile complexes of their borders. This prompted incoming President Richard Nixon to halt the Sentinel program pending a review.

It was just over a year ago that Sentinel resurfaced, with a new name and a whole new reason for being. Now it was to be a "thin" system, called Safeguard, to be deployed not near cities but near missile sites, to protect not the lives of civilian populations but the retaliatory capacity of U.S. minuteman ICBMs, not from the distant Chinese potential but from the immediate Soviet threat, which, President Nixon explained, had suddenly grown "larger than was envisaged in 1967."

So we had entered the era of missiles to protect missiles. But the special virtue of the new system, it seemed, was that Safeguard was not merely a weapon; it was a diplomatic coup. As the President put it: "The program is not provocative. The Soviet retaliatory capacity is not affected by our decision . . . In other words, our program provides an incentive for a responsible Soviet weapons policy." Thus, to the arsenal of clean hydrogen bombs was added a new instrument for harmony among the nations—the unprovocative antiballistics missile. And lest the logic of this unique claim be lost on the general public, "White House sources" offered this illumination through the obliging medium of the New York Times:

"It was not, they insisted, cause for concern to the Russian leaders because, by not protecting the cities, it would do nothing to diminish Soviet capability of a counterattack on the cities; and because it would not diminish this capability, there was no reason for the Soviet Union to embark on new efforts to improve their retaliatory capacity."

#### THE NEWEST PLOY

There, in a single paragraph, was a fair paraphrase of all the shamming, misleading rationales foisted on a credulous and excitable public over the long course of the ABM's existence. If this intelligence could

be accepted at face value, it appeared that now we were to be handed over to the Russians as a burnt offering to gain their indulgence for our desire to protect our missile sites. But in truth, it looked like nothing more than a ploy, a vast wink from our side signalling the other side that we were merely reinvesting the growth stock of our Pentagon portfolio—nothing, really, to be alarmed about, fellows.

And like so many other Pentagon ploys, it was serviceable for only a year. Two weeks ago, the President unveiled the new, expanded, dual purpose 1970 Safeguard system, a versatile number that will not only afford protection to both civilian population and missile sites but will deter both the Soviet and Chinese threats. As Defense Secretary Laird urgently explained to Congress: "In view of the continued growth of the Soviet threat and the prospect of Chinese deployment of an ICBM force in the mid-1970s, we could not justify delaying a further step to protect ourselves against these dangers."

This sounds very much like the clear and present danger that has sent us rushing to the barricades every time an ABM I.O.U. has fallen due in the past 10 years or so. The administration nevertheless plans to spend \$920,000,000, just for openers, on the Safeguard expansion. Aside from protection of two additional missile sites, the new wrinkle is "area defense"—advance preparation work on missile installations in five regions of the country, "without a commitment to deployment"—which, it can be assumed, leaves wide latitude for next year's Pentagon maneuvers.

The total costs of this missile-mania to date are not merely staggering. They induce the sort of "psychic numbing" that according to psychiatrist Robert Jay Lifton has dehumanized many of our combat soldiers in Vietnam. Stuart Symington, a veteran member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, reported last March, for example, that up to that point the Pentagon had invested over \$23 billion on "what are now acknowledged to be unworkable or obsolete missiles." This presumably included some \$6 billion lavished on the old Sentinel before it was finally junked in 1968.

Safeguard already stands on a plateau by itself. When it was first announced a year ago, the total cost was estimated at \$6 to \$7 billion. A few months later, this was raised to \$10.3 billion, on the basis of "additional costs" omitted from the original estimate. When the current expansion was announced last month, Deputy Defense Secretary Packard upped the ante to \$11.9 billion, an increase of \$1.6 billion which he attributed to inflation, delay of the program, and "certain design changes found necessary and advisable during the year"—no doubt, the same sort of necessary and advisable changes that ultimately deposited Sentinel and its predecessors on the scrap heap.

Nothing in the past history of the ABM encourages a belief that the spending will stop there. By authoritative estimates, the "thick system" toward which Safeguard is steadily evolving will cost something beyond \$30 to \$40 billion.

Any range of billions is a no-man's land for most men. Who can grasp the meaning of such figures? They begin to have significance only in the simplistic, but legitimate exercise of placing them alongside more palatable realities. The fact, for instance, that President Nixon dramatically vetoed an education bill a few weeks ago because he regarded the appropriation of \$1.2 billion more than he had requested as "inflationary." The fact that five days before the President announced his new program for a cleaner environment, a federal agency denied a fund request from New York City to demonstrate pollution-free cars because, "there will not be sufficient funds available to meet our commitments for the continuation of existing

demonstration projects." Or the fact that entire, loudly trumpeted war on pollution calls for Federal expenditure of only \$4 billion over a four-year period. Or all the facts of underplanned, underfunded environment, transit, poverty, health and welfare programs in America.

But more basic than how much is being spent on ABM is the question of why it is being spent at all. It would be totally unrealistic to argue that the U.S. can ignore the need for a strong defense posture in the face of two such powerful rivals as Soviet Russia and Red China. But it is in the matter of the "sufficiency" of this defense that a fundamental irrationality begins to overwhelm all pretense of logic in the program.

#### RULES OF THE GAME

In the realm of missilery, the arms race is a deterrence race, a flaunting of plumage by hostile peacocks. One must understand to begin with that nuclear missiles are weapons of phantom warfare, calculated, that is, to insure that they will never be used. It is not what they can do, but what they are capable of avoiding that makes them mighty. If the enemy trusts in that capability, then the missiles become an effective deterrent to warfare, and they will not be used otherwise if the enemy has a comparable deterrent.

In order to be credible, the enormously complex ABM system of defense—which depends on a precise, chain reaction sequence of detection and destruction of attacking missiles—must function at 100 per cent efficiency, with no margin for error. It is no use to talk of knocking out, say, five of eight enemy ICBMs, because the thermonuclear warheads of the other three would wreak death and damage of catastrophic proportions. The ABM is thus unlikely to deter a fanatic enemy unless he is convinced he cannot possibly penetrate its defenses. There is a deep division of opinion within the scientific community over whether the ABM can ever provide such a guarantee. Yet we continue to posit that guarantee as our goal. It is presently estimated that the U.S. has about 1,700 "deliverable" nuclear warheads, as against Russia's 950. These totals do not include the rapid development in converting warheads to MIRV use (Multiple Independently Targeted Re-entry Vehicle), which permits a single missile to carry multiple warheads. When MIRV is completed late in this decade, we will have over 8,000 nuclear warheads at the ready.

