EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HOW DOES YOUR DETERGENT RATE AS A POLLUTER?

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1970, I introduced legislation which would remove phosphates from detergents, one of the leading polluters of our lakes and streams.

The case has been clearly established that detergents and household cleaning products are one of the most serious offenders of polluting our water resources.

In an article written by Mr. Sammye Malosky of Chicago Today, he discusses the findings of a recent study of 22 leading detergents and concludes that the bulk of the detergents on the market have between 20 and 30 percent phosphate levels which are major threats to the plant and animal life in our waters not to mention the threat that is posed to human life.

I am inserting the complete text of this article by Mr. Malosky as well as the bill I introduced on March 3, "The Detergent Pollution Control Act of 1970":

How Does Your Detergent Rate as a Polluter?

(By Sammye Malosky)

Those detergents you've been using may be "murder on dirt," but they're also murder on water.

Detergents contain phosphate, an ingredient currently under attack as a major pollutant of water and killer of plant and fish life in lakes.

Axion, Colgate-Palmolive's enzyme presoak, contains more phosphates—43.7 per cent—than any of 22 leading detergents, according to a study compiled by Limnetics, Inc., a Milwaukee consulting concern. Another enzyme pre-soaker, Biz, by Procter & Gamble, is not far behind with 40.4 per cent phosphates.

Nevertheless, some detergents have a surprisingly low concentration of phosphates. With a 1.4 per cent reading, Trend by Purex corporation has the lowest amount. Diaper Pure [Boyle-Midwest, Inc.] is next with a 5 per cent phosphate level.

Other low phosphate brands include Lever Brothers' Wisk at 7.6 per cent and their Cold Water All at 9.8 per cent.

The bulk of the leading detergents, such as Tide, Fab, Cheer and Bold, have phosphate levels between 20 and 31 per cent. Three firms, Procter & Gamble, Lever Brothers and Colgate-Palmolive, produce 79 per cent of the detergents on the market today.

According to scientists, phosphates cause excessive growth of algae and weeds harmful to a lake's plant and fish life. When algae decompose, they use up large amounts of oxygen, asphyxiating fish and finally "killing" the body of water.

The result is death by slime, mud, and bacterial sludge. Witness the fate of Lake Erie. And Lake Michigan is fast deteriorating.

Dr. Eugene F. Stoermer of the University of Michigan's Great Lakes research division says increased phosphates in waste water flowing into Lake Michigan is thought to be a chief culprit in eutrophication, or premature aging of the lake. Unless the deterioration is halted now, he says, it could be irreversible in 10 to 15 years.

In light of these findings, entertainer Arthur Godfrey has refused to make any more commercials for Colgate's Axion. He will continue only if the company lets him declare that Axion is a water pollutant.

"They call it an enzyme pre-soak, but that's misleading," Godfrey charged last week. "They should say it's an enzyme-active detergent."

However, a pre-soak and a detergent contain essentially the same ingredients of phosphates, enzymes and surfactant, a cleaning agent. They differ only in the concentration of active ingredients.

The Federal Water Pollution Control administration has called for an immediate reduction in the amount of phosphates in detergent products with complete removal by 1973.

Municipal waste was pinpointed as the cause of more than 60 per cent of the pollution in the lakes area by an FWPCA advisory board. The board, composed of United States and Canadian agencies investigating pollution in Lakes Erie and Ontario and the St. Lawrence Seaway, named phosphate detergents as a "major constituent" of that waste.

How your detergent rates

(Percentage of Phosphates in Detergents)

Axion	43.7
Biz	40.4
Bio-Ad	35.5
Salvo	35.3
Oxydol	30.7
Tide	30.6
Bold	30.2
Ajax Laundry	28.2
Punch	25.8
Drive	25.3
Dreft	24.5
Gain	24.4
Duz	23.1
Bonus	22.3
Breeze	22.2
Cheer	22.0
Fab	21.6
Cold Power	19.9
Cold Water All	9.8
Wisk	7.6
Diaper Pure	5.0
Trend	1.4

A spokesman for the Chicago FWPCA estimates that home detergents account for 70 per cent of all phosphates passing thru municipal sewage plants. The remaining 30 per cent comes from fertilizers and human and industrial wastes.

H.R. 16256

A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to ban polyphosphates in detergents and to establish standards and programs to abate and control water pollution by synthetic detergents

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Detergent Pollution Control Act of 1970".

DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that—

(a) the surface and ground waters in the United States are being seriously polluted and degraded by the continuing discharge into such waters of synthetic detergents whose ingredients feed polluting green algae, deprive lakes and rivers of lifegiving oxygen, decompose slowly or not at all, and can be toxic to fish and wildlife and pose human health hazards;

(b) to abate and control the pollution and degradation of surface and ground waters in the public interest, it is necessary to insure that the components of synthetic detergents which are offered for introduction or delivery into interstate commerce in the United States, or imported into the United States, and which may eventually be discharged into such waters, not cause or contribute to the pollution or degradation of such waters;

(c) research published in 1966 by scientists of the United States Public Health Service; the report of the Lake Erie Enforcement Conference Technical Committee, March 1967, and the report of the Technical and Advisory Boards to the United States-Canada International Joint Commission of September 1969, as well as other scientific studies in the United States and abroad demonstrate that polyphosphates in detergents are an undeniable major cause of water pollution, accelerating beyond control the growth of algae which interfere with fishing, navigation, recreational use of water, and degrade the water to the detriment of our water resources and the environment generally;

(d) published findings in the patent and scientific literature and recent public scientific testimony before Congress confirm that nonphorous based ingredients have been found which perform at least as well as the present polyphosphate ingredients in synthetic detergents and soaps;

(e) Congress must require the use of nonpolluting substitutes for detergent polyphosphates in order to protect our lakes and rivers from further degradation from this pollution source;

(f) there are strong indications that the wetting agents in detergents such as the linear alkylbenzene sulfonates (LAS) and alkylphenoe derivatives are not adequately degradable in septic tanks and continuously operated bilogical treatment units and that they are toxic to a degree which affects lower forms of aquatic life; and that the recently added enzyme ingredients in presoak compounds and laundry detergents have been found to pose health hazards to humans on direct exposure, and may also act as disease carriers if they are not free from live spores;

(g) in order to eliminate wherever possible massive damage to the environment from unforeseen or ignored consequences of the products and byproducts of our society, and to minimize public expenditures frequently required to restore the damaged environment, it is necessary that national standards be established that require all ingredients, present and proposed, in detergents be tested for environment and health protection before they enter the environment;

(h) Congress must direct the establishment of standards of detergents, biodegradability, water eutrophication ability, toxicity, and effects on the public health and welfare, to achieve pollution-free detergents;

(i) to accelerate the development and manufacture of detergents that are free of phosphorus and whose other ingredients, including the phosphorus substitutes, are pollution free, there is a need for the Federal Government to inventory and report on the presently available technology on the substitutes for polyphosphates in detergents and other technology relating to the development of pollution-free detergents, and to provide assistance for research and development of new technology where needed.

SEC. 3. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by redesignating section 19 as section 23 and by inserting after section 18 new sections as follows:

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 19. For the purposes of this section and sections 20, 21:

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

"(a) The term 'synthetic detergent' or 'detergent' means a cleaning compound composed of inorganic and organic components, including surface active agents, soaps, water softening agents, builders, dispersing agents, corrosion inhibitors, foaming agents, buffering agents, brighteners, fabric softeners, dyes, perfumes, enzymes, and fillers, which is available for household, personal, laundry, industrial, and other uses in liquid, bar, spray, tablet, flake, powder, or other form.

"(b) The term 'polyphosphate builder' or 'phosphorus' means a detergent ingredient used principally as a water softening and soil suspending agent made from condensed phosphates, including the pyrophosphates, the triphosphates (frequently called tripolyphosphates) and the glossy phosphates or metaphosphates.

"(c) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.

"BAN OF PHOSPHORUS IN DETERGENTS

"SEC. 20. (a) It shall be unlawful after June 30, 1972, for any person to import into the United States or manufacture in the United States any detergent containing phosphorus.

"(b)(1) Any detergent containing phosphorous imported or manufactured in violation of this section shall be liable to be proceeded against on libel of information and condemned in any district court in the United States within the jurisdiction of which such detergent is found.

"(2) Such detergent shall be liable to seizure by process pursuant to the libel, and the procedure in cases under this subsection shall conform, as nearly as may be, to the procedure in admiralty; except that on demand of either party any issue of fact joined in any such case shall be tried by jury. When libel for condemnation proceedings under this subsection, involving the same claimant and the same issues, are pending in two or more jurisdictions, such pending proceedings, upon application of the United States or the claimant seasonably made to the court of one such jurisdiction, shall be consolidated for trial by order of such court, and tried in (A) any district selected by the applicant where one of such proceedings is pending; or (B) a district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties. If no order for consolidation is so made within a reasonable time, the United States or the claimant may apply to the court of one such jurisdiction, and such court (after giving the other party, the claimant, or the United States attorney for such district reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard) shall by order, unless good cause to the contrary is shown, specify a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business, in which all such pending proceedings shall be consolidated for trial and tried. Such order of consolidation shall not apply so as to require the removal of any case the date for trial of which has been fixed. The court granting such order shall give prompt notification thereof to the other courts having jurisdiction of the cases covered thereby.

"(3) Any detergent condemned under this subsection shall, after entry of the decree, be disposed of by destruction or sale as the court may, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, direct and the proceeds thereof, if sold, less the legal cost and charges shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States; but such detergent shall not be sold under such decree for a use which would result in the pollution of the navigable waters of the United States; except that after entry of the decree and upon the payment of the costs of such proceedings and the execution of a good and sufficient bond conditioned that such detergent shall not be sold or disposed of contrary to the provisions of this section, the court may by order direct that such detergent be delivered to the owner thereof to be destroyed or brought into compliance with the provisions of this section under the supervision of an officer or employee duly designated by the Secretary, and the expenses of such supervision shall be paid by the person obtaining release of the detergent under bond.

"(4) When a decree of condemnation is entered against the detergent, court costs and fees, and storage and other proper expenses, shall be awarded against the person, if any, intervening as claimant of the detergent,

"(5) In the case of removal for trial of any case as provided by paragraph (2) of this subsection—

"(A) the clerk of the court from which removal is made shall promptly transmit to the court in which the case is to be tried all records in the case necessary in order that such court may exercise jurisdiction; and

"(B) the court to which such case is removed shall have the powers and be subject to the duties, for purposes of such case, which the court from which removal was made would have had, or to which such court would have been subject, if such case had not been removed.

"(c)(1) The United States district courts shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown and subject to the provisions of rule 65 (a) and (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to restrain violations of this section.

"(2) In any proceeding for criminal contempt for violation of an injunction or restraining order issued under this subsection, which violation also constitutes a violation of this section, trial shall be by the court or, upon demand of the accused, by a jury. Such trial shall be conducted in accordance with the practice and procedure applicable in the case of proceedings subject to the provisions of rule 42(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

"(d) All libel or injunction proceedings for the enforcement, or to restrain violations, of this section shall be by and in the name of the United States. Subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend a court of the United States in any district may run into any other district in any such proceeding.

"(e) The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary shall jointly prescribe regulations for the efficient enforcement of the provisions of subsection (g) of this section, except as otherwise provided therein. Such regulations shall be promulgated in such manner and take effect at such time, after due notice, as the Secretary shall determine.

"(f)(1) The Secretary is authorized to conduct examinations, inspections, and investigations for the purposes of this section.

"(2) For purposes of enforcement of this section, officers or employees duly designated by the Secretary, upon presenting appropriate credentials and a written notice to the owner, operator, or agent in charge, are authorized (A) to enter, at reasonable times, any factory, warehouse, or establishment in which detergents are manufactured, processed, packed, or held, or to enter any vehicle being used to transport or hold such detergents; (B) to inspect, at reasonable times and within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, such factory, warehouse, establishment, or vehicle, and all pertinent equipment, finished and unfinished materials; and (C) to obtain samples of such materials. A separate notice shall be given for each such inspection, but a notice shall not be required for each entry made during the period covered by the inspection. Each such inspection shall be commenced and completed with reasonable promptness. If the officer or employee obtains any sample, prior to leaving the premises, he shall give to the owner, operator, or agent in charge a receipt describing the samples obtained. If an analysis is made of such sample, a copy of the results of such analysis shall be furnished promptly to the owner, operator, or agent in charge. If the owner, operator, or agent in charge of the factory, warehouse, establishment, or vehicle refuses to permit the Secretary's designee to enter, inspect, or obtain samples as authorized by this subsection, the Secretary's designee may seek a warrant from any court or magistrate to enter, request, or obtain samples as authorized by the subsection, and such warrant shall be granted if the court or magistrate finds probable cause to believe that detergents containing phosphorus which were imported or manufactured in violation of this section are in the factory, warehouse, establishment, or vehicle.

"(g)(1) The Secretary of the Treasury shall deliver to the Secretary, upon his request, samples of detergents which are being imported or offered for import into the United States, giving notice thereof to the owner or consignee, who may appear before the Secretary and have the right to introduce testimony. If it appears from the examination of such samples or otherwise that such detergent contains phosphorus, such detergent shall be refused admission, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause the destruction of any such detergent refused admission unless such detergent is exported, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, within ninety days of the date of notice of such refusal or within such additional time as may be permitted pursuant to such regulations.

"(2) Pending decision as to the admission of a detergent being imported or offered for import, the Secretary of the Treasury may authorize delivery of such detergent to the owner or consignee upon the execution by him of a good and sufficient bond providing for the payment of such liquidated damages in the event of default as may be required pursuant to regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

"DETERGENT STANDARDS

"SEC. 21. (a) The Secretary shall establish standards of water eutrophication ability, biodegradability, toxicity, and of effects on the public health and welfare which must be met by all synthetic detergents according to the procedures prescribed herein.

"(b) The standards shall be designed to insure that synthetic detergents will not encourage the growth of algae and other undesirable aquatic plants will substantially decompose or degrade in municipal, industrial, and other sewage treatment processes without impairing the efficiency of such processes will not pollute surface or ground waters receiving effluent from such processes, will not be toxic to, or threaten or interfere with the conditions of the reproduction or the survival of fish and other forms of aquatic life, and will not pose hazards to human health.

"(c) The standards shall be based on studies which shall include a water eutrophication ability test in algae growth basal media containing each of the individual components of synthetic detergents, and a biodegradability test which shall truly simulate the operation of municipal and industrial sewage treatment processes employing biological treatment with practical and typical retention times in order to predict the concentration of undegraded or undecomposed components of synthetic detergents which would enter the waters receiving the effluent from such processes, and other tests which the Secretary determines may be appropriate.

"(d) The Secretary shall, on or before June 30, 1971, prescribe and publish in the Federal Register, pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code, such standards and rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the policy of this section.

"(e) Any detergent which after June 30, 1972, does not conform with standards, rules, and regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (d) of this section shall be liable to be proceeded against on libel of information and condemned in any district in the United States within the jurisdiction of which such detergent is found.

"(f) The Secretary and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly promulgate rules and regulations that prohibit the importation of any synthetic detergent which fails to meet the standards as established herein.

"(g) Any person who willfully violates any provision of rules and regulations established pursuant to this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject for the first offense to a fine of not more than $5,000 and for any subsequent offense to a fine of not more than $20,000.

"(h) In carrying out the purposes of this section, the Secretary is authorized to make grants and contracts.

"(i) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 22. (a) To accelerate the development and manufacture of detergents that are free of phosphorus and whose other ingredients, including the phosphorous substitute, are pollution free, the Secretary shall inventory and report existing technology on substitutes for polyphosphates in detergents, and other technology relating to the development of pollution free detergents, and shall also assist in the research and development of formulations which will eliminate pollution from detergents. In carrying out the purposes of this subsection, the Secretary is authorized to make grants and contracts.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1970, and for each of five subsequent fiscal years, $10,000,000".

LAW PROFESSORS OPPOSE JUDGE CARSWELL'S CONFIRMATION

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to note that 21 Senators have now announced their opposition to confirmation of the nomination of Judge G. Harrold Carswell to the U.S. Supreme Court. Unfortunately, so far there are an insufficient number publicly committed against this nomination. Let us hope that other distingiushed Members of the other body will soon make clear their opposition to this nomination.

Judge Carswell's record leaves no doubt that he should not be seated on the highest Court of our land. His record on civil rights, both as a judge and a private citizen, shows that he is not even in tune with the temper of the times, let alone in the vanguard.

His decisions and his judicial attitude, as testified to by civil rights lawyers who appeared before him, are consistent with his infamous statement of 1948 that "segregation of the races is proper and the only correct way of life in our State" and 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 law of the land.

Apart from Judge Carswell's record on civil rights, leading lawyers and law professors have found his judicial record to be lackluster. The U.S. Supreme Court, faced with the most difficult problems of our society, should be composed of those who have achieved the pinnacle of legal achievement. Judge Carswell can hardly be described as one who meets this test.

I urge the careful attention of my colleagues to the following three letters, representing the views of 45 law schoool faculty members from the University of California Law School in Los Angeles, the Yale University Law School, and the University of Virginia Law School. These letters appeared in the March 4, 1970, issue of the Washington Post.

As Charles L. Black, Jr., Luce professor of jurisprudence at Yale Law School writes:

> The appointment of such a man would be a wrong to the court, a wrong to the American people, and a bitter wrong indeed to the blacks of America.

The letters follow:

[From the Washington Post, March 4, 1970]

LAW PROFESSORS OPPOSE JUDGE CARSWELL'S CONFIRMATION

Surely no one who values the unique role of the United States Supreme Court as both a symbol and as a vital instrument of liberty can relish the spectacle of yet another struggle in the effort to maintain high standards and judicial integrity on the nation's highest tribunal. Exhausted from a struggle to save the court from the damage it would have suffered from the appointment of a judge who demonstrated a singular insensitivity to accepted norms of behavior in conflict of interest situations, the legal profession must now protect the court from a one-time self-professed white supremacist whose undistinguished career on the bench has contributed to the fulfillment of the vows he made more than 20 years ago to uphold the "ideals" of racial segregation.

The Supreme Court is as threatened now by racism as it was by impropriety two months ago. A judge whose career has all too frequently been marred by evasion of the letter and spirit of Supreme Court decisions, who has repeatedly been reversed by the Court of Appeals for his decisions in racial cases, and who has demonstrated a callous indifference to the constitutional rights of America's black citizens can hardly be gauged the right man for the Supreme Court at this turning point in American history.

For these reasons, as law professors who view the law as an instrument of peaceful and orderly social change, we feel a special responsibility to oppose the elevation of G. Harrold Carswell to the Supreme Court.

HENRY W. MCGEE, Jr.,
University of California, Los Angeles, Law School.
LOS ANGELES.

(This letter also bore the names of 24 other members of the law school faculty.)

I am writing in regard to the pending nomination of Judge Harrold Carswell to the Supreme Court.

Judge Carswell is established, by unrebutted and indeed undenied evidence, to have been a vehement and utterly convinced racist in 1948, when he was a mature man. So far as I can judge from press reports, no hard evidence has been adduced to show a subsequent change. The Tallahassee golf club incident is, on the contrary, corroboratory. The testimony of civil rights lawyers practicing before him (one of whom is personally known by me to be a reliable man, and the other of whom I neither have nor can imagine any reason to doubt) is strongly corroboratory, and indicates an entrance of these improper feelings into the judicial function itself, a thing maximally wrong and distasteful. The "darkie story" reported by Newsweek magazine, evidence coming from only a few months ago, is the act of a man callous as if by instinct to the claims of Negroes to dignity; it brings to mind Plutarch's insight that one can often tell more about a man by some playful action of his than from his great public deeds.

The appointment of such a man would be a wrong to the court, a wrong to the American people, and a bitter wrong indeed to the blacks of America. Like many others, I have publicly and privately exhorted them to trust to the law for redress of the horrible injustice they have suffered and still suffer. I will continue so to exhort them, whatever the event as to this nomination. But if this sort of judge is to be the sort of judge they will have to rely on in the last resort, I shall have some difficulty looking them straight in the eye as I speak.

I would not acquiesce in the notion that such a man ought to go on the court, even if he were a conspicuous leader of thought in the law. One need not face that question, however, for there can hardly be any pretense that he possesses any outstanding talent at all. On the contrary, all the evidence I have seen would lead to the conclusion that his mediocrity is an independently valid objection to his appointment.

It is of the highest importance that the Senate withhold its advice and consent to this nomination.

CHARLES L. BLACK, Jr.,
Luce Professor of Jurisprudence, Yale Law School.
NEW HAVEN, CONN.

The failure of the organized bar and the law schools of this land to oppose vigorously the nomination of Judge Carswell to the Supreme Court can only be described as lamentable. President Nixon is entitled to his belief that what the Supreme Court needs now is another Southern justice, indeed even a "strict constructionist," but as faculty members of a Southern law school we cannot remain silent while a judge whose legal abilities and judicial background are so sadly wanting is awarded one of the highest judicial honors that this country can bestow upon a member of our profession.

R. B. LILLICH,
University of Virginia School of Law.
CHARLOTTESVILLE.

(This letter also bore the names of 18 other members of the law school faculty.)

THE COMPREHENSIVE HEADSTART CHILD DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1970

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, with 17 of my colleagues, I introduced the Comprehensive Headstart Child Development Act of 1970. This brings the total of sponsors of the bill

in the House of Representatives to 39; we have been joined in the other body by 5 additional sponsors.

Yesterday also, President Nixon sent to Congress his message on educational reform. This message commented in some detail upon the problems of providing the kind of early childhood services needed by the children of this country and made two specific recommendations in this area, with which I strongly concur and which are reflected in the Comprehensive Headstart Child Development Act of 1970

First, the President called for the creation of a National Institute of Education as a focus for educational research and experimentation in the United States, which might eventually spend as much as a quarter of a billion dollars annually. This Institute, he said, would "set priorities for research and experimentation projects" and would "link the educational research and experimentation of other Federal agencies to the attainment of particular national educational goals."

The bill I introduced yesterday provides for the creation of a National Institute for Early Childhood Development and Education. As outlined in the proposed legislation, it would also be aimed at serving as a focus for educational research and experimentation, in the early childhood area, would set priorities for research, and would also attempt to link and coordinate the activities of various agencies of the Federal Government which pertain to research in the early childhood area. For this Institute, we have proposed a first-year authorization of $10 million; $15 million for the second year.

Both ideas are compatible with one another—so much so, that the sponsors of this bill hope that the National Institute for Early Childhood Development and Education could be brought under the umbrella of the much larger National Institute of Education proposed by the President yesterday. The National Institutes of Health, encompassing many separate institutes for research into specific health areas, set a model for comparison here.

The advantages of bringing the two proposed research structures together are twofold. First, joining the two structures together would prevent needless duplication of facilities, data gathering, and other support activities which could be carried on in common, and would in fact probably make possible devotion of more resources of this nature to the early childhood area than might be possible under a totally independent arrangement. Second, the delineation of a district institute focusing on the questions of early childhood learning provides some assurance that work in this area will have a measure of continuity and will not be turned off and on as internal priorities or fashionable research topics change from year to year.

President Nixon yesterday also described a network of child development projects to improve early childhood programs by trying out a variety of approaches to the organization of services for young children—ranging from kindergarten-type compensatory education to the tutoring of toddlers, to work with infants and their mothers at home. The bill I introduced yesterday also specifically provides for programs of this kind as well as other approaches which may prove effective.

H.R. 16265 contains a number of other points, in addition to the two which were emphasized in the President's message yesterday. Although they were explained in some detail on February 9 in speeches made here in the House, I feel that it would be useful to go over them briefly:

First. Consolidation under one funding authority, the major Federal programs which provide operating funds for day-care and child development programs. The expenditure for these programs in fiscal year 1971 will be over $560 million.

Second. State commissions will be established in each State to plan for the use of early childhood funds in that State and to approve applications.

Third. Urban areas will be assured an equitable portion of the early childhood funds.

Fourth. Phased implementation: Federal expenditures for early childhood programs should not increase substantially until and unless there are adequate facilities and sufficiently trained personnel to support such programs.

Fifth. Private enterprise must be involved in providing early childhood services so that the entire burden will not rest upon the Federal Government.

Sixth. Evaluation of early childhood programs to make sure that good programs are strengthened and that programs which are not working can be improved or dropped.

This outlines some of the things the bill is intended to do. Let me also point out some facts which may help to clear up misunderstanding as to what the bill will not do.

The highest priority, under this proposal, is upon providing services to the educationally disadvantaged children who need them the most and who have no other way of obtaining such services. Funds are allocated to the 50 States according to the number of disadvantaged children, the number of children of working mothers, and the total number of children in each State. But after this allocation has been made, the funds will be allotted within each State in a way that gives the highest priority to the economically disadvantaged children.

But I want to point out further that the bill does not establish programs solely for the economically disadvantaged. It is our goal to see that eventually there will be enough programs and services available so that all children who want, need, and can pay for them will also be able to obtain early childhood services. While Federal funds should be used to subsidize such services only for the poor who could not afford them otherwise, this should not afford other children who could benefit from early childhood from having access to such programs. Yet, unless the capacity of our early childhood programs is increased significantly, this will be the result—right now, there are simply not enough nursery schools, child-care centers, and early learning programs for all the children whose parents are able and willing to pay for them. This hits especially hard at the working mother who, because of her income, usually in addition to her husband's, is not eligible to place her children in any of the federally sponsored child care centers now in existence, even if she is willing to pay the full cost of her child's services. A recent amendment to Headstart, however, promises to open this program to paying nonpoor children if program capacities will permit.

Although under the provisions of this proposed legislation, the State commissions will be responsible for approving applications for grants, their procedures will have to be consistent with Federal laws and regulations. If they are not, or if a State does not form a commission, then the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be able to administer that State's funds.

Existing programs to train educational personnel will be expanded under the proposed legislation so that greater emphasis can be placed upon training both professional and paraprofessional personnel. Additionally, a measure has been included so that ongoing, inservice training and upgrading of early childhood personnel can take place, in much the same way that Headstart inservice training programs have operated.

In the bill, the Federal Interagency Daycare Standards are mentioned. If private enterprise participation is to be encouraged, we must at the same time assure a high standard of performance, from the private as well as the public sector. The language in the bill, however, is in no way intended to irrevocably book all future programs into the formula prescribed by these standards. Should our ideas regarding early childhood practices be modified so much that these standards become impractical, restrictive or out of date, we would hope that they would be adjusted as the realities of the situation might require.

This measure encourages parent participation in early childhood programs. Many positive benefits are derived from this participation—to the children in the program, to the parents and to other children in the family. But, we do not require parent participation because in some instances this may be inadvisable—programs serving children who need relief from disturbed home environments—or in other instances this may be virtually impossible—working mothers seldom have the time or energy to devote long hours of volunteer service to early childhood programs.

Finally, although it is not specified in the bill introduced yesterday, I would hope that during the legislative process, consideration would be given to the possibility of reserving a portion of the funds for early childhood programs for special model and experimental programs within the States. This would be a constructive change in the proposed legislation and would serve to reinforce the "early learning program" described in President Nixon's message, which will provide us with "a strong experimental base."

MOMI KAMAU—OUTSTANDING EXAMPLE OF DEDICATED PUBLIC HEALTH FIELD NURSES

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is with special pride that I call the attention of the House to an outstanding young lady from Hawaii, Mrs. Momi Kamau, who, through her work as a public health field nurse, is making her presence felt in community improvement and in the betterment of mankind.

Mrs. Kamau is one of 62 public health field nurses on the Island of Oahu, and Honolulu Star-Bulletin Writer Judy McKnight recently journeyed with her on her rounds for a day to observe her work for an article featuring the "Wahine of the Week."

Hawaii is indeed famous for its lovely and gracious wahines—ladies. But Momi Kamau brings more than those attributes to her work. She possesses an unusual desire to help and a special empathy in her consultations with her clients that brightens their lives and helps to solve some of the very real problems which confront those in need of assistance.

There are 15 clinics serving the health needs of the people on Hawaii's most populated island. Last year, 23,594 cases were admitted to the clinics, 2,390 clinic sessions were held, and 50,451 people were served.

In her feature article, Judy McKnight quoted a statement by Mrs. Kamau which certainly reflects the true spirit of nursing—

It's a constant job, but that's why I like it. I really feel like I'm helping people.

I know my colleagues and others would wish to join me in this salute to Mrs. Momi Kamau. In order that they may read her inspiring story, I take pleasure in submitting for inclusion in the RECORD the February 19, 1970, article from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Feb. 19, 1970]

SHE'S A PEDDLER OF FREE ADVICE

(By Judy McKnight)

Momi Kamau is a special kind of door to door salesman.

As one of 62 public health field nurses on Oahu, what she's peddling—advice, knowledge and encouragement—comes free to her clients.

Very rarely do they slam the door in her face or refuse to answer at all.

They don't always take her advice, but they do listen.

As Mrs. Kamau said, "I just keep telling them and eventually I hope they will understand and do something about it."

Her work day is from 7:45 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. but she might work nights or weekends "if I've been unable to see some of the families."

A day's travel with her is a busy one.

On a Thursday recently her first stop was in Nanakuli for a well baby clinic.

Each month the infants are brought in for a routine check-up. If the baby appears sick, he would be referred to a doctor or one of the 15 other kinds of clinics manned by public health nurses, five practical nurses and sometimes a doctor.

Last year, 23,594 cases were admitted to the clinics; 2,390 clinic sessions were held and 50,451 people were served.

Cries from anxious youngsters, questions from worried mothers were Momi's greeting at the Nanakuli clinic but she was able to reassure everyone she talked with.

Her first consultation was with a young mother whose 8-month-old baby Momi had seen before.

"Blue marks gone?" questioned Momi. "Blue marks gone," beamed the mother.

"What does baby eat for breakfast?" she asked. "Bananas, cereal good for baby but what about eggs. Does she eat eggs?"

"No eggs," said the mother. "You give her eggs in the morning, okay?"

"Okay."

"What about poi? Do you give the baby poi?" Momi asked next.

"Mother don't eat poi too," she replied.

After explaining the importance of nutrition to the mother, Momi held the baby for a minute and then handed her back saying, "She a good baby. You take care of her."

The rest of her consultations ran the same way. Each time, Momi would ask the mother what the baby ate and how much milk he drank. If the child was due for a shot. Momi explained why it was needed and reassured the child that it wouldn't hurt much.

The mothers who use the clinics are there because they can't afford a private doctor. "But," as Momi said, "many people have the mistaken notion that our clinics are for welfare recipients only. We need to get more of the borderline cases who would have difficulty paying monthly doctor bills.

"I always ask a prospective client what kind of bills her family has. Even if their income is over our maximum they may have a lot of bills and have no medical plan."

If that's the case, Momi said, she usually accepts them.

Her next stop was Makakilo School for vision screening. The children had been referred to her because they had not passed the first eye test given by the teachers and volunteer parents.

Nothing can be more terrifying to an elementary student than to be called to the office, but when the children got there, the nurse in the light blue uniform seemed able to reassure them.

Perhaps the first child was a bit anxious but after seeing how easy Momi made it, the rest relaxed.

One child complained of headaches. Momi questioned him about where it hurt most. "My eyes," he said.

The test showed that the child could hardly see out of his left eye. The boy said he has told his mother "but she just keeps saying she will take me to the eye doctor when she has time."

Momi told the boy that she would call his mother and let her know that he must have an eye examination soon.

"In the meantime," she said, "sit in the front row."

By lunchtime Momi was at a care home, one she's been visiting regularly since she started as a public health nurse over three years ago.

The four men who live there, all former patients of Hawaii State Hospital at Kaneohe, had difficulty finishing their lunch, they were so pleased to see her.

Their expressions showed this was a big day . . . Momi had come by. She asked the woman who owns and runs the home how the men had been acting, if she had any questions and then Momi advised her on the problems she had.

The woman, upset because one of the men complained that he didn't like meat, was advised by Momi that it was probably a habit he wouldn't get over and that she should try and forget about it.

"He doesn't have that much to enjoy," she said. "You must remember that."

While driving the back roads of Waipahu, on her way to her home visits, Momi recalled that when she first started in the area, "I was scared to death. Actually, I was afraid that the people wouldn't accept me—that they wouldn't let me try and help them.

"It was difficult to talk to them at first but once I established a rapport with them it was easy."

Because of her case load, she is involved with about 250 cases, 120 of them families. She quickly learns the people who live in her district.

Each home, each person she passed, reminded her of some story.

"A midget woman and her son live here," she said at her first stop.

"Last year during the bad storm, their home was flooded. Because they have no electricity, they go to bed when it gets dark and on that particular night they probably would have drowned if they luckily hadn't been visiting relatives.

"You know," she continued, "that home may not look like anything and its furnishings are poor but it's also spotless, one of the cleanest homes I've been in."

The story of the next house was not quite as pleasant. The women of the family traditionally bear their children while they are teen-agers, and none of them has finished school.

Momi stopped especially to see a 17-year-old who had not taken her baby for his regular checkup. The girl married after having her first child, and her husband, Momi said, frequently causes trouble for the child.

"He doesn't want to spend money on baby food," Momi said, "and he becomes difficult at times."

Momi wasn't surprised when she heard that the girl couldn't go to the clinic because her husband had wanted the car for something else and had left her with no other transportation.

The nurse was concerned because the baby's stomach had been distended during his last visit to the clinic. She asked the mother what the child had been eating since.

The girl had not been giving the baby the prescribed food because she said it came out undigested and that meant the baby didn't like it.

"So I gave it to my sister," she laughed.

"The people around here are very superstitious," Momi explained later. For instance, at that house, the daughters don't like the doctors in the area.

"One of their own racial extraction talks to them funny they say and the other is spooky because he is from a European country they know little about.

"So instead, their mother, who doesn't believe in doctors, treats the sick infants with her herb medicines. So far, she's been lucky," Momi continued, "and has been able to pull the babies through their sicknesses. Naturally, her daughter's faith in their mother is restored as a doctor."

Another daughter had just had her third premature baby. Throughout her pregnancy, Momi had tried to convince her to go to the doctor but the girl refused any doctor's care. Soon after starting labor "she had someone drive her to the hospital she had had her other two children in," Momi said.

"I've suggested she and her husband practice some kind of birth control but the girl's husband refuses."

During this visit, Momi asked her again, "Have you asked your husband about what we discussed earlier?"

The girl said she had, that he had said he didn't care and that she would ask a doctor about it the next time she went.

"But you never know," Momi said. "You just never know."

What Momi did on that particular Thursday is just part of her job.

She also makes regular stops at the schools in her district, visits the pre-schools as part

of an inspection team once or twice a year, works with children, readying them for Head Start schools and talks with a group of unwed mothers in her area whenever she gets a chance.

She may be called on by doctors to help families learn nursing procedures and she helps people locate other agencies that might be able to assist them.

"It's a constant job," said Momi, "but that's why I like it. I really feel like I'm helping people."

SILENT MAJORITY CONDEMNS LIBERAL DOUBLE STANDARD

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress we are here to represent the people of our respective districts in the Congress, and in a larger sense, to represent the people of the United States as their legislators.

While here in Washington our contact with the news of the world is through either the national radio and television networks or the wire services. The alternative is the news and views published or broadcast for the Washington audience by local newspapers or radio and television stations. In either event, we should realize that the editorial opinions which we constantly hear expressed—usually not labeled as such—are aimed at a select audience, and do not represent the views of any significant portion of the American people.

Our good friend Horace R. Kornegay, formerly a Member of this House, was kind enough to send me a transcript of one of the editorials broadcast over WRAL–TV, the "Voice of Free Enterprise," in Raleigh-Durham, N.C., with the very excellent suggestion that every responsible Member should be aware of both the facts and the attitude expressed.

This broadcast truly represents the voice of what is now called the silent majority of Americans, and I commend it to all our colleagues, and include it in my remarks:

WRAL–TV VIEWPOINT

The gentlemen of the "liberal" press, radio and television are indeed a schizophrenic group, yet it must be said of them that they are, in a way, remarkably consistent. They never let facts or truth stand in the way of their reaching phony conclusions designed to mislead the public.

The brethren have been working themselves into a self-righteous lather of late concerning the matter of Arthur Ashe. Young Ashe is a tennis player, and quite an excellent one. He is a resident of Richmond, Virginia. He is a Negro. And, a week or so ago, he was refused permission by the government of South Africa to enter that country to compete in a tennis tournament.

South Africa, to be sure, is a strictly segregationist country. Thus, when Arthur Ashe's application for a visa was rejected by South Africa, the liberal news media around the world flatly declared that the decision was made because of the color of Arthur Ashe's skin. The real truth, however, is that young Ashe was told to stay out of South Africa because of the irresponsibility of his tongue.

Our own view happens to be that skill is skill, and talent is talent, and we enjoy observing capable people in competition—even despite an occasional instance of a loud mouth or boorish conduct. It might have been well for South Africa to have taken a similar position in the instance of Arthur Ashe.

But the plain truth is that Arthur Ashe was not barred from South Africa because he is black. He was denied entry because he had been repeatedly insulting to South Africa, and because he has been busy trying to deny South African athletes *their* opportunity to compete in sports events around the world. Young Ashe, for instance, was one of the leaders of a 1968 campaign which kept South Africa out of the Olympics. Ironically, the athletes that South Africa had planned to send to the Olympics included several Negroes. Last year, Arthur Ashe succeeded in persuading the International Tennis Players' Association to condemn South Africa.

Arthur Ashe, in other words, had deliberately made himself *persona non grata* in South Africa. And when he applied for admission to that country, he offered the friendly little comment that he would like to "drop an H-bomb" on Johannesburg, the largest city in South Africa.

Other Negro sports figures have been, and are being, admitted to competition in South Africa. So it cannot be—contrary to what the liberal news media claim—that Arthur Ashe was barred because of his race.

So, call it a political decision to keep him out, if you wish. The "liberals" say that's bad, too. After all, they say, the United States has granted entry to such people as Khrushchev, Castro—and to countless thousands of other foreigners who came (and come) to America to curse and malign us. To hear the "liberals" tell it, everybody ought to be allowed to go anywhere they please, regardless of how offensive they may have been in word and deed.

We're glad the "liberals" brought that up. If they feel that way, why did they lift nary a finger, nor raise the slightest protest, when the United States refused to admit Moise Tshombe to our shores? Mr. Tshombe was our friend; he was premier of Katanga; he was solidly opposed to communism; he was a dedicated Christian. He was a Negro. But, no, sir, the "liberals" didn't mind his being refused entry into the United States.

And, come to think of it, Prime Minister Ian Smith of Rhodesia has been repeatedly refused admission to the United States to fulfill numerous speaking engagements extended to him. Not a peep out of the "liberals" about that. You see, Ian Smith and his country also want to be our friends; they, too, are anti-communist.

So, as we say, the "liberals" are consistent. Consistently inconsistent.

U.S. ADMIRAL WARNS OF RED NAVY THREAT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is curious that seldom do those who decry Defense Department spending ever balance the picture by publicizing the military buildup of the Soviet Union, the prime reason for our high defense expenditures. Soviet involvement in the Arab-Israeli conflict, their increasing naval presence in the Mediterranean, their ABM program—all somehow indicate in some minds nothing more than honorable intentions on the part of the Soviet Union.

Recently the chief of the United States naval forces in Europe, Admiral Waldemar F. A. Wendt, supplied some sobering information on the U.S.S.R.'s campaign for "peace" on the high seas. After pointing out various aspects of the Soviet buildup, Admiral Wendt stated:

The Russians are in the Mediterranean. They also operate regularly and continually in the north Atlantic and the Norwegian sea. Russian naval units now are being seen with regularity in the Indian ocean and off both coasts of Africa. They are in the Pacific, the Arctic, and the Antarctic.

Perhaps it is time that those irrational opponents of defense spending be made to answer how we are going to cope with the mushrooming Soviet military might. We all oppose the needless and wasteful expenditure of funds in any agency and a strict accounting along with corrective action should be the order of the day in overseeing Federal expenditures. But in the case of Defense and other agencies responsible for the security of this Nation, information such as that provided by Admiral Wendt should be a part of any judgment as to what size appropriations are necessary in these areas.

The February 28 issue of the Chicago Tribune carried an article from London reporting on a speech by Admiral Wendt which I am inserting in the RECORD at this point:

U.S. ADMIRAL WARNS OF RED NAVY THREAT

(By Robert Merry)

LONDON, February 27.—Soviet Russia has raced to become a major seapower in an effort to wrest supremacy of the seas from the free world, a top American military man said today.

He is Adm. Waldemar F. A. Wendt, commander in chief of the United States naval forces in Europe.

Wendt, a native of Millstadt, Ill., told a luncheon audience here that the Soviet Union is spending about the same amount on defense construction as the United States. He said that Russia is making this outlay despite the fact its gross national product is only about half that of the United States.

CITES 1,600 SHIPS

Wendt said the Soviet navy numbers about 1,600 vessels with only one per cent more than 20 years old.

"Their shipyards launch nine merchant ships to every one produced in the United States," he said. "Their excellence in naval missiles, electronics, fire control, and hulls design is a fact western experts must acknowledge."

The admiral said Russia has two new helicopter ships with both anti-submarine and amphibious warfare capabilities, 24 cruisers with surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles, 120 new frigates and destroyers; and 175 ships powered by gas turbines.

TELLS OF SUBMARINES

The Soviet navy musters about 350 submarines, of which more than 50 are nuclear powered and 100 are missile armed, he said. The Russians are launching missile-firing submarines, similar to Polaris units at the rate of seven or eight a year, the audience was told.

"Their submarine threat is real and must be recognized as such," Wendt warned.

He said the Soviet Union is deploying its naval might far from its own shores.

"The Russians are in the Mediterranean," Wendt said. "They also operate regularly

and continually in the north Atlantic and the Norwegian sea. Russian naval units now are being seen with regularity in the Indian ocean and off both coasts of Africa. They are in the Pacific, the Arctic, and the Antarctic.

"The swimming Russian bear is not yet 10 feet tall, but he is 5 feet, 8 inches, and growing rapidly. He has not yet wrested supremacy of the seas from the free world, but he is making a very determined effort to do so.

"If we are not alert, we may find tomorrow that our strength has been checkmated at sea."

MORE FUNDS NEEDED FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, recently my colleague DON RIEGLE delivered an address to a meeting of the Federation of State Associations of Independent Colleges and Universities in Houston, Tex. I believe his speech will be of interest to other congressional Members and am pleased to insert his remarks in the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY HON. DONALD F. RIEGLE, JR.

It's a pleasure to have the opportunity to share some thoughts and ideas with you this evening.

I come in the place of Congressman Silvio Conte—a good friend of mine—and a good friend of yours. Serving with Silvio and Jeff Cohelan on the Appropriations Committee I have been pleased to work with them as they led the fight to beef up our national commitment to higher education in America.

As you know, many of us in the Congress, in both parties, feel that education in America has to move up the list of national priorities.

Now on your program, you will note the theme of this particular session was to have been higher education and the states. That will not be the main thrust of my remarks—but I do wish to express the following views with respect to that subject.