The arithmetic of destructive power becomes as awesome as the sums of dollar cost. McNamara once estimated that a mere 400 warheads of one megaton each (a megaton being equal to 1,600,000 tons of TNT) would kill 74,000,000 people in the Soviet Union and destroy 76 percent of that nation's industrial capacity. Within a few years we will have a missile arsenal of 20 times that potential—enough, surely, to wipe out any moving or breathing object west of Hawaii and east of Bermuda.

But will it be sufficient? If the present script runs true to form, the Chinese will be spurred by the Safeguard expansion to step up their budding nuclear arms development program; the Russians, perhaps unconvinced by our reassurances about long range expansion for short term restraint, will redouble their development of offensive systems in an attempt to overmatch it. (Indeed, they have just declared that they now have the ability to knock down any ballistic missile we may send their way.) The U.S. defense establishment will then ask for more weapons to balance the Soviet development, and so on, to the far side of the ludicrous.

This is the dynamism that fuels the nuclear arms race. It is the underlying absurdity of a game whose only operable rule is that if it is once commenced it is instantly forfeited. Even as they prepare to resume their Strategic Arms Limitations Talks, the United States and Soviet Russia

continue their cost accounting for Armageddon. And in our own country at least, one no longer hears any effective voice or chorus of voices raised to demand an audit of that account.

## CONTROL OF POPULATION

### HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have said a great deal this past year concerning the problems of the world's population explosion.

As chairman of the Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, I have brought to the attention of my colleagues the information our task force has been studying over the past 8 months.

We reported our study on Federal Government Family Planning Programs—Domestic and International. We have offered legislation to amend the Public Health Act that would provide family planning services to all American women who want these services but who cannot afford them or do not have facilities available to receive them.

This House, last week, voted to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future by an overwhelming margin. I feel that a majority of us recognize the need for a national policy on population. I understand why many of us are reluctant to publicly discuss birth control because of the religious implications. I doubt that any of us support legislation to control our population but realize that in some manner through public debate that the American public must understand the implications of the current growth rate of our population.

It seems to me that what needs to be done is to develop such a strong case for parents to limit the size of their families that population control laws will never be necessary. Are we, in our ignorance of understanding the current and future tragedies resulting from continued population growth, unwittingly driving a bigger wedge between the haves and the have nots?

In the current issue of *Life*, author Robert Ardrey zeroes in on some very real probabilities resulting from man's lack of innate behavioral or physiological patterns characteristic of animals in controlling their populations.

I recommend that every Member read this article and I offer it for the RECORD at this point:

#### CONTROL OF POPULATION

(By Robert Ardrey)

In 1932 the director of the New York Aquarium, C. M. Breder Jr., working with a colleague, performed an experiment with those small fish known as guppies that shook no worlds. Their conclusions were published in a little-read scientific journal, *Copeia*, and few people today are aware of their work. Yet the 51 guppies who participated in Breder's adventure should one day be memorialized by some watery monument, for they have threatened with ruin a scientific doctrine as unquestioned as any in our time.

There are few of us unfamiliar with the tiny fish so common in our children's aquaria. Guppies multiply lavishly and are born in a ratio of two females for every male. Breder arranged two tanks of equal size, each with an abundant food supply and aeration ample to tolerate a host of fish. Then in one tank he placed 50 guppies with an unnatural distribution of approximately one third males, one third females and the remainder juveniles. In the other tank he placed a single gravid female—one heavy with eggs already fertilized. What he expected to happen, I do not know. What happened defied prediction then, as it defies explanation today.

A remarkable character of the pregnant female guppy is that a single fertilization may give as many as five broods, born every 28 days. The lone gravid female cooperated nobly with the experiment, producing broods as high as 25. Yet at the end of six months there remained only nine fish in her tank. She had eaten the surplus young. In the meantime the tank with an original population of 50 had witnessed a rapid and immediate dieoff. No newborn survived. Cannibalism of the young was so active that it was seldom witnessed. The fish surviving at the end of five months were all from the original population. Here too there were nine. And in both tanks there were three males and six females, the ordained proportion among guppies.

An ironic turn in the history of science took place when both Charles Darwin and Alfred Russel Wallace found their inspiration for natural selection in Malthusian doctrine, a thesis which sooner or later must be accepted as in large part false. Thomas Malthus was an English economist who in 1798 published his *Essay on Population*, demonstrating that while human populations multiply—increase, in other words, at geometric pace—food supply can increase only by addition. The number of the population must therefore increase until at some point it overtakes the supply of food. At that point, according to Malthus, the population will reach its limits.

Darwin and Wallace saw in the Malthusian doctrine a natural law which must apply to all animal species. They deduced that through competition for a limited resource, food selection must take place between the fit and the unfit. The Malthusian logic seemed inarguable. And yet out of the revolution that has so recently overtaken biology, no proposition is more demonstrable than the natural control of animal numbers. Rare is the animal population, unaffected by climatic catastrophe, that has ever expanded until it reached the limits of its food supply. Rare are the individuals who directly compete for food. An infinite variety of self-regulatory mechanisms, physiological and behavioral, provide that animal numbers—except in the case of climatic catastrophe—will never challenge the carrying capacity of the environment. Population control is the law of the species.

Fifty-one guppies, controlling their numbers through a blend of infanticide and cannibalism, can scarcely be regarded as furnishing a sufficient case for the toppling of Malthus. But as we inquire among species drawn from many a quarter of animal life, the conviction must grow that self-regulation of numbers expresses the law of nature. By one means or another—reduction of litter size, spontaneous abortion, parental neglect, genetic deterioration, even, when other means fail, death by stress—breeding populations are limited. And as the law governs animal groups, we shall see that it governs primitive human societies as well. Civilized man will do well to take notice.

Among all the devices limiting a population, the necessity for a breeding territory is among the most common. A portion of the earth's surface exclusively your own brings

you as the proprietor many a material benefit. You are defended, since you know it better than do your enemies. Possession in some strange way enhances your energies and so, through a process of animal justice, sheer might no longer makes right, and on your home grounds you are capable of resisting intruders mightier than you are. Territory may insure a food supply for you and yours. These are benefits accruing to the proprietor, but there are two other powerful benefits accruing to the population and the species. By the physical separation of individuals or groups, dangerous aggressive forces are reduced to shouted insults over common boundaries. And the distribution of available space among breeding couples or groups means that the number of offspring will remain below the carrying capacity of the environment.

Only in recent years has the relation of territory to population numbers become accepted. Even in 1956 Cambridge's eminent ethnologist Robert Hinde rejected the proposition as unproved.

Hinde's objection had real grounds: while the necessary possession of a territory quite obviously distributes breeding pairs throughout an environment, it does not follow that territory limits the numbers of such pairs. Space is seldom that confined. To meet the objection, Adam Watson at the University of Aberdeen set up an experiment with red grouse in the Scottish moor.