My personal view is that the success of higher education—whether public or private—is a matter of vital concern to all levels of government and to the nation as a whole. Accordingly, the resources must be marshalled, regardless of source, to meet the needs of higher education in America. Different states have taken widely varying directions with respect to the issue of financial support to independent colleges. The trend, I think, however, is in the direction of greater assistance—just as has been the case at the federal level. Thus, I expect to see these trends continue—and feel that this evolving partnership between state governments and private colleges is productive and worthwhile for both parties.

But one over-riding financial reality is this: Today, two-thirds of all the tax revenue raised in the United States goes to the federal government. While I believe that percentage is too high—it nonetheless is a reality we must deal with. And that is why what I wish to explore with you now are the issues that bear on how these federal monies are allocated.

In this regard, the Congressional fight for higher appropriations for education goes beyond the issue of education itself. It goes directly to the issue of national priorities—of national needs and goals—of national direction and purpose—of what's more important than what.

And the essence of the national priorities issue really focuses around our view of man—of his needs, his capacities, what is uplifting to him, what makes him more noble, more sensitive, more able to deal sensitively with himself, his fellowman and the world around us.

Today, in my view, our national priorities—as reflected in our national budget—are wrong. First, our national resources are spread too thin—and too much is diverted and lost on projects of little strategic importance.

For example, having reached the moon, some feel that we must race on to Mars. I disagree.

Others clamor for a supersonic transport airplane—arguing this project should stand front rank in its claim on our national resources. Again, I disagree.

Others, like Mendel Rivers, feel we must increase the Defense budget by $1 billion to finance new battleships that the Secretary of Defense has not requested. I disagree.

But these things are being done. These are the kinds of things your tax dollars are being spent on. And when the budget pressures become compelling, as you are witnessing, it is the budget for Health, Education, and Welfare that is threatened with a Presidential veto.

As a nation are we better advised to send astronauts to Mars—or find an answer to heart disease or to cancer? Should we build more battleships and ABM's—or should we provide glasses for a youngster in Harlem who otherwise will never learn to read?

When I travelled from Memphis, Tennessee to Clarksdale, Mississippi yesterday, I passed hundreds of pine board shanties where America's poor and hungry and cold are living (if you can call it living)—but the food they need to eat isn't available because it isn't raised on adjacent land—because the government pays to keep the land idle in the soil bank. Yes, we find the money to pay Senator Eastland $175,000 a year in federal farm subsidies—but money for the poor and hungry is socialism—or so the rationalizations go.

America's in trouble. The young people know it. You're feeling it on your campuses.

And Mainstreet America is just as deeply troubled—it too senses that things are wrong. And that while our GNP races toward the trillion dollar mark—the quality and meaning of life here in America seem to be more uncertain—more in jeopardy—less than what we want it to be.

Here in Houston people suddenly are realizing they don't want to choke to death on polluted air.

Across the country college administrators and educators have come to realize that you must organize in order to press your claim for a meaningful share of national resources for the nation's educational needs. Presumably, that's why the Muskies and the Riegles are invited to appear at these gatherings.

And the anti-war people found they had to organize to try to reverse the loss of American life in Vietnam.

Students found they had to organize to confront and disrupt educational institutions to try to achieve, in many cases, necessary and long overdue educational reform.

I could go on and on with examples here—but let me get to the point I wish to make because that point goes beyond the direct interests of higher education. Beyond the now familiar issue of national priorities. It goes to the question of what America's all about—and what that means to you and me as human beings, as citizens, and as people with some influence and potential power.

I would submit to you that the difficulties the nation is experiencing constitute a crisis in self-government and a crisis in the responsiveness of our institutions.

For today, for many reasons, the nation is not responding adequately to its needs. The evidence of this comes in many forms:

High interest rates—housing shortage;

High taxes;

The racism that is institutionalized in virtually every segment of our society;

Inflation;

Needless and unwanted wars;

A massive and self-perpetuating Military/Industrial complex;

The relentless destruction of the environment;

A crime crisis of unprecedented dimension;

Special-interest government;

The increasing "bureaucratizing" of men and their work;

The virtual wasteland of television.

The list is endless of things that are wrong—where the trend is in the wrong direction—where the emphasis is misplaced—where people and human values are neglected and shoved aside.

And America is groping for a better way. And most of our people discount the slick, simple answer:

They have seen through the approach of throwing dollars at problems.

And after getting some gut therapy, they are seeing through the approach of yelling at problems.

They know that problems don't disappear even if bureaucrats with pointed heads learn to park a bicycle straight.

They know the answer is not the formula of more bombs—or the formula of more troops—or the SDS formula of more violence—or the Mayor Daley formula of more violence—or the silent majority formula of more silence.

The people of America are looking for a better way, for new leadership. And they are *only* going to find it in *themselves*. Because our nation, unique among nations, is geared to citizen involvement, citizen capacity, and broad citizen effort. Our political institutions are organized on this basis and when they fail to work properly it's more often due to disuse than misuse.

Now, the Congress of the United States is the people's branch of government. Each year it allocates some $200 billion. This assignment alone does as much to determine the tone and vitality of America as any single force in the country.

But the Congress today, for many reasons, is not up to the job that is required of it. The Congress is old, it is inefficient, and it is not responsive to the urgent realities we face as a nation.

There are too many men in Congress who should not be there. And they are found in both political parties.

The political process in the United States is not encouraging our best men and women to seek public office; and the Congress, by its antiquated methods and rules, tends to drive out or frustrate the good men and women that are elected.

As you know, the Congress has saddled itself with the blind and unthinking seniority system—a medieval procedure whereby the oldest surviving member of the body automatically becomes the committee chairman. There is no competition for these powerful committee chairmanships, no election process, no analysis of ability and energy and skill.

As a result, today, in the House of Representatives, we have seven committee chairmen who are in their 70's—in fact, we have two more who are in their 80's.

In the Senate—six committee chairmen are in their 70's.

Consider this:

In the House, the Chairman of—

Banking and Currency is 76.

Science and Astronautics 79.

Judiciary 81.

Rules 79.

Government Operations 83.

In the Senate—

Rules and Administration 73.

Government Operations 73.

Banking and Currency 70.

Agriculture and Forestry 79.

Aeronautical and Space Sciences 74.

Appropriations 72.

I believe it would serve the national interest to set a mandatory retirement age of 70 for all Members of Congress. With rare exception, the country would be better off with men 69 and younger.

And the same rule should apply in the executive branch.

One specific point is J. Edgar Hoover. He is now 75, five years beyond the mandatory, legal federal retirement age. This is certainly a violation of the spirit and the intent of the law—and it seems to me that our chief law enforcement officer ought to precisely obey the law himself. Yet he hangs on. I think he's too old and too ineffective. I think it's time we brought some new leadership and some new management into the FBI.

It's a bureaucracy that needs new thinking, new ideas. Anyone who has witnessed the unbelievable increase in crime and criminal activity in the United States in recent years must conclude that the FBI in the 70's must do a much better job than the FBI of the 60's.

Today the Mafia and organized crime are flourishing, making billions of dollars illegally. This can only happen because the leadership of the Mafia is smarter than the FBI. I want the leadership of the FBI to be smarter than the Mafia and put the Mafia out of business. If Hoover needed additional laws he could ask for them and Congress would quickly pass them. But that's not the problem. The problem is a failure of leadership by FBI executives who are too old, inefficient, and bureaucratic. The American people deserve a better performance than that. I hope President Nixon will not sign an executive waiver which would allow Hoover to stay on.

Back to the Congress:

We need to throw out the seniority system. Committee chairmen ought *to be elected,* and on the basis of ability.

Further, we need to open up many of our closed committee hearings. We should make public the secret record of key votes that occur during closed committee sessions.

We need to modernize our procedures, to staff ourselves adequately, to use data processing equipment and systems analysis technology.

We must change the rules of the House so that we squarely and fully face the issue.

But even with these internal changes we must do more. We must increase the competition for the 435 seats in the House and the 100 seats in the Senate. For this to happen new people must step forward as candidates and as supporters. Some of you here in this room may have to be candadates this fall. *All* of you should contribute financially to the candidates you believe in.

Let me give you another example.

My mind goes back to 1964 to the Presidential election, the race between Goldwater and Johnson. Most of the people I spoke to at that time didn't want to vote for either man. What a shame it is when many of our citizens must decide who they are going to vote for President on the basis of whom they hate the least. In my own judgment, neither man was the man for the job in 1964.

Another man should have made the Vietnam decision—

Now, in 1970—

40,000 American lives later;

$110 billion later;

After dropping more bombs than we did in all of World War II.

Today, we're crab-legging out of Vietnam which is what we should have done many long years ago.

What we need in 1970, above all other things, is a renaissance in American politics. We need new candidates, with new ideas, to step forward to help lead America to a new set of national priorities, to a restatement of American philosophy geared to the 1970's and beyond, hopefully, a set of priorities that is based on human values, and on meeting urgent human needs here at home.

For it is not enough to effectively lobby poor national leadership. Our first priority must be to see that our best men and women are in the key positions of public responsibility. When we have done that then we can properly address ourselves to the question of the needs in the field of education *per se.*

And we should remind ourseleves that the institutions of education cannot long survive in the eye of the hurricane. And, as educators, I think we should face the fact that we have, with meager exceptions, failed miserably in bringing these compelling issues before our students, to motivate them and prepare them for creating and manning effective self-government.

In fact, just the reverse has happened. The students figured it out before the faculties and administrators did. The students have forced these issues. And they have made the campus a battleground over national and inter-national issues that are often beyond the direct control of the colleges. *But whose fault is that?*

And now many of our colleges are in the midst of a painful re-evaluation of their purpose and their manner of operation. On the whole I think this is constructive and good. I think, if the federal and state governments can restrain themselves and resist the temptation of repressive legislation (which would only be counter-productive)—that both colleges and college students will be better off when the dust settles.

But a new day is here, and I think the time has come for a greater measure of leadership on these issues by *you* and by your institutions.

Teddy Roosevelt once said:

"It is not the critic who counts—not the one who points out where the strong man stumbled—or how the doer of deeds might have done them better—The credit actually belongs to the man who is down in the arena—whose face is marred by blood and sweat and dust—who strives valiantly only to fall short again and again—but who knows the great enthusiasm—knows that he has spent himself in a worthy cause—and who knows that if he fails—he fails while daring greatly . . ."

America is waiting to dare greatly, and your help is needed *now—to help lead,* to get directly in the fight.

Because things can happen, we can change things for the better. One man can make a difference if he decides to.

John Kennedy closed his inaugural address in 1960 with these words:

"With a good conscience our only sure reward, and with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love. Asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth, God's work must truly be our own."

Thank you.

HOW TO SALVAGE TWO IMPORTANT RESOURCES—YOUNG MEN, TREES

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, throughout my career in the U.S. House of Representatives, I emphasized the importance of protecting our natural resources and including what is probably our most vital resource that we have in this Nation today—the youth of our Nation.

In the development of a Youth Conservation Corps program, I feel that we can accomplish the dual mission of preserving our youthful resources plus our natural resources—or in the words of the February 1970 article in Forest Industries, "How To Salvage Two Important Resources—Young Men, Trees."

It was with a great deal of pride that I assisted the Sierra National Forest and the several cosponsors of this legislation—Office of Special Manpower Programs; Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor; Division Manpower Development and Training, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission; Sierra National Forest; State Center Junior College District and Reedley College; Fresno County Department of Education; American Forest Products Corp.; and Frontier Chevrolet Co., Fresno—in this effort in putting the package together and I would like to share with you the following report on the success of this venture made last year:

HOW TO SALVAGE TWO IMPORTANT RESOURCES—YOUNG MEN, TREES

(Sal'vage—To rescue or save from wreckage, ruin, or the like. That definition aptly describes efforts by public agency and industry people in a pilot project in the California Sierras where some young men, on the borderline of being dropouts from society, and some timber and terrain, needing man's help, were both given new purpose. In fact, everyone involved gained and the project could be a guideline for other regions where commercial forests are part of the scene—and young men need help.)

CHIQUITO CAMP, SIERRA NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.—A husky young fellow, who never before in his life had operated a chain saw, but now was trained, watched with satisfaction as small, dense trees fell before his saw in a timber stand improvement project.

Another boy expressed appreciation for the engineering principles involved in a gabion dam—and it was no longer just a pile of rocks dropped into a wire basket. And another gained new insights into relationships between man and his environment. These, and countless other incidents, marked the success of SYCC 1969.

What's SYCC 1969? What's so great about boys such as these comprehending these kinds of things? Why should an operational business magazine like FOREST INDUSTRIES devote four pages to a summary of the project?

In the first place, SYCC stands for Sierra Youth Conservation Corps. Secondly, it was great because the success of this project of helping some youngsters exceeded even the most optimistic hopes of the persons and organizations who set it up. And the magazine is presenting this summary because, increasingly, the forest industry, as well as the public agencies already involved, will have to help solve community social problems. The SYCC project was successful and can be a guideline for others elsewhere in the country.

There is not sufficient space in these pages to chronicle all the steps which went into creation and operation of SYCC. The main point is that it worked and worked well. Names of persons and organizations are listed elsewhere, but the priming on the project was done by supervisor Zane Smith, Jr., of the Sierra National Forest. He had come to the Sierra, as deputy supervisor, from work with the Job Corps and the Job

Corps camps in California were then being phased out. He felt there should be some way to help some youths in need of help, to the benefit of the forest resource. There were plenty of tools available from shutdown Job Corps camps, and American Forest Products Corp. offered its idle Chiquito logging camp for use as the SYCC camp.

The plan was basically a simple one . . . to set up a program whereby 60 young men could learn, do a useful job, and even earn some money. There were but two basic requirements. The boys must be from needy families; and they must be interested in furthering their education. The corpsmen, as they later were called, were boys who wanted to learn more and a number of them wanted to get into college . . . but they needed the psychological and financial boost to get over that next step. In SYCC they got it.

The original plan was to accommodate 60 youths, but by the time the approvals had been through all the channels and all the necessary coordination had been achieved the potential recruiting period was shortened. When camp started, there were 48 boys, ranging in age from 16 through 19. Of these, 41 completed the 10-week course and pocketed $350 each. Seven dropped out for a variety of reasons, some to take regular jobs, some because of homesickness, and even fear of snakes. Only one boy was asked to leave. That's a fine batting average in anybody's league. And they worked 11,000 man hours without a disabling injury.

What did they do? They worked half a day and went to school half a day. And these were field trips to further broaden their knowledge. They did TSI work on 30 acres of ponderosa pine; worked on two rehabilitation projects in Mountain Meadow; rehabilitated a public camp; did roadside brushing; and did train maintenance. Some time was spent setting up and breaking camp. The achievements and the value of the work performed all are a matter of record on the National Forest.

Specifics about the program may be secured from the Supervisor, Sierra National Forest, Fresno, Calif., or the Fresno county Economic Opportunities Commission, among others. American Forest Products Corp., San Francisco, Calif., can also provide information on how the program operated.

This made headlines locally, but nothing like the negative headlines made by some other youths across the nation. It worked. Something was accomplished. And with the growing demand for cooperation in solving some of the nation's social problems, people—public and private industry—who work with the commercial forest resource have a blueprint in the SYCC 1969 project.

The statistics are a matter of record. Beyond them, the real payoff was in boys who now are more mature, more in tune with things, more qualified with tools and more eager to gain more education.

CHICAGO'S PROPOSED LAKE AIRPORT—IV

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the Professional Air Traffic Controllers in Chicago have expressed strong reservations regarding the safety and feasibility of a Lake Michigan site for Chicago's third major airport.

According to Mr. Donald Polston, a member of the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization, Chicago Terminal, the already saturated air space around Chicago cannot safely handle additional air traffic from a lake airport located only 25 miles southeast of O'Hare Airport. His recommendation is that no other major airport should be developed within 50 miles of O'Hare.

Because of Mr. Polston's close and expert familiarity with the problems of air traffic control, I commend his statement to my colleagues who have indicated concern for the safety problems which might accompany a lake airport.

Mr. Polston's statement follows:

CHICAGO'S PROPOSED LAKE AIRPORT

The Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization feels that under any air traffic control system that we know today, the proposed site for the third airport in Lake Michigan centered eight and a half miles east of 55th Street is completely unsatisfactory.

There already is a maze of crisscrossing air traffic over the City of Chicago and suburbs. To add another master jet port on the lake site would compound the problem ten-fold.

Ideally, no other major airport should be developed within 50 miles of O'Hare, to place one 25 miles southeast of O'Hare, directly in line with its NW-SE runways, would reduce the air traffic capacities of both airports to such an extent that a single airport would be just as efficient.

An airport located at the lake site would give Chicago a worse airspace problem than exists in the New York area where 5 major airports handle less than O'Hare alone.

Already there are turn and altitude restrictions placed on aircraft operating in and out of O'Hara and Midway airports due to the close proximity of the airports. This causes aircraft operating into and out of Midway to be restricted to low altitudes (1,500 feet above ground level) for long periods of time, and traffic departing O'Hare to complete turns within 4 miles of O'Hare.

Aircraft noise should be a prime consideration in the selection of a third airport. The lake site would cause more aircraft to be at lower altitudes for longer times. This could bring noise problems to areas from Evanston to Gary and the whole south and southwest Chicago and suburban areas, not yet exposed to the noise.

Chicago now has the finest airport in the world for handling air traffic and will continue to with the present expansion plans. O'Hare airport has not reached its saturation point but the airspace around Chicago has almost reached its capacity. A lake airport would saturate the airspace and would not allow more aircraft into the Chicago area.

DONALD POLSTON.

IS CANCER IN RETREAT?

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, according to Dr. Joseph Burchenal, "A lot of the work being done in cancer research is almost ready to pay off." This optimistic conclusion and the facts to support it are set forth in a recent issue of Medical World News, dated February 6, 1970. The same article, however, suggests how incredibly imprudent is the pennywise, pound-foolish attitude of this administration, which seeks to make a few points in its public relations campaign against inflation by cutting cancer research funds.

Dr. Burchenal's comment is:

It's absolutely stupid to cut back on this research just when things are really popping in cancer . . . And you can't just cut funds off this year and restore them next year.

I include the article referred to at this point in the RECORD:

IS CANCER IN RETREAT?

"A lot of the work being done in cancer research is almost ready to pay off," says Dr. Joseph Burchenal. But he adds that cutbacks in research funds threaten to delay that payoff needlessly. A number of developments, he thinks, suggest that leukemia and lymphoma are curable.

As support for this conclusion he cites:

The curability of such other types of disseminated neoplastic disease as trophoblastic tumors and Wilms' tumor;

Evidence in man of host resistance to such tumors as Burkitt lymphoma and localized melanoma;

Suggestive evidence of the possible value of immunotherapy in acute leukemia;

The previous significant, though small, five-year survival rate in acute leukemia and Burkitt tumor; and

Evidence of a much higher rate of long-term remissions following new and more intensive combination therapy in these two conditions.

Dr. Burchenal, who is professor of medicine at Cornell Medical College and vice president of Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, noted that as many as 95% of choriocarcinomas of the uterus can be brought into complete remission with disappearance of all evidence of disease, including the return of chorionic gonadotropin to normal. Three out of four can be brought into long-term remission—more than a year—which in this condition amounts to cure, since fewer than 1% relapse after a year's remission.

He attributed the curability of choriocarcinoma largely to the tumor's great sensitivity to chemotherapy and to the availability of an extremely precise technique for measuring chorionic gonadotropin in the urine, to detect minute amounts of residual tumor.

Similar factors seem to account for the curability of half the patients with metastatic Wilms' tumor: the sensitivity of the neoplasm to dactinomycin and the accessibility of the metastases, which are usually pulmonary, to visualization by radiography. Dr. Burchenal pointed out that in both conditions therapy can be continued until all disease is eliminated, thanks to precise techniques for detecting residual tumor cells. He also thinks it probable that there are host defenses against both these types of neoplasm.

Another method that promises to aid in locating humor foci in Hodgkin's disease and other lymphomas is lymphography, which has been made much more precise by recent advances in technique. "Lymphography will still show only fairly large involvement of the retroperitoneal nodes and the like," says Dr. Burchenal, "but I'm sure it can be made better. It is very useful, and it converts a lot of cases that were thought to be Stage I and II disease into Stage III. Obviously that's extremely important, because if you think it's Stage I or II and treat it with just radiation therapy to the localized areas, and don't touch the abdominal nodes, you're not going to cure anybody."

The low cure rate in testicular tumors suggests that host defenses may be comparatively ineffective in spontaneous autochthonous tumors because the antigenic differences between the host's normal cells and these tumors are less pronounced than the differences between normal tissue and tumors

of fetal origin, such as choriocarcinoma. But even in testicular tumors some long-term remissions are achieved. At New York's Memorial Hospital, of 154 patients treated with triple chemotherapy (methothexate, dactinomycin, and an alkylating agent) or with dactinomycin alone, 15% had complete remissions, of which about half appear to be cures.

"In leukemias and lymphomas the two brightest areas are Burkitt tumor and acute leukemia," Dr. Burchenal believes. "The progress that has been made in the past ten years is fantastic."

Some Burkitt tumor patients treated with methothexate in 1960 by Denis Burkitt were still alive nearly a decade later, and a 1967 study showed that 15% of a group of 245 patients had achieved complete regressions of more than a year. Recent results are even more promising; Dr. Paul P. Carbone treated 12 cases at the National Cancer Institute with massive doses of cyclophosphamide, and six were surviving 12 to 24 months after treatment.

Dr. Burchenal noted that in one series of 56 cases, 100% of Stage I and II patients had initial complete responses, while 74% of Stage III patients had similar responses, as did 28% of Stage IV patients. He pointed out that patients in early stages usually have a smaller actual volume of disease than those in Stage III, and that since the malignancy is limited to the jaw it can be observed much better than can the intra-abdominal disease of Stage III.

Also, patients with advanced disease are more likely to be immunologically deficient. Studies have shown that patients with Burkitt tumor have an antibody against the tumor cells, and that those who later achieved complete remission had higher titers of the antibody than those who did not. Other studies indicate that immunologic competence is a factor in the success of treatment for Hodgkin's disease and melanoma.

Acute leukemia was considered hopeless before 1947; there was no specific therapy. In 1953, remissions were produced for the first time with folic acid antagonists. By 1967 Dr. Burchenal was able to collect case records for 159 patients in whom long-term remissions had been achieved, and to predict from experience with them that at least half of all patients with acute leukemia who survive five years after diagnosis will survive indefinitely. With the addition of L-asparaginase to other forms of therapy the percentage of cures may well improve even further.

Immunotherapy with BCG vaccine, pooled irradiated allogenic leukemic cells, both, has been shown effective for patients with acute leukemia in remission. Dr. Georges Mathé of the Institut Gustave Roussy near Paris reported that seven of a group of 20 patients were still in remission from one to more than four years after undergoing immunotherapy (MWN, Aug. 29, '69).

"The best we can hope for in immunotherapy is a relatively small effect," Dr. Burchenal predicts. "It may be an extremely important effect, but we can't hope to get rid of pounds of tissue with immunotherapy. We can use chemotherapy and other treatments to get rid of large amounts of tissue. Unfortunately, in most cases they don't get rid of every last tumor cell, but maybe that's when immunotherapy can do the final mopping up. After all, that's what happens with infectious disease. Many of our antibiotics don't really kill off the last microorganism, but they kill off a large number, and then the patient's host defense mops the rest up and he's cured."

These optimistic predictions hold true only if enough money is available to keep up the present pace of research, and recent cuts in federal appropriations for research seriously threaten to slow the rate of progress. "We don't have as much money as we need, and we have to stop types of research that might be very useful," Dr. Buchenal says. "I think it's absolutely stupid to cut back on this research at a time when things are really popping in cancer. The amount of money that's needed for cancer research, compared with the national budget, is just peanuts, and yet it would make all the difference in the world.

"And you can't just cut funds off this year and restore them next year," he warns. "If you cut the money for research or training, people who have been in clinical research get out and go into practice. They get used to eating and their children get used to wearing shoes. It takes a lot of dedication to go into this kind of work, and I've very, very rarely seen anyone who has gone out of research into practice who has ever come back again."

ATOMIC ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT—CONTINUED

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to include in the RECORD three additional statements on atomic energy and the environment. These statements, which were submitted at a hearing on this subject I held in New York last month with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID), are from: Saul Harris, a respected constituent of mine who is president of the Greater New York Chapter of the Health Physics Society; James Miller, a commercial fisherman; and Elise Jerard of the Citizens Rights Committee.

STATEMENT OF THE GREATER NEW YORK CHAPTER, HEALTH PHYSICS SOCIETY

(Presented Feb. 6, 1970, by Saul J. Harris, President)

The Greater New York Chapter of the Health Physics Society is pleased to have this opportunity to participate in a public discussion of radiation problems associated with the operation of nuclear power plants on Long Island Sound. Through our regular program of participation in similar public hearings, Chapter members are aware of the keen interest in radiation hazards of all types by the general public. The possible effects of radiation on living systems and on future generations continues to be of wide public and scientific concern. The Health Physics Society is the nation's leading radiation protection organization. Among its objectives is the improvement of public understanding of the problems and needs in radiation protection. The Society has been responsible for the development of the health physics profession through which the benefits of nuclear energy can be enjoyed safely.

The health physicist is concerned with an understanding of the mechanisms of radiation damage; with the development and continued assessment of protection standards; with the development and application of instruments, methods and procedures to monitor the environment; and with the evaluation of radiation hazards from unwarranted exposure. The knowledge about the biological effects of radiation is further advanced than knowledge about comparable environmental problems. Even though our knowledge is substantial for high radiation exposures, we continue to seek data on radiation exposures at lower and lower levels. These data are presented at our regular national and local meetings and published in the Journal of the Health Physics Society and elsewhere for discussion and review. An International Radiation Protection Association has been formed in which the Health Physics Society plays an important role. The world's literature on radiation effects is regularly summarized by the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR). Extensive hearings by the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy and other Congressional committees have provided an extensive supply of documented information and comment on radiation hazards and their control. These reports are in a form suitable for reading by the general public. None of these reports is secret.

Basic standards for the protection of employees and the public against radiation and radioactive material in the United States have been developed by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP). These standards have been incorporated into the regulations in Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 20 as well as in the model regulations supported by the Council of State Governments and adopted by most states. These standards are soundly based. In light of present-day knowledge, there is little doubt that the standards are sufficient to provide an acceptable degree of safety.

Sources of radiation were recognized as hazardous immediately after their discoveries. A "tolerance dose" for radiation was first published in the U.S. in 1931. Initial standards were based upon actual biological effects, but were changed to independent, scientific standards as improved radiation instrumentation became available. Further revisions in these standards were made downward in anticipation of expanded use of radiation in medicine, research and industry to maintain the lowest total population dose practicable. These changes were made without any observed instances of biological damage at previous permissible exposure levels. Radiation protection has been possible without the occurrence of the usual type of tragedy which led to the recognition of other health and safety problems.

Voluntary radiation standards were in use prior to the discovery of fission and available decades ahead of the development of the nuclear power industry. The privately-owned nuclear industry was first provided for in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, which contained repeated expression of concern that such development be consistent with public health and safety considerations. The licensing of the use of nuclear materials by the Federal government (an innovative feature in itself) was based upon the need recognized by Congress to assure public health in advance of facility construction. Through the regulatory processes authorized by this law, the nuclear industry was born regulated.

In addition, other sources of radiation are regulated by states. In December 1955, both the N.Y. State Departments of Health and of Labor promulgated comprehensive radiation protection rules. These, as well as the Federal regulations in 10 CFR 20 adopted in February 1957, were based upon the recommendations of the NCRP. Extensive regulation of all radiation sources is now in effect throughout the nation. Recent Congressional action which resulted in Public Law 90–602, the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968 has broadened Federal responsibility for electronic product radiation of all forms.

Environmental monitoring programs have been operated in the vicinity of nuclear reactors by reactor operators, universities and Federal and state radiological health agencies. These instrumentation systems are capable of detecting radioactivity at levels at or even below that from natural "background" radiation levels. Data from these programs have indicated that radiation ex-

posures to persons around nuclear reactors have been well below permissible levels. This radiation safety record associated with the operation of nuclear reactors should be admired and encouraged by the public for all industries. Selection of an alternative method of generating and distributing electricity should involve weighing the radiation hazards from nuclear power plants against the known and unknown risks from alternatives.

The Health Physics Society feels that the risks associated with radiation exposures at permissible levels, if any, are considered to be essentially negligible compared with many other risks encountered and accepted in day-to-day living.

STATEMENT BY MR. MILLER

My name is Jim Miller, commercial fisherman, I have a wife & 6 children that I support with money earned from the water. My home port is Port Jefferson, L. I. Centrally located, between Long Island Lighting Co., Northport Plant and their proposed Nuclear Plant at Shoram.

In the past year we harvested 100,000 lbs. of marketable sea food. Lobsters, Striped Bass, Blue Fish, Flounders, Black Fish, Weak Fish, Spanish Mackerel, Boston Mackerel, Shark Squangelli & Hard Clam & Squid, are only some of the species we harvest. Much of my catch is sold directly to the consumer every day at reasonable prices.

On days when the catch is larger than the local market needs, seafood is then shipped to the New York City Market.

Therefore, the future of Long Island Sound is my future!

No one has been able to tell me if Thermal Pollution or Thermal Enrichment is going to be a great bonanza for me, or bankruptcy.

Stony Brook University, & New York State Conservation Department are all making studies, but they operate out of a small aluminum boat with a borrowed thermometer & are then asked to write a comprehensive report on effects of Thermal Pollution. No fisherman could hope to stay in business with so little & poor a set up as these agencies operate. Yet, their opinion will be balanced against a well financed study of the power company.

Studies are now being conducted in the area in question.

There is 45 commercial net fishermen working in the area. No one has been contacted or consulted. Fishermen, as a group, are not college educated, but, have a vast knowledge of the water & fish in it. 100 to 150 full & part time lobster men, also earn their living from this area. Shell fish men that work at the bay & harbors that border the sound have not been consulted.

The power company states the need for electric power at low prices, increases with additional population. This is a fact no one can dispute. But, as the population increases so does the need for food. Which comes first, food or electric power?

The commercial fishermen has been losing. He has been forced to fight for the right to earn a living & supply the general public with good fresh sea food.

If the commercial men lose the battle with selfish sportsmen, the power company will be the winner!

In the past year at the Northport Power House, many bragged that they could catch blue fish far later in the season because of the heated effluent from the power house. They bragged until the fish, that were trapped here by warm water, started to die.

We now believe that all fish that are fooled by the warm water of the power house, will have to die before spring. It has been reported to be enough fish to support a commercial fisherman, had the fish lived to maturity. The Hudson River has been long known to be the hatchery of striped bass, that later migrate to this area. Con Edison operates Nuclear Power Station on this river, it has been reported in one 4 hr. period, 17,000 fish were killed here.

A fine of $27.50 for each fish killed could be levied against the power company. If one power plant can kill 17,000 fish in 4 hrs., how many plants do we need to kill all the fish in 2 days?

What does a fisherman do with his boat and equipment when the power companies have reduced the fish population, to where it no longer pays to work? The state will collect the fine & we can then collect welfare payments.

The housewife will no longer have fresh fish and must pay more for frozen fish imported from other countries.

But we will have cheap electricity and no fight with the sportsmen.

If the power companies are so sure that Thermal Enrichment is really a bonanza for the commercial fishermen, then I'm all for it; but, do you think the power companies will come and reimburse the people that earn a living from the area, if they are wrong? Or will it be a situation where they always blame the other guy?

Is the commercial fisherman just another expendable item in the march of progress? If this is progress!

STATEMENT OF CITIZENS RIGHTS COMMITTEE

My name is Elise Jerard. I have worked towards a doctorate in biological sciences and speak as Chairman of the Independent Phi Beta Kappa Environmental Study Group, a research society of members of Phi Beta Kappa not representing the United Chapters which pursue no environmental studies; also, as Chairman of the nationwide Citizens' Rights Committee; and as Co-ordinator of the all-professional Committee on Environmental Contamination comprising professors, scientists, physicians and heads of scientific-humanitarian organizations.

We appreciate deeply this opportunity to be heard on the crucial issue of nuclear power, with proliferation racing towards us if a red flag does not stop the reckless rush. Congressman Wolff's courageous statement called for a moratorium on construction of nuclear power plants, while the grave problems were probed and due perspective gained. Twice the New York Times editorial page supported Senator Kennedy's proposal for moratorium, which was beaten down by the objections of the industry, with the backing of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Power. It is no secret that some 16 proposals for review of a dangerous situation have been frustrated; that a proposal by Senator Thruston Morton for a public hearing on the total issue, with review by a Board including independent scientists and informed non-scientists, was blocked by the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as in 1969 Senate Joint Resolution 91, introduced by Senator Marlow Cook, was blocked, and as the Bingham Bill, also, was blocked.

The problems of New York City and Long Island are directly related to the fact that this nuclear program is being pushed at all costs, Federally and in this State. What is needed is an open review of: (1) the role of the AEC, its built-in conflict of interest in selling atomic power and inducing by subsidies an over-swift proliferation of this one form of power generation, while being charged with protecting the public; (2) the role of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. For all its diligent work, there is in this Committee a bias in behalf of promotion of nuclear power, which may not serve the interests of the people as would a Committee whose concern was a balanced power policy. Perhaps such a Committee should be created; (3) the role of Congress itself in passing, and extending the duration of the Price-Anderson Act which, unprecedentedly, removes a normal liability from the shoulders of the industry and insurance companies and places this burden on the unaware and unconsenting people, who are the potential victims of damage from nuclear accident and radiation-induced injury. Behind closed doors, with a voice vote, private insurance pools were allowed to pledge only 74 million dollars in damages, while the taxpayers were to furnish 486 million, the whole totaling only 560 million dollars regardless of damages incurred. Yet the Brookhaven Institute Report estimated on the basis of a plant one-fifth the size, or less, of those now being built or projected, that a major accident could cause 3,400 deaths, 43,000 injuries and 7 billion dollars worth of property loss and damage, without counting the contamination of land, crops, water, property and people.

Multiply that by 5 or 6 and extend the damage by acknowledging that large populations cannot be feasibly evacuated, and the question is: Is this a responsible policy for legislators to impose upon the people? With an issue of this magnitude and potential, what is the excuse for not discussing the whole problem in open hearings, now that over 100 plants are envisaged, with accompanying processing plants, and problems of transport of wastes and disposal of high level radioactive wastes.

Review of this issue bears directly on the predicament of the Long Island region—because it is not an island to itself—and if 14 large plants are projected for siting there, with 4 large plants on David's Island near New Rochelle, it is because the basic question has not been confronted: what kind of power—and for whom? In another sense, the wisdom of this power elite in this Nation and this State is forcing this single most perilous method of generating electricity—and the policy needs to be challenged at the source.

David Rittenhouse Inglis, an Argonne National Laboratory physicist, has written: "The government . . . (has) offered attractions to entice industry: the fruits of its own research and development, reactor blueprints, even *cheapened safety standards*. Industry entered the field in a reckless stampede. We have been expanding nuclear power before we have learned how to make it very safe and we are doing this in industry where the *cost of a desirable degree of safety would cut profits unduly*.

"Plants now being planned could be priced out of the market by enforcement of the long overdue requirement that they assume responsibility for risks, as other industries do." *If our young people want to demonstrate, intelligently, repeatedly, urgently—let them make this demand.* Then perhaps we should not need to worry about the horde of plants on Long Island and David's Island—and encircling New York City, if present plans are fulfilled, and even getting inside the City limits, as has been proposed, all in violation of the AEC's own guidelines for a prudent exclusion area.

We further recommend to you perusal of the 1969 study by the Minnesota scientist who sparked a rebellion against the AEC's permissible levels of radioactive emissions. This study describes not only the problems of discharges into the environment, but also how the emergency systems of the new giant plants can fail to perform in the critical event of loss of coolant, which would result in cataclysmic excursion into the environment and pollution by a massive discharge of radiation. Such an event is unthinkable—and we should therefore think of it. An AEC study acknowledges that "effective performance of emergency systems cannot be predicted with assurance." Dr. Dean Abrahamson, professor at the Minnesota Medical School, who has served as a reactor designer, stated in confrontation with the AEC in Burlington, Vermont, that such catastrophic accidents should not be regarded as ex-

tremely remote possibilities because there could, with proliferation, be such accidents.

The Minnesota Pollution Control Board has, as you members of Congress surely know, cut the AEC's permissible levels of radioactive discharge by nuclear power plants, and at one point in 1969 it was also proposed by the New York State Health Department that levels be cut to one-tenth of the AEC's allowable values. Vermont and Michigan have sided with Minnesota. The present issue of the publication Environment contains a discussion of Dr. Ernest Sternglass' prediction of appalling damage to children if present policies continue to be pursued; the article in Environment contests Sternglass' figures but the possibility of radiation damage is indisputable. Dr. Alice Stewart, who studied the effects on the fetus in utero of radiation and the rise of leukemia incidence in children who had been irradiated during pregnancy has expressed profound concern about the proliferation of radioactive releases.

A recent issue of the Journal of Environmental Health notes a rise in radioactivity of the Columbia River, as a result of nuclear installations, and correlates this rise, rightly or wrongly, with increased cancer incidence in Oregon along the shores of the river. The prediction of an increase in cancer incidence by some 17,000 deaths a year is postulated by two eminent scientists of the AEC's Lawrence Laboratory, Dr. John Goffman and Dr. Arthur Tamplin. Dr. Tamplin has been working with genetic effects of radiation, also, while Dr. Goffman, a former colleague of Dr. Glenn Seaborg, has concentrated on biologic influences of radiation, in a more general manner. We are submitting as an Exhibit testimony by these scientists, so that the Members of Congress can see this work in summary.

The point does not seem to lie in a debate as to whether the figures of these scientists are right or wrong, since predictions are extremely hard to prove. The point lies in the fact that ionizing radiation is a recognized cause of cancer, that no one can say what is the threshold dose for varied human beings, and that common sense, as well as humaneness, should compel us to ask: Is this risk necessary—for the purpose of generating electric power?

We should like to call the attention of the Members of Congress to a study, "Evaluation of Radiological Conditions in the Vicinity of Hanford, 1963" [1] which has considerable relevance to the proposals for 14 plants to be sited at Long Island. The Conditions are not identical because the Hanford region uses irrigation by the affected water; however, the analogy is sufficiently close, we believe, to be taken seriously. It is shown in this study how radionuclides are discharged by nuclear power installations into the Columbia River. Micro-organisms pick up the dissolved chemical substances containing the radioactivity.

In the case of zinc 65, the adventures of which we shall follow, the level is stepped up in the micro-organisms; then in the algae; then in the flesh of fish feeding on them, until radioactive values are considerably increased. Oysters had the highest concentration, as high as 63,500 picocuries, *330 times* the concentration of the river water. The radioactivity is carried to the vegetation, including the food plants of the area, watered with the affected river water, is stepped up in milk, as well as meat of the cows, and in the flesh of other food animals. The fish, milk and meat of this region also travel, to be consumed at a distance.

[1] "Evaluation of Radiological Conditions in the Vicinity of Hanford for 1963," HW–08991, UCO41, Health and Safety (TID–4500, 31st Ed.) pp. 47–48.

The whole-body radioactivity of the people in the Hanford region averages 36,000 picocuries, which is greater than some of the amounts found in workers at nuclear installations. Bone levels have reached 50% of the official limit for bones; whole body levels are 25% of the permissible concentrations. This estimate includes measurements in children. With continued exposure and proliferation, what will be the effects on highly diverse individuals, including those who depart from the normal? What will be the genetic effects? The truth is: that no one can say.

Further questions must be asked about transit of waste on crowded highways and through traffic-jammed streets. Former AEC Commissioner David Lilienthal acknowledged 47 accidents, 18 entailing spillage, 15 severe impact accidents. By now there have been over 70 such accidents, the importance of which is played down. Without wanting to be sensational, let us offer the story of one episode which may not be characteristic but nevertheless should constitute a warning. A little boy picked up a spilled radioactive pellet, played with it, took it home, laid it on the kitchen table. Subsequently, most of the members of that family died. The record occurs in a book of accidents compiled by the nuclear expert of the United Auto Workers. Multiple plants in the Long Island-New York area mean a sharp increase in wastes travelling to and fro, with a commensurate increase in the possibility of transport accidents.

It may seem that the problems of disposal of high-level nuclear wastes, some radioactive for a thousand years or more, have no bearing on the plans for the Long Island-New York area. But this would be a parochial attitude. In 1964 Belter and Pearce surveyed for the AEC 183 giant storage tanks, each with a capacity of 300,000 to 1,000,000 gallons of nuclear waste. Nine were found to have leaked or to be leaking their lethal poisons. One had lost 60,000 gallons before discovery. It has been estimated by Snow and other radiation physicists that one gallon could threaten the health of 1 million people. Did these poisonous long-lived wastes contaminate groundwater, drinking water, soil, the growth from the soil? Storage containers were leaking at all three tank farms. In the 1968 Authorizing Legislation the AEC requested an appropriation of $2,500,000 for replacement of failed or failing tanks at Richland. The question is: Why was this not a signal for slowing down proliferation of this program? Why are all signs at Go when critical problems are unsolved?

We are submitting an Exhibit which shows that the AEC knows very well that this complex and hazardous program is not under as orderly control, as is represented. Fallible humanity, not God-like omniscience is in charge of, and operating this program. We are submitting for your inspection the words of the Director of Reactor Development of the AEC describing the problems.

In closing, we quote from the St. Paul Dispatch of June 1, 1969, the day of the announcement of the shut-down—for scrapping—of the Elk River Plant. Under the headline: "Troubles Plague N Plants" was the following summary which discloses the unreliability of the plants: "Technical troubles have plagued most of the 13 nuclear power plants financed jointly by the AEC and public and private utilities. Five have been shut down permanently, two have been inoperative for more than a year, an eighth is 'on, again, off again.' . . . The five still producing electricity have been beset by technical problems and accidents. . . . Besides the five still operating, five additional plants have started . . . around the country, 44 are under construction, and utilities have announced plans to buy or have bought another 43 nuclear reactors." The answer to an unsuccessful program is to step up the number of nuclear stations to over 100, design them larger than ever, and erect twins or nests of plants.

It is time for a pause and an effort at perspective. We shall support any attempt to bring this issue out into the daylight, with the people having a say over their fate.

Dr. Glenn Seaborg, in his recent statement before the Congressional Joint Committee (which has made similar statements), expressed anxiety that the American people, if they continue to obstruct the nuclear program, would find themselves, at some future date, sitting in the dark while the wheels of industry had ceased to turn. We have a great many causes for worry, but that is, happily, not one of them. There is plenty of fossil fuel at hand, with improved stack emission; there is hydro-electric power. Magneto-hydrodynamics has been vigorously developed in Europe; while in our country it has been starved for funds. Solar energy, which Dr. James Conant believes may be the ultimate solution since, as he has stated, "nuclear power is too costly and too dangerous," ought to be thoroughly researched. The Soviet is reported to have solved numerous problems of nuclear fusion, which does not pollute the environment in the manner of nuclear fission, nor are its prospects so perilous. Meanwhile we should not be browbeaten by excessive respect for authority, into accepting unnecessary risks and costs in money and in environmental and human welfare.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud that the Oregon State winner of the VFW Voice of Democracy contest is from my congressional district. Miss Judy Long of Portland, Oreg., will be arriving in Washington within a few days to compete with the other 49 State winners for scholarship prizes amounting to several thousand dollars. Every single one of these young people is to be highly commended. Each has won the right to be here through competition in a total field of 400,000. Theirs is a truly formidable accomplishment.