The problem was to demonstrate that the territorial necessity actually eliminates healthy adult birds from the breeding population. Red grouse males establish territories in the autumn, holding them till the following summer. Space for breeding in the moorland is truly unlimited, yet the competition for territories takes place only in restricted areas. Watson began by selecting a study area and marking all birds in the vicinity. He then cleared 119 territories by capturing or shooting the proprietors. Within a week 111 of the 119 were filled by new males, only a dozen of whom were of unknown origin. All the rest had come from the marked population of the vicinity which constituted a non-breeding reserve. All bred successfully the following spring. Watson had demonstrated that at least in the red grouse it is the shortage of breeding territories that limits the breeding population.

The most prevalent of all territorial arrangements was first thoroughly demonstrated in 1920 by Elliot Howard's observation of countless species of finches and buntings, warblers, lapwings and woodpeckers in which the female is sexually unresponsive to an unpropertied male. But further research demonstrated the converse of Howard's proposition: the unpropertied or dominated male, in the phrase of the American zoologist A. M. Gihl, tends to be "psychologically castrated." Thus not only does female sexuality guarantee that breeding will be accomplished within a select circle, but sexual inhibition provides that the disenfranchised male will break up no homes.

We still have no certain answer concerning the physiological linking of territorial behavior and the sexual impulse. But the explosion of field research proceeding today leaves no doubt about its reality. In 1966, when I first wrote about the territorial imperative, only one species of African antelope seemed to fit the pattern earlier observed in birds. This was the Uganda kob, a species in which males occupy an arena of territorial competition and to which females are attracted for copulation. Females will accept no others than the successful males, and the masses of surplus males amuse themselves in their bachelor herds. In the few short years since I published my review, territorial systems of breeding have been described in the waterbuck, in the Grant's and Thomson's gazelles and the comparable southern springbok, in the hartebeest and

topi and puku and in the smallest of them all, the oribi and dik-dik and steinbok. Systems vary, from the modified arena competition of the wildebeest and puku to the birdlike family territories of the steinbok. But all the main propositions hold true: the female will be attracted only by a territorial male; the male who has failed in the territorial competition will retire into the careless existence of males in groups.

In many a species, of course, the territorial compulsion is absent or fails sufficiently in itself to reduce breeding. Such a force as neglect of offspring may come into play. While parental neglect may seem to the human observer an unappealing means of keeping down numbers, still if we inspect the African lion and its prey, the wildebeest, we shall glimpse a systematic contribution to natural balances.

The wildebeest, one of the most common and certainly the most grotesque of African antelopes, possesses no social organization worthy of analysis excepting the incidence of territorial bulls who maintain a monopoly on copulation. Beyond that, wildebeest, like schools of fish, congregate in immense, disorganized herds, offering the lion his favorite dish, and migrate with the rains, in the hundreds of thousands. And population control takes place in an adjustment of unlikely instincts. The mother drops her calf without more emotional engagement than might take place with a bowel movement. But the calf has an instinct to follow its mother. Miraculously, the newly born wildebeest within five minutes can stagger to its feet and follow. Having identified her calf through its following, the mother will lick it and proceed to recognize it as her own. What, however, happens when herds are so dense that the unfortunate newborn after five minutes cannot recognize its mother? Let it make a wrong guess in the confusions of a wildebeest Times Square. The nonmother will butt it away. The mob will swallow the calf's identity. Lost, unprotected, it must in the end fall to the hyena or jackal.

The lion, preyed on by none, not very susceptible to disease or parasites, could in a few generations be a victim of overpopulation. The lioness produces her several cubs in a short period of gestation, and should she lose them comes into heat again immediately. Yet on Tanzania's great Serengeti Plain a stable population of about a thousand lions varies little in number from season to season. The area's immense numbers of prey animals, such as wildebeest, Thomson's gazelle and zebra, could support far more lions. What keeps their numbers down? A subtle combination of behavior patterns, foremost among them maternal neglect, provides that only so many lions will reach a breeding age.

The first control is territorial. Only those females who are part of a permanently resident pride breed successfully. The second control is a dominant order like few other species'. The young eat last. With George Schaller, our foremost student of dangerous animals, I once watched a zebra-kill where nine lionesses, rumbling at each other with the collective menace of a volcano, ringed the carcass flank to flank. In 90 minutes they ate some 450 pounds of meat, while a lone cub on the outskirts played with the zebra's tail which he had somehow managed to secure. Had he sought a single bite before the lionesses were finished, quite probably he would have been killed.

This rank order of feeding, which places the males first, if they are present, the females second and the cubs last, compels no great deprivation so long as large game is available. A wildebeest or zebra will provide food for all. But through the dry season comes a food shortage of a technical nature. The larger game migrates out of the grasslands into the woodlands. The breeding prides refuse to leave their territories and follow. Through the dry season they live off

the non-migrating animals, chiefly Thomson's gazelle—and a Tommy weighs only about 45 pounds. Adult appetite is seldom sated, and cubs go hungry. There is little wonder that infant mortality runs to about 50%. Should you in August glimpse two wan cubs waiting while their mother goes hunting, you may be fairly sure that only one will remain in November when the rains and the big game return. Yet food exists in plenty scarcely 50 miles away.

The great majority of animal species, whether through territorial spacing or sexual inhibition, through infanticide or systematic neglect, succeed in maintaining stable populations year after year. But there are those that fail and, to keep numbers in order, must suffer the more drastic solution of cyclical population crashes. With a prayerful thought for our own species, let us consider just what happens to them.

The morbid activities of the lemming have been tantalizing the human imagination for centuries. About every 3 to 5 years, under the sway of some mysterious compulsion, he commits mass suicide.

As recently as 1963 Sweden witnessed one of the greatest "lemming years" in decades. Lapps in the far north first reported the disappearance of lemmings in the month of August. Originating in the mountains, they vanished moving south. They moved mostly at night, and observers at a crossroad counted 44 pass per minute: they moved as individuals, not as groups. Although food was abundant, if one died he was immediately eaten by others, the skull being opened neatly and the brain being eaten first. Of several hundred taken and examined, almost all proved to be the young of the year, and although sexually mature not a female was pregnant. The migration was a youth movement. At any water obstacle, like a lake, they massed on the beaches in such number that an observer could not move without squashing them. Fair enough swimmers, they were not good enough. From a dead-end peninsula on Lake Störsjön so many obeyed the impulse compelling them that the shores of the lake, the following year, were carpeted with lemming bones.

Generations of zoologists interpreted the lemming die-off in Malthusian terms: that is, populations increased until encountering the limits of food supply, then crashed. But observations revealed that migrations as likely as not occurred in years of abundance when no food shortage existed. Investigation of the mystery shifted as early as the 1930s to North America's snowshoe hare, a similar victim of a 10-year cycle. In Minnesota's Lake Alexander area a man named R. G. Green, with various coworkers, started picking up samples from the countless corpses. None showed undernourishment, few any evidence of infectious disease. Their manner of death, however, was odd. Some might be behaving normally, others might be in torpor, when suddenly they would be seized by convulsions and die. Another odd symptom was exhibited by hares captured, apparently healthy, and placed in captivity. The normal snowshoe hare tolerates the experience with indifference. But in the springtime of the population crash, captive hares died almost immediately. Autopsy showed a certain degeneration in the liver, a deficiency of blood sugar and minor internal hemorrhages. Green described it as shock disease.

The description satisfied no one. But at about the same time observations of the meadow vole in upstate New York showed almost duplicate behavior. Something specific enough to produce such similar deaths in species so different must be susceptible to definition. And why should it occur in the spring? Various hypotheses were advanced, the most persuasive by J. J. Christian, one of today's most earnest investigators. He saw the building up of a population as a time of increasing stress. The increasing number of

young, the increasing competition of adults the increasing number of strangers in a massive, increasingly disorganized population at last brings on a state of exhaustion both psychological and physiological. It is as if the cycle's last winter with its normal hardships sets the stage for the entrance of the last straw. And that last straw comes with the sexual demands of the spring. Everybody drops dead.

Whether or not Christian's hypothesis is correct remains unproved. But it served to shift the emphasis of research from the old food-supply theory to the new investigation of the physiological consequences of social stress in high-density populations. Further evidence from the field emphasized the lethal relationship. Most studies had been made of rodents, particularly susceptible to population crashes. But the shrew, studied in Manitoba tamarack bogs, is an insectivore like the mole. During a population explosion in 1957 the excitability of the animals was such that they lived only four days in captivity. By autumn, and the peak of the explosion, they lived only eight hours.

While limitation of numbers through food supply still has its champions in the sciences, most investigators today are turning to social stress as the factor diminishing numbers long before food resources are exhausted. But a menace of another order may come about in rapidly expanding populations: the weakening of the entire gene pool.

The French zoologist Francois Bourlière has recorded two illuminating studies of deer. The first occurred on a large plateau in Arizona, where a stable population of 4,000 deer lived in balanced relationship with a fair number of wolves, pumas and coyotes. The effect of predators on a prey population is almost invariably to weed out the sick, the malformed, the deficient. The net consequence, observed again and again, is to keep the prey population healthy. But early in this century men began to slaughter the predators and virtually eliminated them. With the slaughter, the numbers of the deer began to rise. By 1920 there were 60,000, by 1924 over 100,000. Then in a single year it crashed to 40,000 and by 1939 it was down to 10,000. Overgrazing and food shortage had undoubtedly contributed to the peak crash, but it could not explain the continued decline.

The other example came about through the efforts of the U.S. government to build up a herd of reindeer as food supply for the local inhabitants of St. Paul, one of the Pribilof Islands. Here there were no predators at all to exert a selective pressure on the herd, yet for many years the experiment seemed a huge success. It had begun in the autumn of 1911 when four bucks and 21 does were placed on St. Paul. By 1932 they had increased in number to 523, by 1938 to well over 2,000. But then came what Bourlière described as a cataclysmic decline. By 1950 eight remained.

The only possible conclusion is that failure by any agency to remove the weak and the deficient from the breeding population gradually sapped the vitality of the whole gene pool.

It is a fate many scientists have predicted for the human species.

With ample field material now available, science has begun to shift its attention to the laboratory. A single inspired experiment, confirmed and reconfirmed is worth our attention.

The house mouse is territorial and the female under conditions of normal density encounters only her male. The experiment, which exhibited what later became known as "the Bruce effect," was first conducted in Britain. A female mouse was impregnated by a male. If within four days she was mated by a strange male, she aborted. The implication was that of a morality in mice previously unsuspected. But the investigation went further. If the impregnated

female even saw a strange male within four days, the chances were almost fifty-fifty that she would abort. The final experiment demonstrated that the same failure of pregnancy would come about if she were merely placed in a cage where a strange male had been, and she smelled his recent presence.

The experiment had been conducted under most elegant conditions, with ample numbers of subjects and ample controls who, sniffing no strange males, proceeded on with their normal pregnancies. Even so, other biologists suspected that something must be wrong and set up new experiments. Bruce had used an albino strain of laboratory mouse, and such inbred creatures frequently yield untrustworthy conclusions. Another investigator set up the same experiment with wild deer mice. The results were the same. Physiologists demonstrated the cause: it is the smell, in all situations. The odor of the strange male frees the fertilized egg from implantation.

The Bruce effect is a form of natural birth control. In all probability comparable effects, of which we are yet unaware, explain in many species the reduction in the number of embryos. But the simple effect of stress due to density cannot alone be responsible for the control of animal numbers.

A frequent observation has been the variation of response to growing density by different groups of quite the same creature, living under quite the same conditions. While all at some point must reach a point of reproductive breakdown, levels of tolerance may differ widely. The difference is probably due to the presence or absence of a very strong leader.

The term "alpha" is frequently used in the study of animal behavior to designate the individual of extraordinary endowment who comes to dominate a social group. He may excel in strength, in intelligence, or perhaps in assurance. It is his capacity to dominate a situation, or for that matter to command his fellows, that so often lends cohesion and stability to the group itself. And it is probably such a social group that lends the greatest resistance to stress.

The relation of rank to stress, however, has its grim side. An overdominated animal may with small ado lie down and die. Rats, introduced to established groups of fellow rats, suffer persecution and may die within days. In a Glasgow laboratory, one died in ninety minutes. He had no significant wound nor had he suffered the least internal injury. He died of stress.

We know that subordinated animals experience enlargement of the adrenal gland, and under the pressure of sufficient stress through adrenal exhaustion may sink into apathy or death. But a curious quality of the alpha male is his relative invulnerability. The same seems to be true of the alpha female in those species where female rank orders exist. In Australian experiments K. Myers has shown that among rabbits subjected to density pressures it is the low-ranking female who suffers the greatest fetus mortality. We may speculate, then, that the "temperament" of a population may well be determined by the random incidence or absence of a powerful alpha, male or female, whose very presence acts to forestall the disintegration of social organization.

The relative immunity of the alpha and vulnerability of the omega, or lowest-ranking, member of a social order is suggested in a 1968 study of men. In that year our *Journal Science* published a medical study of all 270,000 male employees of a major American corporation. The mammoth investigation linked educational background, job achievement, and incidence of coronary heart disease.

The corporation offered, like a perfectly arranged laboratory condition, a single controlled environment. Operating units whether in Georgia or New York State had simi-

lar structures, fulfilled similar functions, provided similar jobs. All was directed by a single top management policy with the same system of pensions and security, insurance and medical practices, and perhaps most important, of recordkeeping. And the 270,000 case histories provided a sample so large that even small variations from the expectable would have statistical significance. The variations were not small.