This year's contest theme is "Freedom's Challenge." I wholeheartedly subscribe to the argument Miss Long presents: that our greatest challenge today is not in winning freedoms, but in preventing those who would do so from robbing us of the liberties we have. I present the full text of Judy Long's essay in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Judy Long)

Today we are free. Free to get a good education. Free to make our own laws. Free to raise our standard of living. Free to say what we want, to think what we want, to be what we want.

But what about tomorrow? Or the day after tomorrow? Will we be free then? For here lies the challenge of freedom, to keep it. Our founding fathers sacrificed much when they fought to gain independence. It is now up to us to see that this great heritage remains ours. Will we be free tomorrow? Only today can tell. Only today, when we have the opportunity to use our freedom, can tell.

But opportunity is not all we have. The important matter of choice is concerned

here, too. Once we recognize the knock of opportunity, we must choose whether or not to open the door. We are given a chance to vote, but do we? We are given a chance to learn something, but do we? We are given a chance to better ourselves, but do we?

We are all given opportunities like these, and we all must decide what to do with them. If we choose to ignor them, we put ourselves in a very vulnerable position. If we ignore these opportunities, our freedom will become dependent upon those who do not ignore them. These people will then be faced with another opportunity which they may choose also not to ignore. That is the opportunity to rob us of our freedom. How are we, who misuse our freedom, to keep this from happening? The simple truth is we can't! And soon we may find we haven't any freedom left to misuse.

This idea shows us that something is lacking in our concept of freedom. That something is responsibility. Without responsibility, opportunity and choice breed tyranny and anarchy. With responsibility, the seed of freedom is planted to grow for all peoples. Yes, for all peoples, not just an elect few. Everyone has a right to opportunity and choice, but we must not forget that with that right comes responsibility. Responsibility in our education, our government, and our relations with fellow men. Responsibility in our thoughts, words, and deeds.

By so doing, we will be grasping our freedom a little tighter. We cannot stay free by being ignorant and apathetic. And we cannot leave the protection of our freedom up to others. We are all presented with an opportunity to fight for this heritage. But it is a different kind of combat than our founding fathers were engaged in. Ours are the weapons of opportunity, choice, and responsibility. If we use these weapons, it will be impossible for freedom to slip out of our grasp. It will be ours tomorrow, and every tomorrow after that. If we use these weapons, we will have met the challenge of freedom.

WHITE HOUSE BACKS CRAMER OIL POLLUTION CONTROL AMENDMENTS

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I discussed my proposals at the leadership meeting at the White House on Tuesday. Now the administration is backing the Cramer amendments to the legislation now pending in conference where I am ranking minority conferee.

The Cramer amendments to the proposed Water Quality Improvement Act would—

Require the President within 60 days to prepare a national contingency plan for removal of oil. The plan would set up a national strike force with experts and the latest equipment available to move in quickly to contain an oil spill and begin immediate cleanup to limit damage to the ecology, wildlife, and other natural resources;

Allow the U.S. Coast Guard to board and inspect vessels for potential pollution dangers; and

Establish a high-priority research and development program to devise means to contain an oil spill and disperse the pollutant rapidly without endangering the ecology.

We must mobilize the technology and know-how of both Government and the private sector in this effort. As soon as there is a spill, we must be able to move in the latest in equipment and harmless chemical dispersants to limit the damage.

I met with Carl Klein, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water Quality and Research, and he approved the amendments.

I have also asked the Coast Guard and Interior to investigate the possibility that the asphalt that came ashore at St. Marks in Florida may have come from the *Darian Appolon*, the Greek vessel which ran aground, spilling oil into Tampa Bay, on February 13, 1970.

A DISTINGUISHED STATESMAN WARNS OF BONN-MOSCOW AXIS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions it has been my privilege to call to the attention of our colleagues the writings—and the earthy recommendations—of a distinguished and experienced European statesman. This gentleman is not only a veteran diplomat who has served as his nation's foreign minister, but was an eyewitness to the European tragedies of World War I and II.

Writing in the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader under the pen name of Z. A. Rust, he favors us with a penetrating analysis of the weakening American position in Europe, the likely result, and the potential cost in blood. He then suggests that the key to the solution of the problem in Europe lies in Vietnam and is easily within our grasp.

I include his article, warning of the impending Bonn-Moscow Axis, in my remarks:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Feb. 11, 1970]

BREWING NOW BETWEEN BONN AND MOSCOW: UNITED STATES COULD BE TARGET FOR A "THIRD RAPALLO"

(By Z. A. Rust)

The massing of Soviet troops at the Czechoslovakian frontiers in 1947 during election time—without any reaction from the Western victorious powers—brought a Communist government in Prague.

The massing of Soviet troops in 1968 at the frontiers of Germany near election time—without any reaction from the NATO powers—brought a Socialist Government in Bonn.

Although less spectacular, the election of Willy Brandt as German chancellor might prove finally to be at least as important as that of Hitler in 1933 for the destiny of Europe and of the world.

We are at the eve of a third Rapallo—Just to refresh memories:

April 8, 1922, British, French, United States, Italian and German delegations met a Soviet delegation in Genoa with the hope of reaching an understanding with the Kremlin.—April 15th, 2 a.m., surprise conclusion of the Treaty of Rapallo between Germany and Soviet Russia. Collapse of the Genoa Conference.

Aug. 23, 1938, during military negotiations among France, Britain and Soviet Russia, surprise Agreement Ribbentrop-Molotov. Collapse of the France-Anglo-Soviet military negotiations.

The "Third Rapallo" which is brewing now between Bonn and Moscow will not be as the Ribbentrop-Molotov's, a passing "ruse de guerre." It corresponds to the feeling of all German political groups that the U.S. will never risk a confrontation with the Soviets for Europe's sake, and that the two Germanys can be brought together only through an understanding with Soviet Russia.

The "Third Rapallo" will be unavoidably directed against the United States. Its first consequence will be a merger of German and West European industrial potentialities with those of Soviet Russia brought to a maximum by German know-how.

A further consequence will be the pushing of the frontiers of Soviet military dominated Europe from their present position to the shores of the Atlantic, from Spitzberg to Pt. Maroqui, and to the shores of the Mediterranean from Pt. Maroqui to Constantinople.

SEVERAL FACTORS

Several factors have brought West Germany and the rest of Free European countries from a Washington-oriented to a Moscow-oriented policy. Among them:

(a) The fact that despite some verbal election-time pro-liberty declarations, every U.S. administration since the end of World War II has confirmed and upheld Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam and the results of the Marshall Mission to China.

(b) The astounding progress of pro-Communist infiltration in the U.S. state-apparatus and in every channel of their national life, concomitant with the visible collapse of government authority in front of the endemic and growing insurrection.

(c) The fact that the U.S. military policy is obviously directed by the occult and anti-constitutional Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and by the Rostow/Kuznetsov understanding, which means: toward quasi total unilateral disarmament.

(d) The fact that, under the totally anti-national control of the Rostows and Kissingers, the U.S. have joined the Soviets in forcing or trying to force all other countries to sign the Non Proliferation Treaty. Which means that after having given up their first strike nuclear weapons, the U.S. were giving up their first line of nuclear defense.

This last item asks for some elaboration, as many patriotic and national-minded senators have voted for the N.P.T. without understanding its real meaning and its unavoidable consequences.

ONLY WAY

The only way of breaking the state of permanent nuclear blackmail, of which the Soviets have been the unique beneficiary and the U.S. the principal victim, would have been the constitution of two more independent nuclear powers on the anti-Communist side of the contest: a Western-European independent nuclear armed federation and another with Australia and New Zealand. That was what the Soviets were specially afraid of and that is the great political and military victory with which they have been presented by the U.S. solons.

This treaty means that the U.S. foreign policy will continue to be essentially controlled by the terror of the Soviet nuclear weapons, with which—according to Secretary Laird's recent declarations—the Nixon administration also has decided not to compete.

In front of this preventive surrender the European countries have reacted differently. De Gaulle's France has refused to adhere to the NPT, West Germany and the other free European countries have decided to open new routes towards the only nuclear big power that counts and acts, convinced that there was no other way to a relative safety from this power's constant pressure and

menace. The same thing will happen with East and South Asia still free countries.

It was not North Vietnam that the U.S. were fighting in South Vietnam but the Communist Empire, Soviet Russia and Red China, indissolubly united in the Communist fight for the conquest of the world, in spite of the profusely advertised hoax of the "Fight Between Two Giants."

It is at the mercy of those two giants that South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand, will be abandoned when the last U.S. soldier will have left the South-West Asian battlefield. Those countries know it very well, even if the misinformed U.S. public ignores it and the well informed organizers of the U.S. defeat, together with the news media which they sometimes criticize, will never tell it to this public.

What could not be hidden is the stampede toward the victorious power which will follow the United States' self inflicted defeat. Such signs as the promised abandon of Okinawa or the denial by the U.S. Senate of a few 54 million dollars worth of armored cars and fighter planes to Chiang Kai Chek, or speeding the opening of economic and semi-diplomatic relations with Red China, or the continuous and conclusive presence of Mr. Henry Kissinger in the highest—although unconstitutional—key position of U.S. foreign policy control, cannot be made up for by a reassuring visit to the Philippines and Formosa, even by Vice President Spiro Agnew.

It would be against reason to believe that when South Vietnam will also be handed over—as North Vietnam has been in the Eisenhower-Dulles era—to the horror of a Communist domination by the only Western power which could have prevented it, there will be anything left in Asia of loyalty to the West. Slowly, from South Korea to Pakistan all along the Western and Southern Asiatic countries, defection will follow defection, and nobody could blame them for it.

Military surrounding of a country in modern military terms has little to do with the military surrounding of Germany, for instance, in 1935 by the Franco-Czech-Sovietic Alliance, no close-up presence of enemy divisions is required. Surrounding today is measured in terms of domination of continents, oceans, straits, in terms of nuclearly powered and armed submarines, of quantity, of power and positioning of transoceanic bombers and nuclear missiles.

With the Communist third octopus in Cuba, the surrounding of the United States will be completed when Europe and Asia will have turned their backs to Washington, when all the Eastern shores of the Pacific and the Western shores of the Atlantic will be under Communist control, garrisoned at Moscow and Peiping's will with missile installations and air and submarine bases.

It will be then that powerful political groups—using if necessary methods of persuasion of which the U.S. people has had only a foretaste—will, in the moment of an election, press for a McCarthy, McGovern or Ted Kennedy kind of government as the most likely to ward off the peril of such a geopolitical situation . . . as it happened in 1947 in Prague and 1969, in Bonn.

It is not so much in terms of weaponry or of extension of territorial domination that the Communist powers have been until now the victors in the cold war, but in terms of prestige. It is the prestige of the United States which has to be reestablished in its fullness, nationally and internationally, before it is too late.

This prestige had been already seriously shaken by a continuous withdrawal in front of Communist resoluteness (Czechoslovakia, Pan-Mun-Jong, Hungary, etc.), it has undergone a deep slide after the occupation of Cuba by Soviet armed forces, it is falling with a vertical acceleration since the moment when, yielding to treasonable and clearly insurrectional pressure, the U.S. Government has informed the world that it has accepted defeat in Vietnam, in a long and cruel war it has never permitted its army to win for fear of angering Moscow and Peiping.

It is in the most sensitive spot of the pride and honor of a country, in the pride and honor of its armed forces, that the prestige of the United States is attacked today by the order of slowly abandoning the battlefield to the advancing enemy, by the concentric campaign of defamation and vilifaction to which even the U.S. Government is participating in a certain measure, by the corruption of the soldier's moral to which the Government participates also when it permits the introduction of the clenched fist salute in barracks and in service time, or when it issues the "Guidance for Dissent" order, which could have been written by the notorious Father Stock of the antidraft conspiracy.

It is, therefore, first by taking vigorously the defense of the U.S. Army that the process towards total international eclipse and national disintegration must be interrupted, before it has passed the point of no-return. It is obvious also that the Washington Government has to be helped in that effort by groups and personalities not hindered like it by routine and probably quite mistaken electoral considerations.

To that effect, let a recognized leader or a group of prominent personalities, take clamorously and steadfastly the defense of the more than one million young U.S. soldiers who have passed through the Vietnam inferno, against the offensive of the ungrateful and vote-hungry politicians and of a corrupt news-media industry.

What must be asked and obtained is the immediate abandon of any prosecution for imaginary massacre of civilians, the indictment of the calumniators and an investigation of the real origin and scope of the nauseating attack against the U.S. armed forces.

USE PUBLICITY

Let this leader or these personalities use every way of publicity to convince the U.S. public that there is no other difference than a difference of time table between the immediate abandonment of the Asiatic battlefield asked by defeatists political groups and the staged abandon of Vietnam, without victory, which constitutes the Kissinger program.

Despite the enormous difficulties created by the anti-national character of the news-media trust, the truth must be brought home to the U.S. public that it is only a victory in Vietnam which can restore the prestige, otherwise almost ruined, of the United States and the deterring power of its Armed Forces—two decisive factors not only for this country but for the destiny of both the free and the enslaved world.

A brilliant and rapid victory in Vietnam will convince again both friends and foes that the free countries are not left absolutely alone in front of the diabolic Communist conspiracy, and that the enslaved ones are not abandoned without hope to the Communist inferno—leaving the United States as they are now, a unique target to the world-embracing Communist voracity.

Better than billions of dollars spent in foreign aid, a victory will provoke a spectacular revolution in the vacilliating policy of Europe, Asia and Ibero-America's free countries. Every U.S. citizen will be a "beautiful American," and none will be asked to go home.—There will be no more Rapallos.—By the same token victory will deliver a most needed blow to the Conspiracy's hidden or open agents in the United States and reestablish the vanishing authority of its administration.

CANNOT BE REACHED

Victory cannot be reached as long as even patrol activities continue to be controlled from Yarmolinskys, Rostovs and Kissingers' desks and so long as generals and admirals are not allowed to do their best, even in enemy territory and waters if necessary.

Deplorable blunders have already been committed. As for instance the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Thailand, comprising the most promising strategic operation; the cutting of the enemy supply lines, north of the demilitarized zone, by moving across Laos, from Thailand to the sea and from the sea to Thailand.

Other errors are about to be committed. Increasing considerably the military and psychological consequences of the U.S. troops withdrawal, Chiang Kai Chek has been asked to mothball half of his divisions "in order to be able to provide the rest with up-to-date arms and equipment."

A clue as useful to the Asiatic enemies as that which informed Moscow in 1941 that Japan will not attack in Siberia.

The yearly military help to Chiang's friendly army has been slowly reduced from 90 to 45 million dollars. Tito's Communist army has been already helped with three billions worth of arms and equipment.

It is obvious that victory in Vietnam cannot wait until 1972. The present administration in Washington has therefore to be helped by an irresistible current of opinion in the right direction.

It is only a new leader and his devoted and tireless collaborators and supporters that can create it. The streets and the constitutional rights do not belong only to the neo-cavemen and to the enemy agents.

WHAT FRUITED PLAINS?

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the quality of life in America has been subjected to increased examination and evaluation. The recommendations for action have been varied, but the conclusions reached have been virtually the same. The "good ole days" are gone and there is no turning back. Present conditions must be reckoned with now, so that future life will be worth living.

Mr. Saul Pett, Associated Press writer, aptly expresses this questioning of the quality of life in his article "What Fruited Plains?" which I think our colleagues will find of interest:

WHAT FRUITED PLAINS?

(By Saul Pett)

Quality of life? You could start anywhere.

With a new car that won't start or an old war that won't end or a dollar that won't stretch or an optimism that won't revive.

Or a lake too dirty to swim in or a plane that is late or a supermarket checkout counter that resembles an exercise line for the catatonic.

Or the phone bill you can't understand and the computer you can't fight or insult, or the traffic that boils your bile, or blacks whose progress is too fast or too slow or just right for no one.

Or the two-way generational guilt a man can feel today toward the young who get away and the old he puts away, or that vague unspoken feeling that life is cheating us these days, or the single fact that poor old square dad has to hide in the cellar to hear his Tommy Dorsey records.

And what in the hell ever happened to simple nonpolitical, nonissue-oriented, non-

crisis-connected, nonecological romance in the U.S. of A.?

Quality of life? You could start anywhere. With a crack by comedian Woody Allen: "Not only is there no God but try getting a plumber on week ends."

Or with the mournful thought of a poet, William Butler Yeats, that dying faiths and decaying philosophies hang like "old clothes upon old sticks to scare a bird."

Or with the feeling of another poet, Archibald MacLeish, that "someone has written a new equation somewhere and our lives have changed without our changing them."

Or with the solemn cry of former Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall: "Why do we linger outside the door of distinction, so rich and so slovenly, so friendly and so filled with hate?"

We walk safely among the craters of the moon but not in the parks of New York or Chicago or Los Angeles. Technology and change run berserk, headlights hide by day and moral values shred overnight. The unthinkable multiplies until it seems "things fall apart; the center cannot hold."

The standard of living rises while the satisfaction of living declines. Hunger haunts our prosperity and minorities circle the conscience of the majority with louder cries.

The young mock our past, robbing us of the comfort of our victories in depression and war, and inflation, the ubiquitous pickpocket, keeps lifing the pay raise in our wallets.

Protest grows louder and civility becomes a whisper. The Gross National Product grows grosser in reverse proportion to the gross national tranquility.

The planes are faster and the cars are faster but we have fewer unspoiled places to go and more people who want to get there.

Problems beget solutions which beget new problems and, in the rising tide of our numbers and the spreading unresponsiveness of our bigness, dust coats the refrains of Walt Whitman, "The American compact is altogether with individuals . . . America is nothing but you and me."

But America, we seem suddenly to have discovered, is no longer infallible or, as Arthur Schlesinger notes, immune to history. We are no longer the good guys who win all the wars. At home and abroad, we are caught, Schlesinger says, in the "collapse of our pretensions."

America, we seem suddenly to have discovered, is no longer infinite in space or resource or hope. There is no next valley of quiet or virgin forest to tread. Beauty diminishes and tastelessness and flatness abide in neon lights and urban sprawl.

Beer cans now litter the beach of our beginnings, at Plymouth Rock, and 6,000 miles away, at the other end, Polynesia turns plastic. The hotel sign in Honolulu says, "Aloha Congoleum dealers."

We live with the trauma of the present and apocalyptic visions of the future. Every day, it seems, serious experts tell us that our society may become a series of armed camps between black and white, urban and suburban.

VOICES OF DOOM

Every day, it seems, serious experts surround us with doomsday predictions of a shattered ecology, of babies dying from pollutants in the soil, of lakes and oceans dying, of a population too vast to feed, of the atmosphere warming up enough to melt glaciers and drown cities.

City noises, we are told, can damage our ears, constrict our blood vessels, and increase our blood pressure, and laboratory experiments show that prolonged exposure to excessive sound has made homosexuals out of rats. Will the cavalry never come?

We live in an expanding theater of the absurd and the unreal. Between beers, we watch real men dying on television and, same station, same network, we get a poetic message about the dangers of smoking and a poetic message about the joys of smoking.

In Santa Barbara, Calif., a seabird is unable to take off because of the weight of oil on its wings and a man in a plexiglass helmet steam-cleans the black sludge off the rocks and a bitter resident predicts. "Next thing, they'll be putting plastic crabs on the beach to make it seem natural again."

Elsewhere, a headline proclaims, "Aleutian Bomb Is Fired Without Setting Off Earthquake." Look, ma, no earthquake.

In Alexandria, Va., a lady frightened by all the cancer talk rushes into a supermarket to exchange soda with cyclamates for cigarettes with nicotine tars.

On Long Island, a finely impartial mail order house urges us to "stand up and be counted" and buy, for one dollar, either a flag decal or a peace symbol.

In Kansas City, a union sues to enjoin Trans World Airlines from claiming in its advertising that TWA employes are happy. On the same day, a TWA plane is hijacked all the way to Rome. At any moment, talk of happiness may become actionable.

Much of the quality of life in America today is related to numbers; lopsided numbers. "In the United States," Gertrude Stein once wrote, "there is more space where nobody is than where anybody is. This is what makes America what it is."

CRAMMED AND CRANKY

In the United States, two-thirds of the people live on one-fiftieth of the land. In the United States, current trends persuade experts that we will be 300 million by the year 2000 and, to accommodate the added 100 million, we will have to crowd them in where we are or build the equivalent of a new city of 250,000 every 40 days for 30 years; 35 more Los Angeles or 250 more Newarks, NJ, or 1,600 more Levittowns, Pa. The mind boggles.

Where we already are we are crammed and cranky. We have less room to live or work or die. Man's castle is a number in an unending line of numbers on the door of an apartment in the city or a box in a row of boxes in the suburbs. We flee from the cities to the suburbs and from the suburbs to the exurbes and the rat race of numbers is never far behind.

Every day it comes harder to remember the smug satisfaction we once took from pictures of those godless Communists lining up for scarce consumer goods in Moscow. Now we God-fearing capitalists are lining up all over America.

We line up for our pleasure and our pain, for ski lifts, trains, planes, license plates, school lunches, tax payments, college registration, golf courses, movies, supermarkets, restaurants, and popcorn.

We line up our cars, bumper to bumper, for the privilege of working in cities and the need to escape them. One man in San Francisco carries a carrier pigeon in his car to alert his wife when freeway traffic will make him late for dinner.

"The effect of liberty to individuals is that they may do what they please," said Edmund Burke. "We ought to see what it will please them to do before we risk congratulations."

It has pleased us to do much.

We have polluted the land and the air and the water, defaced the horizon with commercial clutter and blurred our history and our symbols with dollar signs. We have left Lake Erie beyond redemption and Lake Tahoe beyond recognition.

We have pasteurized our milk and put strontium 90 in its source and enough waste in streams and lakes to kill 15 million fish in one year.

We have turned the New England farm of Robert Frost into an auto junk yard and built high-risers that block the view of Mount Rainier in Seattle and the bay in San Francisco and the surf in Waikiki and countless other vistas that nourish the soul of man.

We have put enough smog in the air over Los Angeles to warn school children not to play too strenuously or breathe too deeply on the days of the amber cloud and enough toxics in the air over New York to make a day's walking and breathing equal the intake of almost two packs of cigarettes.

And between the coasts we have made eyes smart in mile-high Denver and not-as-high Phoenix and countless smaller places once idyllic.

We have put DDT in the Shellfish off Martha's Vineyard and human excrement in Sugar Creek, Charlotte, N.C., as well as the streams of tiny Peterborough, N.H., where Thornton Wilder based his bittersweet tale of "Our Town."

We have mined enough coal and iron to sag and crack two million acres of land and strip-mined enough to bring floods in Kentucky and West Virginia.

DESECRATION RAMPANT

We have made parking lots out of houses older than the American Revolution and rumpus room bars out of trees older than the discovery of America.

We have paved valleys with giant shopping centers and blanketed meadows with dreary housing developments and scarred mountains with utility poles.

We have shaken our ecology with technology, our houses with huge diesel trucks and our teeth with monster jets and we have put enough cars on the "freeways" of California to tie up, in a single accident, 200 vehicles, like uncut sausage.

We have built a "Walden Breezes—Trailer Sales" across from Henry David Thoreau's Walden Pond and a "Plymouth Rock Cleaners—3-Hour Service" across from the Puritan landfall. In Hannibal, Mo., behind Samuel Clemens' boyhood home, we have built "Vic Cassano's Piazza King," and on the side adjoining, the "Mark Twain Drivein" with electronic menus and across town, the "Huck Finn Shopping Center" and the "Huck Finn Cinema."

We have suffered, in Lewis Mumford's words, "disorder, blight, dingy mediocrity, screaming neon-lighted vulgarity . . . We have ceased to respect ourselves . . . we have ceased to cherish our own history and to enlarge our own prospects, by promoting character and variety and beauty wherever we find it, in landscapes or in people."

Hannibal, Mo. is also a relatively placid town. At the foot of Cardiff Hill is a statue of two barefooted boys carrying fishing poles, the two best-loved boys in American literature. A plaque identifies the area where Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn "played and roamed at will."

Today they would find it more difficult. Cardiff Hill is bisected by a busy two-lane highway. Loitering by the young is now prohibited by law in Hannibal after 10 PM because of a rise in adolescent vandalism.

Boys still fish in the polluted Mississippi, now with fibreglass poles and outboards, but the Coast Guard frowns on rafts, insisting on a motor and a sail or an oar and a prescribed number of life jackets.

Change, change, change. Will nothing hold still?

Kids sleep together before they are married and marry before they can support themselves and poor old Dad is regarded as oppressively square for asking, "When WILL you find yourself?"

Today's new jet is obsolete tomorrow, today's new superhighway is a bottleneck tomorrow, today's new clothes dryer needs the repairman tomorrow, today's new mini is maxi tomorrow, and spiders spin webs over the old injunction to "eat it up, use it up, wear it out."

A war to stop the spread of Communism, which was credible in Korea, becomes a credibility gap in Vietnam. Liberals exchange pastures with conservatives and yesterday's interventionist talks isolation today.

Teachers close down schools by strike, police and firemen threaten to walk out, soldiers circulate underground newspapers denouncing the Army, priests quit to marry and the Pope has his troubles with his bishops.

The work week grows shorter, leisure time grows longer and the sale of sleeping pills rises.

New churches don't look like churches and hot dog stands look like space ships and boys look like girls and motels look like rococco grottos or chalets or ranchers, but for a quarter you can make the bed vibrate.

A man making $20,000 moonlights to make ends meet, the Salvation Army turns down gifts of working stoves and TV sets because it has too many, and the poor are hungry.

CAMELOT KEEPS FADING

Public movies resemble private smokers, a national network show makes puns about the Resurrection and a Broadway hit with nudes has fun and games with a presidential nickname. The moon that excited us yesterday seems stale today. Camelot keeps fading.

"Eras don't last long these days," says Daniel Patrick Moynihan, a presidential counsellor who used to work for John Kennedy and now works for Richard Nixon.

Many different kinds of parents, rich and poor, progressive and conservative, are worried, confounded, outraged by or disappointed in their young.

Why can't he be like his father? Why can't she date boys of her own kind? Is marijuana really no worse than the liquor we drink? When I was a sophomore in college I already knew what I wanted to be because I had to know and what the hell is so wrong with making a living? We got a 10-room house and two cars and three TV's and an outboard and a cabin in mountains and Book of the Month and hi-fi—why does he have to wear those damned dirty jeans?

A President's commission tells us we are a racist nation. Another presidential commission tells use we are the most violent nation in the world. An historian tells us the streets are less safe these days then during the Depression when millions were hungry and jobless. The phone operator tells us the circuits are busy.

The General Accounting Office tells us that our major weapons systems are costing at least $20 billion more than original estimates and that no one in the government knows the total number of systems being acquired or their costs.

Wives tell us the checkbook is unbalanced and teachers tell us about the new math and ministers tell us the kids will have no faith unless we go to church regularly and doctors tell us you can get cancer from smoking and hungry from not smoking and heart failure from overeating.

The President tells us we must lower our voices and the vice president calls peace demonstrators intellectual eunuchs. The phone operator says the circuits are still busy.

The Supreme Court says integrate and black militants say they want their own institutions. The blacks in Gary, Ind., which is 60 per cent Negro, tell publisher Walter Ridder of the Post-Tribune that he is a "racist" for not publishing enough black news and the whites tell him he is a "nigger lover" for printing too much black news.

All over America readers complain to editors, "Why don't you tell us what is good about America?"

The restaurant hostess tell us there are no window tables open and, standing there, we can see window tables open. The pulse-takers tell us we are suffering from mutual distrust and a distrust of our government and institutions, and emptor was never more caveat.

The general practitioner tell us to see an internist and the internist tells us to see an allergist and the allergist tells us to see a psychiatrist and, down at the hardware store, the man says he just doesn't know whom we should call to locate a leak in the basement. Meanwhile, the young tell us we are fat and complacent.

The President of the United States tells us we will have all our combat troops out by and by the president of South Vietnam, a junior partner, says no, not all.

The moralists tell us we must do something about pornography and the civil libertarians warn us about censorship. The builders tell us we will have planes big enough to carry 400 at a clip and fast enough to cut two hours off the ocean trip and no one asks us if we want that.

Science reminds us that science has made it possible for more babies to survive birth, more people to survive disease and more old people to live longer. Environmentalists tell us we are running out of space for ourselves and our garbage.

WHO ARE "THEY"?

The airline tells us the skies are friendly and the friendly stewardess tells us, after that damned little paper creamer squirts milk all over us, "I don't know why they give us those things."

But nobody tells us who "they" are, either they who are the silent majority or they who want those huge tail lights that blind the driver behind.

The CIA tells us they can't tell us anything. The tailors tell us you can't lengthen the hem of the new miracle fabrics because the permanent creases will not come out.

The flip kids with the lapel pins tell us, "God is not dead; he just doesn't want to get involved." The phone operator says the circuits are STILL busy.

A full catalogue of our miseries serves a purpose other than masochism. "If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending," said Mr. Lincoln, "we could better judge what to do, and how to do it."

"It is not so much that the pace is fast but that it is somebody's else's pace or schedule," says Paul Goodman, social philosopher. The poets and the philosophers and the psychiatrists agree: Men must somehow regain control of their lives.

There is among many Americans today a yearning for new prophets.

"We need some great statements about what America is about and what we can do about it," says Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University. "We need leaders with a large vision of what the world needs. In a sense we're almost like the Jews were when they needed a prophet to come down from the mountain and tell them some hard things and what to do about them."

But government has its limits, says a man of government, Daniel Moynihan. "It cannot provide values to persons who have none, or who have lost those they had. It cannot provide a meaning to life. It cannot provide inner peace. It can provide outlets for moral energies but it cannot create those energies."

People, we are being told, must find these things themselves. The oratory and literature of the day are, in fact, full of reminders for many different kinds of people.

The minorities are reminded of the progress already made toward more justice and equality. The young and the old are reminded of the need to seek such wisdom as each possesses.

The majority, silent or otherwise, is reminded that a flag decal is not the limit of patriotism, that the American Revolution was led by a minority of intellectuals and scholars and politicians, that it was also Mr. Lincoln who said, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so must we think anew."

And the mourners who wait, still numbed by the passing of Camelot, are reminded that it was John F. Kennedy and Robert F. Kennedy who stressed that one man can make a difference.

The all-out pessimists are reminded that the beginning of the cure is the pain of the illness, that people who become aware of their troubles have thereby taken the first step toward solutions.

It was, after all, an official commission appointed by a President of the United States which said this is a racist nation and another presidential commission which documented the full extent of its violence. A majesty clings to a system which says these things about itself.

Progress there is. The government is committed to ending the war, or at least the combat. There are nuclear disarmament talks. There is a commitment to equality and justice. Arguments there are as to method and speed and even intent, but there are commitments.

The physical world around us is no longer the exclusive concern of poets or eccentric bird watchers or old ladies in tennis shoes.

More and more people actively seek to conserve a tree, a lake, a view. More people question the biblical injunction to be fruitful and multiply.

More people question the old American faith in growth and expansion and suggest that maybe what we don't need is another factory in town.

More middle-aged people have begun to sense a validity in the young who scorn the plastic life. Congress has appropriated funds to fight air and water pollution. People have made a difference.

But awareness and commitments, we are constantly reminded, are only beginnings that guarantee nothing.

"We will not find a way out of our present troubles," says John Gardner, former secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, "until we have the courage to look honestly at evil where evil exists, until we foreswear hypocrisy, until we call injustice and dishonor by their right names, and until a large number of Americans from each sector of opinion—right, left and center—are willing to acknowledge their own special contribution to our troubles.

". . . The path to the recovery of our confidence and well-being will call for courage and stamina. Our salvation will never be handed to us. If we are lucky we will be given the chance to earn it . . . Many things are wrong. Many things must be done.

". . . There is no middle state for the spirit. It rises to high levels of discipline and decency and purpose, or it sags and rots. We must call for the best or live with the worst."

CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON ADVOCATES SEA-BASED ABM SYSTEM IN READER'S DIGEST

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Representative WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, of Tennessee, in a recent article in the Reader's Digest advocates a sea-based anti-ballistic-missile system which would be the first line of defense against an enemy missile attack.

Congressman ANDERSON, who was the commander of the nuclear submarine *Nautilus*, is certainly an authority on seapower and naval defense and is the author of three books on atomic submarines and atomic power.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I include the article by Representative ANDERSON in the RECORD:

LET'S SEND SABMIS TO SEA NOW

(By Representative WILLIAM R. ANDERSON)

Suppose we could have, for a relatively reasonable price, an anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) deployment that an attacking enemy would have a hard time hitting. One that would force him to invest expensive attention on the world's oceans instead of on the continental United States. That would rake from the heavens many of his multiple-warheads missiles before the nuclear warheads had time to spread out—thus immensely simplifying the defensive task of our land-based ABM systems. And that would help provide our President with more time for deliberate decision in the event of a nuclear crisis.

An added bonus would be that with such a system we might be able to retard dangerous nuclear proliferation. We could offer an effective light defense against nuclear attack to countries we are pledged to protect; we would not be restricted, as we now are, to the single choice of delivering holocaustal nuclear retaliation on their behalf. With such a defensive system available to them, such countries as West Germany, Japan, Israel and India, all of whom now are capable of producing atomic arms, might be persuaded not to do so.

Would you buy a defense system that provided all that? I think we should. For such a system is available. It can be built and deployed by the mid-1970s, by which time our defense planners believe the chances of nuclear attack, either from Russia or Red China, may be great.

There is nothing secret about the practicability of this system. I described it last year on the floor of the House, but my words were swept away in the emotional tides that swirled about the ABM debate. It is called Sea-based Anti-Ballistic-Missile System—SABMIS. The concept has been developed and thoroughly analyzed by the Navy. No expensive new research-and-development programs are required. The necessary technical knowledge exists. All that remains is to build the component parts and send SABMIS to sea.

The basic SABMIS unit would be a ship about the size of a large cruiser, fitted with powerful radar similar to a type already in use at sea. It would carry computers capable of tracking simultaneously several attacking intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs). It would be loaded with more than 60 interceptor missiles mounted on Poseidon boosters. If the SABMIS ship were to miss on the first shot, it would have time to recalculate and shoot again. If it were to miss altogether, SABMIS' computers and communications systems could warn the U.S.-based Safeguard ABMs that some warheads had got through, and tell them where to concentrate their attentions.

One of the things that have our defense planners greatly concerned is the communist development of the multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicle (MIRV) ICBM. The MIRV is like one of those Fourth of July rockets that explode into a big, colorful spray as they come down—except that the spray the MIRV unleashes is full of nuclear warheads which can be guided to targets hundreds of miles apart, and mixed with these are all kinds of penetration aids designed to confuse and jam defensive radars.

Against this threat, consider the value of just two SABMIS stations, each including one or more ships. If the first station were in the Gulf of Alaska and the other in Baffin Bay, in the vicinity of our Thule, Greenland, Air Force base, the two could cover the entire threat corridor through which both Soviet and Red Chinese ICBMs would have to be fired toward the United States. At such forward locations, under the umbrella of friendly forces, SABMIS could catch with its missiles many incoming ICBMs before MIRV clouds had much chance to spread. And since the interceptions would occur above the atmosphere and over water, the North American continent would be spared a great deal of nuclear blast and direct radioactive fallout.

In addition to the two forward-based SABMIS stations, we could have other stations somewhere off our Atlantic and Pacific coasts, to help defend against submarine-launched ballistic missiles. These ships would comprise an effective light SABMIS deployment for the United States. Because ships must occasionally return to base, we probably would want to build six or eight in all.

The at-sea SABMIS force would hugely complicate an aggressor's attack problem. To be certain that he had placed a sufficiently destructive amount of nuclear firepower on important U.S. targets, he first would have to knock out our ABM systems, which means that he would have to destroy our SABMIS ships. But it is never easy to destroy a naval force at sea. Our SABMIS ships could, if the threat warranted, cruise constantly in coordination with fast, strong escort forces. Furthermore, if during a crisis an opponent attempted with his own naval forces to close in on our SABMIS force, this in itself would be a clear signal to the President to alert our own retaliatory forces—the bulk of which also could and should be placed at sea.[1]

The Navy's studies show that should an aggressor fire a nuclear missile at a SABMIS ship from, say, the Soviet Union, the ship, alerted, could be well out of the kill zone—as far as ten miles away—by the time the missile reached the target. To have any chance at all of hitting SABMIS, the attacker would have to fire a great many missiles all around a 20-mile diameter of ocean. This would be enormously expensive, and he still could not be certain of success, for if a SABMIS computer showed that any of these were going to come within kill range, the ship could destroy them with its interceptor missiles.

SABMIS together with Safeguard would thus provide us with two interception zones—a defense-in-depth that would increase the survivability of a vital portion of our retaliatory arsenal. Moreover, with its capacity to knock down enemy weapons far from our homeland, SABMIS would make a crucial contribution to the President's decision time. Obviously, he *must* have as much time as we can buy for him to determine whether the country actually is under sustained all-out nuclear assault and, if so, to ascertain the source of the attack and decide on—and be able to deliver—the appropriate response.

There are other attractive features to SABMIS: Its mobility would enable us to relocate it quickly in time of crisis. The system never would be locked in anywhere. Should the world powers ever achieve nuclear disarmament, the ships would still be valuable: they could be converted for conventional warfare missions. And, by comparison with other important items in our defense budget, even SABMIS' price is attractive: less than eight billion dollars is the Navy's estimate for eight ships, their missiles *and* ten years of operations.

A few additional SABMIS ships could go far toward making the recent non-proliferation treaty effective. For instance, with four additional ships we could offer protection to the entire North Atlantic Treaty Organization area without threatening nuclear retaliation aimed at the source of possible attack. With one, we could do the same for Japan; with two, for India. Such light deployments would be possible throughout the free world. SABMIS ships assigned to defend countries in the Southern Hemisphere could also be on the lookout for Soviet orbital bombardment attacks launched against the United States from southerly directions. And there seems no reason why friendly countries who are interested in a stable peace and who wish to avoid the vast expense of building their own nuclear weapons should not be willing to help pay for the SABMIS ships that their defenses would require.

There never has been a reasonable argument against the SABMIS concept. There has been some talk about "ship vulnerability"—people worry that ships can be found and sunk. Indeed they can, but not nearly so easily and cheaply as immobile, land-based systems can be targeted and destroyed—in the kind of attack that would kill millions of Americans an reduce much of our country to poisonous rubble.

Yet SABMIS consistently has been blocked in the Department of Defense. Powerful elements who have committed billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to the land-based ABM concept will not tolerate a system they deem to be in competition with it. But anyone who has been listening should know that the Navy has not offered SABMIS as a substitute for Safeguard, that on the contrary it strongly supports the idea of a terminal-stage defense system and has advanced the SABMIS concept as a vital, relatively inexpensive supplement to it.

Just enough funding has been granted SABMIS so that the Defense Department can say the idea is being "examined." In the current fiscal year the Navy had confidence enough in SABMIS to ask for 55 million dollars. When Defense refused any funds, the Navy reduced its request to ten million dollars, and Defense finally granted three million. Furthermore, it appears that some people in the Defense Department either have not been doing their homework, or deliberately have been misinforming their superiors. Queried on SABMIS during the 1969 ABM debate, Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard said he had been told that the technology was so uncertain that the system could be developed only long after Safeguard. This simply is not true. SABMIS is based on current technologies, and could be operational within the same time span as, and perhaps even sooner than, Safeguard.

Then, there is the tragic fact that the United States still is not a sea-minded nation. A Navy of old and worn-out ships, a decrepit Merchant Marine and a totally inadequate oceanology program are sufficient proof.

The military axiom that the best defense is a good offense still holds true, and that is where our heaviest defense investments should be made. I don't suggest that we spend ourselves to death trying to develop airtight ballastic-missile defenses—I don't believe it can be done. What we can well afford to do, and should do, is develop and deploy a defense-in-depth that will help greatly to lessen the growing nuclear pressures against this country. By continuing to treat SABMIS as an unwanted stepchild, the Defense Department will be making a grave and costly mistake.

[1] See "A Bold New Plan for National Defense," The Reader's Digest, October '69.

REPRESSION IN VIETNAM

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, ever since his November 3 speech on Vietnam, President Nixon seems to have lost all interest in a negotiated settlement in Vietnam, relying instead on the process of Vietnamization to carry on the war indefinitely. This has taken all the pressure off President Thieu to move in the direction of greater political freedom and a broader and more representative government. As was to be expected, Thieu has responded by moving instead toward greater repression.

An example of Thieu's growing intolerance of even moderate dissent is the outrageous prosecution and trial of Deputy Tran Ngoc Chau. In today's Washington Post, Mr. Dan Ellsberg, an expert on Vietnam, is quoted at length on the grim significance of the Chau case. He says the message of the case is that Americans will do nothing to protest Thieu's political opponents, and that the suppression of even non-Communist opponents of Thieu "ends whatever small hope there was for a neogtiated settlement" and "puts time on the side of the Communists." The article follows:

ANALYST FEARS UNITED STATES ACCEPTS VIET REPRESSION

(By Lee Lescaze)

The case of Saigon Deputy Tran Ngoc Chau indicates that the United States is willing to accept any repressive action by the Thieu government, a long-time Vietnam analyst believes.

"The case signals so clearly our willingness to collaborate with a regime that is destroying all factions that seek to end the war and are able and willing to compete politically with the Communists," Dan Ellsberg said in an interview yesterday.

Chau was stripped of his parliamentary immunity by a petition that some Vietnamese lawyers in Saigon feel was unconstitutional. He is being tried for aiding the Communists through conversations with his brother, who is an admitted Communist agent. He earlier was found guilty in absentia and sentenced to 20 years; he is now being retried.

Before his arrest and prosecution, Chau had been critical of the Thieu government and had made public charges that Nguyen Cao Thang, a close associate of the president, was bribing and blackmailing members of the legislature to get their votes.

"If Thieu can act this blatantly against a man known by many Americans and Vietnamese to be an anti-Communist nationalist then he can do it to anyone," Ellsberg said.

Ellsberg says the message of the Chau case to political opponents of Thieu is that the Americans will do nothing to protect them.

Non-Communist elements like the An Quang Buddhists and friends of Chau will think twice before running for the Senate in this year's elections or for the house in 1971 if they fear reprisals, Ellsberg said.

The suppression of non-Communist opponents of Thieu also ends whatever small hope there was for a negotiated settlement, Ellsberg said. "It puts time on the side of the Communists."

In Ellsberg's view the Communists have nothing to fear politically from the Thieu government. Without American support, it will collapse, and the longer it remains in power the more effective it will be in preventing a cohesive non-Communist opposition from forming.

In addition, the Vietcong seem certain to reason that if Thieu and the Americans do not protect the freedom of a non-Communist legislator they would not be likely to guarantee the fairness of elections that included Communists or the physical safety of Communist campaigners.

Ellsberg and Gen. Edward G. Lansdale, for whom Ellsberg worked in Vietnam during 1965–67, agree that Chau is not a Communist.

Chau and other foes of Thieu would, however, not lead an anti-Communist war if they were to come to power, Ellsberg said. They would seek first to end the fighting and then to avoid, to the greatest possible extent, political domination by the Communists.

"Thieu's actions," Ellsberg said, "exclude from power any Vietnamese voices that want the fighting to end."

In supporting Thieu, Ellsberg believes, the United States "has made once again a choice to block a Communist dictatorship by support of a military dictatorship."

He thinks this course will not lead to a successful Vietnamization of the war, but will confront President Nixon eventually with a choice between staying on in support of Thieu or withdrawing and watching the immediate collapse of the Saigon regime.

The South Vietnamese Supreme Court still has an opportunity to review the Chau case and the American Embassy could still break its official silence on Chau. But if the case proceeds as it has begun with, Thieu getting his way, Ellsberg believes the basis for hopes of a Saigon government determined to end the war will have been stripped away.

Before his two years with the State Department in Vietnam, where Ellsberg came to know Chau well, he worked for Assistant Secretary of Defense John McNaughton in 1964–65. He is now doing research on the origins of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

THE PEOPLE ARE NOT STUPID—DOUGLAS MUST GO

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, my convictions that Associate Justice William O. Douglas should leave the Bench or be impeached are well known. When these views are not strengthened by his pronouncements on the Bench, they are fortified by his appalling conduct and writings off the Bench.

Last week I called to the attention of the House a letter to the editor of a midwest newspaper, calling for impeachment of this disgrace to the Bench. Today, I received an intelligent and well-reasoned second to the removal idea, from a writer in New York.

The American people are not stupid. They increasingly demand that we perform our constitutional duty to rid the Supreme Court of this exponent of subversion and perversion.

I include in my remarks my correspondent's letter:

ASTORIA, N.Y.,
February 28, 1970.

Re "Pollution of Justice—Douglas Must Go." (Congressional Record, February 24, 1970, p. 4686).

Hon. JOHN R. RARICK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: I am in full agreement with the February 17 letter published in the *Chicago Tribune*, except for the final sentence (presumably restating the paper's editorial opinion), according to which ". . . impeachment proceedings are in order *if voluntary retirement is not forthcoming.*"

In my opinion impeachment proceedings are in order. Period. Regardless of whether voluntary retirement is forthcoming. The bad behavior of a public official should go on record even if he intends to avoid impeachment proceedings by voluntary retirement and even if there is no hope to muster a two-third majority and to accomplish removal.

If, for the purposes of this argument, we accept the textbook theory of three co-equal branches of government, it is apparent that the controlling powers between the three branches are not and never were equal. Presidential vetoes and judicial review are rather impersonal—they deal with acts of Congress. Lifetime appointment of Justices and subsequent Senate confirmations are personal but positive by nature. The Chief Justice's role in presiding over the impeachment trial of the President is a rather passive, *ex officio* function.

Congress, the first and most responsible branch of government has the duty to exercise the power of impeachment, by character the most sensitive, most personal and most negative control. This is the time for Congress to reassert its prerogatives as the First Branch of Government, by removing this dishonorable man from the highest court of our Nation.

You, Sir, are eminently qualified to initiate such proceedings.

Sincerely,

GEORGE HORVATH.

DOMESTIC SCIENCE SCHOOL FOR MEN

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the increasing number of women entering the ranks of industry, particularly working mothers, certainly the men ought to know something about looking after the house. It is estimated that by 1975, 50 percent of the mothers will be working.

Recently, the German Tribune reprinted an article from the Frankfurter Neue Presse concerning a school established in Munster to train men in the secrets and mysteries of running a household in the event the mother or wife became ill or some other catastrophe occurred in the family.

This kind of training could bring families closer together, and it would make husbands and bachelors realize more the difficult job women face in running an efficient household.

I commend the following article to my colleagues:

DOMESTIC SCIENCE SCHOOL FOR MEN

Men in Münster have given up going to the pub in the evening and have taken up a new hobby—they are now attending a domestic science school.

In many families when the mother or the wife goes sick or is prevented from doing domestic chores for some other reason the household is hit by catastrophe. Suddenly the head of the family finds that he must cook, scrub, darn and sew. Nowadays cooking is the least of his worries since the canning and deepfrozen food industries have come to the rescue of grasswidowers and bachelors.

But industry can scarcely step in and do all the other housewife's duties. The school in Münster has filled this gap. It will help men who are suddenly woman-less to overcome difficulties. With the slogan—Tip-top without a housewife—all men from around Münster are invited to initiate themselves into the mysteries and secrets of housework.

The reputation of the school has spread. Men quickly flocked to fill the places in class. On the curriculum the most important lesson is the care and preservation of clothes. Men are shown, for instance, how to remove spots of grease and wax.

Pressing trousers is one of the simplest tasks, but wielding a needle and cotton is something most men find difficult.

The school in Münster claims that at the end of a course a man should feel as at home taking care of a home as a woman.

One student at the domestic science school has discovered the negative side of the school's beneficial work. Back in action again his wife discovered to her amazement that her better half was also better at sewing. The outcome was inevitable. The husband now does all the sewing.

KCBS LOOKS AT THE CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, Radio Station KCBS in San Francisco has long been recognized for its leadership in broadcast news reporting and its public service in giving its listeners provocative and well-documented editorials.

Presently in California, the State's multibillion water project has become a matter of increased public concern and debate.

Mr. Speaker, KCBS has capsulized this issue in a series of three excellent editorials which I think are an outstanding example of this radio station's objectivity and public responsibility.

The series follows:

CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN I

In Monday morning's paper, you probably saw a full page dealing with California's Water Plan and the peripheral canal, a part of the State Water Project. The subject of that message involves the very lifeblood of California.

Without water, this State's vast economy and dense cities would soon waste away. Unfortunately, the scope of the Water Plan is so large that it staggers the mind. In this series of editorials, KCBS will try to present the project in manageable portions.

The story starts in 1957. At that time, Californians were still discussing the devastating floods which had smashed through the central valley a few years earlier. It was clear that there was a need for some sort of protection. Simultaneously, the southern part of the State was feeling its growing pains. More people were moving to California. More people meant a need for more water. Logically, it might be possible to serve both needs with one device.

Thus, in May of 1957, the California Water Plan was presented. Here's what it proposed: It was not a fixed blueprint by any means. It was divided into two major segments. The first was to deal with the development of local water needs. The second was to propose a major system of public works. This system's goal would be to conserve and export surplus northern water and transport it to areas that lacked adequate supplies. Ultimately, it would stretch from the Oregon border to the Mexican boundary. The State Legislature adopted the plan after considerable debate. In 1960, the voters approved the largest bond issue in the State's history. The price tag was 1.75 billion dollars.

Today that investment may be threatened by the questionable value of the peripheral canal, which we have consistently opposed.

Join us tomorrow for further comments.

CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN II

1.75 billion dollars is a great deal of money. Yet, even that huge sum may be insufficient to complete the vast State Water Project. Current money conditions make the State Water Project bonds unattractive to investors. On top of that, a new challenge has developed over the basic need for such a system. Thus, the idea is in trouble twice over. While all this is happening, the costs continue to increase through inflation, further compounding the problem.

As mentioned yesterday, the State Water Project is the system of canals, pumps and dams designed to transport fresh water. The system provides an immediate benefit through flood control. This is offset by the threat of water pollution in the delta region just northeast of San Francisco Bay. The pollution we're speaking of consists of saline water. This may come from sea water or it may come from fresh water that carries a large amount of mineral salts. In either case, the water is bitter and salty. Fresh water plant systems cannot adapt to such water quickly. In turn, animals and fish which feed on these plants are denied adequate sources of nourishment. In effect, the basic ecological life support system is disrupted, perhaps even destroyed. This is the darkest side of the story. This is what may come to pass if the peripheral canal is authorized and built.

The canal would act as a giant faucet. By diverting fresh water from the Sacramento River and detouring it south, the level of saline water might increase in the delta area. If enough fresh water was diverted, the impact on the delta, its recreational capacity, as well as its economy could be substantial. In tomorrow's segment, we'll compare the natural system with the mechanical method. We hope you'll join us.

CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN III

The peripheral canal, if built, would serve as an essential link in the State Water Project. It is needed to transport surplus fresh water to parched areas of central and southern California.

The peripheral canal, if built, would threaten the economy and ecology of the Delta region. Diversion of fresh water will allow salt water to intrude and thus damage the natural balance which now exists.

KCBS is inclined to support the second position. We recognize the needs for water in other parts of the State. However, we do not feel the economy and recreational value of the Delta should be the price to be paid. Many promises have been made that no such abuses will be permitted. We suspect political pressures from the jammed urban districts could make such assurances quite hollow, very quickly.

Delaying the peripheral canal will certainly cost money. Inflation has already expanded the estimated total cost from 1.75 *billion* dollars to 3 billion dollars for the entire project. However, that delay may provide opportunities to evaluate and adopt new technology. Conceivably, desalting of ocean water may prove competitive to the cost of inland water. A variety of other alternatives has been suggested. We think the time must be taken to evaluate them, rather than plunge ahead with the canal, only to learn later, another alternative was cheaper and better. Such an admission would be small comfort to the residents of the Delta.

Last year, Governor Reagan blocked the building of the Dos Rios Dam up north. He asked for some new thinking on the project. We urge him to follow the same policy on the peripheral canal. Delay might be costly, but we think it would be worth it if we could save the Delta in the bargain.

NOT ENOUGH APLOMB

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune in its editorial this morning has put into proper perspective President Pompidou's visit to Chicago.

The Tribune editorial follows.

NOT ENOUGH APLOMB

President Georges Pompidou of France blew his cool here in Chicago. Then President Nixon too hospitably imitated Pompidou by offering an unnecessary apology for Pompidou's reception here. Chicago took another undeserved black eye when the President, at the New York dinner honoring Pompidou, played for and got a laugh by pausing significantly after he mentioned that Pompidou had seen Illinois.

True, while the French president was in Chicago thousands of people turned out to remind him of what he already knew—that many Americans are critical of and angry about the French government's current policies in the middle east, and particularly about the recent French sale of more than 100 jets to Libya. In extenuation of Pompidou's overreaction to such reminders, it can be said that his time here had been overscheduled and that he was late and probably tired when he arrived at the Palmer House, where the demonstrators had gathered. But the nervousness he betrayed at the Chicago dinner surely was due less to what had happened here than to what he may have feared would happen but did not.

Pompidou has occasion to know crowds can be rough. When Vice President Hubert Humphrey visited Paris in April, 1967, hostile demonstrators were out in strength. They screamed "U.S. assassin!" at Humphrey, threw eggs and paint, burned an American flag in the middle of Avenue George V, and assaulted two American marines who were part of Humphrey's honor guard. The flag burning and assault on the marines caused the United States to file a formal protest. Pompidou surely can remember all this, for his auto in Humphrey's cavalcade was one of those splattered by eggs and paint.

Tho Humphrey had a far rougher time in Paris than Pompidou had in Chicago, he kept his poise better. On his return, he was editorially commended by Business Week for "handling a trying European mission with verve, aplomb, and sensitivity."

President Nixon, too, knows the difference between the orderly protest made by Pompidou's Chicago critics and really dangerous encounters such as he experienced in South America as a touring Vice President. Nixon would not have taken the Chicago incident as seriously as he did if Pompidou had main-

tained the aplomb expected of a man of his position and experience.

Mayor Daley is right in saying no apologies were required and that "the Chicago police department fulfilled its responsibility to both the visitors and the citizens in an exemplary manner."

TEXTILE IMPORTS

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Gene Stone, of Stone Manufacturing Co., Greenville, S.C., is one of the Nation's leading and most respected apparel manufacturers.

Recently, Mr. Stone returned from a trip around the world covering more than 25,000 miles. He visited many countries in the Far East and Europe including Japan, Korea, and Taiwan.

In a recent address Mr. Stone made the following recommendations which are worthy of consideration by the Congress. I commend these timely and pertinent suggestions to the immediate attention of my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY MR. STONE

There are several ways American Apparel Manufacturers can protect themselves from being liquidated by such foreign imports—short of moving their plants and production overseas. These are:

(1) Automate apparel manufacturing completely—This will take years and the cost is almost prohibitive for the apparel industry.

(2) Demand that all foreign companies that desire to ship apparel and textiles into America operate under the same wage and hour laws that we do and see that these laws are enforced. This, of course, is economically and politically unfeasible.

(3) Subsidize American Apparel Manufacturers for the difference between foreign wage rates and wage rates we pay here in America. This, too, is economically and politically unfeasible.

(4) Restrict imports to an acceptable volume by category and type. This *is* both economically and politically feasible, and is the policy of most nations around the world.

Just how much imported goods can our American Market absorb and still have our textile and apparel industries survive? This is the sixty-four dollar question that must be answered now!

After watching this problem get hotter and hotter for the past several years, until it's now at the boiling point, we would like to offer the following plan as *our* suggestion for a solution.

Allow all foreign countries combined to have up to, but not more than, fifteen percent of what our total American market was the year before in textiles and apparel. Divide this fifteen percent into three major categories: five percent for yarn, five percent for piece goods, and five percent for apparel. Subdivide each of these into more specific categories. Allow no shifting between categories and no carry-overs. That's our plan—simple but effective—and liberal too!

In 1968 the total American Market in textiles and apparel absorbed the equivalent of approximately twenty billion square yards. Fifteen percent of this would be 3,000,000,000 square yards which is just about the total equivalent yardage shipped into America in 1967 by all importers. This plan is far more liberal than any foreign country would offer us. Allowing a larger percentage than this to come in will be disastrous!

We have always tried to be good loyal Americans. We love South Carolina. Our greatest desire is to stay right here and continue working with our many, many wonderful people, who over the years, through loyal devotion and hard work, have helped our company to become, what we believe, is one of the finest apparel organizations in the world today. For years we have operated under strict Government wage and hour controls. Under these rules, when a "push became a shove", we have always been able to hold our own against any American competition.

It is a sorry Government indeed that requires our American manufacturers to operate by these strict rules and at the same time allows all foreign manufacturers to compete against us without abiding by *any* rules whatsoever. Sooner or later American manufacturers are bound to lose! In our own case, although we have lost the cream of our popular price staple business to these foreign imports, we are trading up, at tremendous cost, to fashion merchandise. This requires higher styling and shorter lead times, but since importers haven't invaded this field in depth yet, we believe we will still have a good season ahead of us.

If our government fails to adequately protect our industry in the bargaining sessions now going on in Geneva, and American retailers once become convinced there will be no restrictions put on imports, then I predict that orders placed overseas will make today's volume of imports seem like "nothing but sample shipments." We will then come face to face with that old proverb which says, "If you can't lick 'em—join 'em." If this decision, God forbid, is forced upon us, our industry will have no choice but to move overseas.

DISTINGUISHED UTAH EDUCATOR RECOGNIZED

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Utah's very distinguished superintendent of public instruction, Dr. T. H. Bell, of Salt Lake City, has been named Associate Commissioner of Education. A prominent newspaper in Utah, the Deseret News, has recognized Dr. Bell's achievements and contributions to the Utah educational system in an article which I would like to include in the RECORD:

A LOSS FOR UTAH

With the resignation this week of State Superintendent Dr. T. H. (Ted) Bell, who becomes Associate Commission of Education April 15, Utah loses one of its most skilled and imaginative educators.

Since his appointment as superintendent in 1963, succeeding the late Dr. Marion G. Merkley, Bell's administration has been characterized by vigorous activity in the field of innovative instruction. This has been the case, despite increasing teacher militancy and a host of other challenges.

Dr. Bell has not only served several times as chief mediator when school boards and teachers were in impasses over salaries, but served in other ways to improve channels of communication between boards and teachers.

In his new post, Dr. Bell will direct the U.S. Office of Education's 10 regional offices in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Atlanta, Chicago, Kansas City, Dallas, Denver, San Francisco and Seattle.

It is little wonder that such a dynamic and charismatic individual was selected for such new and high responsibility in the nation's educational affairs. As Dr. James E. Allen, U.S. Commissioner of Education, said, "The Office of Education is fortunate to be able to obtain the services of Dr. Bell, who is an experienced educator and is eminently qualified."

Utahans regret their loss, but at the same time are highly appreciative of Dr. Bell's job here and extend him every wish for additional success.

TRIP TO NOWHERE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the complications of drug addiction are becoming more obvious to us as widespread use of drugs dramatizes the problem. An editorial in the February 26 Blue Island, Ill., Sun-Standard, based on a great deal of study and research on which this paper's staff participated, merits very thoughtful review.

The editorial follows:

TRIP TO NOWHERE

Some young people use drugs. This is a fact.

While in all probability this fact affects communities surrounding this one, it cannot be dismissed as someone else's problem.

The possibility of drug abuse among our own young people must be kept constantly in mind as a threat to our own children.

The recent death of a 19 year old youth whose body was found here Sunday was a shocking revelation.

While the cause of death of this young man has not been positively laid to the use of drugs, indications point to that probability.

This youth had no previous record of drug abuse. He was known by his mother to deplore the use of drugs. Still, he may have been a drug victim.

LSD, one of the most damaging drugs used by young people today, can be responsible for an undetermined amount of brain damage.

It is suspected that many innocent youths have been sent on an unwanted trip by a "friend" who spiked a soft drink with this colorless, odorless tasteless, destructive monster—LSD.

Young people who use drugs by choice often go undetected by their own families for many months. We heard recently of a 16 year old lad who had to be confined to a sanitarium by his parents—he was an addict.

His understanding parents mistook the drug reactions as the not uncommon moodiness of a 16 year old boy. These were interested, concerned people who had no prior knowledge of their young man's use of harmful drugs.

We do not feel it necessary to alert readers to the dangers of drugs but rather to impress upon them the fact that a young, unsuspected addict could be their own child.

We all feel that our own children are above suspicion. No parent wants to become a spy, but we must be constantly on the alert. Elementary age young people are not to be discounted. Eleven and 12 year old drug users, while not common, are known.

First year high school students are probably the most vulnerable. They want to try everything and be accepted as one of the crowd. No one knows to what lengths they may go to achieve this desire.

When young people attain the age where they are often invited to attend house parties, how selective are we, as parents, of the places they are allowed to go?

Warnings and instructions from parents all too often fall on the deaf ears of youngsters. We must, therefore, always be on the alert for any changes in behavior patterns, new friends who are only vaguely described and the telltale signs that all is not well with our offspring.

No, it is not our neighbor's problem. It doesn't necessarily have to be the "kid who has always been in some kind of trouble."

Drug addiction or just trying it out for the first time for kicks is a problem close to the hearts and homes of every parent everywhere.

We ask you to be watchful or it may be too late to help that beloved son or daughter.

If there are any indications that lead you to believe that your child may be a user—first time or otherwise—it is of the utmost importance that you, as a concerned parent, seek immediate professional, medical help.

The authorities are also eager to assist parents who find they have a child with a narcotics problem. They do not just lock them up and throw away the key. They are in a position to advise troubled parents of what their next step in seeking help for a youngster should be.

We are hopeful that parents will take this editorial in the light in which it was intended. That is, to stop a young person from taking a trip from which he might never return.

SOUTH CAROLINA VETERANS HOSPITALS ARE SHORTSTAFFED AND NEED MORE OPERATING FUNDS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the hospitalized veterans in South Carolina are not receiving the quality of treatment which they deserve because the veterans hospitals which serve them do not have sufficient funds or staff to properly operate. They are caught in an impossible squeeze between higher medical and drug costs and rising workloads without receiving proportionally higher funding and staffing allocations.

Mr. Speaker, Vietnam veterans are having to wait for long periods of time for dental examinations and treatments and veterans who do not need expensive hospital care and could be sent to community nursing homes at VA expense are not being transferred because of lack of money. VA hospitals are continuing to use maintenance and equipment money to help pay for drugs, food, blood and blood products, medical supplies, and other operating costs because they are not receiving sufficient money for day-to-day operations. This results in further deterioration of VA hospital facilities and equipment.

Mr. Speaker, the general medical community hospitals and State and local government hospitals have an average staff ratio of 2.72 employees for each patient while the Veterans' Administration has only 1.5 staff for each patient. Some university hospitals operated in connection with medical schools have an even higher ratio of over three employees to each patient.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee investigation in December 1969 of South Carolina Veterans' Administration hospitals revealed funding deficiencies in fiscal year 1970 of over $1.7 million. Hospital directors at the Charleston and Columbia VA hospitals stated these funds were needed to operate about 750 hospital beds serving about 261,000 South Carolina veterans.

The investigation being conducted by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee revealed that under the hospital staffing ratios I advocate, South Carolina VA hospitals are approximately 300 positions short of needed staff. These extra positions would cost about $2.4 million annually. Hospital directors conceded a few of these positions, particularly physicians, would be difficult to fill at current VA salary rates, but most positions would be recruitable. The South Carolina hospital directors also reported that the community nursing home-care program at their hospitals was underfunded by approximately $125,000 and that more funds in the approximate same amount were required for outpatient fee dental care primarily due to the increased workloads created by returning Vietnam veterans.

In December 1969, Director F. C. Fitts, M.D., at the Columbia, S.C., hospital reported he was short about a half a million dollars in salary funds. Other shortages included $31,000 in the dietetic service for food and supplies, approximately $50,000 in drugs and medicines, approximately $20,000 for beneficiary travel and $10,000 for prosthetic appliances.

To meet these unfunded deficiencies and to maintain fiscal solvency, Dr. Fitts stated that planning included the cancellation of all approved nonrecurring maintenance and repair projects, reduction in the levels of all expenditures to a minimum consistent with continued operation, and not filling vacancies through attrition unless essential to direct patient care. He stated approximately $48,888 in funds allocated for maintenance and repair projects would be diverted to cover costs in other areas. Included among items to be deferred were the installation of a fire escape in Building No. 1 at an estimated cost of $16,000; increase the elevator capacity in Building No. 22, estimated cost $11,000; replace window screens, estimated cost $3,300; install new tile flooring $12,000; and install automatic doors. Said Fitts:

> These projects relate to critical areas throughout the hospital in order to maintain our customary hygenic and safety standards.

Dr. Fitts stated that they had 22 patients in the community nursing-care program at the beginning of fiscal year 1970 but that after January 1 they would have no funds for further placements. He said the program was underfunded by $43,000.

To achieve the minimal staffing ratios of two employees for each inpatient, the ratio for general hospitals advocated by me, Fitts said 260 more employees at an annual cost of about $1.7 million would be required. He reported the employee ratio at the Columbia VA hospital as of September 30, 1969, was 1.31 per patient. Fitts also said that physicians would not be recruitable at present VA salary scales but that all other positions required, including nurses, laboratory technicians, pharmacists, and social workers would be recruitable.

Dr. Fitts reported to the congressional committee in January that following review of his budget plan and reported deficiencies to the VA central office, additional funding support in the amount of $220,538 was received. Of this total $8,750 was restricted for fee basis dental care to apply against the $125,000 backlog; also, $11,788 was received to apply toward the reported $43,000 deficiency in the community nursing-care program. Fitts said the remaining $200,000 had been applied toward the funding deficiencies for staffing. He said:

> Although these allocations had materially reduced our projected deficit for personal services to continue current staffing, a sizeable deficiency continues for the fiscal year.

Additionally Fitts said:

> We must use all of our non-recurring maintenance and repair funds to support current staffing. No funds are available for activation of our recently installed speech pathology and audiology unit.

Fitts added:

> The funds allocated to community nursing home care and fee basis dental care do not meet the needs of the remainder of the fiscal year.

Director Robert L. Russell of the 334-bed hospital at Charleston, S.C., reported his funding deficiencies at more than $500,000 to operate during fiscal year 1970 in December 1969. He said he was short approximately $350,000 for an average of about 43 employees including one-half year funding support to activate intensive care units. In order to meet the shortage of funds for staffing, Russell said his plans included the cancellation of all maintenance and repair projects, cancellation of all planned equipment purchases, reduction of requests for supplies and services, and deferral of filling any present vacant positions, however essential.

Russell said that the $67,000 allocated for maintenance and repair activities and the $41,000 additional equipment would be diverted to cover the cost of salaries. Among maintenance and repair projects deferred were an addition to the sprinkler system $5,500; installation of a new incinerator $27,000; replacement of vinyl wall covering in all hospital areas $24,000; interlocks on laundry chutes $5,000; and air supply to surgery $5,000. Items of equipment that would have to be deferred to another year included a nurses call system, $3,300; X-ray apparatus, $2,200; conversion of two X-ray processors from 7 minutes to 3½ minutes processing time, $1,200; and other medical and administrative equipment.

The Charleston hospital reported that the actual cost of an average daily ration was $1.24 during fiscal year 1969. In approving a $1.20 rate for fiscal year 1970 Russell said:

> Requests from virtually all control points were reduced by management in order to stay within available funds. This reduction also applied to food ration costs.

At the beginning of fiscal year 1970, July 1, 1969, the Charleston hospital had 22 patients in the community nursing

home program. Director Russell reported that this program was underfunded by $82,350. He stated that an average of only 17 patients could be maintained within the funds available, but that the potential existed for an average of 32 outplacements during the fiscal year. Russell also reported that to achieve the minimal staffing ratio advocated by me for a general hospital that 26 more positions at an average cost of $225,000 annually would be required.

In a subsequent report to the Veterans' Affairs Committee Russell advised that his hospital had not received any funds other than those allocated to the hospital in October 1969.

Mr. Speaker, these are serious problems which are facing the hospital directors, their dedicated staffs and all of South Carolina's veterans. The Veterans' Affairs Committee will soon hold hearings on the full dimension of this problem throughout the system of 166 VA hospitals. With the bipartisan aid of my colleagues in the Congress, I hope this situation can soon be corrected.

RACIAL PROBLEMS

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article entitled "Moynihan Sees 'Involvement at Top' Essential to Solution of Race Problems," written by Robert Roth and published in the Philadelphia Bulletin on March 4, 1970.

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

MOYNIHAN SEES "INVOLVEMENT AT TOP" ESSENTIAL TO SOLUTION OF RACE PROBLEMS

(By Robert Roth)

WASHINGTON.—The Patrick Moynihan memorandum on racial problems which was inadvertently exposed to public view the other day has generated a lot of flak in the Negro and liberal communities.

This is understandable, but unfortunately it has tended to obscure the real purpose of the President's adviser on urban affairs, which was to call the attention of his chief to some of the weaknesses of the Nixon Administration in this area.

"BENIGN NEGLECT"

It is, of course, true that some of Moynihan's phraseology was unfortunate. He would no doubt have said some things differently if he had known that what he wrote would be published. But no matter how he put it, his suggestion that "the issue of race could benefit from a period of benign neglect" would not be welcomed by black people who feel that all they have had from this administration has been neglect, and not always of the benign variety at that.

They see in Administration policies affecting school desegregation and voting rights evidence of intention to slow rather than accelerate black advancement.

DISPUTE THESIS

They do not take kindly to the Moynihan assertion that the Negro has made extraordinary progress toward economic equality with the white population in recent years, and the accompanying implication that a breathing spell would not now be objectionable. They dispute the statistics on which the conclusion was based and in this they have some support from competent white authorities in this field.

Black resentment runs high, too, against the Moynihan thesis—first broached before he entered the Nixon Administration and repeated in the memorandum—that black problems have their origin in the breakdown of the Negro family structure. Black leaders—and many whites—believe that black family disintegration is not the cause but the result of black problems which in turn are rooted in white racial attitudes.

But it is not necessary to agree with Moynihan on all counts to recognize that he said some things which badly needed saying. For instance:

He told his boss, the President, that "there really is need for a more coherent Administration approach to a number of (racial) issues."

LIAISON ESSENTIAL

No doubt he had in mind, among other things, Administration policy on school busing, the gist of which grows daily more obscure. Moynihan suggested that more Administration conferences should be held to talk such problems out. It was, in a way, a retraction of his "benign neglect" proposal.

Moynihan called the President's attention to the fact that "there is a silent black majority as well as a white one," a majority which is "politically moderate and shares most of the concerns of its white counterpart." Moynihan stopped short of pointing out to the President, as he might have done, that this segment of the silent majority has had none of the attention lavished by the Administration on its white equivalent.

TELLS IT LIKE IT IS

In discussing the problem of crime, Moynihan gave the President, in a respectful way, the rough side of his tongue. He said, in effect, that the Administration has been talking for more than a year about crime in the streets and hasn't yet done anything about it.

I don't see that we have advanced either our understanding of the problem or that of the public at large," Moynihan said. Then he added "at the risk of indiscretion," that his is not a job which can be left to lawyers which is, indeed, exactly what the Administration has done up to now.

The need, Moynihan said, is for new approaches to the crime problem. They will not be found, he told the President, "unless you express a personal interest."

CRUX OF REPORT

Therein lies the crux of the memorandum. Moynihan clearly was urging the President to take a less detached attitude toward the problems of race, to become personally involved in seeking their solution for without such involvement at the top nothing constructive can be expected at the bottom.

Those who regard racial antagonism as the prime problem of our time should be grateful to Moynihan for saying that. Perhaps they should be inclined to forgive him if he said some other things they find less palatable.

FOREST MANAGEMENT

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I submitted a statement of my concern for the proper management of our national forests and questioned the wisdom of present forestry methods employed by the U.S. Forest Service, particularly the policy of clear cutting.

Included in my statement was an editorial from the Western News of Hamilton, Mont., which concluded that management of the Bitterroot National Forest was based upon a single use—timber yield—rather than the accepted principle of multiple use, while violation of the sustained yield concept endangered the future productivity of the area.

At this time I would like to submit an opposing view of forest management in this area and include for the RECORD the remarks of Mr. John R. Stevenson, Chairman of the Forest Resources Council:

REMARKS OF JOHN R. STEVENSON

I would like to answer a few of the many questions raised in your address to the Congress January 19, 1970, titled "The Well is About to go Dry."

As for the "Well," I have printed below a copy of USDA Report, dated November, 1969.

U.S. COMMERCIAL FOREST AREA, 1968

Type of ownership	Softwood saw timber (billion board feet)		
	Inventory	Removals	Growth
National forest	1,064.1	13.4	7.0
Other public	232.7	4.2	3.3
Forest industry	325.1	14.4	10.0
Farm and miscellaneous	381.1	12.1	15.9
Total	2,003.0	44.1	36.2

Looking at the right three columns, you can see that with 706.1 billion or 35% of the inventory, the privately owned timber is producing 26.5 billion ft., or 60% of the annual lumber needs. This is being accomplished in many cases by intensive management. A virgin forest is usually a stagnant forest with very little net growth because of losses due to old age, fire, and repeated insect attacks.

The "National Forest Timber Conservation Act of 1969" would go a long way in timber production, relative to inventories.

It may come as a surprise to "Western News" that one of the biggest problems the U.S. Forest Service has in the Bitterroot is overstocking after harvest or fire. Presently, the Forest Service is not adequately funded to perform the pre-commercial thinnings, after 10 to 15 years, necessary for maximum growth, and the commercial thinnings which should be made after 40 to 50 years. You were one of the sponsors of this sound legislation so there is no use going into the purpose and objectives of the Bill. However, the article from the Western News seems to doubt the advisability of passing such legislation. Mr. Miles Romney seems to be concerned that this money which is to be used for more intensive management will bring ruin and damnation on mankind.

As I am sure you can imagine, we, as an industry, do not always agree with the way the Forest Service handles things. At the same time, we have to remember that the U.S.F.S. is a big company, and the bigger the gathering, the more chance for mistakes. However, the federal employees that do not make mistakes are the employees that aren't doing anything. The only mistake the Bitterroot Forest has made (in the Western News' mind) is that they have been doing something.

In my opinion, the U.S.F.S. has made mistakes, but the good things that have resulted from their actions far outweigh their mistakes. We believe they should be much more vocal about their accomplishments and be quicker to answer critics such as the Western News. The industry has been

accused by Western News of using pressure tactics to have the allowable cuts increased. I can assure you that we are very seldom asked for our opinion when the U.S.F.S. is setting up their management plans. The Bitterroot forest has a management plan that indicates a sustained yield annual capacity of 119 MM. The present allowable cut is 50.3 MM, without including the Magruder Corridor. I can hardly believe they are overcutting.

Timber harvesting has been accused of dominating the forest and multiple uses. But in the Bitterroot, only 47% of the U.S.F.S. land area is even scheduled for management. When you consider the plan is based on a 120-year cutting cycle, only 1/120th of 47% is being harvested each year. The fact that the forested area in the Bitterroot stands on end like a picket fence does exaggerate the effect, and when clear cutting is used it creates a visible but not necessarily true impression of over cutting. In talking with Mr. Tester, the Bitterroot N. F. supervisor, he informs me that in the future cutting area patterns will be modified so that they more nearly resemble natural forest openings.

There has been much talk about the clear-cut method of harvesting, and you have no doubt heard the pros and cons about the use of this harvesting method. There has even been some talk that this method of harvest should be outlawed. Before anyone goes that far, I believe deep thought and a thorough study should be made. Yes, it does look scalped for a year or two, but have you ever tried walking through a lodgepole stand with dead trees lying about chest high? Most of these stands are stagnated and do not support a very healthy forest or provide food for deer or elk. I doubt whether the recreating public gets too much enjoyment out of struggling through this mess, or even looking at it from afar. Take the spruce stands that seem to be most susceptible to the bud worm and bark beetle.

If you take only a selected volume from a stand, the trees that are left, due to their shallow rooting, often topple over from wind throw. Telling a forester (any forester) that he cannot use the clear-cut method to manage a forest in the Rocky Mountain area would be like tying one hand behind his back. In the Bitterroot, the result would be approximately a 50% reduction in harvest and a corresponding loss of jobs. In the Livingston and White Sulphur Springs area, it would mean a complete shut down of operations. In the Ponderosa pine and Douglas fir stands, I believe the clear cut could be reduced and modified in such a manner that it would not offend those that are now being offended.

Mr. Romney states that the clear cut does not compliment the deer and elk population. On this, I have many personal experiences—being an avid sportsman. I believe the Rye Creek drainage, just east of the junction of the East Fork and West Fork, has been logged and burned over just about as heavy as any drainage that I know, and yet it produces more deer and elk than any single drainage of its size that I know. Just ask a few of the natives where the elk are. Ruel Jensen of the Montana Fish and Game Department will tell you that clear cuts produce more forage and grasses than do heavily timbered stands. As for accessibility in hunting deer, elk, or grouse, give me a terrace or an abandoned logging road any day. About all I can gather from Mr. Romney's remarks is that he just doesn't hunt.

Another attack by the Western News was centered around water production from a clear-cut harvested drainage. There is nothing quite as clear cut as a drainage ravaged by wild fire like the Sleeping Child and Saddle Mountain areas which are tributory to the East Fork Drainage. On top of this, there would be in excess of ten thousand acres in this drainage that at some time or other has been clear cut. Yet, the records kept by the USGS indicate that the flow has increased from an average summer rate of 100 days at 200 sec. feet or better prior to 1961 to an average of 109 days at or above 200 sec. ft. after 1961 and these two fires. Peak flow comes four days earlier on the average, but peak volume has remained the same.

Total water flow from April through August has increased 12% with the critical month of August showing a 24% increase. If you want a rancher's opinion talk to Paul Wetzsteon of Sula. The Wetzsteons are an old Bitterroot family.

I don't know what Mr. Romney calls multiple use, but when over 400 families derive their living from 1/120th of 47% of the forest area and hunt on the cutover areas, and ride snowmobiles on the logging roads, what other uses are there? If any one in the Bitterroot wants to hike into the Bitterroot-Selway Wilderness all he has to do is head West and he can disappear for days, weeks, or months.

I know this is the big year for environment and the curse of overpopulation. I never thought I would see the day when we would be trading in motherhood for clean anything, but here we are. All I can say is that we haven't stopped the babies yet, so we better be thinking about jobs. The environment that I believe in has young people going to and from healthy outdoor jobs. Young, healthy children growing up along side of youth healthy trees. Old people and old trees aren't going to do much for Montana.

Thanks for this opportunity to express my views on the Bitterroot Forest and your support of H.R. 12025.

DEATH OF A GREAT ILLUSION

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial from the Chicago Tribune, dated Wednesday, March 4, 1970, entitled "Death of a Great Illusion."

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

DEATH OF A GREAT ILLUSION

Sixteen years after the Warren Supreme court's decision that compulsory racial segregation in the public schools is unconstitutional, it has been recognized, suddenly and almost by national consensus, that compulsory integration is an impossible dream. Not only southern conservatives but northern liberals and Negro civil rights leaders now oppose busing or other means of compulsion to effect integration, for the simple reason that it will not work.

Some ideological zealots are wringing their hands and weeping lugubriously about this. Tom Wicker of the New York Times, for instance, accuses the Nixon administration of selling out to the southern segregationists in one of his lamentations, which concludes: "Poor old Union! Its great and generous dreams falling one by one to dusty death."

We think this apocalyptic view of the failure of integration is preposterous. Recognition of its failure has come with such a shattering impact upon the proponents of integration for integration's sake because they were wrong, not only in assuming that it was feasible but also in their insistence that education in all-Negro schools is necessarily inferior. We agree with the National Observer that it is a gross insult to the Negro race to say, as many white liberals do, that it is necessary for black children to attend school with whites in order to get a good education.

This false premise has adversely affected public education, particularly for Negroes. As. Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, the distinguished psychologist, has said, the fundamental question of quality education "became more and more obscured if not ignored" as controversies and conflict over desegregation increased in frequency and intensity.

Official acknowledgment that integration has failed came when the Senate, with the support of some northern liberals, passed an amendment by Sen. John Stennis of Mississippi to an education bill, providing that federal guidelines for integration must be applied uniformly thruout the country. This would abolish the distinction between segregation in the south, resulting from laws long ago held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, and segregation in the north, resulting from residential patterns. Both the Senate and the House have passed education bills with anti-busing provisions.

Sen. Abraham Ribicoff [D., Conn.], a liberal, accused other liberals of hypocrisy in trying to compel the south to do what could not possibly be accomplished in northern cities. He noted that when black enrollment in the schools reaches a certain point [some say the "critical mass" is about 30 per cent], the whites move away and the schools quickly become resegregated.

So far the Supreme court and most of the lower courts have failed to take note of the obvious fact that integration in cities with large Negro populations is a physical impossibility. Even Robert H. Finch, secretary of health, education, and welfare, an ardent integrationist, has condemned "confusing and misguiding" court decisions, including "totally unrealistic" orders for busing on a massive scale to fill racial quotas.

We believe the "freedom of choice" principle is the answer to this problem. Any pupil would have the right to attend any school of his choice, but not necessarily to be bused there. Some southern states accepted this principle, but the lower courts rejected it as a subterfuge to evade integration and the Supreme court refused to review their decisions.

Last Oct. 29, the Supreme court said it was time for "every school district to terminate the dual system at once and to operate now and hereafter only unitary schools." Freedom of choice is the essence of the unitary school principle. The Supreme court has held that racial discrimination is unconstitutional, but it has not held that integration is compulsory. When it recognizes that compulsory integration is impossible, as it must, perhaps we can expect greater efforts to improve the quality of education in all the public schools.

THE NEW POLITICS: AN ANALYSIS BY LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Lawrence F. O'Brien has written a remarkably apt and astute article on the "New Politics" for the New York Times Encyclopedic Almanac of 1970. Pointing out that the role of political organizations in major elections has diminished dramatically over the past few years, Mr. O'Brien con-

tends that today's educated and affluent voters choose candidates on the basis of "issues and image."

The article follows:

THE NEW POLITICS

(By Lawrence F. O'Brien)

This observer and practitioner of the "old politics," who has participated in the "new politics" that has evolved in the United States during the last two decades, probably defines "new politics" in a markedly different way than those who practiced the "politics of confrontation" in the 1968 campaigns.

The true and lasting values of the new political process in this country are not the disorder, the turmoil, and the physical confrontations that we have witnessed in recent years. Those disruptive elements are the symptoms of change—the manifestations of the restlessness with the old order of those who are impatient with the slow pace of progress.

The new form of the game of American politics today is: Issues and Image. The days of the old power brokers are just about gone, political patronage is almost impotent, and the importance of political organizations has been greatly diminished.

It is a long established tradition among politicians of both parties to discuss winning elections in terms of the local or state party leaders who will "deliver" the needed margins through the effectiveness of their control and that of their organizations. But that tradition is virtually dead, and future campaign managers had better recognize it.

Individuals today can no longer "deliver" the vote to any meaningful extent in an American political campaign. Our society has become too sophisticated for that—too affluent, too well-educated, too independent.

By the same token, a political organization that is merely relying upon the old techniques of poring over registration lists, setting up phone banks, offering rides to the polls, and passing out absentee ballots had better look to the future.

Richard Milhous Nixon was not elected President in 1968 because powerful Republican mayors or county leaders or state chairmen were able to "deliver" the votes for him. He was not elected President because of an effective voter-registration program by the GOP, or because of a get-out-the-vote Republican effort.

He was elected President because he exploited the campaign issues with great care and sensitivity, and because he had an immense amount of money to project an image on television and radio.

Hubert Horatio Humphrey was defeated in 1968 because he was unable to establish an independence from the Johnson administration in the minds of many voters on the issues that were of most concern to them, and because he did not have enough money to purchase mass media imagery.

If there was one overriding lesson to be learned from the last Presidential election, it was that this nation had become deeply polarized over the issues and that, in the process, party lines were blurred.

Mr. Nixon was elected as a minority President with a hairline margin over Mr. Humphrey. While the vote for George Wallace was smaller than many had anticipated, he nevertheless attracted the support of a substantial number of Americans who were unable to bring themselves to vote for either of the major party candidates.

The Nixon campaign in 1968 was strictly a holding action. It brought the Republican candidate virtually no additional strength when viewed in terms of the public-opinion polls. He started the campaign with between 40 and 45 percent support and ended on election night with slightly more than 43 percent. It was the Humphrey support that rose sharply after Labor Day as the Wallace popularity declined and as the number of undecided voters dropped.

I managed the Humphrey campaign. In analyzing why it made such remarkable progress, despite a great shortage of funds and a highly fractured party structure following the Chicago convention, I can only conclude that as Mr. Humphrey asserted his own viewpoints and projected his own image he was able to kindle a spark in the old liberal-progressive-labor coalition that in the past had spelled Democratic victory.

As noted, the polarization of public opinion as evidenced by the 1968 election returns crossed party lines and blurred them. The Vietnam war created "hawks" and "doves" in both of the major parties. The issue of "crime in the streets" was only in part a code name for white backlash. There were many millions of Americans—Democrats and Republicans—who were sincerely and very seriously concerned over the maintenance of law and order in our free society.

There was a turn to the right in 1968, and any viewer of the 1969 local elections must conclude that the swing toward conservatism in American politics has been intensified and broadened.

The revulsion against urban riots, campus disturbances, hippies, yippies, drug users, draft-card burners, anarchistic militants—whether their actions are justified or exaggerated—is nonetheless having a powerful influence on political thought. In effect, the polarization on the left, fueled by an unpopular war, has brought about a counterbalance that will be felt for many years to come in political terms.