From bottom to top in the company's pecking order, the study found that workmen contract coronaries at the rate of 4.33 per thousand per year. Their immediate superiors, the foremen, have it slightly worse, 4.52. But supervisors and local area managers drop to 3.91. Then comes a leap. General area managers have a mere 2.85. We then come to the high competitors, the high achievers, the high executives. Coronaries occur at a rate of 1.85, about 40% of the level of workmen. And while we may say that many a coronary customer could have been eliminated before reaching the alpha rank, we must also reckon that the high executives are much older.

There will be no problem of interpretation for those schooled in the population dynamic of animal groups. Certain environmental influences undoubtedly made a contribution. The study revealed that college men are a far better risk than noncollege, and one may fairly suspect the influence of better social backgrounds. But the investigators pointed out that the single worst record was made by college men who rose no higher than foremen, while noncollege men who rose to the top shared the relative immunity of their fellow executives. The report ended up puzzled, but admitting that something biological must be going on.

Something biological was most distinctly going on. But if we continue to deny that the histories of alpha monkeys, of alpha rabbits, of alpha antelopes and alpha fish contribute to our understanding of men, then we shall continue to remain puzzled indefinitely.

Throughout all animal species self-regulatory mechanisms provide that population numbers will never challenge the normal carrying capacity of the physical environment. In that cultural animal, man, contraception becomes a cultural substitute for innate behavioral or physiological patterns characteristic of animals.

We may regard it as a pity, perhaps, that our females, so unlike the Uganda kob, are sexually responsive to unpropertied males. We may sigh that our omega males do not cheerfully accept a state of psychological castration. We may with less certainty look askance on the lemming's youth movements, under the stress of intolerable numbers, conducting suicidal marches, or the snowshoe hare's dropping dead; for we may just possibly resort to such lugubrious impulses ourselves one day.

However we may regard in human terms the loss of such innate mechanisms, we cannot blame that loss with entire conviction on the mid-Pleistocene expansion of the human brain. Without doubt the rapid enlargement of our cortical equipment exerted increasing inhibition on old forms of compulsive behavior. Even so, in our more primitive days we substituted social traditions for processes that previously had come naturally.

The American ecologist J. B. Birdsell has shown that by natural increase of numbers the aborigine would have reached the food limitations of Australia in two thousand years. But he was there far longer, and he never came close to running out of food. Disease, territorial spacing of groups, tribal warfare may have made contributions. But the principal factor of population control was infanticide. The evidence is as conclusive in the Eskimo, observed before modern influences had modified his ways, as in the Australian aborigine. Both were hunting

peoples with a pressing need for active males. In both, the proportion of young males to females was about 150 to 100. Girl babies had been the chief object of destruction.

The Scottish ecologist V. C. Wynne-Edwards is today our foremost authority on the self-regulation of animal numbers. Almost half a century ago, however, Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders explored the principle as displayed by primitive peoples. At that date he was of course unaware of the long history of animal populations, and he presumed that population control had begun in the Stone Age. His comprehensive review of almost all then known about primitive tribes led to his thesis of "optimum numbers." Within every group there is a number about which population fluctuates only slightly. It is a number well under any threat by starvation, yet sufficient to gain a maximum yield from its environment. The number is sustained by varying traditions—by infanticide or compulsory abortion, by cannibalism, head-hunting, human sacrifice, ritual murder, by taboos against incest or against intercourse during the period of lactation. The environment is held to a constant size either through outright territorial defense, or through traditional attachment to a familiar area.

Even in a modern farming tribe one finds customs specifically regulating sexual and reproductive behavior. Jomo Kenyatta needs no introduction to the contemporary citizen. Yet few are aware that his *Facing Mount Kenya*, written when he was a student at the University of London, is one of the most perfect monographs in the literature of ethnology. As a Westernized mind, he brought scientific discipline to his subject. But as that rare anthropologist, a member of the tribe he describes, he brought the intimacy of birth and young experience to his analysis. He confirms population dispersal through territoriality with his comments on land tenure; and that, while the Kikuyu defended their country collectively, "the fact remained that every inch of the Kikuyu territory had its owner, with the boundary properly fixed and everyone respecting his neighbor's." He considers customs of division of labor, of education, and those tribal traditions resolving adolescent sexual drives with limitation of young.

At the rites of puberty the male is circumcised and the female subjected to clitoridectomy, thus reducing her capacity for sexual excitement. Until puberty masturbation is accepted as a normal boyish practice, and while indecent in the presence of elders, within an age-group it may even be a subject for competition. After initiation, however, masturbation is regarded as babyish. Now the custom of *ngueko* takes over, a restricted form of sex play between boys and girls that insures that the girl remains a virgin. Accepted, formalized, described by Kenyatta as "sacred," the adolescent custom is as deeply a portion of Kikuyu tradition as land tenure itself. Any accident of conception is severely punished by tribal law, and if in later years the girl approaching marriage proves not to be a virgin, her value is drastically reduced.

From Kenyatta's account we may see how finely balanced are those Kikuyu traditions which accept human sexuality but reduce the consequence of unwanted young. Yet with the breakdown of tribal discipline in our time has come the breakdown of such customs, contributing to the population explosion.

In a sense it was not the 18th Century's Industrial Revolution but the simultaneous cultural triumph of humanism that most effectively destroyed the older cultural institutions. Humanism's respect for the dignity of man, and its regard for every human life as sacred, while among the most powerful forces ever to advance man's welfare

along certain fronts, had ambiguous results on others.

Throughout a large world of primitive societies, missionaries and colonial masters reacted with horror to such institutions as cannibalism, head-hunting and human sacrifice. Tribal warfare, particularly in Africa, was ended. Infanticide was discouraged.

Then the advent of modern medicine and biochemistry struck also at the advanced countries. The rate of infant mortality dropped like a rock in a well. Life was so prolonged that a new class of senior citizen came into being. Breeding populations were now seldom reduced by the death of a young mother in childbirth. Strangely enough, with modern nutrition in the same countries the onset of menstruation and fecundity dropped two years in less than a century. Through mass-produced drugs and insecticides, we extended the new breeding potential to all peoples, advanced or otherwise.

The humanist's preoccupation with the numbers game has sacrificed human quality for human quantity. Life must be prolonged, whatever agony it presents to the dying. A child defective physically or mentally must somehow be saved sufficiently to join the breeding population. To restrict the reproductive rights of the genetically afflicted is considered an act of discrimination.