President Nixon accepted his victory as a mandate for all of us to lower our voices, and subsequent local elections apparently have fortified that conclusion in the White House. The President has made a very conscious decision to follow public opinion, rather than to lead it.

The first six months of the Nixon administration were a clear example of the importance of issues and imagery in modern American politics. Imagery has been more dominant, as seen by the efforts of the President—through very clever use of television—to establish himself as being firmly in control and being firmly in favor of a return to "normalcy" in this country. Aside from Vietnam—which was destined to foreshadow any administration taking office in 1969—the major issue of the administration has been law and order at the expense of badly needed but largely unpopular programs for social action.

In the old days, we politicians talked of the electorate in terms of ethnic, religious, and racial groupings. That approach, too, has become an anachronism, along with appeals that are aimed at just the very rich or the very poor.

America has become a vast expanse of middle-class citizens—upper middle, lower middle, or dead-center middle. We live mostly in the suburbs, where most of us share similar concerns about the education of our children, the safety of our neighborhoods, the war, inflation, the high cost of medical care, taxes, air and water pollution, consumer protection, and a myriad of other issues that strike a responsive chord in the vast voting majority.

The middle-class suburbanite—blue collar or white, with two or three children, one or two cars, and a mortgaged home—has become the "typical" American of our era. The national and state elections of the future will be won or lost in the suburbs, which is just where President Nixon won the 1968 Presidential election.

The point is that issues do count these days, and communicating the issues is all-important. Television, which has had a fantastic impact on political campaigns, will continue to play its vital role—at least in the foreseeable future.

A candidate for President can reach 20 or 30 million people with a half hour of prime-time network television. How many hands can he shake in a year? How many people would attend the rallies that a candidate might address in a political lifetime? The power and influence of political advertising on television is breathtaking . . . and frightening.

Because of the awesome political potential of the television tube—in terms of influence—modern American politics must make certain that it is utilized fairly by all major candidates, not just by those who can raise enough money to afford it.

Another issue that modern American politicians must confront is the archaic nature of the Electoral College. In 1968, this system nearly threw this nation into unprecedented uncertainty and chaos. A change in a relative handful of votes in three or four states could have thrown the election into the Electoral College, where a third-party candidate would have been in the position of being able to handpick the next President of the United States.

The principle of a direct vote for President—just as we popularly elect all of our other public officials—is one that wins a high degree of approval in public opinion polls, and it must be translated into timely Constitutional reform.

Finally—and in many ways most important—the "new politics" in the United States is beginning to recognize the growing political force of the young men and women of America.

I refer to the young people who found in 1968 that they could have a significant impact on American thought and opinion. Despite a small but vocal minority of young people who hold our political process in contempt, and who flagrantly violate our laws, the vast majority of young men and women want to accomplish change by utilizing our democracy, not by tearing it down.

In the last Presidential election, these democratically oriented young people worked arduously for their candidates in the Presidential primaries and in the fall campaign. They helped to focus public attention on the overriding issues, and their voices were heard to a significant extent.

My advice to modern political managers is: Look to our young people; that's where the future is. Communicate with our young people.

At present, both major political parties have a long way to go in attracting the youth of our nation to their banners. We must stop segregating young people in junior division of our poltical parties, shunting them aside, paying them little heed, and giving them little voice in party affairs and party policy.

We must offer American young people an opportunity to express their views and their concerns—a true opportunity to participate. Can the major political parties appeal to the millions of young Americans who are restlessly searching for new solutions to the problems of our society? I simply believe that they must.

JOHN S. WILDER, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, at its 24th annual convention held in San Francisco, Calif., February 1–4, 1970, Hon. John S. Wilder, of Somerville, Tenn., was elected president of the National Association of Conservation Districts.

I salute the conservation districts of America and their new president, my friend of long standing, Sen. John S. Wilder. Mr. Wilder was one of the leaders who helped organize his own soil conservation district in Fayette County, Tenn., in 1950. He has served as chairman of his local Soil Conservation District Board, as West Tennessee vice president of the Tennessee Association of Conservation Districts, as president of the Tennessee Association of Conservation Districts from 1955–60, as Southeastern area vice president of National Association of Conservation Districts, as treasurer of the National Association of Districts, and as vice president of the national association.

John Wilder has the background, training, experience, and vision to lead this great national organization. He is a farmer, a lawyer, a conservationist, a State senator, and a regional lay leader in his church. He has received many national honors, yet he remains a leader with humility.

The election of John S. Wilder to the presidency of the National Association of Conservation Districts reflects high honor upon him personally and professionally. Moreover, it reflects great credit upon the Tennessee Association of Conservation Districts.

WHAT WAS THE REASON FOR RUDENESS?

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, now that the President of France has left our shores carrying with him the friendship of the U.S. President and memories of the rudeness of too many Americans, I wish briefly to speak on that subject.

I wish to ask those who picketed, those who boycotted, those who walked out, booed, jeered, and spat, what their real purpose was. Mr. Speaker, I do not honestly know. Their ostensible purpose was to protest the sale of French planes to Libya on the grounds that those planes might someday be used against Israel.

But this cannot be the real reason. These same immature and emotional protestors, these same rude boors and ruffians, have been strangely silent about the real perpetrators of war and turmoil in the Middle East—the Russians.

Mr. Speaker, for years the Russians have been stirring up the Arab Nations against Israel and supplying them with billions of dollars in weapons and accoutrements of war.

Yet, I do not recall any protests by those who insulted President Pompidou when official Russian visitors have come to this country. Why, I do not know. Certainly, if it were merely a matter of befriending Israel, these people should have risen up in righteous wrath against the Russians. But they did not, they have not and they are not about to.

Which brings me back to my original question: Mr. Speaker, what is really behind the outrageous treatment accorded President Pompidou?

SOLUTION TO THE FEDERAL PARKING PROBLEM

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the overwhelming parking problem with which metropolitan Washington is confronted. I therefore noted with interest a recent article in the Washington Star which dealt with the efforts of the Administrator of General Services, Robert L. Kunzig, to alleviate this critical problem. At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert the article written by Joseph Young which appeared in the Washington Star on February 15, 1970:

General Services Administrator Robert L. Kunzig said yesterday a recent General Accounting Office decision could represent a major breakthrough in solving the critical parking problems of federal employees in the Washington metropolitan area.

Kunzig said the GAO decision gives the General Services Administration leasing authority to secure space and buildings for government employee parking.

Based on this decision, GSA intends to go ahead immediately with plans to solve the parking problems of government employees in the Washington area, Kunzig said.

The GSA Administrator said he ordered a study "to go ahead at full speed to explore all possible solutions" possible under the GAO decision.

VOICES OPTIMISM

Kunzig expressed optimism that GSA will be able to come up with a plan to provide adequate parking for government workers at "reasonable" and equal fees.

"I have instructed my staff to let innovation be the watchword," Kunzig said. "The fact that something has never been tried before will be no deterrent in our planning.

"Obviously GSA cannot provide free parking for all federal employees, but we hope to ascertain just how we can solve the problem of providing adequate parking for all at a reasonable fee."

Kunzig said: "Among the things we will explore are the leasing of areas for parking on the fringe of the city, adjacent to bus lines or near subway stations as the underground rapid transit system becomes a reality. We will be in close touch with officials of the Metropolitan Transit Authority."

The GSA administrator said that users of a fringe parking area might be assessed a small fee for use of the facility. He pointed out that cost of such areas outside the downtown area would be considerably less and therefore could be offered to users at a nominal fee compared with the average parking fee in the core of the city.

Other methods also being considered are leasing of land by the government for parking space throughout the city in areas where government buildings are located, with the government and/or private concessionaires operating the parking facilities; the rental of existing parking facilities, and leasing arrangements in connection with the construction of new ones for use by government workers.

"Some of the innovations we develop may call for special legislation," Kunzig said. "Whatever the difficulties, it is time the problems were solved. We will persistently pursue the matter until we have the solutions."

Several years ago the GAO had issued a decision which was interpreted by GSA as limiting its leasing authority in regard to acquiring land and property for parking purposes.

However, a recent GAO decision made clear that GSA has such authority.

FURTHER POSSIBILITIES

Kunzig said the comptroller general's decision could open the way for: Equal parking fees for all federal employees in the Washington area. GSA to lease space, including multilevel parking facilities, "where it is determined that such action is necessary in order to employ and retain personnel to perform the work of an agency, at a particular location." GSA to insist that adequate parking be provided with any buildings it leases in the future.

Kunzig said GSA already is considering other ways to ease the parking crisis using existing resources. Some of the avenues being explored are bumper-to-bumper (or stack) parking in attendant-operated lots and the use of motor pools that would serve several agencies, thus reducing the need for space to park government vehicles.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to submit for the RECORD the winning speech in the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the VFW in the State of Nebraska.

The young lady who was awarded first place in the Nebraska competition is Miss Pamela Edwards, a resident of Mitchell, Nebr.

I herewith commend her essay to the Members for their perusal. It is an outstanding speech, one which will make each of us more aware of our responsibilities as citizens of a free nation:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

Alexander the Great ascended the throne at twenty and conquered the known world by thirty-three. George Washington was sent at twenty-one to deal with the French and won his first battle as a colonel at twenty-two. Gladstone was in Parliament before he was twenty-two and at twenty-four was Lord of the Treasury. Luther was but twenty-nine when he nailed his famous thesis to the door of the cathedral at Wittenburg. Christ began His work at thirty.

These five young men met the challenge of their times and succeeded.

Today, American youth also face an important challenge; one which has never been more apparent—the challenge of freedom!

This is a challenge that must be met not only on an international basis, but also here at home. Too often we stare blindly as our armed forces leave for global trouble spots and fail to see a more subtle, but equally dangerous, threat to our homeland.

Freedom is endangered not only in Cuba, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany, but in New York, in Los Angeles, and in Kansas City! It is a danger characterized by moral decay, apathy among our citizens, the growth of materialism, the decline of spiritualism, and "a failure to communicate".

We, who are left on the Home Front, can be the most effective of the "Freedom Fighters". Our challenge is clear.

It is a ragged ignorant child in the Appalachian Mountains.

It is a hungry family, black or white, in our nation's big cities.

It is the thousands of men and women who never bother to vote, claiming: "My vote doesn't count anyway! Why should I vote?"

It is also the intolerance and hostility between many of our black and white citizens, the needless, and often deadly, violence which suddenly erupts from an otherwise peaceful demonstration, and the impatience of youth, striving for change, and finding themselves entangled in "the Establishment's" web of red tape.

Yes, our challenge is clear and it must be met!

Today's youth is better educated and more aware than any previous generation in the history of mankind, and, as such, the expectations and responsibilities are so much the greater.

Our problems are many, but they are not insurmountable. Our nation has always been blessed with excellent leaders, but we can no longer deceive ourselves into thinking that our leaders or government can carry on entirely alone. We must begin now to effectively meet the challenges we face—not only as a nation, but as individuals.

The isolationism favored by many of our predecessors is no longer practical or possible. Involvement, whether on a personal or political scale, is not only a luxury for those who care to indulge in it, but rather, a necessity. What is needed is meaningful involvement and active constructive participation on all levels; whether it be local politics and activities or in personal relationships.

In this way we can begin to bridge the gaps in understanding and opportunity that threaten the future of our country; gaps between black and white, rich and poor, youth and age.

A short time ago the President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, said in a speech concerning the war in Vietnam: "Let us be united for peace. Let us also be united against defeat. Because let us understand: North Vietnam cannot defeat or humiliate the United States. Only Americans can do that." Mr. Nixon's statement is applicable not only to the Vietnamese war, but to the future of freedom in America and to the challenge freedom presents to each of us.

Who must step forward to face the challenge of freedom? Who must see that the challenge is met? "Only Americans can do that."

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO AMEND THE WAGNER-O'DAY ACT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would amend the Wagner-O'Day Act to extend the provision of the act to handicapped persons who are not blind.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment would extend the very helpful benefits of the Wagner-O'Day Act to the physically, emotionally, and mentally handicapped and would provide the regulations and provisions of the act to enable the above persons to produce certain goods for the Government.

The amendment would in no way serve to deprive the blind workshops and, in fact, has received the support of organizations serving the blind.

LAOS: ANOTHER QUAGMIRE?

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have expressed concern in the past few days as to our policy in Laos.

I, too, am concerned as to what future developments will take place in that Asian country. Will we be asked to furnish advisers and troops to Laos just as we did in Vietnam?

From all newspaper accounts and other news media, it appears to me that the situation in Laos is far more critical than we are made to believe. The public should be told of the nature and the scope of our involvement and before this country makes any commitment to Laos, Congress should be fully informed and our government make every effort to avoid further expansion of the conflict in the Asian area.

Mr. Speaker, the concern about Laos was eloquently expressed by our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Mr. THOMPSON, quite recently. His commentary drew the attention of the Trenton Sunday Times Advertiser which on March 1 carried a lead editorial entitled, "Laos: Another Quagmire?" I think the points raised by Congressman THOMPSON and the Sunday Times Advertiser are so important that I take this opportunity of placing these declarations before the Members of this House, which read as follows:

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Sunday Times Advertiser, Mar. 1, 1970]

LAOS: ANOTHER QUAGMIRE

Rep. Frank Thompson Jr. feels the Nixon administration should give a "full accounting" of U.S. activities in Laos, the Southeast Asian state adjoining Vietnam.

He is not alone. A host of senators is concerned about Laos, and one of them, Senator Mathias, R-Md., has charged that the administration is subverting the will of Congress by the American military involvement there.

The Trenton Congressman warned that "shadowy warfare in that small country" may produce another Vietnam. Senator Mathias expressed fear that the administration is turning Laos into "an area for the repetition of the mistakes of our Vietnam involvement."

Mr. Thompson pointed to press reports that U.S. B-52 bombers assisted the Royal Laotian Army in its unsuccessful effort to hold the Plain of Jars against Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese troops. Senator Mathias cited reports that hundreds of former Green Berets had been recruited by the C.I.A. to assist in clandestine military operations in support of the Laotian government.

Commenting on Senator Mathias' remarks, Majority Leader Mansfield cautioned that if the Laotian war continued to widen, then "all the plans for Vietnamization and all else will go down the drain, and we will find ourselves in a most difficult and dangerous situation."

Senator Mansfield suggested that "one way out of the dilemma in which we find ourselves in Laos" might to be call for the assistance of Britain and the Soviet Union, as co-chairmen of the 1962 Geneva conference which provided for the neutrality of the country. Representative Thompson referred to the same conference asking: "By what rationalization can the United States violate the protocol of the 1962 Declaration of the Neutrality of Laos by which it agreed that the introduction of foreign regular and irregular troops, foreign paramilitary formations and foreign military personnel into Laos is prohibited?"

The unrest among the congressmen drew from Secretary of Defense Laird an assurance that President Nixon would not send ground troops into Laos without the consent of Congress. This was something the Senate thought it had taken care of last December by writing a prohibition on the use of U.S. ground troops in Laos into the defense appropriation bill.

Mr. Laird said the administration does not at this time have anything under consideration that might require congressional action. Other Washington sources have reported that the administration would make no new policies toward Laos until it has a clearer indication of North Vietnamese intentions there.

And it should make no such policies without the "full accounting" Representative Thompson has called for and the demanded and promised consultation with Congress.

PROMPT ACTION AVOIDS TEACHER WALKOUT

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Mrs. Anita Allen, president of the District of Columbia School Board and Acting Superintendent Benjamin Henley, for what I understand to be their successful efforts to reverse the proposed action of the teachers of the local public schools and the union representatives of the Washington Teachers Union to conduct a boycott and walkout of the District public schools today for the purpose of lobbying on Capitol Hill.

I believe the actions of the teachers and the union to have been ill advised and I am pleased that Mrs. Allen and Mr. Henley acted promptly, quietly, and efficiently to head off this proposed boycott and walkout.

I have had several opportunities to observe Mrs. Allen since her election and have discussed District school matters with her at length on at least one occasion. I believe she is capable of giving the District public schools the kind of leadership it so badly needs. I think the action which she took yesterday to head off what appeared to be a proposed strike is an example of this commendable leadership.

I believe that Acting Superintendent Henley responded well to the situation and exhibited a reasonableness, yet a firmness, that was needed to bring about a change of opinion on the part of the teachers and the union representatives.

I certainly do not believe that I am overstating the fact when I say that the contemplated action on the part of the teachers and the union to conduct a boycott and a walkout was ill received by the Members of this body. I am happy to see the reversal of this contemplated action and I commend those who were effective in bringing it about.

THE VA HOSPITALS—A CRISIS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, while the concern of the Nation has been shifted away from the Vietnam war, the killing, the maiming, and the dying continue. Perhaps the scale of fighting has diminished, but some 80 to 90 boys die each week and hundreds are injured, many permanently.

The Veterans' Administration hospitals are attempting to meet the needs of these wounded men as they return home, some without legs or arms—too many without hope.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the VA hospitals, because of staff shortages and other problems largely the result of too little money, cannot meet the needs and the results are tragic.

A recent article in the Sacramento Bee by Mr. Michael Green, Washington correspondent for the McClatchy newspapers, described the nature of this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all my colleagues to read this article and reflect on the reasons for this problem and then address themselves to its resolution.

The article follows:

FUND CUTS RESTRICT VA'S CARE OF VETS

(By Michael Green)

"Ripped open by metal explosion, caught in barbed wire, fireball, bullet shock, bayonet, electricity, shrapnelled, throbbing meat . . . Watch the long, long armies drifting home."—Hair.

WASHINGTON.—Max Cleland, Captain, USAR (Ret.), a Vietnam veteran, appeared minus one arm and two legs before a Senate committee shortly before Christmas. The word "Retired" after his name appeared unnecessary.

"To the devastating psychological effect of getting maimed, paralyzed, or in some way unable to re-enter American life as you left it," he told the senators, "is the added psychological weight that it may not have been worth it; that the war may have been a cruel hoax, an American tragedy, that left a small minority of young American males holding the bag."

If his statement seemed to carry lingering traces of bitterness or to be too political at times, no one in the room questioned his credentials for making it. Capt. Cleland, now 27, from Atlanta, was wounded in a grenade explosion. He holds the Silver Star for gallantry in action.

It was his experience after getting wounded that was the focal point of the committee's attention.

"Unfortunately," he related, "I did not find that the up-to-date, rapidly-applied medical techniques used in saving men on the battlefield had their counterparts in my rehabilitation."

It was a year before he got a wheelchair of his own, he testified. It took twice as long to acquire artificial legs as it should have. There was "a dire lack of information" on what Veterans Administration hospital would best suit his needs. No paycheck appeared for two months. There was nothing for the soul.

"These psychological repercussions do not hit you right away," he reflected. "The inevitable psychological depression after injury, coupled with doubts that it may not have been worth it, come months later like a series of secondary explosions long after the excitement of the battlefield is far behind, the reinforcement of your comrades-in-arms a thing of the past, and the individual is left alone with his injury and his self-doubts."

Capt. Cleland might have been the first to admit that he was among the lucky ones in terms of his rehabilitation and treatment by the Veterans Administration.

The parade of witnesses has been filing slowly past the Senate veterans affairs subcommittee headed by Sen. Alan Cranston, D-Calif., for the past three months. They have been largely unnoticed by the press, as if to confirm Capt. Cleland's observation that "in a war everyone wishes to forget, it is all too easy to forget the men who fought it. . ."

There have been witnesses representing those who were blinded, and those who were paralyzed; men with severe psychiatric problems resulting from the war and others with lasting internal injuries; all representing, in some form, what Sen. Cranston called "the living and the half-living" veterans of the Vietnam War.

So far, the testimony has produced "mounting evidence that cutbacks in funds and personnel are causing a dangerous deterioration in the quality of medical care for wounded Vietnam War veterans," he said.

"Rejections of VA requests over the last three years have caused potentially catastrophic shortages in medical staffs and hospital facilities."

The senator opened his probe last November after hearing stories about allegedly inadequate care being given disabled GIs at the same time the Nixon administration announced a $70 million cut in the VA medical budget as part of its fight against inflation.

The cut, it developed in subsequent testimony, was only the latest in a continuing policy of budgetary restrictiveness pursued by the last Democratic administration no less than the current Republican one. As a result, the VA hospital program remains at the same level today that it did five years ago—before the great influx of Vietnam wounded began.

Cranston estimates that at a bare minimum, an additional $100 million is needed simply to provide 10,000 hospital personnel requested by the VA in vain. No one knows for sure yet how much more money may really be needed.

Dr. H. Martin Engle, chief medical director of VA, testified that nearly 12,200 Vietnam veterans had been transferred to VA hospitals to date, the largest group composed of para and quadraplegics and men with nervous system injuries and the second largest group with psychiatric conditions.

Yet, he also testified that the number of full-time staff has remained the same during the past five years, that overall there were "6000 fewer employes" added to the staff "than we might have anticipated a year ago" as a result of current budget cuts alone, and that beds in VA hospitals had been reduced by 8000 over the last two years.

Both he and other administration spokesmen, while acknowledging that they "would not claim that our physician staff is adequate either in numbers or in distribution throughout the VA system," maintained that the problem was "not the result of any fund shortages" but the stiff competition for skilled doctors, in short supply nationally.

However, one of the major factors in being unable to compete, they agreed under questioning, was lack of funds to pay the kind of salaries that are competitive.

Beyond this, they painted a generally rosy picture of the care being afforded disabled Vietnam veterans.

VA hospitals are able to treat more servicemen with fewer beds and fewer resources, Engle argued, because of "changing patterns in health care" and different "patterns of delivery for health care services" that place greater stress on outpatient treatment.

"Thus far, the VA has been able to absorb the impact of Vietnam casualties without encountering any insoluble problems," he assured the senators.

Few non-administration witnesses agreed.

Dr. Louis Jolyon West, medical director of the UCLA Neuropsychiatric Institute, testified that thousands of GIs with psychiatric disorders resulting from combat were being kept in "chemical cocoons" because of lack of money and psychiatrists to give them proper care.

"We have abandoned the practice of lobotomy," he said, "but we are chemically lobotomizing thousands and thousands of patients, and we can keep it up for years."

Drawing on his own experience, Dr. West called psychiatric care being given at the VA's Brentwood hospital in Los Angeles "20–25 years behind the times" and charged:

"We are giving up on many young men by keeping them tranquilized with drugs and shunting them aside, instead of providing them proper psychiatric care."

It is a view privately confirmed in the experience of at least one, young California congressman who made unannounced visits to several VA hospitals in the state and came away appalled and deeply troubled by what he had seen.

"You can see such men at any mental hospital," Dr. West testified. "They are easy to identify because the drugs make them move slowly and stiffly . . . People can go on for years that way."

But, he said, increasingly heavier dosages must be used.

Cranston professed shock upon learning that there was only one psychiatrist for every 535 patients in VA neuropsychiatric hospitals.

"That would enable a doctor to spend 4½ minutes a week with each of his patients," he observed.

The story of insufficient resources, and thus inadequate care, is paralleled in the cases of GIs with other forms of disabilities.

"In our own state of California," testified Raymond P. Neal, national commander of Disabled American Veterans, "there are new medical units, equipment, beds and wards lying idle because of lack of funds for staffing.

"One specific example is the intensive care unit of the VA hospital in Fresno, which has only recently been staffed—but with only one-half of the staff required to effectively operate the unit. Similar situations exist in the VA hospitals in San Francisco and Palo Alto."

Nationally, facilities costing $20 million are lying idle "because of the lack of personnel," charged Francis W. Stover of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Peter L. Lassen, spokesman for the Paralyzed Veterans of America, charged VA with "letting down—or giving up—on those very seriously disabled who need so much help in all phases of their recovery and rehabilitation."

The Blinded Veterans Association called for expansion of VA facilities "on a crash priority basis."

Government figures showing VA hospitals were operating with "the lowest personnel-patient ratio in the nation" were cited by the American Legion's national rehabilitation commission.

A Stanford doctor called the X-ray facilities at the VA hospital in Menlo Park "obsolete, in the worst sense of the word. Broken down in a very true sense."

And Dr. Stewart Wolf, head of neurosciences of the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation, warned of "a real danger that the administration and the Congress are about to see veterans hospitals revert to the mediocre status of the 20's and 30's, where tired physicians and political job holders provided the care for the defenders of our country."

The problem is expected to get worse before it gets better.

Though the Senate restored about half of the $70 million cut made by President Nixon, there is no assurance he will spend it or additional funds Cranston's subcommittee is expected to recommend when a supplementary appropriation bill comes up later tihs spring.

In the meantime, modern evacuation techniques and miracle drugs continue to save the lives of countless servicemen who would have died in earlier wars.

But, at the same time, those who do survive are more likely to be maimed or crippled for life and to require the best in rehabilitative care.

As Capt. Cleland, the triple amputee, put it in his testimony before the subcommittee:

"The new techniques for saving lives will not go away; they will improve."

YOU GET WHAT YOU PAY FOR

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Polish American, Chicago, serving as it does the Polish-American community of the metropolitan area, maintains a very keen interest in foreign affairs.

A very commonsense editorial was carried in its Saturday, February 7, edition which merits review:

YOU GET WHAT YOU PAY FOR

Before buying a new product, the wise shopper checks both quality and price. Sometimes the higher priced item is the better bargain. There is a simile in this as applied to present-day medical systems that have developed in different countries—namely under capitalism, socialism and communism. Each can be measured by standards of quality and price. Before we trade in the American medical system as we have known it for an imported foreign product we should at least exercise the ordinary instincts of the prudent buyer.

From Moscow, Mr. Michael Johnson, Associated Press correspondent, reports on communist medicine. The best thing about the Russian system, he says, is ". . . that it's basically free." Russians get more free medical services than citizens of socialist Sweden. There are 37,000 neighborhood medical centers in Russia—called polyclinics. There are a few private doctors, described as ". . . fine, highly qualified specialists," for those who can afford them. The public system provides "adequate" but low-quality treatment.

Other points about the Russian medical system, touched upon by Mr. Johnson, are drab hospitals and poor equipment. He also mentions that, "The bureaucrat-ridden drug industry develops new drugs at a snail's pace." The typical Soviet doctor is permitted to earn only $1,400 per year—less than the average Russian factory worker. A British visitor, looking at the Soviet system, commented: "You get what you pay for."

There is no such thing as "free" medical care anymore than a free suit of clothes or a free pair of shoes. The goal of U.S. medicine is broadly based, high-quality medical care at a price fair to both doctor and patient. Anything less is a shoddy bargain.

AN AMENDMENT GUARANTEEING FREEDOM OF CHOICE WITHIN LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I introduced a constitutional amendment aimed at guaranteeing freedom of choice within local school districts. I ask this House for early action on that amendment or similar legislation. I know the amendment process to our Constitution is a long and difficult one. But, this matter deserves our immediate attention.

I am introducing today a resolution which, if passed, would express the sense of the Congress against the arbitrary busing of students.

I feel this resolution to be important for two reasons. First, it provides a vehicle for Congress to conduct hearings and thoroughly discuss this important problem. Nothing has been accomplished in either the Senate or House with the amendments and motions which have been introduced. Second, it will put the House of Representatives on record either for or against forced busing.

In one county alone, the cost estimates for forced busing have reached $40 million. In counties in Tennessee millions of local tax dollars will be spent on busing rather than education, if we continue with current plans. This problem, if not solved, will not only cost local governments millions of dollars, but will destroy quality public education and disrupt our local communities.

Mr. Speaker, this school term is almost over. In some cases as few as 10 weeks remain before classes adjourn. Yet, in Tennessee, students are being forced to change schools now. They are being disrupted, transferred from one school to another, and probably will learn little during the last few months of this year.

The educational opportunities the courts are denying our schoolchildren while they worry about numbers rather than education is not worth it. The disruption our local communities are undergoing is not worth it. Black as well as white citizens are opposed to forced busing. We must take action now.

If we do not do something immediately to stop it, I am afraid we face some very serious problems in the days and weeks ahead. We have reached a stage where it is ridiculous to continue along our present course. It is time to correct that course.

Mr. Speaker, this matter demands our immediate attention. I ask my colleagues for favorable consideration of both my constitutional amendment and this resolution.

LAOS

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, as we meet here daily our thoughts are often focused on the attempts the United States is making to bring a just and lasting peace to Vietnam. Now that we are making progress toward this end, we have been confronted with the grim news of strife in still another country. I am referring to recent activities in Laos.

Now the papers are full of statements by legislators and leaders as to what, if any, should be our involvement in this most recent struggle. The effects of the war in Vietnam on our pressing domestic needs will surely have a bearing on our commitments to Laos. Yet can we in all conscience abandon these gentle people?

Mr. Speaker, Msgr. Edward W. O'Rourke has just returned from a visit to Laos where he met with young people who are working with the Lao under the auspices of the International Voluntary Services. In the January issue of Catholic Rural Life he expressed his thoughts about what is now happening in this tiny country and offered a course of action. I feel that Monsignor O'Rourke has outlined very adequately the problems we face in Laos. His suggestion of U.N. involvement which would help prevent unilateral U.S. action is a plan which deserves our utmost deliberation. I would like to take this opportunity to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial by Monsignor O'Rourke so that my colleagues might have the occasion to review his remarks.

The editorial is as follows:

LAOS—SLAUGHTER OF THE INNOCENTS

(By Msgr. Edward W. O'Rourke)

Seldom has a people so innocent as the Lao been made the victims of war. The people of Laos are almost entirely agricultural. They grow rice and a few vegetables and live in small villages. They are carefree and make few demands on anyone. They have no taste for war.

Yet, they have the great misfortune of being located between warring groups—the North Vietnamese and Chinese on the north and the South Vietnamese, Thai and Americans on the south. They are being crushed between these forces.

I have just returned from visiting the young men and women who do agricultural and educational work in Laos under the auspices of the International Voluntary Services. Our volunteers share in the dangers and tragedy of their beleaguered hosts, having sustained six deaths during the past three years—three of them during the past six months. Our volunteers must now confine their activities in or near the cities of Laos. No foreigner is safe outside the cities.

The Catholic priests of Laos have likewise paid a high price for their zeal. Since 1969, 15 of the 100 priests serving there have been killed. The remaining priests continue to preach and pray among these people whom they love.

There is a small band of opportunists among the Lao people who have become Communists. They are called the Pathet Lao. They are not very effective revolutionaries and are not thoroughly convinced Communists. They are merely betting on the

ultimate victory of Communism in Southeast Asia and joining the side they feel will offer them the greatest advantages.

The real agents of death and insurrection in Laos are the North Vietnamese. They have taken charge of the Pathet Lao and have murdered many people of many nationalities. This, then, is not really a civil war. It is an invasion of a weak country by a despised and cruel foreign power.

Almost everyone to whom I spoke in Laos are convinced that the North Vietnamese Communists will have their way there. No one believes that the United States will "get involved in another Vietnam." Thus, the slaughter of the innocents goes on with little resistance.

The Lao are simple, lovable, agrarian people. The world—at least the part in which they live—is not safe for such a people.

Those who are determined that we shall never become involved in another Vietnam might ponder the fate of Laos and the many other small, relatively helpless countries of the world. Are they all to suffer the same fate?

There is an answer. The United Nations must exercise a peacekeeping role in cases such as these. It is not appropriate for one nation such as the United States to attempt to keep the peace unilaterally. Such efforts—as we see in Vietnam—are ineffective, costly in lives and money, and bring much hatred and reviling upon the United States at home and abroad.

Admittedly, peacekeeping by the UN will be difficult to accomplish. It may be necessary to modify the UN charter to make this objective feasible. However, there is reason to believe that both the United States and Russia are leaning in the direction of UN peacekeeping operations. Therefore, this urgently needed function of the UN may be developed in the near future.

You will be hearing more about the "slaughter of the innocents" in Laos. I hope your reaction will be to join those who vigorously campaign for an effective peace keeping force in the UN to protect such small, innocent nations from their aggressive neighbors.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the President's endorsement of the right to read as a national goal for the 1970's, and his commitment of $200 million in Federal resources toward the attainment of that goal, can have a significant impact on the educational future of the Nation's children. By mounting a two-pronged attack—research in areas of teaching reading that we know little or nothing about, coupled with stress on implementation of the things we do know—the President has taken the first steps toward his announced goal of equal educational opportunity for all children.

Only 19 percent of the disadvantaged children in special reading program under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have shown significant progress. Obviously, a great deal more needs to be done in the field of teaching of reading.

The National Institute of Education, proposed in the President's message on educational reform, can conduct valuable research concerning how children learn to read. It can also disseminate to local school districts the knowledge that is already available, in forms that teachers can immediately put to use.

The President has stated that the right to read should be of the very highest priority for our schools. Working together at all levels of government, we can assure that in the decade ahead no student leaves school unable to read at a level which will allow him to succeed in our highly technical society.

THE NATION RESPONDS TO "THE ADVOCATES" ON MASS TRANSIT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the real potential of public educational television can be seen in a new and valuable television series carried Sunday evenings called "The Advocates." Each week, both sides of an important issue are aired and the viewers are encouraged to send in their opinions to be tabulated by "The Advocates." I was the guest on this show to whom the arguments are addressed during the first east coast broadcast last fall.

On January 11, "The Advocates" discussed the question of whether or not one-half of the Federal highway trust fund should be used for mass transit. The tabulated results showed that an overwhelming 92.7 percent of those who wrote in favored this idea.

Since I have long been an advocate myself of an integrated transportation trust fund, I was particularly interested in this response. While this was not a scientific poll, the extremely favorable response is nevertheless noteworthy.

The tabulated results of "The Advocates" survey follow:

THE NATION RESPONDS TO "THE ADVOCATES" ON MASS TRANSIT, FEBRUARY 3, 1970

In response to the nationwide public television broadcast debating the question, "Should one-half of the Federal Highway Trust Fund be used for mass transit?" The Advocates received 1,509 signatures from 45 states and Washington, D.C. Of the people writing in, 92.7 percent favored the proposal, 5.0 percent were opposed, 2.3 percent expressed other views*

During the January 11 broadcast, Mayor Joseph Alioto of San Francisco appeared as a witness in favor of the proposal, Dr. Richard Michaels, director of research at the Northwestern University Transportation Institute, and Richard Bartlett, Pennsylvania secretary of highways, spoke for the opposition. Senator Jennings Randolph of West Virginia was the principal guest to whom the arguments were addressed.

The Advocates, a new live, Sunday evening public affairs television series (10:00 p.m. EST), seeks to bring people into politics. Each week arguments are heard on both sides of an important "decidable question". At the end of each broadcast, viewers are encouraged to act on the question. The Advocates' staff has undertaken to tabulate views received and pass them on to the respondents' elected officials. The Advocates, as a program, takes no position on any issue debated.

The following is a detailed breakdown of the mail response to our mass transit broadcast:

State	Pro	Con	Other	Total
Alabama	5	2	0	7
Arizona	24	1	2	27
Arkansas	3	0	0	3
California	441	16	9	466
Colorado	20	1	1	22
Connecticut	8	0	0	8
Delaware	3	0	0	3
District of Columbia	11	0	0	11
Florida	25	5	0	30
Georgia	9	0	0	9
Hawaii	9	0	0	9
Illinois	86	3	4	93
Indiana	10	4	0	14
Iowa	9	1	0	10
Kansas	6	1	0	7
Kentucky	8	1	1	10
Louisiana	1	2	0	3
Maine	7	0	0	7
Maryland	22	0	0	22
Massachusetts	66	3	1	70
Michigan	25	2	2	29
Minnesota	35	1	0	36
Mississippi	2	0	0	2
Missouri	5	0	0	5
Nebraska	5	1	0	6
Nevada	3	1	0	4
New Hampshire	3	0	0	3
New Jersey	27	3	1	31
New Mexico	10	0	0	10
New York	120	0	1	121
North Carolina	9	1	0	10
North Dakota	3	0	0	3
Ohio	31	0	0	31
Oklahoma	18	0	0	18
Oregon	44	1	1	46
Pennsylvania	71	11	3	85
Rhode Island	7	1	1	9
South Carolina	5	0	0	5
South Dakota	2	0	0	2
Tennessee	7	2	3	12
Texas	33	2	3	38
Utah	3	1	0	4
Vermont	2	0	0	2
Virginia	8	2	0	10
Washington	89	4	1	94
Wisconsin	42	3	0	45
Other	17	0	0	17

*This category includes those letters which expressed an interest in Mass Transit or in a particular witness or advocate, but which did not express an opinion on the topic.

THE COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleagues in the Senate and in the House for agreeing to the establishment of a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. As our calendar shows, there are many pressing matters that we must act on, but I think to begin our study of the population problem is one of the most urgent. The hearings before our Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization and the debate held on this floor demonstrated dramatically that our numbers are increasing like an onrushing tide and that our Nation and, in fact, the world are ill prepared for the deluge.

I particularly want to commend the Senator from Arkansas, who handled the bill so ably in the other body, for the well-considered and thoughtfully prepared analysis of the implications of the problem that he delivered on the floor of the Senate.

For the record there is one point that I would like to mention which may not have received the emphasis that it deserved. It involves the duty of the Commission to inquire into the various means appropriate to the ethical values and principles of this society by which our Nation can achieve a population level properly suited for its environmental, national resources, and other needs. Surely, this is something on which we should have the best information that can be made available for purposes of future planning and action.

Now, we look at "ethical values" in their broadest sense as including our moral principles refined and transmitted to us down through the generations by our Judeo-Christian religious heritage. With this in mind, I am certain this Commission, which will have a wide representation among its members, will properly mesh these all-important ethical and moral values with the scientific and statistical facts it will have before it, as we intended they should do.

FAMILY PRACTICE MEDICINE

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware of a crisis in health care services in the United States. This awareness is reinforced each time we need medical help. Many of us have difficulties locating a doctor. Once we do we often must wait long hours in crowded waiting rooms.

This unpleasant situation exists, in part, because of a shortage of family physicians. The general practitioner we once knew is vanishing. In 1931, 84 percent of all those physicians in private practice were general practitioners. In 1960, 45 percent of all those physicians were general practitioners. In 1965, 37 percent were general practitioners, and in 1967 only 20 percent were.

The trend toward specialization accounts for these decreases. Only 2 percent of the medical graduates in 1967 became general practitioners. Between 1963 and 1967 the number of general practitioners declined by 6.2 percent.

As the family physician disappears so does the service he provided. He treated a great variety of ailments, he gave support during emergencies, and, most important of all, he had a thorough and intimate knowledge of his patients.

Increasingly, his role is being filled by the pediatrician and the internist. However, his role is not being filled at all in rural and poverty areas. In New York City there are over 200 doctors for every 100,000 residents. In Mississippi there are 69 physicians for every 100,000 residents. The contrast is even more startling in the ghettoes and poverty areas of New York City, where there are only 10 physicians for every 100,000 residents.

In the past few years a new field—family practice—has emerged. A few American medical schools are beginning to offer courses in this area. However, much needs to be done. Such courses must be developed into a curriculum which becomes an integral part of the medical school. Medical schools and teaching hospitals must, furthermore, provide good models of comprehensive health care for their students.

As the Ad Hoc Committee on Education for Family Practice of the American Medical Association put it, the family physician "serves as the physician of first contact with the patient and provides a means of entry into the health care system. He evaluates the patient's total health needs, provides personal medical care in one or more fields of medicine, and refers the patient when indicated to approximate sources of care while preserving the continuity of his care. He assumes responsibility for the patient's comprehensive and continuous health care and acts as a leader or coordinator of the team that provides health services. He accepts responsibility for the patient's total health care within the context of his environment, including the community and the family or comparable social unit."

The family physician in this context would treat most of the patient's illnesses and would provide much needed preventive care.

Several recent developments in the field of family practice have contributed to its advancement. Late in 1968, the American Medical Association's House of Delegates drafted and approved the essentials for graduate training programs in family practice. In 1969, the American Board of Family Practice was officially approved. The board plans to offer the first examination for certification of practice to eligible candidates early in 1970. A new residency review program for family practice has been established. Twenty-two residency programs in family practice have been approved by this new program so far.

To support and encourage such developments in the field of family practice, I am cosponsoring legislation which would authorize appropriations of $50 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $75 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; and $100 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and the next 2 fiscal years thereafter for the purpose of making grants to qualified medical schools and hospitals to create departments of family practice, family practice curriculum, and to provide professional and technical training for medical and paramedical personnel in the field of family medicine.

A SALUTE TO THE PEANUT INDUSTRY

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today we salute the peanut industry, one of the Nation's greatest and certainly one of its most popular. What child has not tasted peanut butter in his school lunchroom, and what party would be complete without some tasty peanuts?

It is National Peanut Day on Capitol Hill, sponsored by the National Peanut Council, as part of National Peanut Week, now underway, March 4 through March 14.

The National Peanut Council is composed of growers, shellers, and manufacturers of peanut products—and that takes in a lot of good people, especially in my part of the country, and particularly in my district.

The peanut is more than just good eating to the citizens of my State. It is big business. The fourth leading peanut producer in the Nation, Alabama produced 285 million pounds of peanuts last year, yielding 1,540 pounds per acre.

Even though most of the planting is done in a relatively small area of the State, peanut production in Alabama last year brought $34.2 million, out of a total cash value for all crops of $200 million. This success is due in no small part to the hard work of the Alabama Peanut Producers Association.

The pride of Alabamians in their State's peanut production is no better demonstrated than in the great National Peanut Festival, held every year around harvest time in Dothan, Ala.

Only a few miles away, stands the famous Boll Weevil Monument in the heart of Enterprise, Ala. This monument honors that tiny pest that really started diversification in farming by destroying cotton crops that dominated agriculture in the State years ago.

It was at Tuskegee Institute in Macon County, Ala., that the great George Washington Carver took the little-known peanut and made it immensely popular and valuable by making more than 300 products from it.

I invite my colleagues to see why I so lavishly praise the peanut. Free peanut soup will be served today in the dining facilities of the Capitol, and bags of free peanuts will be available, compliments of the peanut industry in the six major peanut-producing States.

"DOLLARS" HE CHANGES NET BLIND MAN $1,254

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press dispatch of last Monday is such a delightful contrast to the daily diet of bad news that I want to share it with my colleagues.

The dispatch, which appeared in Tuesday's Chicago Tribune, follows:

"DOLLARS" HE CHANGES NET BLIND MAN $1,254

KALISPELL, MONT.—Wilbur Korb, the blind operator of a newspaper stand at the post-office, couldn't notice he was receiving some unusual "dollar bills" after he and his wife were involved in a collision. Mrs. Korb, also blind, required surgery. After Korb began to notice that many more people kept wanting change, his banker explained that many of the bills were $5, $10, and $20 denominations, giving Korb $1,254 to help with hospital bills.

OF PHARAOHS AND PLAGUES

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the TB epidemic is now considered over and the case closed. Six cases were discovered among the restaurant employees and with organization and dispatch of a well coordinated military engagement, all Members and employees were tested and cared for in a most exemplary manner. We forget however that these original cases did not germinate on the Hill. They originated in the "colony" which surrounds the massive Federal buildings, a colony which is lacking in the most basic forms of protection for its inhabitants.

Federal control of the District of Columba has been and is a national disgrace. This recent episode is but one more example.