We shall find out one day if, as many biologists fear, overprotection of the human being, like underpredation in the reindeer herd on St. Paul Island, will produce a genetic collapse in the most compassionate populations. If so, it will be an appropriate biological conclusion to a valuable if misdirected philosophy. Yet I find it too neat and simple a conclusion.

Let us review the other possibilities. Human numbers will probably never reach such magnitude as to encounter the limitations of food supply. Long before such a rendezvous can take place, other forces will have affected our numbers. If we take nature as a model, there are two probabilities. The first is a sane and humane program of population control. The second is death by stress.

Population control, whatever form it takes, is a cultural substitute for biological mechanisms prevalent in the natural world. As our population problem has a cultural cause, so we are provided with a cultural answer. But that answer must be mandatory. We have seen that in animal species the numbers of young are not determined by parental choice. A number of proposals for the human species have been seriously put forth by population experts. We must consider enforced contraception, whether through taxation on surplus children, or through more severe means such as conception license, replacing or supplementing the marriage license. Abortion should be freely available to those suffering unintended pregnancy. In international relations, of course, any aid to peoples who through ignorance, prejudice or political hypnosis fail to control their numbers might be forbidden.

Such a program sounds more formidable than it would probably prove in practice. The vast majority among us accept traffic regulations without resentment because we are aware of their necessity. Conscience, too, has a way of internalizing what has started with external pressure, and of transferring to the voluntary what was once the compulsory. Even custom makes its contribution, so that what is socially unacceptable becomes something that is simply not done. Most hopeful of all is the demonstrable proposition that a cultural institution which accords with the laws of nature rarely fails. Such is birth control.

Birth control, a solution both sane and humane, has of course its alternative. But the alternative, death by stress, is a messy one indeed. If we recognize that population density, not food supply, is the chief factor limiting animal numbers, and if we recognize also that no population increases indefinitely, then however unattractive or insane the

alternative control may be, we may have to accept it. Since a thoroughly savage program is available, let us consider how we may achieve death by stress:

The rising rate of automobile accidents is a quite perfect example of a form of population control mathematically determined by population density. If we accept an insane solution as preferable to a sane one, then we must see that the automobile, which strikes most heavily at the young, is indeed an excellent instrument for reducing the breeding population.

Another agency striking hard at the young is drug addiction. While we cannot as yet be sure that drugs reduce reproductive potential, still we should be wise to gamble that they do, or that they reduce the breeding drive. We must offer every encouragement to widespread addiction in the young.

The trouble with cardiac and other stress diseases is that they tend to reduce numbers in those who have passed the breeding age. Even so, we know that the omega is far more susceptible to stress than the alpha. We should therefore encourage in business, for example, tendencies toward mergers and ever-magnifying organizations that reduce in numbers the immune alpha and infinitely expand the ranks of the vulnerable omega.

If life in the megalopolis discourages large families, then perhaps by discriminatory taxation falling most heavily on real estate we might reverse the flight to the suburbs and drive middle-class families back to the unpleasantness of urban reproduction. We should have nothing to lose by such a move, in any case, since further concentrations of city life must produce more stress, more broken marriages, more impotency due to acute alcoholism, more corpses, victims of crime in the streets and more couples living together in unproductive sin.

Homosexuality should not be neglected. Already it subtracts four to six percent from the American breeding population. We could do better.

Suicide too offers splendid vistas. We fall far behind such advanced peoples as the Swedes and the Swiss. Here too we could do better. But as stress and density increase I feel a confidence—or perhaps it is no more than a vague patriotism—that we Americans will catch up, and that suicide, particularly in the young and the discouraged, will make a significant reduction in our breeding numbers.

What at all times we must keep brightly in mind, as we inspect the real possibilities of death by stress, is that while any reduction in numbers is a gain, significant reduction can only be accomplished in the young breeding group. The reader may wonder, with such an admonition, why I have so ignored war as an instrument. But war, in my opinion, has seen its best day. Its growing unpopularity with those who must fight it may turn out to be a passing whim. More serious is war's increasing preoccupation with the wastage of expensive machinery rather than with the traditional wastage of inexpensive men. Wars simply do not kill enough people. A nuclear entertainment would of course leave us with no population problem at all. But even as highly publicized a war as that in Vietnam has failed throughout its entire course to kill as many Americans as that magnificent engine of destruction, the automobile, kills in a normal year.

We must look to more imaginative agencies than war to dispose of the immense numbers who must someday die of stress. And I am sure that some future survey of likely instruments will reveal lethal possibilities of a wonder that the imagination cannot glimpse today. When our population has again doubled, when not a water supply remains unpolluted, when the traffic jams of tomorrow make today's seem memories of the open road, when civil disorder has permanently replaced war as a form of organized violence, when the air of the city

can no longer be breathed and the countryside has vanished, when crime has become so prevalent that no citizen goes unarmed, when indigestion becomes a meal's final course and varieties of rage and frustration remain the only emotions man or woman can know, then perhaps, if we are young, we shall comprehend the lemming.

But of course future times of such stressful wonder may never come to be. Somewhere along the road we may choose compulsory contraception. And yet no one can make a sure prediction. *Homo sapiens*, that creature mad beyond the craziest of hares, lunatic beyond all lemmings, may go to the end of the road with no impulse more logical than to discover what lies there. How high is the mountain, how profound the stream? Which in the end will bend the ultimately defeated knee, we or our world? Shall we embrace the logic of limited numbers, acceptable to mice, or shall we mount the hilltop and defy the winds?

One cannot say. The tragedy and the magnificence of *Homo sapiens* together rise from the same smoky truth that we alone among animal species refuse to acknowledge natural law.

#### TODAY'S EXAMPLE OF THE NECESSITY FOR GALLAGHER BILLS TO HUMANIZE THE COMPUTER

#### HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced two bills which are designed to deal with one of the most compelling problems of many of our citizens: trying to talk to a business firm's computer. The bills were H.R. 16227, to provide that a willful and persistent refusal of a creditor to make corrections in the account of a consumer shall relieve the consumer of liability thereon; and H.R. 16266, to prohibit creditors from reporting disputed accounts to credit bureaus as delinquent. During my speech, on page 5748 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 3, I referred to the fact that this problem was one of the most frequently discussed items in the "action columns" of newspapers around the country.

As an example, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the relevant section of today's Washington Star's "Action Line." I will only make the additional comment that it really should not take a letter to a newspaper and a call from a reporter to bring a responsible human being from his hiding place behind the firm's computer.

The column follows:

#### ACTION LINE

My husband and I have been card-carrying members of American Express for years and have always paid our bills promptly. Last April, I was sent a new card and a bill for \$10 for renewal. We felt we had plenty of free charge cards and didn't need the American Express card, so we deducted \$10 from the bill and sent payment and the card back. Each month we get more bills with more threatening comments, despite the fact that every month we have sent letters to our "customer representative" explaining why we didn't owe the money.—Mrs. V. G. P.

A company spokesman promised to immediately issue a credit to your account and then cancel your account.

**HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed very fortunate that at long last the public is awakening to the environmental crisis. The average citizen is at least getting to know the word "ecology" and to appreciate an important element of that science; namely, the limited capacity of the environment to collect, absorb, and recycle our wastes so that they do not accumulate as pollution.

We started with the freshest air and the cleanest water, but now both are polluted to the extent that in some areas they pose a threat to health and even life. We all realize that this abuse of the environment by man, in the name of progress, has often been unintentional.

It is a source of gratification to me that it was the Democrats who first addressed themselves to attempt to solve this growing problem. Ten years ago Congress passed a Federal Water Pollution Act which was sponsored by a well-known Democrat, only to have President Eisenhower veto the measure. In spite of Republican opposition, this legislation was again passed in 1961 and approved by President Kennedy. I cite this as but one example of the Democratic Party's concern for the public good. Of course, numerous other measures to improve the quality of life and to recreate a livable, pleasant environment where man can work and enjoy the benefits of health have been sponsored and supported by most Democrats.

Because of the national importance of this subject, I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the endeavors of Governor Mandel of Maryland regarding pollution. He has given this problem the priority it merits and I think the favorable comments of Mr. Herbert B. Cahan, area vice president of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. will be of interest to my colleagues. Station WJZ-TV-13, one of the leading Baltimore TV stations aired the editorial on February 13, 1970, entitled: "Governor Mandel and the Environment," and I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

GOVERNOR MANDEL AND THE ENVIRONMENT

The growing national concern with the state of our environment has engendered a great deal of talk, but the only thing that really counts is action. Today in Annapolis, before a joint session of the General Assembly, Governor Mandel did a lot of talking, but he backed it up with a plan for action.

Rightfully, the Governor pointed with some pride to the fact that Maryland has a good record, especially in preserving its waterways. Lake Erie is dead, our neighboring Delaware Bay is dying, but the Chesapeake Bay is still abundant with life.

Nonetheless, Maryland must move fast if we are not to be choked with our poisoned air, drowned in our polluted water, buried in our trash and garbage, or desensitized by noise.

Toward this end he asked the General Assembly to enact a bill that would extend State control over the wetlands, which play a vital role in the balance of nature in our rivers and the Bay.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Governor also recognized another growing problem when he asked the General Assembly to put the control of soil conservation under the Department of Natural Resources instead of the Department of Agriculture. This is a recognition that highway building and land development contribute as much as agriculture to soil erosion and the silting of streams.

The Governor's most imaginative proposal is his plan to put the force of the State behind the problem of solid waste—that is trash and garbage—disposal. This is a headache in almost every subdivision and can benefit by the planning and the prodding of the State.

The Governor himself will take other important steps, including the creation, by executive order, of a Council on Environmental Control. Mainly, however, the burden falls on the General Assembly to make the Governor's proposals a reality. There is no longer any doubt about the need to save the environment.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

**HON. FRANK E. EVANS**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and the other distinguished Members of the House are aware of the importance of encouraging our Nation's young people to develop an appreciation of the opportunities we possess as a free people. Each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars sponsors its Voice of Democracy essay contest, giving our youth the opportunity to participate in our democratic system by voicing their views. This year's theme was "Freedom's Challenge."

Mr. Ronald William Moore, of 116 Leta Drive, Security, Colo., of my district, was awarded first place in this year's contest in Colorado. I should like at this time to include his comments in the RECORD as a source of encouragement to us all:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

There exists in the hearts of a devoted free people two eternal aspirations—to preserve their own freedom and to insure a liberty to others of the world who so desire. To convert these aspirations into realities, however, three formidable obstacles have severely tested the courage of even the most dedicated of free men. They are domestic apathy, domestic division, and foreign ignorance, and not only do they stagnate freedom, but they paralyze progress as well. From the beginning of time, these barriers have been, and remain even today, challenges to freedom. To see the actual threat these challenges pose to a free government, an understanding of each must be attained.

First, the challenge of domestic apathy:

If there is one thing that a government must demand of its governed, particularly in the instance of a democracy, it is participation. Without it, one is left with an institution OF the people and FOR the people, but not BY the people, the most important part of that classic definition of "democracy." Since "no man is free till all men are free," to quote Abraham Lincoln, a genuine liberty cannot be obtained unless all participate in the government. Sporadic interest and involvement by the members of any group is ultimately a danger to the administration whose duty it is to govern them.

Next, to the challenge of domestic division:

It was John Kennedy who once said that democracy and teamwork are really one and the same. The truth in that statement is irrefutable and anyone who symbolizes freedom as I do—as the pinnacle of a pyramid, the base of which is labeled "Participation" and "Unity"—anyone who symbolizes freedom in that way will agree. Within any form of government, totalitarian systems included, there are, of course, many different factions. Political beliefs, religious convictions, and economic positions are some of the regards that distinguish them. But for a government to function effectively, these fragments must not allow their various opinions to stand in the way of the oneness of a nation and its people. Division only serves to wreck the foundation of the pyramid of freedom and send its lofty peak tumbling into disgraceful abuse or nonexistence.

Now to the challenge of foreign ignorance:

The Commissioner of National Goals, established by the late President Eisenhower in his last year in office, reported that, as Americans, our ultimate goal is to "extend the opportunities for free choice and self-determination throughout the world." In one word, this process can be called "education." We don't want to force democracy upon others of the world on the basis that it is superior to any other type of government. If the other countries are not experienced or equipped to cope with self-administration, the entire effort would be wasted. Rather, we propose our purposes are intended to educate, to enlighten our foreign friends so as to qualify them to make the decision that will determine their lives and their future for generations to come. If an attempt is not made to erase this preponderance of foreign ignorance and innocence, we will be leaving dozens of nations, mostly in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, vulnerable to the immense program of propaganda that many Communist countries invariably launch, and usually with considerable success. To prove my point and dramatize the dangers of such vulnerability, within the last fifty years, the Communists have gained control of more than 12 million square miles of territory and the 900 million people that inhabited those lands. We will be backing down from the third and perhaps the most important of freedom's challenges if we do not inspire those foreign nations to search within their separate and individual selves for the form of government for which they are most suited and to act upon their ultimate decisions as they will.

In retrospect, then, freedom today faces three ancient but persistent challenges—domestic apathy, domestic division, and foreign ignorance. It fights the apathy by encouraging participation; it fights the division with a call for unity; and it fights the ignorance by preaching education. But until we can evoke legitimately concerned responses from the world-at-large to these summons to freedom's unity, freedom's challenges will remain themselves unchallenged and we, as Americans, as a devoted free people, will not have done our duty.