I recommend the following commentary by Leo Rennert of the McClatchy newspaper chain to my fellow Members. I hope it will strike a responsive chord. It follows:

OF PHARAOHS AND PLAGUES

(By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—The most popular pastime on Capitol Hill during the last couple of weeks has been a rush by members of Congress and their staffs to makeshift clinics to find out if they have tuberculosis.

It has been an odd interruption in the usual pattern of congressional life.

For a few moments at least, the great and mighty of the land were forced to set aside legislative maneuvers and reelection strategy to await a verdit of far more intense personal interest.

Dutifully, they lined up to have their forearms punctured and their chests X rayed.

If their skins remained clear after 48 hours, they could breathe a sigh of relief. If there was some swelling, they knew TB in some form had crept into their system. The lucky ones—those with clear X rays—were told a positive reaction was no major cause for concern. Their TB was inert and probably would remain so—with proper vigilance and medication for a year. Another X ray was recommended in about three or four months time.

Similar precautions were taken at the White House.

ACTIVITY

All this activity, of course, followed disclosure that half a dozen active TB cases—including two fatal ones—had been discovered on Capitol Hill.

To the country at large, the news may have come as somewhat of a surprise. Perhaps even shock. To think that in this day and age TB, for which there are such effective controls, should infiltrate the very seat of power of the mightiest nation on earth!

To Washington residents, however, the episode had a distinct ho-hum, so-what-else-is-new aspect. From long and bitter experience, they know how this city has been cheated of basic public services—whether in health, law enforcement, education or almost any other field of municipal responsibility.

Washingtonians have no self government. Their interests are cared for by presidents and remote politicians who head the House and Senate District of Columbia Committees and the respective DC appropriations subcommittees.

It is the only colonial form of government within the territorial confines of the United States.

MODEL CITY

Every modern president has talked of turning Washington into a "model" city—a shining example to the rest of the world. Well-meaning colonial governors also had such intentions about their domains—with equally impressive results.

Congress at least never pretended that DC was anything more than a collection of government buildings and fashionable residential enclaves for the rich and the powerful. If the rest of the city—75 per cent of it—was a festering slum, overrun by rats and incubating social dynamite, so what. Let them subsist on law and order.

Lock the doors, arm the police, buy more watchdogs and throw a wall around those sickly looking people. Block them off with a cordon sanitaire—a barricade behind which the well-to-do can feel safe.

It did not work.

The outsiders governing this city, it turns out, permitted restaurant employes to serve them all along without first getting a TB check. This type of public health safeguard long has been in effect in most cities. But Washington naturally is a special case. The only Safeguard which holds its interest is protection against Communist missiles.

REMINDER

So the TB spread on Capitol Hill might be considered poetic justice—a reminder that no man, not even a congressman, is an island. A containment policy against ghettos and slums will not work.

Unfortunately, this is not exactly the lesson Congress has drawn from the TB scare. Rather than tear down walls and make all of Washington a fit place in which to live, the barriers simply will be reinforced. Food handlers will be screened more carefully, while TB remains unchecked a dozen blocks from the Capitol.

While doctors and nurses labored to cleanse Congress of this infection, the Senate was debating the question of school segregation and agreeing with Sen. John Stennis, D-Miss., that integration ought to proceed at the same pace in the South as in the North. Translation: Forget about integration. Otherwise, said Sen. Abraham Ribicoff, D-Conn., the country would be guilty of "monumental hypocrisy."

Yet strangely, no senator rose to demand similarly uniform standards in TB prevention for all persons in the nation's capital—its residents as well as it rulers. There was no suggestion that rushing the finest medical care to Capitol Hill, while the rest of the city continues to be victimized by the disease, is the kind of double standard which is bound to brew more trouble.

When Martin Luther King Jr. was alive, his followers pictured him as a modern Moses leading his people out of slavery. But King is dead and the pharaohs on Capitol Hill do not even realize they have been struck by a fateful plague.

THE NATION'S ECONOMY IS IN SERIOUS TROUBLE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the economy of our Nation is in serious trouble. Interest rates have risen to a record high. Money is scarce. Credit is difficult to obtain. Business throughout our country is slowing. Unemployment is increasing, our country is faced by a depression.

The basis of business transactions is credit. Practically all individuals involved in transactions of any sort require credit. Manufacturers, merchants, builders, farmers, homebuyers, automobile purchasers must have credit.

The high Federal Reserve exchange interest rates is reflected in such high rates to borrowers that most businesses have slowed, and many may go under.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that our Federal Reserve Board lower its exchange rate. Further, I submit it is urgent that those in authority use their powers of persuasion on our great banking institutions to lower prime interest rates.

A recession is now in progress; by immediate action in lowering interest rates, a depression may be averted.

WHO'S FAITHFUL, LOYAL?—A SOUL-SEARCHING STORY

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring a couple of important articles by Joe Young which appeared in the Washington Star on February 4 and 8 to the attention of my colleagues. These articles relate to the pay matter and I highly recommend that all my colleagues read them:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 4, 1970]

WHO'S FAITHFUL, LOYAL? A SOUL-SEARCHING STORY

(By Joseph Young)

An authoritative source—well, actually, he's not too reliable—gave us this inside account of the soul-searching that President Nixon and his top advisers went through before deciding to ask for a six-month delay in raising government and military pay.

The scene goes something like this:

The President: The budget has got to show a surplus, or else the Democrats will play (gasp) politics with the budget. We've got to cut the budget. We've got to cut the budget estimates somewhere. What do you suggest?

First Top Adviser: Well, sir, you could give back the $100,000-a-year pay raise you got last year.

The President: Are you crazy? With the big mortgages I'm saddled with on the three houses I bought in Florida and California last year, I need every cent of that $100,000.

Second Top Adviser: Well, how about eliminating the $12,500-a-year pay raise Congress got last year?

The President (grimly): There is nothing better I would like to do to those Democrats, but you know how money-hungry and selfish they are:

Third Top Adviser: How about eliminating the new helicopter landing pad we're building next to your house in Key Biscayne.

The President: How would you like to be transferred to the Tariff Commission?

Fourth Top Adviser: I've got it! After all, who is it that we're always saying is faithful, loyal, dedicated and true?

The President: The government employe!

Fourth Top Adviser: Exactly. So who will be reasonable, patient, gentle and understanding about a six-month delay in a pay raise? The government employe, of course.

The President: You are absolutely right.

(He suddenly frowns). But what about military personnel? How will they take it? After all, some of them are getting shot at out there, you know.

Fourth Top Adviser: They are patriots and patriots are never concerned about such grubby things as money.

The President: You're so right. Now, how much will we save by delaying the pay raises six months?

Fourth Top Adviser: A grand total of $1.4 billion.

Nixon: Splendid. But I want to make one thing perfectly clear—I'm not going to play politics and claim a $1.4 billion surplus. No, sir, I'll only claim a $1.3 billion surplus. (Chuckles.) It will drive the Democrats crazy trying to figure out what we did with the other $100 million.

Third Top Adviser: But, sir, the postal and federal employe unions are awfully strong and they're not going to like it one bit and they have a lot of powerful friends in Congress. And the military has Mendel Rivers on its side.

The President: And the Tariff Commission has got you on its side—as of now.

The President sighs as his staff troops out of his office. Sitting alone, the President muses? Why all this fuss over a six-month delay—after all, I promised government employes and the military during my election campaign that I would change the federal pay comparability lag with industry. True, I am changing it the other way—making it 18 months behind industry instead of 12. But, at least it shows that I haven't forgotten about comparability. No, sir, there never was a president who devoted more thoughts to government workers than I have.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 8, 1970]

COMPARABILITY DELAY PLAN RECALLS 1968 NIXON STAND

(By Joseph Young)

How about playing a little guessing game this morning?

Who was it who said on Sept. 24, 1968:

"Federal employes in my administration are not going to be treated as numbers in a machine or as 'second-class' citizens."

And who said on the same date:

"The Republican platform provides for insuring comparability of federal salaries with private enterprise pay."

And who also said on that date:

"Finally, I intend to direct the appropriate officials of the administration to examine the comparability of all areas of fringe benefits, including federal employe retirement benefits, particularly with Social Security and railroad retirement programs."

Of course, you've guessed it. It was none other than Richard Milhous Nixon, the Republican candidate for President of the United States.

But, oh, how times have changed.

Last week President Nixon asked Congress to delay federal and postal and military pay raises until next January, thereby increasing the government's pay comparability gap with industry from 12 to 18 months.

And as for improving employe fringe benefits, as promised in the Sept. 24, 1968 statement, the Nixon administration is opposed to any liberalization, whether it be health insurance, retirement or any other kind of benefits.

It may be a bit naive to take campaign oratory very seriously. But on the matter of securing federal pay comparability with industry, candidate Nixon went out of his way in letters to all the major postal and federal employe unions to stress that he would eliminate the gap. But now he wants to widen it.

As late as last June, Nixon administration officials testified before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and said the administration not only would support a pay government raise in July 1970, but also would support another one in January 1971 to narrow the comparability gap.

But that was eight months ago and the administration has changed its tune.

Federal and postal employe leaders say the request for the delay wouldn't be so hard to take if similar wage restraints were placed or even advocated for the private sector.

But when they see large pay raise settlements being negotiated nearly every day in the private sector, they wonder just how noble and self-sacrificing government workers and military personnel are supposed to be.

AGNEW GOES TO THE PEOPLE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision to move some office space used by Vice President AGNEW from the White House next door to the Executive Office Building was interpreted in some quarters as a "downgrading" of the Vice President's influence; however, I feel that a more accurate analysis of the move is outlined in an editorial appearing in the February 28, 1970, edition of the Peoria Journal Star and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Feb. 28, 1970]

AGNEW GOES TO THE PEOPLE

(By C. L. Dancey)

Nobody ever really knows what the role of a vice president is going to be—and you can't "plan" it, altogether, either.

It depends on the president and his daily reactions as much as any formal arrangement. And it depends a great deal on the vice president, himself.

Above all, it depends on the "image" and the role that the public chooses for him.

In the case of Spiro Agnew, strange and funny things have happened in comparison with the past.

The vice president has become the down-to-earth link for many Americans with the White House. Nixon is president in an age of unparalleled security restrictions, with a calculated "style" of presenting a workmanlike, dignified, but "low profile" appearance.

The vice president, however, has become one of the busiest speakers in history. He is making speeches and major local news weekly.

He is a full time campaigner, an emissary to the great mass of "middle America" (or whatever it is), a link who comes out and speaks the language of the average guy—only better—in his own rare way.

It is increasingly clear that there is more to Agnew than his early appearance, the fragment-quotes of early news reports, and the original "image."

There have been celebrities, some of them political, who have brought out already hysterical crowds . . . who appealed to people given to extravagant demonstrations.

But it is many a year since we have seen a political speaker with the amazing talent for speaking to a sober and sedate crowd, beginning in a somewhat pedestrian manner, who suddenly with a particularly apt and earthy expression shocks that audience into a genuinely spontaneous outburst of near pandemonium.

He obviously doesn't need a rigged claque or a built-in cheer leader. He evokes sudden, spontaneous and exaggerated reactions by his own speaking technique, and while something close to this has often been "framed" (as in the conventions themselves) the real thing has become a very rare article.

A vice president with this kind of rapport with that broad area of American life that has been most difficult to reach by politicians doesn't belong behind the iron fences and strict controls on the White House grounds.

Agnew has to be more accessible.

Indeed, the Executive Office Building isn't good enough, but may be a necessary compromise.

The truth is that functionally the building where he has moved is part of the White House, still. It is next door, and while on the surface the White House retains its isolated and somewhat residential appearance for tradition's sake, the two are, in fact, linked directly and largely interchangeable.

So, the vice presidential move "from the White House" isn't really such a big deal.

In truth, it just puts the vice presidency closer to the people.

TELLING IT LIKE IT IS—OUR GI'S VERSUS THE CAB

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, for years air transportation to and from overseas points at less than prevailing commercial rates has been available for active duty and retired military personnel and Department of Defense civilians and the dependents of all three groups.

Last year these fares were further reduced making it possible for thousands of service personnel, their dependents, and Department of Defense employees to travel to and from Europe on charter flights.

As a result, the Civil Aeronautics Board, in the guise of "helping the GI's," has proposed a change in the regulations for these charter flights which would drastically reduce the number of persons eligible to participate. The Department of Defense is very much opposed to this proposed change.

It would be a great disservice to the military and Department of Defense employees for the proposed change to be put into effect and I have asked the CAB to reconsider their proposal.

It is difficult to comprehend how two Government agencies can go off in such divergent directions. The Department of Defense is very much concerned about morale, reenlistment rates, officer and noncommissioned officer retention, and service benefits. They are rightfully concerned. Now, the CAB—with one fell swoop—proposes action that could well be the straw that breaks the camel's back so far as morale is concerned.

An editorial appearing in the Armed Forces Journal of February 28, 1970, is very accurate in its summation of the problem and I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

LARGE LETTERS AND LONG WORDS

(By James D. Hessman)

Until now, we had always thought that rules should be made to serve the needs of the people.

But the Civil Aeronautics Board tells us it's really the other way around. People must

serve the needs of the rules, especially our rules, says the CAB.

In case you hadn't heard, the Board is tinkering with the rules on military charter flights to and from overseas, and the results are similar to what would happen if you used a jack-hammer to do a little fine-tuning on your TV set.

The military charter flights, which most knowledgeable observers say would be cut drastically—if not eliminated entirely—under the proposed ruling, serve primarily to provide low cost transportation to and from overseas points for active duty and retired military personnel and DoD civilians, and the dependents of all three groups. The flights have been running on and off since the end of WWII, but have really taken off since the mid-60's.

Everybody is happy with the program. DoD likes it, the airlines and travel agents like it, Congress likes it, and most of all the three broad categories of military people eligible for the program like it. Only the Civil Aeronautics Board doesn't like it, it seems.

So the CAB has decided to change the rules. From now on, says the Board in a proposed ruling with a 7 March "comments" deadline, military retirees and DoD civilians, and the dependents of both groups, will no longer be eligible for the flights. Charter service for active duty personnel and their dependents, moreover, would be limited to flights from overseas only—and then only if DoD—not the travel agents who built up the business—sponsors and administers the flights, says the CAB. So much for free enterprise.

And so much for the balance of payments, which will suffer to the tune of an estimated $5.8-million this year—more in the future—if the CAB has its way.

And so much for the courts of the land, which have often held that military retirees—who really are "retainees" and may be recalled to active duty if the government so decides—have a legal status different from retirees in other professions. Now the CAB has ruled they are retirees, nothing more, and not entitled to active duty fringe benefits such as the charter flights.

And so much for the CAB's own rules of "affinity," under which the Board permits employees of a corporation to sign up for the same type of flights for which DoD civilians—employees of a very large "corporation" themselves, it seems to us—would no longer be eligible under the CAB ruling.

Retirees and DoD civilians are screaming. So are the travel agents, so are the airlines, so are the House and Senate Armed Services Committees—which are worried about the impact on morale—and so is the Department of Defense, which is unhappy because its people are unhappy and which does not, in any event, want to assume the costs and headaches involved in running a charter service program of its own.

We would scream, too, but we're far too polite to do so and don't really like to get involved in matters of this sort, anyway.

We want to be fair about this. We would like to present both sides of the case, and we would if we could. But unfortunately the CAB did not hold a fact-finding investigation before issuing its proposed ruling. And it has as yet, so far as we can determine, been unable or unwilling to cite anyone who will benefit from the change. And the substance of its legal arguments—which we must regretfully omit due to lack of space—could be summed up, in our opinion, between here and the end of this editorial.

Provided you write in large letters and use nothing but long words.

NEWSMEN'S PRIVILEGE BILL

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have witnessed an unprecedented series of attempts to intimidate and cow the press of this Nation into an attitude of either silence or acquiescence with the policies of the administration. From a Vice President who launches a tirade of invective against the press for daring to criticize the President, to the FCC Chairman's demands for transcripts of specific broadcasts, to the Attorney General's attempts to make the media an arm of the law-enforcement apparatus, we are confronted with an orchestrated assault on the press that fits hand-in-glove with other administration efforts to silence all dissent.

Today, I am taking what will be just the first step in countering this threat to the Nation. I am introducing legislation to clearly establish the news media's freedom from Government intimidation and coercion. This measure—the Newsmen's Privilege Act—is a direct response to the Attorney General's recent attempts to subpena the notes, tape recordings, film clips, photographs, and other confidential materials from the working press. It is also a direct response to the Attorney General's attempts to achieve the same goals by pressure tactics such as telephone calls from the FBI.

The thrust of this bill is to protect newsmen, including freelance journalists and photographers, from forced disclosure before any Federal court, jury, agency, commission, or Congress itself, of confidential information received by them in their capacities as newsmen. It also protects them against disclosing the source of such information.

This legislation is not intended to place newsmen above the law. Rather it is designed to combat a policy of repression which threatens to make our news media a mere propaganda arm of the Government. What I am defending is the public's right to know, a basic right which undergirds our system of popular constitutional government, and which can only be effective with an assured free flow of information through our news media to the public.

The American Newspaper Guild has a canon requiring newsmen to "refuse to reveal confidences or disclose sources of confidential information in court or before other judicial or investigatory bodies." Such ethical rules, however, have not been given precedence over legal considerations by the courts. Two national campaigns have been mounted on behalf of legislation to establish a newsmen's privilege, and 15 States have enacted statutes to date: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. The State laws generally protect against forced disclosure of sources of confidential information only. Bills have been introduced at the Federal level starting with the 71st Congress through the 88th, with no success.

The basic argument for the newsmen's privilege rests on the public interest in maintaining a free flow of information to the media from all possible sources. What is involved is not a personal privilege of a reporter to remain silent under certain types of questioning, as in the fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination. What is at issue is a reporter's legal right to guarantee to his sources that their confidences will be held inviolate, based on the first amendment guarantees of a free press.

The newsman's practical right to maintain confidentiality, which he exercises every day, is as vital to his social function of discovering and disseminating news and information as is the right of a physician to respect the confidences of his patient. A psychiatrist could not continue in practice for a week if he could not guarantee to his patients that no power of law could ever wrest the patient's communications from him. In the interests of making it possible that the sick should be treated, the law recognizes the sanctity of such communications, extending the same privilege to accountants, attorneys, and priests.

The reporter's case, as has been said, is different. Yet it is true that he could not continue to function as anything more than a sounding-board for propaganda if he were unable to guarantee anonymity to his sources. In the interest of insuring a free flow of news and information to the public, the law should recognize the sanctity of this particular type of communication. The doctor's privilege is immediately in the interests of the patient, only secondarily of the public of which the patient is a part. The reporter's privilege is immediately in the interests of the public, not at all in the interests of the source who must remain anonymous, and what benefits the source may derive are purely incidental to the fact that only by allowing them can news and information be made to flow.

Anyone at all acquainted with the operations of newspapers and the mass media knows that the right to grant anonymity in return for information is the one most important and carefully preserved tool of reporting—of all really good reporting as well as of some bad or malicious reporting. It is not always realized that it is a no less important tool of the historian, the sociologist, the economist, the serious investigator of all kinds of human activity. To take a possibly extreme but far from unrepresentative example: What chance would Dr. Kinsey and his colleagues have had to compile their valuable material had there been general acceptance of the power of any court, grand jury, or congressional investigating committee to identify under penalty of contempt the individuals from whom the material was gathered? Few serious studies of recent history, involving individuals now alive or their immediate descendants, could be

written without use of sources available only on the historian's assurance that they would remain confidential.

The argument for the reporter's privilege—the reporter including writers of books or magazine articles and reporters for the electronic media—proceeds from these considerations. The freedom of the press, as guaranteed in the first amendment, implies the free flow of news and information; within the limitations of the laws of libel and obscenity—laws in no way weakened or diminished by the privilege here considered—it implies the free flow of information good, bad and indifferent; true, semitrue, or false; noble or malicious. A compulsion to reveal sources would, no doubt, restrain the publication of no small amount of malice, gossip, falsehood, and unwarranted inuendo which now sees the light of day. But the argument is not simply that it would also restrain the publication of a vast deal more that is true and useful; it would cut off acquisition of this information altogether; it would leave it not simply unpublished but unknown. It would impoverish the whole intellectual as well as informational climate of our times. It is for that reason that the privilege is in fact so generally respected in practice. A privilege so essential to the normal functioning of our society should also have standing in law.

Until the current furor sparked by the Attorney General, the most famous recent case involving this issue dealt with a suit by Judy Garland against Marie Torre in 1957–58 when Miss Torre was a columnist for the New York Herald Tribune. After Miss Torre quoted "anonymous network executives" concerning Miss Garland, the actress sued for damages and demanded that Miss Torre reveal the names of her informants. The columnist refused on first amendment grounds and the case was decided by Judge Potter Stewart, who was then on the court of appeals. He applied a test of first amendment rights that is favored by a majority of the current Supreme Court—a balancing of the need for the information with the deleterious effect on the newsmen's rights.

Late last month it was learned that the Justice Department had issued subpenas to newsmen demanding such raw data as reporter's notes, tape recordings, news film, and unedited files. The subpenas were issued by grand juries that were investigating the activities of the Weathermen faction of SDS and the Black Panther Party. The news was met with statements of criticism and concern by officials of the New York Times; CBS; Time, Inc.; and Newsweek. On February 4, the Justice Department disclosed that it would not insist on obtaining all of the material demanded and indicated it would negotiate for the information it sought rather than use the subpena power. The Justice Department particularly emphasized its willingness to negotiate to obtain material from Earl Caldwell, a black New York Times reporter in San Francisco, who had written articles about the Black Panthers.

On February 5, former Attorney General Ramsey Clark said the issuing of subpenas in these cases represented a sharp departure from previous Justice Department policy. He said there was a difference between calling a reporter to testify in a specific murder case and summoning one to disclose his files in a general "fishing expedition." At the same time, Norman C. Isaacs, president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors; Elie Abel, dean of Columbia School of Journalism; Newton N. Minow, former FCC Chairman; and H. Roger Tatarian, vice president and editor of UPI, urged newsmen to refuse to honor any such subpenas.

On February 8 it was learned that Attorney General Mitchell planned to meet with representatives of the news media in a personal effort to ease the bitterness these incidents had aroused. At the same time, the New York Reporters Association, the New York State Publishers Association, and the New York State Press Association announced their support of a bill introduced in the State legislature by Democratic Assemblyman Arthur D. Kremer to safeguard the right of newsmen to protect confidential sources.

On February 11, Time, Inc., protested the Government's commandeering of confidential information concerning a Fortune magazine interview with conglomerate tycoon, James L. Ling. The Government had issued a subpena last October 2, demanding the surrender of tape recordings, interview notes, and editorial drafts of Fortune editor John McDonald's interview with Ling, which was published by the magazine last summer.

On February 12, a group of 70 black journalists announced in New York that they would resist any attempt by the Government to force them to appear before any investigating or law-enforcement agency with unpublished or unbroadcast material they had gathered. The stand was inspired by the Earl Caldwell case.

They said:

> We are not the white world's spies in the black community. We are not undercover agents for local, state or federal law enforcement agencies. We are black journalists attempting to interpret, with as great an understanding and truth as possible, the nation's social revolutions.

The most recent development occurred Monday, February 23, when it was learned that correspondents Mike Wallace and Paul Loewenwater, of CBS news, may defy threatened Justice Department subpenas for testimony before a Federal grand jury inquiry into the Black Panthers. Both men got phone calls last week from the Justice Department seeking their testimony before the grand jury in New Haven. Wallace was the reporter and Loewenwater the producer last January 6 of a segment of the CBS–TV program "60 Minutes," which included a report on the Black Panthers and a filmed interview in Algeria with the fugitive Panther leader, Eldridge Cleaver.

The need for newsmen's privilege legislation has been made manifest, and I am pleased to see the gathering bipartisan support for this effort to maintain the independence of the press from governmental control. Identical legislation is being introduced by Senator THOMAS MCINTYRE, of New Hampshire, this week, and I am hopeful that widespread support will enable us to obtain hearings so as to focus national attention on the public interest in maintaining a free flow of confidential information to the media.

Members of the House joining me in sponsoring this bill today are Representatives SCHEUR, BIAGGI, FARBSTEIN, WOLFF, KOCH, LOWENSTEIN, and BUTTON, all of New York; Representative PEPPER, of Florida; Representative BRADEMAS, of Indiana; Representative CLAY, of Missouri; Representatives EILBERG and MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania; Representative HARRINGTON, of Massachusetts; Representative HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey; Representative MIKVA, of Illinois; Representatives WHALEN and STOKES, of Ohio; Representative CONYERS, of Michigan; and Representatives VAN DEERLIN, ROYBAL, and GEORGE BROWN, of California.

The text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis follows:

H.R. 16328

A bill to provide certain privileges against disclosure of confidential information and the sources of information obtained by newsmen

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Newsmens Privilege Act".

NONDISCLOSURE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 4, no person shall be required by any court, grand jury, agency, department, or commission of the United States or by either House of or any committee of Congress to disclose any confidential information received or obtained by him in his capacity as a reporter, editor, commentator, journalist, writer, correspondent, announcer, or other person directly engaged in the gathering or presentation of news for any newspaper, periodical, press association, newspaper syndicate, wire service, or radio or television station.

NONDISCLOSURE OF SOURCE

SEC. 3. Except as provided in section 4, no person shall be required by any court, grand jury, agency, department, or commission of the United States or by either House of or any committee of Congress to disclose the source of any information received or obtained by him in his capacity as a reporter, editor, commentator, journalist, writer, correspondent, announcer, or other person directly engaged in the gathering or presentation of news for any newspaper, periodical, press association, newspaper syndicate, wire service, or radio or television station.

QUALIFICATIONS

SEC. 4. (a) The privilege conferred by section 2 shall not apply to any information which has at any time been published, broadcast, or otherwise made public by the person claiming the privilege.

(b) the privilege conferred by section 3 shall not apply—

(1) to the source of any allegedly defamatory information in any case where the defendant, in a civil action for defamation, asserts a defense based on the source of such information; or

(2) to the source of any information concerning the details of any grand jury or other

proceeding which was required to be secret under the laws of the United States.

(c) In any case where a person claims a privilege conferred by section 2 or 3, the person seeking the information may apply to the United States district court for an order divesting the privilege. Such application shall be made to the district court in the district wherein the hearing, action, or other proceeding in which the information is sought is pending. The order shall be granted if the court, after hearing the parties, determines that there is substantial evidence that disclosure of the information is required to prevent a threat to human life, of espionage, or of foreign aggression.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF CONGRESSMAN RICHARD L. OTTINGER'S NEWSMEN'S PRIVILEGE ACT OF 1970

SEC. 2 NONDISCLOSURE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

No newsman shall be required to disclose confidential information before any branch of the Federal government (courts, grand juries, departments, commissions, Congress). Newsmen shall include all individuals engaged in the gathering and presentation of news for newspapers, periodicals, press associations, newspaper syndicates, wire services, radio, or television. The difference between this bill and statutes in force in 15 states is that State laws protect only the source of information and not the information itself. The Act is drafted to include freelance journalists as well as those regularly employed. Exceptions set forth in Section 4.

SEC. 3 NONDISCLOSURE OF SOURCE

The same privilege against required disclosure of the source of a newsman's information before any Federal authority. Exceptions set forth in Section 4.

SEC. 4 QUALIFICATIONS

Since the courts have consistently held that First Amendment rights are not absolute, and since legal groups studying this question have recommended qualifications on the privilege to safeguard the public interest, the following are generally recommended exceptions where the privilege may be denied.

Subsection 4(a) removes the privilege with regard to confidential information which has already been made public by the person claiming the privilege. In such cases, the newsman shall be deemed to have waived the privilege once the information is in the public domain.

Subsection 4(b)(1) The privilege shall not protect against disclosure of the source of allegedly defamatory information in any case where the defendant in a civil action for defamation asserts a defense based on the source of such information. The right of any person to claim personal damages through the courts is established in American jurisprudence, and there is no justification for removing responsibility for publishing libelous charges. The right of an individual not to be libeled overrides the benefit to the public of assertion of the privilege.

Subsection 4(b)(2) The privilege against disclosing the source of information is removed when details of a proceeding required by law to be kept secret are published, e.g., Federal grand juries and treaty hearings. The granting of a newsman's privilege is based on the public interest in maintaining a free flow of information to the press. However, the public interest in favor of disclosure overrides the privilege when publication of information clearly violates public policy codified in law.

Subsection 4(c) This section provides that a district court may, upon application, divest the privilege conferred in either Section 2 or 3 where the information in question has a direct bearing on a threat of foreign aggression, espionage, or to human life. This interposition of a court between prosecutor and newsman provides a buffer against "fishing expeditions" by requiring the person seeking information to prove the existence of a legitimate and specific threat to human life or an overt threat of a takeover of the machinery of government. In the event of such threats, obviously the public interest is not served by protecting a newsman's right to remain silent.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the annual Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary. The contest theme this year was "Freedom's Challenge," and over 400,000 school students participated in the contest competing for five scholarships which will be awarded.

I am very happy to announce that the winning speech from Missouri was submitted by Mr. Jim Coffin, 18, of Centralia, Mo., which is in my congressional district.

Each State winner will be brought to Washington for the final judging as guests of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and we will all have the pleasure of meeting these fine young people at the VFW annual congressional dinner March 10.

I would like to share with you Jim Coffin's winning speech:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

SOMEWHERE IN VIETNAM,
Thanksgiving Day, 1969.

DEAR MOM AND DAD: It seems a little strange to be so far from home on Thanksgiving Day. Today didn't really seem like a time for giving thanks. We were under heavy fire all day and witnessed a terrible battle. Now we are having a lull so I will write and wish you a very happy holiday.

You know, Mom and Dad, I have been doing some serious thinking since I came here to Viet Nam. I am not sure whether or not we should be over here fighting this war, but when I see how the very few freedoms these poor people have are threatened, I begin to realize what a challenge it is to us as Americans to maintain our freedom. The longer I am here the more I see how easily freedom is lost. Freedom is earned, not merely handed out! We must constantly work to attain freedom and when we attain it, we must continue working to maintain it.

I don't like war. I am afraid of it, but can we compare our draft card burners to Patrick Henry who said, "Give me liberty or give me death." Do we regret that we have but one life to give for our country, or do we regret that we even have one life to give for our country? Was Patrick Henry fighting for the same things that we are? The challenge of freedom is one that we must be willing to face even to death.

Today being Thanksgiving, I can't help but think of the origin of this great holiday. It began as a day of giving thanks for liberty. Do we still connect it with the privilege of freedom? We must, for freedom is lost as easily as it is gained.

The great symbol of our freedom is our flag. After being here on this foreign soil fighting, the flag has taken on somewhat of a new meaning to me. Dad, you once told me of when you were released from prison camp by the Japanese at the close of World War II. You mentioned the lump that came to your throat and the tears in your eyes as you once again saw Old Glory swelling in the breeze. I think I can now understand how you felt, Dad. Truly, the flag is a very worthy symbol of our liberty. I wish I could be at home right now so I could talk to young and old, as well, and explain to them just what our freedom really is and the challenge we must face, if we are to retain this liberty we love so dearly. I would tell them of the many people who have lost the freedoms that we possess. I would remind them of the great sacrifices made by our forefathers that we might enjoy freedoms as we now have. I would plead with would-be draft card burners to take as their motto "My country, may she ever be right, but right or wrong, my country." Oh, that our people will bond together and continue striving to maintain our freedom, so our great United States might remain, "one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

I am proud to be an American!

Much love.

YOUR SON.

HOUSING SHORTAGE

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the housing shortage, its effect upon the economy and the individual, and I would like to make some brief observations on the causes contributing to this critical housing situation.

There is no question in my mind that the all-time-high interest rate and cost of money is, in fact, the prime deterrent to new housing construction. This element is critical and paramount but in my judgment there are other major contributing factors which must also be recognized and be assessed as part of the problem, particularly as it relates to the almost confiscatory local real estate taxation which is severely draining family financial resources. In addition there is the essential need to recognize the obvious severe competition that has developed for the use of our land and natural resources which is most apparent in urban and suburban areas.

The time is long overdue for a complete reevaluation of archaic and antiquated zoning laws, planning procedures, and building codes, many of which have been deliberately formulated in an attempt to deter housing developments, because of the effect, in part, added populations in a community or city may have upon additional need and cost of public service nee their impact on increased local real estate taxation.

All of these forces are working to contravene a rational housing expansion program to meet the needs of the exploding populations of our Nation commensurate with the capability of the individual family income to be able to afford to build or acquire a home.

The critical import and vital need of the people of America for decent, adequate, clean, and safe housing should

certainly be apparent to all and recognized to be within the first order of domestic priorities in the country. The order of magnitude of this problem defies resolution with the usual fragmented governmental approach of paste, glue, and bandaids when the crying need is for major surgery.

In devising an overall formula to begin to meet our housing needs, we must include a stabilized interest rate specifically for housing financing free of the fluctuation of the national prime interest rate; Federal revenue sharing with the States to help relieve local real estate taxation; Federal subsidies for low income and senior citizens housing; and the establishment of a national framework of regional building standards and codes upon which the degree and extent of Federal participation in local housing needs would be based.

The building and construction trades must also take serious stock and evaluate their participation in the formula, particularly through the widest possible application of the latest up-to-date construction technology and the use of new innovative building materials.

This is not meant to be a full treatise on all of the ills, woes, and solutions to our housing needs but an attempt to convey a broad observation of some of the factors that I believe must be dealt with if we are to begin to achieve a substantive solution to the problem.

TWO MILLS SHUT DOWN

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, because of the severe slump in the housing industry, the State of Oregon is experiencing a critical period in its economic history. Lumbering is our No. 1 industry, but every day we see more and more men being laid off because of the market conditions.

I am inserting a newspaper report from the Salem, Oreg., Statesman on the closure of two plywood mills, in Corvallis and Eugene, resulting in 150 employees being thrown out of work. What is particularly distressing, Mr. Speaker, is that stories such as these are appearing all too regularly in the Oregon press, all around the State, not just in my district.

The report follows:

TWO MILLS SHUT DOWN

CORVALLIS.—Two plywood plants of Brand-S Corp. will be closed Friday for an indefinite period because of the weak condition of the plywood market.

Harley Willis, vice president and general manager, said the Corvallis and Eugene mills would shut down, causing layoff of 120 employes in Corvallis and 30 in Eugene.

He said the company's veneer mill at Five Rivers in southeastern Lincoln County would continue to operate on a one-shift basis.

Closure of another Oregon plywood mill, Georgia-Pacific's No. 1 plant at Springfield, also was announced this week. It was described as too small and too old to compete in today's market and the closure was called permanent. It has about 125 employes.

MINNESOTA PAPER PRAISES NIXON POSITION ON THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, many editors throughout our Nation have commented on President Nixon's outstanding message to the Congress on the environment.

One thoughtful statement on the President's call to fight pollution appeared in the Worthington, Minn., Globe. The Globe editorial sums up the situation with an assessment of the real problem that faces us. The editorial stressed what some noted authorities have pointed out. It is not "Can we stop pollution?" but rather "Will we make the effort?"

I believe that America can and will act to stop the decline in the quality of our environment. In my mind, the President's eloquent statement of national priorities in pollution control is a first, great step toward that goal.

For the reference of the Members, I am including in my remarks the Globe editorial entitled "President's pollution stand heartening":

PRESIDENT'S POLLUTION STAND HEARTENING

The President's clarion call last Friday for "total mobilization" against air and water pollution can only be greeted with applause by the many who have been waging a losing battle in the total conservation effort for so many years. It will certainly give heart to the multitude of concerned citizens who have only recently become enough concerned with pollution of the environment to join in the efforts of private groups committed to bettering the environment. His statement will likely give heart to the great silent majority of Americans who are worried about pollution.

President Nixon said Friday that his administration has evolved a new set of the three R's—reform, restoration, and renewal. The middle R—restoration—refers to the environment, and the President spelled out the terms of restoration in a special message to the Congress today.

To be against pollution today is to align yourself with the white hats, the good guys. Denouncing pollution of the environment is to this age what pronouncements for God, motherhood, and patriotism were to a less complicated time in America.

Yet to the analytical mind, to the person who brings to bear a clear intellect unencumbered by rhetoric and sentiment, the President's call for "total mobilization" strikes but little response. It strikes small response because the person who has any first hand knowledge of the pollution problem in this country, the person who recognizes the difficulties inherent in cleaning the air breathed by Americans and the water drunk by Americans, knows first of all that air and water are not cleaned by slogans. He also knows that the best of intentions of the air-pure water enthusiast are going to run smack dab into a frighteningly complex problem, and that his efforts to make the air pure and the water clean are going to be seriously encumbered by any number of vested interests.

He is also going to discover that the worst offenders are not the industrial polluters, though their offenses are indeed gross. He is going to find that the worst offenders are not the municipalities dumping sewage into streams and rivers, though their turning rivers into open sewers is indefensible.

The worst offenders are the drivers of automobiles pumping millions of cubic feet of noxious gases into the nation's air every day. It is householders burning trash in the backyard. It is the shore dweller flushing waste through an inadequate septic tank into the lake. It is the person carelessly tossing garbage out the car window and daily cluttering the environment with the discarded containers from pre-packaged food he demands for his convenience.

The worst offender polluting the environment is any one and all of the 200 million Americans, the average Joe, the private citizen, John Q. Public. He is the worst offender by sheer weight of numbers if for no other reason.

To halt pollution of the environment will take much more than slogans. It will require much more than good will. In the final analysis, halting pollution will require that all of us give up some conveniences, even a degree of freedom in the way we use our surroundings.

But the task of halting the present rate of air and water pollution and rolling back the enveloping tide of contaminated water and bad air is not an impossible task. It will take a commitment, it will take money, it will take effort, and it will take the kind of resolution willing to trade convenience for improvement in the quality of the environment.

First of all it must be noted that pollution is nationwide and cumulative. This means that the effort to clean the air and water of America must be a national effort. Recall the dust bowl of the Thirties. The dust clouds arose in the West, but they drifted all across the country. The topsoil of the Dakotas settled from Maine to Florida. State and local efforts at pollution control are vital, but the ultimate solution must be nationwide. An approach to pollution that places the burden of cleaning air and water on state and local government is no solution. Nor is it an honest solution to a nationwide problem simply to offer incentives to state and local government to clean the air and water.

Cost will be an important factor in any effort to restore the environment. Halting pollution will be expensive. Beware not only of simplistic solutions but of solutions that promise to be cheap.

Inconvenience to the private citizen must necessarily be the result of any honest effort to restore the quality of the environment. Take note of solutions that zero in only on offenses of industry and the cities. The private citizen may have to be willing to walk or bicycle or use public transportation where now he rides. He may have to forgo the convenience of packaged dinners. He may have to let the prunings from his grove return to the soil by the slow process of decay rather than a quick hot fire.

The pollution of half a century of burgeoning industry and population will take some while to relieve. Therefore, beware of the quickie solution. Anyone who promises clean air and water the day after tomorrow given the aid of the local newspaper and a law or two is either a fool or a charlatan. The most optimistic of ecologists say that if all the wastes presently being poured into Lake Erie were instantly halted, the lake would not recover to a point acceptable for recreation in fewer than 10 years.

There are other criteria that can aid the private person to determine whether he is listening to a real effort at restoration or something else. But these are some of the more important. The quick and easy solution that promises low-cost cleanup and fails to mention any inconvenience to the private citizen is no solution. Cleaning up the environment means a slow, tedious, costly effort that will inconvenience the private citizen.

The only question that remains is whether or not we are willing to make the effort necessary for clean air and water. We haven't been to this point, and there isn't much to suggest optimism that we have reached such a commitment at this point.

USE AND ABUSE OF THE GREAT SALT LAKE

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on the environment has directed a great deal of attention to the conditions under which we all live. I believe that the citizens of Utah will want to turn their efforts toward solution of the pollution problem of one of our greatest natural resources, the Great Salt Lake.

Since congressional interest in environmental problems is great, I would like to share with my colleagues an editorial on the "Use and Abuse of Lake" which appeared in the February 17, 1970, edition of the Salt Lake Tribune:

USE AND ABUSE OF LAKE

The use and abuse of Great Salt Lake for years has been a subject jam-packed with contention. A natural wonder holding fascination for scientists, technologists, recreationists and the just plain curious, the inland sea is constantly in the middle of arguments over how its vast potential can be totally realized. But one point ought to be abundantly clear: The lake is too valuable to be turned into a cesspool.

But even though there is general agreement on this, it appears not enough is being done to prevent such a probability. According to Grant K. Borg, Utah Water Pollution Committee chairman, Great Salt Lake is suffering badly from sewage pollution. He noted tests along the lake's eastern and northern shores have recorded high disease producing organisms in the water.

The information is somewhat startling considering progress made by Wasatch Front communities in building sewage treatment plants. Prof. Borg points out, however, that while helpful, these plants are only 85 percent effective in cleansing waters channeled through them into the lake. And as population increases or industry expands, the problem will grow unless additional treatment stages are provided.

Aside from protecting overall environmental conditions, the situation described by Prof. Borg requires particular attention after the time and money already spent developing the lake's tourist and recreation possibilities. State and local government funds have been used to create extensive public facilities on Antelope Island in the northeastern section of Great Salt Lake—an area threatened by sewage pollution.

The contradiction is serious enough to justify official action. Since there has never been a comprehensive study of long-range pollution effects on Great Salt Lake, this should be a priority project with sufficient state funding. The water pollution control committee, though established in 1953, has never been able to afford a full staff. Its research capabilities should be strengthened.

Great Salt Lake should be preserved as a proud Utah possession, not turned into the country's largest body of contaminated salt water. Those with answers for the problem should be given the authority and money necessary to move ahead now.

FREEDOM FOR LITHUANIA

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on this year's occasion of the 52d celebration of the anniversary of Lithuanian independence appropriate ceremonies were held in the Congress and throughout the United States in order to pay well deserved tribute to the heroic people of Lithuania and to encourage them to remain steadfast in their determination to finally restore to their native land the liberty that is rightfully theirs.

But we, who are free have the obligation to do more than that. It is our duty to repeatedly publicize and emphasize to the civilized world the tragic truth of Lithuanian oppression under Russian tyranny.

As long as we keep alive the terrible truth about Communist treatment of Lithuania we are encouraging the hope and perseverance of the Lithuanian people for eventual freedom and independence.

The cause of freedom for Lithuania is a just cause and it is one in which I am particularly pleased to pledge my own cooperative efforts unceasingly until it is accomplished.

Of course, all Lithuanian Americans are dedicated in their objective to expedite the day of freedom for their homeland and I am pleased to include, at this point, a copy of the resolutions, on behalf of Lithuanian freedom, that were adopted at a mass meeting of Lithuanian citizens in my home city of Worcester, Mass., last February 15, 1970. The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTIONS

At a Mass Meeting held by the Lithuanians of Worcester, County of Worcester, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, under the auspices of the Worcester Area Council of Lithuanian Organizations, at the Lithuanian Naturalization Club Hall, Worcester, Massachusetts, on February 15, 1970, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, the 16th day of February, 1970, marks the 52nd Anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania as a Free and Independent Republic,

Whereas, the unlawful, by "Force of Arms", occupation of the Republic of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, in June, 1940, and the commitment of atrocities against her people, the deportations, the destruction of her institutions and her Democratic Form of Government, by the Soviet Union, continues,

Whereas, the Soviet Union has consistently and unilaterally violated all of the Pacts and Declarations solemnly underwritten by the Soviet Union, viz:—"Peace and Nonaggression Pacts with the Baltic States, the Atlantic Charter, United Nations Charter, Four Freedoms, Yalta Declaration, and the Potsdam Agreement,

Resolved, that the citizens of Worcester, County of Worcester, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, of Lithuanian descent, do most vigorously condemn and protest against Soviet Russia's such Unlawful by "Force of Arms" occupation of the Republic of Lithuania, the commitment of atrocities against her people, the destruction of her institutions and her Democratic Form of Government and the violation of Pacts and Peace Treaties,

Resolved, that the Lithuanian-Americans of said Worcester County, once again reaffirming their loyalty to the principles of American Democracy, pledge their wholehearted support to the President and the Congress of the United States in their efforts to bring about a lasting peace, freedom and justice in the world,

Resolved, that the President of the United States bring up the Baltic States question in the United Nations and demand that all Soviet Military Forces, Government and Agents be forthwith evacuated from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia,

Resolved, that copies of these resolutions be forwarded to Richard M. Nixon, the President of the United States; Secretary of State William P. Rogers; United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Charles W. Yost; the Senators and Congressmen of the United States from Massachusetts, and to the Press.

PRANAS STANELIS,
President.
Mrs. JOHN C. ADAMAITIS,
Secretary.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, as my distinguished colleagues are probably aware, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary each year conduct a Voice of Democracy contest. One winner is chosen from each State and these finalists come to the Nation's Capital to compete for the five scholarships awarded as top prizes. This year over 400,000 students participated.

I am proud that the finalist from Massachusetts this year is Miss Bonnie Brewster, a resident of Bridgewater, Mass., in the 12th Congressional District. Bonnie is a 17-year-old high school student whose future plans included college and a career in communication, arts, and English. She has won many awards in the areas of oration and interpretation. Her talents in this field are more than evident in her composition on "Freedom's Challenge."

It is an honor and a pleasure to present Bonnie's essay to the U.S. Congress, as follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Bonnie Brewster)

"I have died in Vietnam
But I have walked the face of the moon.
I have beat down my enemies with clubs
But I have built courtrooms to keep them free.
I have built a bomb to destroy the world
But I have used it to light a light.
I have outraged my brothers in the alleys of the ghettos
But I have transplanted a human heart."

Closing the cover of today's Time Magazine, 1969, I recall the words of a favorite novel which speak to me of yesterday.

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of uncertainty, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair."

So wrote Charles Dickens, 1869.

And it is the best of times—fantastic achievements is now and always will be our path—the corridors of space loom infinite

and inviting through the explorations of Apollo 11 and 12, modern medicine has thrown open the window for new hope through continuing research, and now, as never before, the doors of higher education stand open to all who seek admittance.

It is the worst of times. There are killers lurking among us—wars rage taking their toll upon humanity, air pollution and water pollution threaten extinction of life, while rioters plague university campuses and city streets.

Why? and how? in such an age of wisdom, can man be so foolish?

We, as human beings have been given such a capacity to love and to give—and yet, we continue to hate and to take and to demand.

I speak today of Freedom's Challenge—that challenge which I believe, in the best of times, seems disciplined, loving and selfless men build and develop life for a newer and brighter world, while, in the worst of times, sees selfish, undisciplined, slavish men destroying any semblance of earthly harmony and—ultimately—destroying their very freedom.

Remember when the first step was taken on the moon, and astronauts Aldrin and Armstrong, looking down on their small world, described it as a mere "pinpoint" where imposed barriers, boundaries, and "gaps" no longer existed. Through the revelation that this giant step gave to mankind, I ask you, has any time, any era, ever been such a season of light?

In Sydney Carton, Dickens saw that it was the courage and spirit of each individual that salvaged the world. Carton lived with compassion and love for his fellow beings, for a universal justice—even to his death on the guillotine.

Let's all try to live every minte projecting this freedom of our best times onto the kaleidoscope of the worst times. Let's bring the baptism of liberty, the spring of hope, to those prisoned times which are ever born in the winter of despair.

These times present the challenge which I realize as a spoiled patriot, and as an unspoiled patriot. I, as an individual, try to live this challenge in my refusal to lapse into the apathetic and "comfortable" life, in my refusal to condone slavery and slaughter and suffering and starvation, and in my refusal to recognize those who strike out against peace among men. It is in my refusal that I do accept Freedom's Challenge. I am humbled, but I am proud—I am an American.

MARSHAL WILSON OF WESTERN MISSOURI

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas City Times' tribute to F. M. Wilson as he left office as U.S. marshal for western Missouri defines his area as the widest spectrum of America.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the editorial which follows praising the distinguished and far-ranging service of this dedicated public servant and my good friend:

MARSHAL WILSON OF WESTERN MISSOURI

In nearly a decade as United States marshal for the Western district of Missouri, F. M. Wilson looked at the widest spectrum of America in the 1960s. His deputies were present at school integration confrontations in the South, demonstrations by the Black Panthers in Kansas City, the recent Chicago trial and events that surrounded the Minutemen. Wilson men ranged far and wide as they were called in for special service.

Now, F. M. Wilson, a Democrat, is succeeded by John T. Pierpont, Jr., a Republican. Such change is the nature of the job which is held at the pleasure of the President. Wilson was appointed by John F. Kennedy and re-appointed by Lyndon B. Johnson. John Pierpont is the Republican nomniee of Richard M. Nixon. As Wilson has said, he came in through the political system and he leaves by the political system. Before his appointment, Wilson was known as a strong, partison Democrat. As marshal, he kept a 50–50 balance of Republicans and Democrats in office. He leaves many friends in the federal courthouse where he has been a courteous man in the halls of that building and a firm, disciplined executive who carried out his duties, often under extreme difficulties that really should have had nothing to do with the routine of the job.

As an arm of the court, the marshal's office handles 3,000 or more prisoners a year (Wilson has done so without an escape); serves at least 5,000 papers annualy (criminal and civil) and sends men to any part of the country where needed.

William H. Becker, chief judge of the Western district, says that F. M. Wilson has been one of the outstanding marshals in the country. If he now moves to quieter pursuits and leaves the large responsibility of office to John Pierpont, Wilson can look back on a distinguished career in the midst of trying times.

A PLEA TO ATTEND EXPO '70 IN TOKYO

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the more outstanding public-spirited groups of entertainers in New York is the Cama Music Society whose young members have built up a wonderful reputation—volunteering their services to raise money for worthwhile projects.

Indeed, its not uncommon for this independent music group to have its choristers singing Jewish horah at a community center, its troupe of black dancers performing a ballet for a scholarship fund, or its variety performers singing for children at a public home.

After performing all these good gestures, the Cama Music Society is now seeking a gesture of public good will itself. Fifteen members have been invited to perform at Expo '70 in Tokyo, but their leader, Carl Ferrar, one of my constitutents, cannot raise $10,000 in travel expenses.

In the hope that Cama's activities may attract some financial support for their dilemma, I am inserting a recent news article describing Cama in the RECORD for my colleagues' information:

THEY SING BENEFITS, NOW THEY NEED ONE

Fifteen members of the Cama Music Society have been invited to perform at Expo '70 in Tokyo this summer. They are the only teenage group from New York State to receive an invitation, but it looks as if they won't get to go—they can't pay for the trip.

It's an ironic situation. For the 11 years the group has been volunteering its services to raise money for all sorts of worthwhile projects.

They have performed at nursing homes, hospitals, children's shelters, senior citizens' homes and church benefits. They have raised thousands of dollars for others—but they have never accepted a penny of payment.

LIVE UP TO NAME

The Cama Music Society was founded in 1959 by Carl Ferrer, a magazine writer from Kew Gardens. The word Cama is a Cheyenne Indian word meaning "a fertile spot in a barren land." And the society has tried to provide some sort of fertile ground for the development of youthful musical abilities.

The group is composed of teenagers from Kings, Queens and Nassau counties and it has never taken money from anyone. Ferrer said: "We've never had any financial assistance from city, state or federal agencies. We've done it all on our own."

Rehearsals are held in the Ferrer home. "We can't even pay for a rehearsal hall, so we make do with my house," Ferrer said.

ALL HIGH SCHOOLS

"We recruit in high schools all over the city," he added, "they come for an audition, and, if they are good enough, they're in."

Everyone practices at least twice a week. "We do all kinds of music. Anything young people are interested in. We have a 13-year-old operatic singer and we have a rock band," Ferrer said.

Ferrer has been trying to raise funds to take the teenagers to Tokyo. He has written to the city, the state and various foundations. Everyone has turned him down.

"I don't know what we're going to do," he said. "This is the opportunity of a lifetime for these kids. And unless we can raise about $10,000 for transportation money, I don't see how we'll be able to go."

SUPPORTING THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the education message which the President has sent up this week calls for the creation of a much-needed National Institute of Education. Ever since the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965 there has been an extensive Federal commitment to compensatory education. This commitment to raising the achievement level of the disadvantaged child continues to be a major concern. However, as the President indicated in his message:

> The best available evidence indicates that most of the compensatory education programs have not measurably helped poor children catch up.

As we move into the decade of the seventies, our knowledge of how to approach this difficult problem of compensatory education will be immeasurably improved by the National Institute of Education. The Institute, modeled after the successful formula of the National Institutes of Health, will be able to bring together the widely fragmented pieces currently operating in educational research into a structured system for research and development.

I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this worthwhile proposal for the future educational needs of the country.

WHAT'S GOOD ABOUT THE U.S.A. TODAY

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Don C. Dailey, vice president and general manager of Radio Station KGBX in Springfield, Mo., tiring of the constant stories of how we are being overrun by crime, corruption, violence, race riots, and antiwar demonstrations, took to the airways recently to tell the other side of the story.

The facts as set down by Don's editorial should make interesting reading for all.

The editorial follows:

WHAT'S GOOD ABOUT THE U.S.A. TODAY

We know that you must be as sick and tired as we are of hearing about what's *wrong* with America today. Our newspapers, television and radio news programs are filled with how we are being overrun by crime, corruption, violence, race riots and anti-war demonstrations. This produces the sensation that the only stories that deserve attention are the dreadful ones. The effect of such daily reports picturing the United States as a country unfit for human habitation might be expected to frighten off strangers from venturing toward these shores. Yet, foreigners continue to arrive from the four corners of the earth in ever increasing numbers, not only to live but to study here. We think it's obvious from the statistics published by *U.S. News and World Report* recently in a book entitled, "Good Things About the U.S. Today" that America is doing something right and we heartily recommend this book for some most interesting and enlightening reading.

The most eloquent tributes to the status of freedom and liberty in the United States comes not from Americans, but from foreigners. They see America somewhat with the eyes of the first settlers to these shores. Recently Stalin's daughter was so overcome she could hardly believe what she saw. She was astounded by our own unawareness of the great good she has found in this country. She said, "Nobody here can realize what is the difference between the free world and the world of totalitarian ideology." She understood why we had no terms of reference or of comparison. We do not know the other world. We have never lived there. You should go try it, she told the youth of America. Those that do go are carefully isolated from any real contact with the Russian people, so they never know what Stalin's daughter meant.

In 1950, 249,187 people immigrated into the United States from all parts of the world. Eighteen years later almost twice that many people came, 454,448 people. In 1960, 53,000 foreign students studied in the United States. In 1968 well over twice that number were here studying, a total of 133,499.

Let's look at some of the good things in America today. We Americans consistently give away more of what we earn than any other group of people in the world. There is a general feeling of social responsibility that's a part of our culture. For those that argue that modern Americans are generous mainly for tax deductions, the experts disagree. Bryce Whalen, who researched income tax deductions throughout America, points out that the average American family gives away much more than it takes credit for on its income tax. Not only money, but time from volunteers for a thousand different causes is available for the asking.

There are a million stories across America like the one of the Watts Labor Community Action Committee, which showed up with volunteers the minute the flash floods of 1969 hit Southern California. They cleaned up a sea of mud and debris covering many residential areas. When they were asked how much was owed them, they simply smiled and said nothing. In Indianapolis, 1,500 volunteers from business, college, church and fraternal organizations signed up for the Volunteer Advisory Core. Working with businesses, they helped over 2,000 people each year to find steady, productive jobs. In New York over 4,000 men and women contributed four hours a week as auxiliary city policemen serving without pay. A professor at Columbia University set up a unique one-man war on racial discrimination. For two hours on Saturdays he works with more than 100 high school boys and girls in grooming, speech, poise, general deportment and culture. With better personal habits he knows they will find better jobs and educational opportunities. He finances the project himself.

In Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania last spring, 100 college students gave up their spring vacation to paint and repair homes in poor neighborhoods. Business firms in Pittsburgh donated all the supplies. A bank in Portland, Oregon kept track of the voluntary contributions in time, effort and expense made in a single year by its 1,000 employees. According to their scorecard, they worked 147,400 hours for charitable causes. The out-of-pocket expenses borne by the employees themselves amounted to $60,000. They devoted 10,675 hours to fund raising! They spent 23,576 hours on church work, other than attending services and another 6,678 hours on community drives. The bank itself made sizable contributions. It paid its employees $166,480.00 in salaries, while they worked on philanthropic projects during banking hours.

We could go on and on. The volunteer spirit of people helping people is not dead in America. It just doesn't get any attention, but don't think that good things aren't happening in America today. Kenneth A. Meades, an Englishman who recently became an American, says he has seen many countries and lived in several of them and the closest thing to a people's paradise is right here on Main Street, U.S.A. He says this country represents the haves in a world of have nots, while reminding us that America began with nothing but its bare hands. He reminds us that we arrive all colors races and creeds and what was built here was done without any foreign aid or a world bank around to finance it. So we say let's stop beating ourselves over the head about what's wrong and start emphasizing what's right. If we don't, we may wake up to an America some day soon that really will have more wrong with it than right!

DON C. DAILEY,
Vice President and General Manager.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 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?

REMARKS AT FUNERAL OF JAMES B. UTT

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, we are deeply saddened by the sudden death of our friend and colleague, James B. Utt, and we would like to share the remarks at his funeral made by the Reverend Robert Schuller, as follows:

REMARKS AT THE FUNERAL SERVICE OF JAMES B. UTT BY ROBERT SCHULLER

Speaking as Jimmy Utt's pastor, may I express my deepest gratitude to all of you for your reverend and respectful attendance at this service, which is affectionately dedicated to the memory of our friend Jimmy Utt. I recognize the fact that many of you have come a long distance and made a great personal effort to attend this service. It is a powerful statement of your devotion and affection to your friend Jimmy Utt. The family recognizes your presence and would have me express their warmest gratitude to you.

When he suspected that he might possibly be going, Jimmy said to his wife, "if anything happens to me, Charlene, I don't want a long service in Washington. If anything happens to me, just take me home."

So today he has come home—the sunny land of his birth. For seventeen years he has been coming home, always to be warmly welcomed by his friends or tackled by his waiting adversaries. Today's home-coming is his last and for the first time his enemies are silent.

All of us here will feel Jimmy's loss deeply. Our nation has lost a faithful Congressman. A wife has lost a devoted husband of 49 years, a son has lost a loving father, a devoted esteemed employer, a political party has lost a strong leader, this church has lost an honored member. I have lost a personal friend.

There is much that can be said about Jimmy Utt.

Like: *His incredible unpretentiousness.* How he remained an unaffected, genuinely humble man in spite of his power and success.

Or his unquestionable integrity. No one could ever buy his favor. He was first always devoted to the granite principles carved deeply into his character by his personal conscience. His first thought was never his reelection—but what in his judgment was best for his country. If that meant taking a vote losing position, then this was the price he was prepared to pay.

Or his genuine graciousness. Perhaps no man on the Hill had a more devoted staff than did Jimmy Utt. They knew him as a gracious, generous, thoughtful and solicitous human being. Amazingly—even those who disagreed with his views knew him to be a kind heart and a gracious spirit.

I found myself today recalling another dear friend, the late Congressman Clyde Doyle, who, like Jimmy Utt, worshipped often in this sanctuary. I recall a day when both Congressmen worshipped in this church, sitting in the same side of the aisle! At dinner that Sunday, Clyde Doyle and I were chatting and the Congressman said, "You know, Bob, everyone in Washington respects Jimmy Utt—even if they don't agree with him." Continuing, he said, "I recall a social evening in the White House with President Roosevelt. I saw the President standing alone staring wistfully out of an open window across the spaces to the Jefferson Memorial. As I walked over to him

the President said to me, "Mr. Doyle, I have made mistakes, I know that now. I only hope that history will believe me when I say they were *sincere* mistakes." "Sincerity," Clyde Doyle added, "that's what Jimmy Utt has in abundance and that's why we respect him."

Which leads me to what must be said was the most remarkable quality in the life of Jimmy Utt—Congressman, husband, father, citizen, church member. No quality stands out more strongly than his capacity for commitment. He knew the meaning of that word "commitment." Commitment is daring to make a decision even though you cannot be positively sure that the decision is absolutely correct. It is believing that people will respect you even if they do not agree with you. It is knowing that the rewards for genuine and sincere commitment far outweigh the risks. For the final reward of commitment is self respect!

When I think of Jimmy Utt, I think of the lines of an earlier American, Theodore Roosevelt, who said, "It is not the critic who counts, not the man who points out how the strong man stumbles or where the doer of deed could have done better, the credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood, who strives valiantly, who errs and comes short again and again, who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions, and spends himself in a worthy cause; who, at best, knows in the end the triumph of high achievement, and who at worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat."

What were Jimmy Utt's commitments?

He was first of all deeply committed to both freedom and peace—but never to peace at the price of freedom. In the mind of Jimmy Utt, we are stewards of freedom—stewards, not title holders! Freedom is not a personal possession that we can give away under the threat of military blackmail. Freedom really belongs to boys who bought it and paid for it with their lives—their hands, their legs, their eyes. Freedom was bought with a price and it is not ours to give away. It is a sacred national trust which is ours to treasure—and if need be to die for—that it might be passed on to the next generation. Out of this very strong commitment to freedom there arose in Jimmy Utt's mind a strong commitment to anti-Communism, for which he was to receive no small amount of criticism. At times, if you were to believe his enemies, he was a right-wing conservative that posed a great threat to our national security. Well, neither James Utt nor his colleagues ever led mobs through the streets, or burned down banks, or vandalized the schools, or spit in the faces of judges and university professors.

Where the 60's saw America suffering from an almost paranoiac fear of so-called right wingers—perhaps the 70s will see our country waking up to a realization that the real enemies in our land are found in the camps of those who ridicule our courts, insult our judges, mock our religions, and set race against race even while they hypocritically denounce racism! All the while poisoning the mental, moral and spiritual environment with a pollution even more deadly than the dangerous smog and oil slicks that besmirch our land. The real enemies of our country are those who are polluting the minds of youths, peddling poisonous pills and paper prostitutes! It is to Jimmy Utt's lasting credit that a fortnight ago he initiated legislation hitting at the pornographic problem.

What good will it do to have—and we must have—clean air, pure water, if we have a nation of polluted minds? The Bible is clear—man without legal and moral restraint will turn his liberties into license, his license into lust, and when lust has become commonplace and boring, the urge for stimulation will turn man inevitably toward unnatural perversions and ultimately murder. This is a certainty—if our highest courts continually interpret our constitution in such a manner as to frustrate any and all attempts to stem the flood tide of moral pollutants that are inundating our land—than be prepared to see this nation, under God, perish from the earth. Jim Utt was deeply concerned about this, and so am I.

Then, Jimmy Utt was deeply committed to our free enterprise and capitalistic system. What is very important is that Jim Utt was not simply committed to capitalism—but Christian capitalism. Capitalism without Christ and without God can be dangerous too. But the Christian capitalist is one who is interested in making the most money under the highest principles in order to have money that can be given to worthy causes. As his pastor I can testify that Jimmy Utt was a very generous man. No hypocrisy here! What a contrast to the producers and publishers of the modern-day rock musical, "Hair"—this musical, which is so harshly critical of our American system and so blatantly anti-Capitalistic is bringing in, as it plays in 14 cities around the world, $1 million a week! Publishers of the musical have raked in a bundle of royalties from an estimated sales of $25 million in records. All of this from a musical anti-Capitalistic message. I see no hospitals or churches, or hungry and poverty-stricken people, benefiting from the money that is being raked in by these anti-establishmentarians.

James Utt was committed to freedom—to the American free enterprise capitalistic system—and James Utt was deeply committed to his Christ and to his church. In spite of the fact that America is undergoing a dangerous moral and spiritual depression, Jimmy Utt remained to the very end a great possibility thinker. Never did he become an impossibility thinker. To the last he believed that it was possible—if not to turn the tide, at least to clean it up! Jimmy Utt was a great believer in prayer. It is most fitting that he was stricken on his way to church. This very day he was planning to deliver an address to a church group in Washington, D.C. Within the last month I saw him sitting in the fourth pew from the front of this church. I know that his favorite Bible verse was John 3:16, "God so loved the world that He gave His only Begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life."

There was no doubt about Jimmy Utt's deep commitment.

Is there any doubt about your commitment or mine? Indeed there are tens of thousands of people in this country that rejoice that the voice of Jim Utt has been silenced. There are tens of thousands committed to violence, to revolution, to anarchy, and to the violent overthrow of our system and the establishment. And they are committed! To them there is no turning back! They have a plan—and plans! How committed am I, how committed are you? Do you have a plan to save our country? I fear the no-plan people. Yesterday Peanuts' cartoon showed four pictures. The first showed Charlie Brown addressing his dog sitting on the little dog house. Charlie Brown speaks up, "What are you going to do about pollution?" In the second picture the dog bewilderingly asks, "About what?" And in the third picture Charlie Brown answers, "You're the Head Beagle, you're supposed to do something about these things!" And the dog replies, "I am?" In the last picture the dog's mouth is wide open and he is shouting out "WHAAH"! And Charlie Brown answers, "Crying is not going to help." Crying over the problems of our country are not going to help. We need a plan. If you fail to plan, you are planning to fail.

Jim Utt understood what my plan was and we agreed that the ultimate salvation of our country is going to demand a religious and a spiritual renewal.

My plan is very simple. I ask you to commit your life deeply to peace and to freedom, to brotherhood to Jesus Christ. I invite you to accept Jesus Christ into your life. As your Lord and your Saviour. Protestant, Catholic or Jew—whatever your faith or lack of it—you can't go wrong following Christ. He is still the most inspiring person who ever lived. He is the greatest possibility thinker that ever walked on the face of the earth. If I knew a better person than Christ I would give him my full, perfect and life-long allegiance. Not knowing a better person, I give my love, my loyalty and allegiance to Him.

If in all philosophy, religion or psychology I knew a more inspiring, uplifting, loving person to follow, then I would forsake Christ and follow that other person. But since there is none greater or wiser, then I choose to follow Christ.

If I knew anyone else who could promise life eternal and abundant—and the hope of Heaven beyond this life—I would follow such a saviour. But I know of no one else who has made such a claim and such a promise other than Jesus of Nazareth. And so I follow Him. So has James B. Utt. Today James Utt is alive, for Christ has promised, "He who lives and believes in Me shall never die." Together let us offer our lives to Him as the Lord and Saviour of our souls and our nation.

Amen.

THERE IS A TV BIAS

HON. EARL B. RUTH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, when criticism of biased television newscasting is made by leading Republicans or by members of the "silent majority," it is easy for the objects of that criticism to cry "sour grapes" or say that those doing the criticizing "do not understand" the true situation.

However, when one of the leading network newscasters, self-described as "left of center" in his political beliefs, states that there is bias and unfairness in much news coverage, even the most sanctimonious members of the broadcasting industry ought to pay close attention.

Such is the case, Mr. Speaker, with a recent interview of Howard K. Smith of ABC, from TV Guide magazine. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

THERE IS A TV BIAS

On Nov. 12, 1969, when the liberal media were angrily aboil over Vice President Agnew's blasts at the liberal left and its frequently violent crusades, a quiet voice on ABC–TV declared: "Political cartoonists have that in common with the lemmings, that once a line is set, most of them follow it, though it lead to perdition. The current cliche shared by them and many columnists is that Spiro Agnew is putting his foot in his mouth (and) making irredeemable errors. . . . Well, . . . I doubt that party line . . . There is a possibility it is not Mr. Agnew who is making mistakes. It is the cartoonists."

One week later, on Nov. 19, 1969, when the liberal media were even more violently aboil over the climactic Agnew speech blasting bias in network news, that same quiet voice on ABC–TV once again was heard: "I agree with some of what Mr. Agnew said. In fact, I said some of it before he did."

The speaker was Howard K. Smith, ABC's Washington-based anchor man, ex-CBS European correspondent, and winner of a constellation of awards for foreign and domestic reporting. Mr. Smith has, indeed, said some of what Mr. Agnew said before Mr. Agnew had said it. For several years, despite his respect for network news departments and their achievements, he has been criticizing his colleagues—on the air and off—for falsifying U.S. political realities by means of biased reporting.

Mr. Smith is by no means an unqualified supporter of Mr. Agnew and he has reservations about The Speech. To name the two most important: "A tone of intimidation, I think, was in it, and that I can't accept . . . Also a sense that we do things deliberately. I don't think we do them deliberately."

Mr. Smith, however, says: "I agree that we made the mistakes he says we made." And he himself levels charges at the network news departments.

In fact, according to Howard Smith, political bias in TV reporting is of such a magnitude that it fully justifies the explosion we have seen. Here is this insider's analysis of the problem.

His candor begins at the very base of the network news operation—namely, with the political composition of the staff. Networks, says Mr. Smtih, are almost exclusively staffed by liberals. "It evolved from the time when liberalism was a good thing, and most intellectuals became highly liberal. Most reporters are in an intellectual occupation." Secondly, he declares that liberals, virtually by definition, have a "strong leftward bias": "Our tradition, since FDR, has been leftward."

This is not to say that Mr. Smith sees anything wrong with being a leftist—"I am left-of-center myself." But he sees everything wrong with the dissemination of an inflexible "party line"; and this, he charges, is what liberal newsmen are doing today: "Our liberal friends, today, have become dogmatic. They have a set of automatic reactions. They react the way political cartoonists do—with over-simplification. Oversimplify. Be sure you please your fellows, because that's what's 'good.' They're conventional, they're conformists. They're pleasing Walter Lippmann, they're pleasing the Washington Post, they're pleasing the editors of The New York Times, and they're pleasing one another."

He says a series of cartoonlike positive and negative reflexes are determining much of the coverage.

He names a series of such negative reflexes—i.e., subjects which newsmen automatically cover by focusing on negatives. Herewith, excerpts from his comments:

Race: "During the Johnson Administration, six million people were raised above the poverty level . . . And there is a substantial and successful Negro middle class. But the newsmen are not interested in the Negro who succeeds—they're interested in the one who fails and makes a loud noise. They have ignored the developments in the South. The South has an increasing number of integrated schools. A large part of the South has accepted integration. We've had a President's Cabinet with a Negro in it, a Supreme Court with a Negro on it—but more important, we have 500 Negroes elected to local offices in the deep South! This is a tremendous achievement. But that achievement isn't what we see on the screen."

Conservatives: "If Agnew says something, it's bad, regardless of what he says. If Ronald Reagan says something, it's bad, regardless of what he says. Well, I'm unwilling to condemn an idea because a particular man said it. Most of my colleagues do just that."

The Middle Class: "Newsmen are proud of the fact that the middle class is antagonistic to them. They're proud of being out of contact with the middle class. Joseph Kraft did a column in which he said: Let's face it, we reporters have very little to do with middle America. They're not our kind of people . . . Well, I resent that. I'm from middle America!"

The Vietnam War: "The networks have never given a complete picture of the war. For example: that terrible siege of Khe Sanh went on for five weeks before newsment revealed that the South Vietnamese were fighting at our sides, and that they had higher casualties. And the Viet Cong's casualties were 100 times ours. But we never told that. We just showed pictures day after day of Americans getting the hell kicked out of them. That was enough to break America apart. That's also what it did."

The Presidency: "The negative attitude which destroyed Lyndon Johnson is now waiting to be applied to Richard Nixon. Johnson was actually politically assassinated. And some are trying to assassinate Nixon politically. They hate Richard Nixon irrationally."

If this is a sampling of the liberal reporters' negative reflexes, as seen by Howard Smith—what then are the positive reflexes? He provides an even more extensive set of examples—subjects on which, he says, his colleagues tend to have an affirmative bias and/or from which they screen out negatives. Again here are excerpts from his comments:

Russia: "Some have gone overboard in a wish to believe that our opponent has exclusively peaceful aims, and that there is no need for armaments and national security. The danger of Russian aggression is unreal to many of them, although some have begun to rethink since the invasion of Czechoslovakia. But there is a kind of basic bias in the left-wing soul that gives the Russians the benefit of the doubt."

Ho Chi Minh: "Many have described Ho Chi Minh as a nationalist leader comparable to George Washington. But his advent to power in Hanoi, in 1954, was marked by the murder of 50,000 of his people. His consistent method was terror. He was not his country's George Washington—he was more his country's Hitler or Stalin . . . I heard an eminent TV commentator say: 'It's an awful thing when you can trust Ho Chi Minh more than you can trust your President.' At the time he said that, Ho Chi Minh was lying! He was presiding over atrocities! And yet an American TV commentator could say that!"

The Viet Cong: "The Viet Cong massacred 3000 Vietnamese at Hue alone—a massacre that dwarfs all allegations about My Lai. This was never reported on."

Doves: "Mr. Fulbright maneuvered the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution through—with a clause stating that Congress may revoke it. Ever since, he's been saying: 'This is a terribly immoral thing.' I asked him: 'If it's that bad, aren't you morally obligated to try to revoke it?' He runs away! And yet Mr. Fulbright—who incidentally has voted against every civil-rights act—is not criticized for his want of character. He is beloved by reporters, by everyone of my group, which is left-of-center. It's one of the mysteries of my time!"

Black Militants: "A few Negroes—scavengers on the edge of society—have discovered they're riding a good thing with violence and talk of violence. They can get on TV and become nationally famous."

The New Left: "The New Left challenges America. They're rewriting the history of the Cold War. Some carry around the Viet Cong flag. Some shout for Mao—people who'd be assassinated in China! They've become irrational! But they're not portrayed as irrational. Reporters describe them as 'our children.' Well, they're not my children. My children don't throw bags of excrement at policemen . . . If right-wing students had done what left-wing students have done, everyone, including the reporters, would have called in the police and beaten their heads in. But we have a left-wing bias now, that has 30 years of momentum behind it."

What do Mr. Smith's examples of negative and positive biases add up to, politically? He says: "The emphasis is anti-American." In fact, as he portrays the pattern, it is a dual emphasis: This coverage as described by Mr. Smith is anti-American in that it tends to omit the good about America and focus on the bad. And it is also biased in favor of attackers-of-America by tending to omit the bad about them and focusing on the good. Mr. Smith has actually reconstituted here a loose variant of the New Left line. And New Left attitudes are influencing newsmen, he says. "The New Left," says Smith, "has acquired a grave power over the liberal mind."

This is not a new charge—it is the essence of the public outcry against network news, and it's the essence of the long-standing conservative charges against the newsmen. Mr. Smith himself, although he's been described as a "conservative" because he supports the war, is, as he says, a Leftist—indeed, a semisocialist who shares many views with economist John Kenneth Galbraith. He has been one of TV's most ardent fighters for civil rights—too ardent, Smith says, for CBS's tastes, which is one reason why, he adds, he is at ABC today. He is generally in disagreement with political Conservatives on virtually everything. And, for that matter, he finds it psychologically easier to defend TV news departments than to criticize them. But on this issue of anti-American, pro-New-Left bias in the network news departments, his observations are identical to those coming from the right.

His explanation of the causes of this pattern, however, are quite different from those which emerge from the right. Where conservatives are often inclined to see this pattern as a deliberate, conscious and intellectually potent conspiracy, Mr. Smith sees it as the opposite—as a largely unconscious phenomenon, stemming from intellectual impotence, from such qualities as "conformism," "hypocrisy," "self-deception" and "stupidity."

One of the chief conformist patterns, he says, is the automatic obedience to a convention of negativism in journalism itself, often for self-serving reasons. "As reporters, we have always been falsifying issues by reporting on what goes wrong in a Nation where, historically, most has gone right. That is how you get on page one, that is how you win a Pulitzer Prize. This gears the reporters mind to the negative, even when it is not justified."

But how about the opposite form of bias—a chronic omission of negatives and the unremitting focus on the good in our country's enemies? Here Mr. Smith tackles the New Left influence head on. He attributes it to a mental vacuum in the liberal world:

"Many of my colleagues," he says, "have the depth of a saucer. They cling to the tag 'liberal' that grew popular in the time of Franklin Roosevelt, even though they've forgotten its content. They've really forgotten it.

They don't know what 'liberal' and 'conservative' mean any more! They've forgotten it because the liberal cause has triumphed. Once it was hard to be a liberal. Today it's 'in.' The ex-underdogs, the ex-outcasts, the ex-rebels are satisfied bourgeois today, who pay $150 a plate at Americans for Democratic Action dinners. They don't know what they stand for any more, and they're hunting for a new voice to give them new bearings."

The search for a "new voice," he says, has catapulted such men into the arms of the New Left: "They want to cling to that thrill of the old days, of triumph, and hard fighting. So they cling to the label 'liberal,' and they cling to those who seem strong—namely, the New Left. The New Left shouts tirades, rather than offering reasoned arguments. People bow down to them, so they have come to seem strong, to seem sure of themselves. As a result, there's a gravitation to them by the liberals who are not sure of themselves. This has given the New Left grave power over the old Left."

It is this New Left "power" over many of the Nation's liberal reporters, he says, that underlies an anti-American and pro-radical bias in network coverage—and that underlies public anger.

What is the solution to this problem, as envisaged by Mr. Smith?

Let public protest rip, he says. He experiences a twinge of discomfort over the fact that his solution is identical to Mr. Agnew's: "There have been very unpleasant, even threatening, letters," he reports. "But, quite literally, what Mr. Agnew suggests is all right."

Public protest, he thinks, will knock these men back into contact with U.S. political realities.

The networks have ignored this situation, despite years of protest, because they have power. And you know what Lord Acton says about power. It subtly corrupts. Power unaccountable has that effect on people. This situation should not continue. But I wouldn't do anything about it. I would let public opinion and the utterances of the alleged silent majority bring about a corrective. The corrective? Just a simple attempt to be fair—which many people have thrown aside over the last few years."

LEW DESCHLER

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to greet an old friend and wish him well—even if the occasion means he is 1 year older. So, I happily join with my colleagues in wishing our Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler, a very happy birthday.

Lew has been a good friend to many of us over the years and has been of invaluable assistance to six speakers since coming to Washington in 1928. He is a sincere, unassuming, hard working man—a genuine person. I am sure that all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle wish Lew happiness and good health in all the years to come.

MR. AGNEW IS UPHELD BY ONE WHO KNOWS

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, when Vice President AGNEW recently pointed out that some news coverage might not be entirely fair or objective, he was severely criticized by many members of the news media.

However, now that a noted TV newscaster has iterated the Vice President's charges, it will be more difficult to dismiss them. I refer to the recent TV Guide interview of Howard K. Smith, in which he says:

Our liberal friends today have become dogmatic. . . . They have a set of dogmatic reactions. . . . Be sure you please your fellows because that's what's "good" They're conventional. They're conformists. They're pleasing Walter Lippman, they're pleasing the Washington Post, they're pleasing the editors of the New York Times, and they're pleasing one another.

This charge clearly is not one to be taken lightly, and is one which bears consideration from us all. I insert an editorial from the Chicago Tribune, discussing Mr. Smith's interview, in the RECORD:

[From the Chicago Tribune, March 2, 1970]

MR. AGNEW IS UPHELD BY ONE WHO KNOWS

When Vice President Agnew accused the television networks and certain newspapers of a left-wing bias in their broadcasts and reportage, the targets of his broadside squealed like a pig stuck in a gate. Now Mr. Agnew has received support from one of the most improbable and most authoritative sources.

Howard K. Smith, Washington-based anchor man for the American Broadcasting company's news department, asserts in an interview with TV Guide that most reporters, for television and the other news media, have a "strong leftward bias."

Mr. Smith may be viewed by his liberal colleagues as an intellectual traitor, but the supreme insult in their demonology—"right wing radical"—would sound pretty silly as a label for him. Altho he is a hawk on Viet Nam, he describes himself as a left-of-center liberal. Not long ago he was considered left of liberal.

In 1962, for instance, he put Alger Hiss, an ex-convict who had served a prison term for perjury involving espionage for the Soviet Union, on a television program titled, more hopefully than prophetically, "The Political Obituary of Richard M. Nixon." Hiss, a former state department official, was permitted to denounce Nixon, who had spearheaded a congressional investigation that resulted in Hiss' undoing. Earlier, a book written by Smith, titled "The State of Europe," was praised by the communist Daily Worker.

Thus Smith knows his way around in the fever swamps of liberalism. Mercilessly, he blows the whistle on his liberal colleagues of both press and television. "Our liberal friends today have become dogmatic," he says. "They have a set of dogmatic reactions. . . . Be sure you please your fellows, because that's what's 'good.' They're conventional. They're conformists. They're pleasing Walter Lippmann, they're pleasing the Washington Post, they're pleasing the editors of the New York Times, and they're pleasing one another."

In short, they're knee-jerk liberals.

Smith asserts that President Johnson was "actually politically assassinated" and that the same liberals now "are trying to assassinate President Nixon politically." He says "they hate President Nixon irrationally."

Any newspaper man who has traveled with Presidential candidates in recent campaigns knows that Smith is right. The liberal reporters were as irrational in their hatred of Nixon in the 1960 and 1968 campaigns and in their contempt for Barry Goldwater in the 1964 campaign as they were in their adoration of President Kennedy.

As Smith says, these political activists are "proud of being out of contact with the middle class." He quotes Joseph Kraft as saying in a recent column: "Let's face it, we reporters have very little to do with middle America. They're not our kind of people."

However laughable it may seem, these aspirant Walter Lippmanns consider themselves intellectuals. Actually they are not as stupid as they seem. Just as they discerned with horror, in 1968, that Nixon probably would win, they now perceive, in Kraft's words, a "reactionary tide running in America." If they have very little to do with "middle America," they may soon learn that the American middle class—the great silent majority—has very little to do with them.

THE GATES COMMISSION REPORT ON AN ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMED FORCES—PART II, CHAPTER 5

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, chapter 5 of the Gates Commission report deals with the question of compensation and management of military personnel. It includes recommendations on basic pay for enlisted men and officers.

The text of chapter 5 follows:

CHAPTER 5: COMPENSATION AND MANAGEMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Pay is not the only, and perhaps not even the primary motivating force for joining or remaining in the military services. A sense of duty, a desire for adventure or travel, society's esteem for military service, a desire for training, the quality of military life and the general conditions of military service—all affect individuals' decisions. Some of these non-pecuniary factors are beyond the control of the services. Others, however, can be controlled, and the Commission is recommending a number of changes in military manpower procurement and management practices to improve the non-monetary conditions of military life and thereby help increase the attractiveness of military careers. These steps will contribute to the attainment of an all-volunteer force, but are not sufficient in themselves. Military compensation in the early years of service is now so low that it will not sustain an all-volunteer force of the quality desired. Until that condition is corrected, an all-volunteer force cannot be realized.

Our studies show that the increments in pay, and therefore the incremental budgetary outlays, necessary to provide a voluntary

force in the 1970's of about the same size as our pre-Vietnam force are fairly small; that they are, in fact, only about as great as those that are required to correct the inequities that have developed in the structure of military compensation during the 21 years that the draft has been in effect.

The increase in military compensation that is required to sustain an all-volunteer force of any given size depends upon three factors: (a) the number of accessions that will be needed each year, (b) the number of truly voluntary accessions that are forthcoming at current levels of pay, and (c) the extent to which increases in compensation increase the flow of volunteers. The annual flow of accessions required to maintain the projected all-volunteer forces was discussed in chapter 4. The extent of voluntarism in the present force is summarized in table 5–I. The next to the last line of table 5–I shows that even under the extremely low levels of entry pay that prevailed in the pre-Vietnam period, the vast majority of those in the then current active duty forces were true volunteers (2.1 of the 2.6 million or about 77 percent of the total force were true volunteers). Indeed, the estimated number of true volunteers even in the Vietnam period (2.1 million) represents a significant fraction of any of the four projected forces the Commission has considered.

The number of volunteers in table 5–I suggests that the forces under study can be attained on a voluntary basis. However, the data also show that unless pay is increased, there will be shortfalls in first-term enlistments, particularly in the Army. For instance, in 1965, true volunteers constituted 76 percent of the total DOD enlisted forces. In the Army, however, only 65 percent of enlisted men were true volunteers.

For a stable force of pre-Vietnam size, the remaining 35 percent of Army enlisted men (either draftees or draft-induced volunteers) could have been replaced by true volunteers, through increasing voluntary enlistments by about 51,000 men per year. Similarly, the entire armed forces in 1965 could have been put on a voluntary basis by adding about 4,000 officer and 84,000 enlisted true volunteers per year. As discussed in chapter 4, smaller forces would actually require even fewer additional true volunteers. With a continuously rising population 17 to 21 years of age, the taks of providing these additional volunteers is not insurmountable.

TABLE 5–I.—NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS ON PRE-VIETNAM AND VIETNAM ACTIVE DUTY

[Thousands]

	All services combined			Army only		
	Total [1]	Officers	Enlisted	Total	Officers	Enlisted
JUNE 30, 1965						
All first-term personnel [2]	1,357	92	1,265	560	31	529
Other personnel	1,286	247	1,040	407	81	326
Total active-duty personnel	2,644	339	2,305	967	112	855
Number of true volunteers in first-term forces [3]	768	54	714	245	18	227
Total number of volunteers [4]	2,054	301	1,754	652	99	553
Percentage of volunteers in the total active-duty forces	77.7	88.7	76.1	67.4	88.0	64.7
JUNE 30, 1967						
All first-term personnel [2]	2,100	126	1,974	1,022	53	968
Other personnel	1,265	259	1,006	418	90	328
Total active-duty personnel	3,365	384	2,981	1,440	144	1,297
Numbers of true volunteers in first-term forces [3]	819	53	766	291	22	269
Total number of volunteers [4]	2,084	312	1,772	710	112	598
Percentage of volunteers in the total active-duty forces	61.9	81.1	59.5	49.3	78.2	46.1

[1] The differences between totals and the sum of the other entries are due to rounding.

[2] First-term personnel have been defined as those serving their initial obligated tour of duty. In the case of officers, they include regular officers in all branches in their first 4 years of service and nonregular officers serving their first 2 years in the Army and Marine Corps, their first 3 years in the Navy, and 4 years in the Air Force. In the case of enlisted men, first-term regular personnel include those in the first 3 years of service in the Army, 3½ years in the Navy, and 4 years in the Marine Corps and Air Force. Nonregular first-term enlisted personnel are those serving in their first 2 years in all branches of the military.