WEATHERMEN AND BLACK  
PANTHERS

**HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, forces which emphasize the use of violence to redress their grievances and attain their

goals strain the fabric of democratic society to the utmost. Too often, the temptation is to meet such forces with repressive measures that are the very antithesis of democratic processes.

The noted author, Michael Harrington, has written perceptively on the problem of dealing with two violent groups in this country—the Black Panthers and the Weathermen faction of the Students for a Democratic Society. He suggests what seems to me a balanced approach without the hysteria that so often pervades discussion of this issue. Mr. Harrington's column, from the January 1970 issue of ADA World, follows:

**DEFENSE OF PANTHER RIGHTS DOES NOT REQUIRE AGREEMENT**

(By Michael Harrington)

The test of a civil libertarian today is whether one is willing to defend the rights of the Black Panthers. And tomorrow the criterion may have to include the Weathermen faction of Students for a Democratic Society.

The point is not whether one agrees with the Panthers. I have long been opposed to their emphasis on violence—"Power grows out of the barrel of a gun"—their praise of Mao, their attitude that Robert Kennedy's assassination simply marked the death of another "pig," and much else. And in fairness I have also been heartened by their rejection of black racism and their insistence on the need for an integrated movement. But these pluses and minuses are not the issue.

The question is simply whether or not Panthers can be executed by the police, which seems to be what could have happened in Chicago, whether they are to be held in jail without bail or on excessively high bail, whether every police department in the country has the right to send a couple of hundred armed men to investigate their headquarters. The answer is, so long as America is not the fascist society the Panthers say it is, these actions violate the Bill of Rights.

That is why Roy Wilkins, Arthur Goldberg, Ramsey Clark and their associates are to be praised for establishing a Commission of Inquiry into the attack on the Panthers and particularly with regard to the killings in Chicago.

**MURDER, MAYBE**

It is a sad, but very real, fact of life that no one has any confidence in an investigation by the Chicago authorities. They have already acted to try to cover up any possible police guilt and presented "evidence" in defense of the officers involved—evidence which actually implicates them in a crime.

So the distinguished panel assembled by Roy Wilkins is probably the best way of handling the matter. Of course, if it corroborates the prima facie case which now exists against the police, then the Justice Department will have to move.

And the Weathermen may be next. I am much less compassionate toward the hoodlum tactics (which are legally, morally and politically wrong) employed by these "revolutionary" children of the upper middle-class and the rich than I am toward Panthers whose rage was provoked by racism and the slums. But here again the issue is not whether you agree, or disagree with them. They are now being pictured as conspiratorial monsters who are responsible for all the ills of the society and that is usually the prelude to suspending civil liberties.

The Communists were the test case in the late Forties and the Joe McCarthy Fifties. Defending the rights of the Panthers—and probably the Weathermen—is the current

measure of sincere commitment to a democratic freedom.

**BUT GENOCIDE, NO**

But a word of warning to those who do stand up for the Panthers' civil liberties is in order. It has to do with rhetoric and it relates, not simply to this issue, but to the language of the American Left in general. At the funeral of Fred Hampton, the slain Panther chief in Chicago, the Rev. Ralph Abernathy said that the killing was part of a plan to inflict "genocide" on black America.

Such a description might be excused in the emotion of a funeral, yet it has become a characteristic mode of expression by many of the Left. But however monstrous it is if the police use the authority of justice to commit a murderous injustice, it is still not part of an attempt to exterminate every black in the land. Similarly with the charge that America is "fascist."

There are indeed ugly repressive forces on the move in this country. But when one organizes a march and a mass meeting and proclaims that fascism is already here, that is not simply inaccurate—can you imagine that Hitler would have tolerated such an expression of dissent for one second?—but it means that there will be no usable word around if the nation does indeed become more fascist.

America is not fascist today. But one must say in measured, serious language that there is shocking evidence that the constitutional freedoms of the Black Panthers are being subverted by police officials under color of law. At this moment, every civil libertarian, every democrat, must be prepared to stand up for their rights, no matter what he thinks of their politics.

**HORTON PRAISES MISS MARY SWITZER'S CONTRIBUTION SPANNING 48 YEARS TO THE GOVERNMENT**

**HON. FRANK HORTON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, Miss Mary Switzer, Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has just retired.

I feel that we all owe very much to Miss Switzer. She brought to the Social and Rehabilitation Service the idea that this Service must be seen in terms of people, not programs.

A poem by Carl Sandburg, which is one of Miss Switzer's favorites, expresses the hope and faith she epitomized in her service to the Government:

I see America, not in the setting sun of a black night of despair ahead of us.

I see America in a crimson light of a rising sun fresh from the burning creative hand of God.

I see great days ahead, great days possible to men and women of will and vision.

The hope in this poem has been evidenced in all of Miss Switzer's work. Miss Switzer served in Washington for 48 years under the term of eight Presidents. She came in 1921, straight from Radcliffe College. She started with the Department of the Treasury as a researcher. By 1928, she was handling press

intelligence for the Secretary of the Treasury. In 1934, she became assistant to the Assistant Secretary who headed the Public Health Service.

In 1950, Miss Switzer was named head of the Federal-State program for the rehabilitation of the disabled, a position she held until her appointment as Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service in 1967.

Under her guidance, the rehabilitation program expanded and improved services were offered to the disabled.

We, in Rochester, are very grateful to Miss Switzer. She played an important role in the selection of Rochester Institute of Technology as the site for the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. She played an active part in starting this innovative program.

When Miss Switzer became the head of the rehabilitation program in 1950, fewer than 60,000 people were being reached through rehabilitation. Under her administration, nearly a quarter million disabled Americans a year have been rehabilitated for useful work.

She assumed responsibility for unifying all of the major welfare and rehabilitation programs of the department and heading them in a new direction. Her basic conviction is that the overwhelming majority of welfare recipients prefer work and self-support to idleness and dependency. She had the tremendous task of welding into a single organization the income support programs for needy Americans, rehabilitation services for the disabled and specialized services for youth and the aged.

Miss Switzer has received numerous awards, including the President's Certificate of Merit, the highest wartime award for civilians. Her outstanding worth has been recognized all over the country.

Miss Switzer has spent 48 years in the service of her country. She has brought her charm and innovative ideas and her compassion to each difficult job. Most of us know of Miss Switzer's valuable work. All of us owe much to her, and I want to thank her for her vast contribution to the country.

**BULGARIAN LIBERATION DAY**

**HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the great struggle for freedom of the Bulgarian people. For the past 25 years they have gallantly sought to cast off the shackles of Communist oppression.

It is with great admiration and grave concern for this brave and undaunted people that I now speak. We must continue to pursue the cause of liberty for all peoples. We must never forget that others of mankind are not blessed with such freedoms.