[3] The number of volunteers in the first-term forces was estimated with the aid of attitude surveys conducted by the Department of Defense. In these surveys, taken in 1964 and 1968, first-term personnel were asked whether they would have enlisted in the absence of a draft. The proportion of respondents who answered "yes" and "probably yes" as opposed to "no" and "probably no" who entered in the year of the survey was applied to the first-term force. The data for 1965 have been adjusted with the factors from the 1964 survey, while those for 1967 were adjusted on the basis of the 1968 survey.

[4] This number is the sum of all those beyond their initial service obligation plus the fraction of true volunteers in the first-term forces.

The problem of attracting more officer volunteers is discussed in detail in chapter 6. It is important to note here that the shortfall of officer volunteers is small—especially in view of the discrimination which has prevailed in the treatment of pay for first term officers. Between 1948 and 1965, or between the year the post World War II draft law was first passed and the most recent peacetime year, the average basic pay of officers with two or more years of military service increased 45 percent while that for officers with less than two years of service increased only about 13 percent.

The history of discrimination against first term enlisted men is even more striking. During the 1948 to 1965 period the pay of enlisted personnel with two or more years of service increased about 45 percent compared to 4 percent for those with less than two years of service. During the period 1948–1969 the same comparisons show increases of 111 percent and 60 percent respectively. In other words, the basic pay for enlisted recruits increased little more than half as much as that for those with two or more years of service.

Comparisons with civilian pay in table 5–II also point to the relatively low levels of entry pay. Columns 4 and 5 of table 5–II show the ratios of regular enlisted and regular officer compensation to the earnings of their respective civilian counterparts. Although; in general, officers fare relatively better than enlisted men, officer compensation in the first two years of service is below that of comparable civilians. Similarly, based on regular compensation, enlisted pay during the first two years of service is less than 60 percent of comparable civilian pay. Comparisons based on total military and civilian compensation (column 5 of table 5–II) also reveal that enlisted entry pay is significantly below that which the average first-term serviceman would have earned in the civilian economy.

THE EFFECTS OF PAY ON RECRUITING AND RETAINING VOLUNTEERS

The data presented in table 5–II suggest the importance of pay as an inducement to enter and remain in the military. For example, the deficits for the officers are smaller than for enlisted personnel. That result is to be expected given that officer entry pay is relatively higher than enlisted entry pay. Voluntary enlisted deficits are highest in the Army. This result too, is to be expected, given that entry level pay is lowest for enlisted personnel and that the non-monetary conditions of service are less attractive in the Army than in the other three military services.

TABLE 5–II.

ENLISTED MEN'S AND COMPARABLE CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROFILES BY LENGTH OF SERVICE [1970 PAY RATES] [1]

Years of service	Regular military compensation [2]	Total military compensation [3]	Total civilian compensation [4]	Regular military compensation as a percent of total civilian compensation	Total military compensation as a percent of total civilian compensation
1	$2,776	$3,251	$5,202	53.4	62.5
2	3,357	3,935	5,803	57.8	67.8
3	4,496	5,725	6,370	70.6	82.8
4	4,909	6,249	6,908	72.2	90.5
5	5,783	8,516	7,409	78.1	114.9
6	6,172	8,151	7,876	78.4	103.5
7	6,636	8,741	8,306	79.9	105.2
8	6,845	9,125	8,691	78.8	105.0
9–10	7,242	9,505	9,065	79.9	104.9
11–12	7,715	9,825	9,327	82.7	105.3
13–16	8,290	10,643	9,956	83.3	106.9
17–20	8,964	11,611	10,928	87.0	112.8
21 plus	10,483	14,047	10,723	97.8	131.0

Footnotes at end of speech.

TABLE 5-II—Continued

OFFICERS AND COMPARABLE CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROFILES BY LENGTH OF SERVICE [1970 PAY RATES][1]

Years of service	Regular military compensation [2]	Total military compensation [3]	Total civilian compensation [4]	Regular military compensation as a percent of total civilian compensation	Total military compensation as a percent of total civilian compensation
1	$7,337	$8,422	$8,558	85.7	98.4
2	7,568	8,740	9,291	81.5	94.1
3	9,145	10,732	9,957	91.8	107.8
4	10,906	12,874	10,556	103.3	122.0
5	11,963	14,486	11,089	107.9	130.6
6	12,277	15,050	11,555	106.2	130.2
7	12,779	15,880	12,021	106.3	132.1
8	$12,856	$16,214	$12,488	103.0	129.8
9-10	13,245	16,759	13,243	100.0	126.5
11-12	14,058	18,144	14,689	95.7	123.5
13-16	14,986	19,545	15,844	94.6	123.4
17-20	16,159	21,290	16,470	98.1	129.3
21 plus	19,142	26,771	17,765	107.8	150.7

[1] See app. B below for a discussion of the degree of comparability between the military and the civilian compensation figures recorded in this table.

[2] Regular military compensation is the sum of basic pay, basic allowances for subsistence and quarters, and tax advantage. The 2 allowances are provided either in cash or in kind. In either case they are nontaxable. The tax advantage is an estimate of the taxes saved by the military personnel but paid by a comparable civilian in order to have the same net compensation. The basic pay rations are those expected to be in effect in late 1970, which are assumed to be 8 percent above those prevailing in July of 1969.

[3] Total military compensation includes, in addition to the regular compensation, the other current cash pays such as bonuses, incentive pay, and specialty pays (except hostile fire pay), as well as the estimated value of future retired pay. It also includes an estimate of the value of such fringe benefits as full medical services for the individual and his family and commissary and post exchange privileges.

[4] The total civilian compensation figures recorded in col. (3) are derived from the wages and salaries reported by the Census Bureau's current population survey for 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966. These earnings were converted to 1966 dollars, were smoothed somewhat to reduce sampling error, and were adjusted by a factor of 1.226 to take account of the pay raises between 1966 and 1970. In addition, the reported earnings were raised by 8.6 percent to take account of the employer's contributions to such fringe benefits as are included in the total military compensation figures. The 8.6 percent figure is based on the 1967 Civilian Fringe Benefit data reported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The civilian compensation figures that are being compared with the compensation figures for enlisted personnel are those for white high-school graduates aged 19, 20, 21, and so on, while the figures used for the officer comparison are those for white college graduates, 16 years of education or more, aged 23, 24, 25, and so on. It is assumed here that the average enlisted man enters military service at age 19 and the average officer begins his career at age 23

[5] Total military compensation is higher in year 5 than in the subsequent 2 years of service because it includes the regular reenlistment bonus that is given in lump sum form at the point of reenlistment.

In addition to this indirect evidence, we have used several methods to estimate directly the effect of increases in first and second term pay on voluntary enlistments and reenlistments. Based on these studies, and on the observed impact on retention of proficiency pay and the variable re-enlistment bonus, we estimate that a 10 percent increase in the current value of first-term regular military compensation will result in an increase of about 12.5 percent in the voluntary enlistment rate from the 17 to 21 year old civilian population. In the case of the Army, a 40 percent pay raise would increase the voluntary enlistment rate from about 1.388 to about 2.079 per 100 men in the 17 to 21 age cohort. The same percentage increase in officer compensation will induce a roughly comparable rise in the voluntary enlistment rate from the college population.

The Commission's compensation recommendations are designed both to eliminate past inequities and to assure the services a flow of enlistments of the quantity and quality that will be required to maintain a base force of about 2.5 million men and women. Smaller forces could be maintained with smaller increments in pay, while larger forces would require a larger increase in pay.

The Commission has made two kinds of pay recommendations, those requiring implementation prior to or concomitant with the transition to an all-volunteer force, and those equally necessary for reasons of equity and efficiency, but not essential to the achievement of an all-volunteer force. In the former category are increased basic pay, the extension of skill differentials to the first-term population, and an increase in hostile fire pay. In the latter category are the development of a military salary system comparable to that in the civilian sector, including the substitution of cash for some benefits that are now provided in-kind, and the modification of the present retirement system, including the introduction of vesting.

Basic pay

The recommended increases in basic pay are designed to provide the Army with the quantity and quality of volunteers required for an overall force level of approximately 2.5 million men. The evidence is overwhelming that, if compensation is set at levels which satisfy Army requirements, the other services will be able to attract enough qualified volunteers to meet their respective requirements.

The Commission urges that its recommendations be enacted with a minimum of delay and recommends an effective date of July 1, 1970. Since there is a good chance that civil service and military pay will also increase during fiscal 1971, we have assumed a basic pay increase of 8 percent on July 1, 1970 for all military personnel. The pay rates in table 5–III reflect a combination of that across-the-board increase with the recommended pay raises designed to achieve an all-volunteer force of 2.5 million men. The latter increase raises the current value of enlisted basic pay during the first-term of service by about 50 percent. The recommended increase for those in their second term of service is about 9 percent. Officers in their first 3 years of service receive a 28 percent basic pay raise.

Table 5–III shows that these recommended increases merely "straighten" the regular military compensation line; they give individuals in their initial years of service about the same pay relative to civilian compensation as the career force receives. These pay raises for first-term personnel are justified on equity grounds alone.

This recommended pay increase will add $2.69 billion to the budget in fiscal year 1971, but this added outlay will be smaller in future years if forces decline to the 2.5 million man level and, also, as a result of the further manpower reduction produced by lower turnover in the all-volunteer force which will decrease the force strengths required to provide a given level of defense capability (see chapter 4). Since military pay is either high or low only in relation to civilian earnings, annual adjustments in military pay will be necessary to ensure that they remain competitive.

TABLE 5–III.—RECOMMENDED PAY PROFILES FOR ENLISTED PERSONNEL FOR JULY 1, 1970

Years of service	Regular military compensation [1]	Total military compensation [2]	Regular military compensation as a percent of Total civilian compensation [3]	Total military compensation as a percent of Total civilian compensation
1	$4,498	$5,041	86.5	96.9
2	4,917	5,631	84.7	97.0
3	5,311	6,237	83.4	97.9
4	5,735	7,195	83.0	104.2
5	6,143	[4] 9,131	82.9	123.2
6	6,530	8,597	82.9	109.2
7	6,880	9,055	82.8	109.0
8	7,203	9,582	82.9	110.3
9-10	7,510	9,838	82.8	108.5
11-12	7,721	9,745	82.8	104.5
13-16	8,296	10,550	83.3	106.0
17-20	8,969	11,616	87.1	112.8
21 plus	10,489	14,053	97.8	131.1

RECOMMENDED PAY PROFILES FOR OFFICERS FOR JULY 1, 1970

1	$8,868	$9,952	103.6	116.3
2	9,635	10,808	103.7	116.3
3	10,315	11,902	103.6	119.5
4	10,923	12,885	103.5	122.1
5	11,999	14,520	108.2	130.9
6	12,313	15,077	106.6	130.5
7	12,810	15,897	106.6	132.2
8	12,890	16,243	103.2	130.1
9-10	13,271	16,756	100.2	126.5
11-12	14,080	18,128	95.6	123.4
13-16	15,008	19,534	94.7	123.3
17-20	16,192	21,293	98.3	129.3
21 plus	19,168	26,757	107.9	150.6

[1], [2], and [3]: See footnotes [2], [3], and [4] respectively of table 5–II for the definitions of regular military compensation, total military compensation, and total civilian compensation.

[4] See footnote [5] of table 5–II.

The pay recommendation incorporated in table 5–III is intended to apply to the 2.0, 2.25, and 2.5 million forces, but they are actually in excess of those required for either the 2 or 2.25 million man forces. Indeed, the figures in table 5–I suggest that no pay increase is required to provide an all-volunteer force of 2 million men and that a relatively small increase over current levels is required to induce the additional volunteers necessary for a 2.25 million man force. The Commission recommends this pay raise for all three of the above named forces on equity grounds alone. The 3.0 million man all-volunteer force will require a pay increase above that shown in table 5–III. The extra increase required for the 3 million man force would add $2.21 billion more to the budget in the years 1977–1979.

Skill differentials

The basic pay recommendations in table 5–III are designed to cover the majority of the enlisted force. However, the armed forces must attract some persons with special skills or unusual aptitudes. The military services have the authority to offer higher pay to such individuals by offering higher grades when they enter service or by increasing the speed of promotion. To some extent both of these practices are being followed by the services. These practices should be broadened and formalized, to make military careers more attractive to high quality personnel.

To ensure further the maintenance of the quality of military personnel, proficiency pay should be made available to those in critical occupations after the satisfactory completion of advanced training. Currently, proficiency pay is available only to those in the career force. These recommendations

should enable the services to satisfy their needs for exceptional personnel. It is estimated that an additional $214 million per year will be required to cover the expenditures for this purpose.

Hostile fire pay

Military service demands a high degree of personal commitment and exposes most servicemen to risks and hardships that are generally greater than those found in the civilian economy. Beyond that, a small fraction of the military force is sometimes required to serve under conditions of risk to life and limb that are not only greater than those faced by most service personnel, but exceptionally high even among those serving in a combat zone.

As a matter of equity as well as to provide compensation flexibility in conflict situations, the Commission recommends that a new and higher maximum level of hostile fire pay of $200 per month be enacted. Eligibility for this maximum level of hazardous duty pay should be restricted to those who in the course of their duties are regularly exposed to hostile fire and only for the period of such exposure. The current levels of hazardous duty pay should be provided to others in the combat zone who take higher than normal risks but are not regularly exposed to hostile fire.

Since the specific number of individuals who will serve under such extreme hazardous conditions is likely to be small, we have not estimated the budgetary implications of this proposal.

Development of a military salary system of pay

Military pay today is a conglomeration of current and future pay and benefits that are difficult to enumerate and even more difficult to measure and evaluate. Military pay lacks visibility. It functions as a continuous source of controversy. It is inequitable. It is inefficient in attracting and retaining desired personnel.

All of these deficiencies, and especially the last two, result from the different ways of paying individuals performing the same task, and from the large proportion of pay that is provided either in-kind or as retirement income. This in-kind and deferred compensation has little value for a new recruit or a first-term serviceman trying to decide whether to re-enlist.

Recognizing these defects, a Department of Defense study group recommended the introduction of a "salary" system of pay in which allowances for quarters and subsistence would have been combined with basic pay to provide a "salary." The Commission supports this recommendation.

Retirement vesting

Because military retirement benefits are budgeted each year out of current funds, servicemen have never acquired vested retirement rights except those which arise after one has served long enough (19½ years) to be eligible to retire. This policy has a number of undesirable effects.

First, because retired pay is deferred it has little value for an individual in his early years of service, even if he is seriously considering a military career. It is worth nothing to the serviceman who does not plan to make the military a career. Yet, the armed forces need both non-career and career personnel.

Retirement benefits have the additional disadvantage of being worth too much to the individual who is beyond his tenth or eleventh year of service. He cannot afford to separate from the service because of the benefits for which he will qualify after another 9 or 10 years. Because of this potential loss, the military rarely discharges individuals who have served more than say, 10 years.

Also, the substantial retirement income available after 20 years of service (when some enlisted men are only 37 years old) induces many individuals to retire as soon as they are eligible. The combination of retirement income and civilian earnings is very attractive. Men who retire early are often those with superior civilian earning opportunities and they are precisely the individuals the services would like to retain longer. The Department of Defense group organized to study compensation recognized the shortcomings of the present retirement system. They recommended: increasing military pay sufficiently to enable military personnel to contribute 6½ percent of their salaries annually to their retirement account without any loss in net income, the introduction of partial vesting after 5 years of service, and a reduction in the retirement income available in the years prior to the normal retirement age. The recommendations incorporated provisions to ensure that those who entered the services under the old retirement system would suffer no loss.

The Commission supports these recommendations regarding retirement benefits. The Commission also believes that it would be equitable and desirable to give officers and enlisted men the same vested retirement rights as civil service employees currently have.

Compensation-in-kind and fringe benefits

Many recommendations have been made for increasing military compensation-in-kind including improved housing, educational programs, dental care for dependents, etc. The quality of military life needs to be improved generally, and such programs would surely contribute to that end.

Nevertheless, we have decided against recommeding general increases in such benefits or in income-in-kind items of pay. We have done so because the military pay package already has a substantially larger proportion of such items than is found in the civilian sector of the economy and because we believe that general increases in non-cash pay would be an inefficient means of compensating military personnel.

Funds that are used to construct and maintain housing can also be used to increase basic pay, and funds to sponsor educational programs can be used to provide dental care for dependents. Thus, the question is not whether such benefits are desirable, but whether they are the most effective form of compensation. Providing compensation in cash has an inherent advantage in that context—it allows each individual to decide how he or she will use whatever he earns. He can thus get the full value of whatever costs are incurred by the government in paying him. When he is compensated in non-cash form, however, the value of what he receives is often less to him than its cost to the government. Meanwhile, he is encouraged to consume more of particular goods or services than he otherwise would. Non-cash pay also tends to result in inefficient patterns of compensation by favoring some individuals (heavy users of these items) over others, independent of performance. For example, most military non-cash pay is of little value to young men and women. Therefore it is not very effective in helping to attract and retain new personnel. Finally, as was learned in the Defense Department study, the effect of non-cash remuneration on enlistments and retentions is attenuated because such compensation is not very visible. While compensation-in-kind is sometimes justifiable for tax reasons in the civilian economy, that reason does not apply to military compensation since the government is both payer of the cash compensation and recipient of whatever taxes are collected.

However, special circumstances in the military often warrant pay-in-kind. At remote bases, housing and other services often would not be available unless provided under military auspices, and in many instances, military personnel are required to live on base. Under such circumstances accommodations and services should be made attractive and efficient so as to enhance the conditions of military life.

MANAGEMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

The Commission believes that in addition to the recommendations above there are several opportunities available to increase voluntarism, particularly among higher quality personnel, by improving the conditions of military service and the quality of military life.

Terms of enlistment

One of the conditions of military service that distinguishes it from civilian employment is the practice of requiring enlisted personnel to obligate themselves for specific limited terms of service. An enlisted man is required periodically to declare his intentions to remain in the military, and he is permitted to resign only when he reaches such a decision point. We believe that this policy is not necessary, and that it adversely affects the attractiveness of military service. We recommend elimination of the present system of obligated terms of service so that enlisted personnel would be recruited and retained on the same basis as commissioned officers. Within the limits prescribed below, this means that enlisted men would generally be granted discharges upon request.

The right of enlisted men to a discharge should be limited in the following ways:

(a) The Defense Department should have the authority to deny such discharges in an emergency, just as it does with officers.

(b) Enlisted men should be obligated to fulfill terms of service commensurate with the cost of the training they receive. This should apply not only to new recruits, but also to those receiving advanced training. The Defense Department should undertake a study to determine the length of obligated service to be required for various training programs. Such a study would specify a minimum term of service for new recruits. We do not contemplate that it would be reasonable to require terms of service of less than approximately two years for recruits.

(c) The Defense Department should have the right to deny discharges to enlisted personnel who have received orders for overseas duty or sea duty.

If the Defense Department adopts this policy as to obligated terms of service, the services should simultaneously establish procedures for periodic reviews designed to identify and separate servicemen who are not performing satisfactorily.

Though this change may appear dramatic, the abandonment of the present system of fixed enlistment terms should not create serious problems for the military. Such a system has not harmed the officer corps. The increased freedom of choice should make military service more attractive and enhance the dignity of an enlisted career.

Choice of military occupation

The Commission recommends an expansion of the current program whereby enlistees are permitted to specify their choice of occupation as a condition of enlistment. Such a policy should increase the efficiency of manpower utilization within the military and, also, by reducing the uncertainty of military life, increase the attractiveness of a military career.

The Commission believes that expansion of the existing program will not weaken the services' ability to fulfill their mission, even though it may increase somewhat the cost of managing the recruitment facilities. The services do not appear to have experienced any ill effects from their present policy of giving individuals a choice of their service branch and, to a large extent, their occupational field.

Lateral hiring

Many of the functions performed in a modern military organization have parallels in the civilian economy, for example, construction, supply and logistics, personnel management, equipment and facilities maintenance, research and development, and medical service. With minor exceptions the officers and the enlisted personnel who staff these functions in the military are products of the military personnel system. They enter the service as untrained recruits, take basic and advanced formal or on-the-job training, and acquire the experience necessary to function effectively while on a military assignment. The similarity between military and civilian functions, however, suggests that military positions might in many instances be filled by already skilled individuals who transfer from the civilian economy.

Lateral hiring—the hiring of skilled personnel into the armed services at pay grades commensurate with their training and experience—offers the services an opportunity to enlarge the manpower pool from which they draw. In the past they have resorted to lateral hiring to procure personnel with special skills. During World War II the practice was used extensively, not only for enlisted personnel but also for officers. Also, the military has consistently permitted doctors, dentists and lawyers to enter the services at officer ranks above the usual entry level.

Currently, the largest enlisted lateral hiring program is the Navy's "Direct Petty Officer Procurement Program" which has been used since 1965 to man Naval construction battalions. Under this revival of the World War II Seabee program over 5,000 civilian construction workers have been hired into pay grades E4 through E7 with a service obligation of two and one-half years. The program is apparently a success. Draft pressure, higher pay and the shorter service obligation (two and one-half rather than the normal four years) have allowed the Navy to be highly selective.

The Army has used lateral hiring to recruit medical and dental technicians at entry pay grades of E4 and E5. Each lateral enlistee receives about 16 weeks of basic and advanced training. The Army also plans to introduce a program for selected engineer occupational fields which are significantly undermanned.

These examples, however, are the exception rather than the rule. On balance, the services have used lateral hiring sparingly. At worst they have limited the payment of re-enlistment bonuses to those who re-enlist within six months of discharge so that a qualified trained veteran who has been out longer is offered no special incentive to return.

There are, of course, inherent limits to lateral entry. Not all military occupations have civilian counterparts, and even where such counterparts exist it may be less costly for the military to provide the training and experience. Notwithstanding the limiting considerations, the military are sacrificing an important opportunity by severely restricting the use of lateral entry. Moreover, lateral entry would help dissolve the barrier which some feel separates the military from civilian society.

Entitlements

At present, enlisted men who are not E4's with four or more years of service are not entitled to dislocation allowance and reimbursement of family travel expense when they are ordered to a new duty station. This discrimination imposes an unnecessary hardship on first-term servicemen. The Commission recommends that entitlement to reimbursement of family travel expense and dislocation allowance be extended to all enlisted personnel.

"PROGRESS" FOULS MONTANA SKY WITH SMELL AND SMOKE

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the problem of pollution is perhaps the greatest question confronting our Nation today. I believe it is important to realize that the problem is not confined to the metropolises of Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and other large urban areas but everywhere—even in the less populated and rural areas of western Montana.

There are certain annoyances which industrial progress always brings to an area but in the past these have been overlooked for the more obvious short-term advantages. This is no longer the case. The cost of progress can no longer be paid by the price of a pollution level which fouls the air we breathe and the water we drink.

I would like to take this opportunity to submit for the RECORD the following article by Haynes Johnson which appeared in the Washington Post concerning air pollution in Missoula, Mont., and the concern of local citizens for a clean environment.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 14, 1970]

"PROGRESS" FOULS MONTANA SKY, WITH SMELL AND SMOKE

(By Haynes Johnson)

MISSOULA, MONT.—When the first demonstrations against air pollution in the Missoula Valley took place in the spring of 1968, Marilyn Templeton and Nancy Fritz did not participate. They were, as they said, too conventional; they were housewives and "good Republicans," not activists.

Today they head an organization that is taking an increasingly militant stance as it attempts to do something about pollution here in this valley tucked away in the Rockies.

"Now I can understand and sympathize with those students who take over administration buildings," said Mrs. Templeton after reciting her efforts in dealing with a host of state and local agencies from the governor's office down.

Mrs. Fritz adds:

"Some of our members tell us they'll come back to our group when we're ready to lie down in front of the trucks and stop production at the paper mill. And they're right. We know they're right."

They were underscoring a fact of life in Missoula, Montana. In a short period Missoula has turned from apathy to action—and anger—over its pollution problems. Missoula has not solved those problems, but it does provide evidence of how swiftly pollution has caught on as an emotional issue in the small out-of-the-way towns of America as well as the large mainstream ones.

"You can't be a politician in Missoula and say the companies are right and get elected," says Sam Reynolds, editor of the editorial page of The Missoulian, the local paper that is conducting a vigorous campaign against pulp mills that are filling the narrow valley with smoke.

Last month Reynold's paper greeted the news of another plant planning to locate in the valley in the new fashion.

"So Missoula is going to get a $2 million chemical plant," it said. "One cheer. The old days of reflexive rah-rah over every bit of industrial expansion are gone forever. More and more economists and industrialists, not to mention environmentalists and the general public, are thinking that an ever-growing economy isn't all that it's cracked up to be. Other values now come first.

". . . If the plant does increase pollution, then nuts to it. It should NOT be built. Pollution abatement is the salient value in this valley, as every local politician knows. And any politician at the state level who fails to recognize that fact does so at peril of losing lots of votes."

In a sense, Missoula is a microcosm of the nation. It is no sleepy backwoods town, but a university community, the site of the University of Montana, and a city that has grown and prospered over the years. Its citizens are proud of their area, and the beauty of their natural surroundings. They live within a few minutes drive of some of the finest trout fishing in the country, and of excellent skiing. Glacier National Park and Yellowstone are within easy reach.

And they are typical of citizens in another important sense: until recently, they have accepted without question the traditional American concept of industrialization as being synonymous with progress. They never questioned industry's good faith, or its willingness to live up to its promises voluntarily.

When the Hoerner Waldorf Corp. opened a paper and pulp mill in 1957, the people of Missoula took for granted that the plant design would, as promised, provide for the "virtual elimination of undesirable water and air pollution."

The plant, which makes linerboard and bleached kraft pulp to serve a number of packaging needs throughout America—everything from boxes for suits to the lining around refrigerators—enjoyed economic success. From a $7 million operation with 78 employes in 1957 it grew to a $30 million investment and 438 employes in 1968. Production has increased four-fold in that time.

With progress, came problems.

The plume of smoke from the paper mill can be spotted for miles. It fills the valley not only with fumes, but with a foul odor. Company officials liken the smell to that of cabbage cooking on the kitchen stove. Others are less delicate. The odor smells unmistakably like a skunk.

Unpleasant as that is, odor is not the principal problem. Because Missoula, like Los Angeles and Phoenix is in a valley or basin, temperature inversions frequently occur. Warmer air aloft holds down cooler air in the valley along with the smoke, dust, industrial and automotive gases.

LIKE LONDON CRISIS

For a period last December when Missoula lay in the grip of a week-long temperature inversion, the Missoula air pollution control authority recorded atmospheric data that was "startling," according to Dr. Kenneth J. Lampert, the city health officer. Dr. Lampert said the readings were coming close to those recorded when London experienced a major pollution crisis in 1952, when 2,000 Londoners died. Now, Dr. Lampert says, emergency procedures are being considered that would require the shutting down of every pollution source in the valley during such an inversion period.

He also says that hospital admissions for respiratory ailments go up dramatically during the worst air pollution months.

The company maintains its fumes do not create a . . . .

"It's not a medical problem, it's an odor problem, and that's a nuisance and people have a right to expect us to go great lengths to reduce that," say Roy Countryman, vice president and manager of the Hoerner Waldorf plant.

The company is now spending about $2½ million on new anti-pollution equipment, he says, and intends to spend several times that amount before the mill is brought into compliance with Montana's clean air standards.

"I represent a company that has demonstrated—and positively demonstrated—its willingness to go to great lengths to put in the best technology to do the job. Our critics would have you believe we're in terrible shape. We're not. We are in great shape. What's changed since '57 when we came in here is a lot of emotion, and a genuine interest in pollution problems."

COMPANY WAS SUED

Others are not so kind. They say the company took no steps to change until a long campaign that began in Missoula resulted in passage of Montana's first Clean Air Act in 1967. Another sharp prod came when the company was sued in an important case by the Environmental Defense Fund, Inc., a national organization active in the anti-pollution field.

The suit claims the emission of noxious sulfur compounds by the company has degraded the balance of life in the Missoula area, thereby depriving not only citizens of the region of their natural resources, but all citizens of the nation. It seeks a permanent injunction restraining the company from emitting the compounds.

The company says such an injunction could put it out of business. Its promotional material reminds everyone of its economic impact on the area. Annual purchases of over $20 million worth of goods, services and raw materials. Direct or indirect support of hundreds of local businesses. Annual payroll of more than $4 million. Employes paying more than $113,000 a year in income taxes.

In Missoula, that's big money. In the past, just the briefest recitation of such economic power would have been sufficient to still effective critics.

It isn't good enough today.

Rather than ceasing or reducing their efforts, the townspeople have continued their attacks. They point out that, despite its assurances and expenditure of money, the company still hasn't actually installed its anti-pollution devices. Fear is widely voiced that the company intends to follow an old procedure and ask for a "variance" from the state board of health, exempting it from pollution regulations because compliance would work a "hardship."

ACRIMONY INCREASES

While Missoula waits, the atmosphere has become more acrimonious than ever.

"I find the climate within town very destructive," said Daniel Potts, company spokesman. "Before I came there was no question in my mind that I was performing a socially useful task. Here my wife and I encounter another kind of attitude, even from members of church, civic and other community groups.

"Here, you're regarded as part of something that exists only to profit and pollute the environment. There's no question in my mind that we do more than profit and pollute, and there's no question that we make a product essential to society.

"We recognize the community's desire—and we share that desire—to clean up. At the same time, the community's overlooking a lot of problems when it asks you to clean up."

What's happened is clear enough. Anti-pollution has become a cause, one that is attracting a vocal legion. A visit to Missoula leaves the strong conviction that here, at least, this cause represents something more than another instant American allegiance. It seems certain to remain a primary interest, both on the university campus and in the town.

"Our American tradition is that you can do anything you want with what you own," said Mrs. Arlene Dale, a research assistant to Dr. C. C. Gordon, a university botanist who is gaining a national reputation for his studies of the effects of environmental pollution. "My concern is that Missoula is not going to be like that.

VALLEY ON DECLINE

"What we're trying to find out are some basic questions: What is pollution actually doing to the plants and animal population? Those who say no one's died in the Missoula Valley from pollution are completely missing the point. The valley is on the decline. At the rate it's going, it may be 50 years or a hundred years, before it's a dead valley.

"If you want to see an example of what I'm talking about go down to the Anaconda Valley. You'll see what I mean. The smelter operations there before the turn of the century killed it. It's a moonscape, a pock-marked desert. Essentially the same thing is happening to the Missoula Valley. The decline has already set in. We know that.

"There are still people who think we're all alarmists. They think there's nothing to worry about. We have no real evidence. There is no problem. And we disagree very much.

"You know, in the American industrial thinking you have no problem unless you are taken to court. The emissions are not a problem, the dead and dying vegetation is not a problem. It's not a problem until you're taken to court.

"VERY SELFISH REASON"

"This is the kind of community I like to live in—and I intend to stay here and make it better. It's a very selfish reason, you know. There's nothing more basic to human rights than the right to have clean air and clean water. If you don't provide a clean environment for your children, what have you done?

"There's pesticides in the food we eat, and pollution in the air we breathe and water we drink. We've always accepted these as the necessary evils of American technology. We may have used our rivers as sewers and pumped pollution in the air because that used to be the American way—but it's not the way now."

Such militant words are common in Missoula today. There will be more of them in the future.

Missoula citizens now are wrestling with news that two companies plan to build large plants in their valley. One is a formaldehyde plant, the other a particle board plant. No one knows for sure how much chemical vapor will be emitted into the air, but already some figures are creating new alarms.

For Nancy Fritz, whose organization called GASP (Gals Against Smog and Pollution) has taken a leading role in the anti-pollution fight, the latest news adds up to one more frustration.

She still has great faith in the American system, she says, but she confesses to nagging doubts. "It's not working on pollution," she says. "I don't go along with these doomsday theorists, but I'm just about to join them."

ALCATRAZ: NEW HOPE FOR INDIAN PEOPLE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last November 20 marked a milestone in the history of the American Indian people. On that day, a small band of young Indians—mainly from the San Francisco area university community—landed a small boat on deserted Alcatraz Island, thus initiating the now famous "invasion" of that desolate island in San Francisco Bay.

After the immediate impact of the act wore off—the belief that it all was only some wild-eyed public relations trick—the fuller meaning of the occupation continues to gain recognition.

And that fuller meaning stems from the utter failure of our Government to adequately deal with the Indian people. As one of the authors in the excellent study of Indian economic development compiled by the Joint Economic Committee puts it:

> The American Indian population is rural, poor, and essentially outside of the mainstream of the larger society.

A few available statistics present the grim picture. Birth rate 105 percent above the national average; average age of death 20 years below the national standard; infant mortality rates 45 percent above the average; 62 percent of rural Indian families with incomes under $3,000; more than 20 percent of Indian men with less than 5 years schooling—and, at most, only half of all entering Indian students ever finish high school; unemployment rates ranging from 30 percent upward.

The "occupation" of Alcatraz serves as a harmless, yet effective, method of bringing to notice the stark fact that we have completely neglected the Indian peoples' needs.

To date, Government Indian policies have been utterly patronizing, treating the Indian people like children and further alienating them—and, at the same time, destroying their rich culture.

Assimilation of Indians into the "mainstream," cash-payment settlement, and termination of Government jurisdiction over Indians—the entire list of Indian policies have failed miserably. Time after time, it has been the governing society telling the Indian people what Indians must do, and then supervising administration of often misguided policies. Rarely, if ever, have Indians been able to control their own destiny.

On Alcatraz the Indians are doing something positive—by and for themselves. On that barren, unwanted island they have created a living community. Their plans envision establishing a cultural center and educational complex.

In late December, I was joined by 10 other Congressmen in introducing a resolution in the House of Representatives calling for immediate negotiations on use and ownership of Alcatraz between the government and representatives of the Indian community. Now apparently, negotiations are underway and I am hopeful that a reasonable settlement can be reached.

Certainly, recent reports are encouraging.

Last week, representatives of a negotiating committee comprised of members of various Indian groups in the San Francisco region met with the acting Executive Director of the National Council on Indian Opportunity.

A planning proposal drawn up by the

Indian people was presented to the Government, and I hope positive action accepting this proposal will soon be forthcoming from the executive branch.

I have gone over the proposal and I am quite impressed by its soundness and its depth. In many ways the rather brief manuscript exposes the failures of existing Indian policies, and it vividly—and depressingly—reveals the effects that current policies have on the entire life of the American Indian.

Matched against the vast sums spent for ongoing Indian programs, the funds requested by the San Francisco negotiators are miniscule. In terms of potential gains, I feel that returns from allocating money for the Indian proposal will be significant.

Alcatraz can be a landmark for the Indian people—as well as for our whole society. I shall write to President Nixon and to the National Council on Indian Opportunity expressing my support of this proposal, and I urge my colleagues to join me in this venture.

For me, the Alcatraz situation clearly shows the intense need for a complete revamping of Government's relationship with the Indian people. As one means of achieving that objective, I have recently introduced House Resolution 854 which would create a select House committee to study economic and social development of the Indian people, paying particular attention to problems of off-reservation, relocated, and traditional Indians.

At this point I insert the proposal written by the San Francisco Indian group, which has incorporated under the name of "Indians Of All Tribes," into the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to look carefully at this document, and then also to extend their support for these ambitious plans.

The proposal follows:

PLANNING GRANT PROPOSAL TO DEVELOP AN ALL INDIAN UNIVERSITY AND CULTURAL COMPLEX ON INDIAN LAND, ALCATRAZ, FEBRUARY 1970

(Submitted by Indians of All Tribes, Inc.)

INTRODUCTION

Indians of All Tribes greet our brothers and sisters of all races and tongues upon our Earth Mother. We here on Indian Land, Alcatraz, represent many tribes of Indians.

We are still holding the Island of Alcatraz in the true names of Freedom, Justice and Equality, because our brothers and sisters of this earth have lent support to our just cause. We reach out our hands and hearts and send spirit messages to all Indians.

Our anger at the many injustices forced upon us since the first whitemen landed on these sacred shores has been transformed into a hope that we be allowed the long-suppressed right of all men to plan and to live their own lives in harmony and cooperation with all fellow creatures and with nature. We have learned that violence breeds only more violence and we therefore have carried on our occupation of Alcatraz in a peaceful manner, hoping that the government will act accordingly.

Be it known, however, that we are quite serious in our demand to be given ownership of this island in the name of Indians of All Tribes. We are here to stay, men, women, and children. We feel that this request is but little to ask from a government which has systematically stolen our lands, destroyed a once-beautiful landscape, killed off the creatures of nature, polluted air and water, ripped open the very bowels of our earth in senseless greed, and instituted a program to annihilate the many Indian Tribes of this land by theft, suppression, prejudice, termination and so called re-location and assimilation.

We are a proud people! We are Indians! We have observed and rejected much of what so-called civilization offers. We are Indians! We will preserve our traditions and ways of life by educating our own children. We are Indians! We will join hands in a unity never before put into practice. Our Earth Mother awaits our voices. We are Indians of All Tribes!!!

WHAT ALCATRAZ IS ABOUT

We came to Alcatraz because we were sick and tired of being pushed around, exploited, and degraded every where we turned in our own country. We selected Alcatraz for many reasons but most importantly, we came to Alcatraz because it is a place of our own. Somewhere that is geographically unfeasible for everybody to come and interfere with what we would like to do with our lives. We can beat our drums all night long if we want to and not be bothered or harassed by non-Indians and police. We can worship, we can sing, and we can make plans for our lives and the future of our Indian people and Alcatraz.

After we landed on Alcatraz, we got a lot of attention and publicity. Support came in from the local areas and the nation, and even world wide. People wanted to give us benefits, have us speak at schools, be in programs on television and radio, and even have movie premieres on the island. We were flooded with everything and everybody, from opportunists and vultures to sincere and dedicated people. Somehow, we survived all the glory and confusion even though we have never been the victims of attention before and the symbol of the American Indian shined out before the nation and the whole world.

Indians of All Tribes united on the Alcatraz issue and for the first time in the Bay Area, Indian organizations representing over 40,000 Indian people, united and formed the Bay Area Native American Council in order to push the government to deal with Alcatraz as the priority issue.

The Bay Area Native American Council is a support group for Alcatraz. They do not speak for Indians on Alcatraz, although we consult with them, and support them in their work to help Indians in the Bay Area.

Our work on Alcatraz is different from BANAC. We are maintaining the Island during the occupation, as a way of promoting the general welfare of all Indian people, which means that our occupation is not strictly Alcatraz but rather for all Indian people. We hope to concern and involve ourselves with national Indian problems as well as planning and building our own Indian University and Cultural Center.

We on Alcatraz formed a non-profit corporation called Indians of All Tribes, Inc. We represent who we are, and we are Indians of All Tribes.

We don't speak for Indians all over the country. The Indians all over the country speak for themselves.

When Indian people come to see what Alcatraz is all about and to see what they can do for the Alcatraz movement, then they speak for themselves. We have a radio station that broadcasts live from the Island where they speak about their reservations and it draws attention to their particular problems. We have a newsletter as well. Anyone is welcome to write what they have to say.

Before we took Alcatraz, people in San Francisco didn't even know that Indians were alive, and if that's a sample of what the local people knew, considering that this is the main relocation point for Indians through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, then there are people across the nation who never even knew that Indians were alive or ever even knew our problems. They never knew anything about our suicide rate that is ten times the national average, or our education level that is to the fifth grade. Alcatraz focused on the Indian people. Now the Indian people have a chance for the first time to say what they have to say and to make decisions about themselves, which has never happened before.

The decision we want to make is in governing ourselves and our own people, without interference from non-Indians. Naturally we don't have all the tools that we need in order to make decisions on the engineering or structural engineering on Alcatraz or the planning of the Island, so we would need non-Indian advice as well. We need everyone's advice who has something to contribute.

Our main concern is with Indian people everywhere. One of the reasons we took Alcatraz was because the students were having problems in the universities and colleges they were attending. This was the first time that Indian people had ever had the chance to get into a university or college because relocation was all vocation oriented and it was not until 1968 and 1969 that Indians started getting into the universities and colleges. So, when this happened, we all realized that we didn't want to go through the university machinery coming out white-orientated like the few Indian people before us, or like the non-Indian people who were running our government, our Indian government, or our Indian affairs. We didn't want to alienate ourselves from the non-Indian people because we were learning from everyone else as well, but we also wished to retain our own identity, with the whole conglomeration of everybody. We didn't want to melt with the melting pot, which was the object of federal relocation programs. We wanted to remain Indians. That's why native American studies became a prime issue, and when we had a big confrontation with the administration, we could see that we weren't going to fool ourselves about the university; we could see that we could never get everything through it. They would make small concessions, but still didn't give us what we needed. It was just a token of what we actually wanted and we didn't want to be used like that.

This was one of the reasons why we wanted our own Indian university, so that they would stop whitewashing Indians, which was happening, not only on the university level, but in the Indian boarding schools and summer home programs for Indians and just everything that the government had to do with Indians.

We were also concerned about our own lives and our children and what was happening on the reservations as well, because while we were physically away, we still had our families and people in our hearts and on our minds, the problems that they were facing, and the frustration of not being able to help them because we were trying to get the necessary tools so we could return to our reservations some day. In the meantime, there were all types of road blocks. We needed attention brought to our people, and we needed a place to get together in the city so that we didn't become victims of assimilation. It finally all came to a point and we decided we would just go liberate our own land since all of our other lands had been taken away and the cities were so crowded and we had no where to go together for Indian dances or pow-wows or anything, or even to have our own religious ceremonies. We'd get arrested if we practiced our own religion and had peyote in our home. In 1964 a Sioux landing party had taken Alcatraz which was federal surplus land that, according to the Sioux treaty, should revert back to the Indians after use. The Sioux wanted the government to live up to their treaty and they landed on Alcatraz and staked their claim. They were rejected and turned away, so we followed it through, when all

of the proposals came out from Hunt, Treshman and other millionaires.

What we want to do in the long range view is to get some type of help for our people all across the nation. We must look at the problem back on the reservation, where it all begins, with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. There's going to have to be some changes made within our own government structure. We often thought of ourselves as a sovereign nation within a nation, but through the years, this has fallen apart, because the state has beaten us on jurisdiction rights on different reservations, and the termination of the Indian people is close in sight. We all can see those things that are coming on and we want to avoid having our life taken away from us. What few lands we do have left on the reservations, we want to keep. We have no government for our own people and we live under what is really a colonial system because we do not select the people who govern us, like the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who is appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, who is appointed by the President, and the Superintendent on every reservation, who is appointed by the Commissioner. We must somehow make up our own plan of government for ourselves and for our people, rather than have someone else decide or plan what is ahead for us. We must make up those plans and decisions for ourselves.

Alcatraz is a beginning, because we are doing that on Alcatraz now. We are making up our own plans.

We want to have our own Indian university because we need to develop things from our own culture that are being lost, like our own language. It is hard for us to go to the universities and have them tell us that we must learn a foreign language, when we know that English is the foreign language and we have some native speakers of our own tribal languages. The tribal languages will eventually die out, and we don't want to see it happen. So we need an area of tribal languages, where we could pass these things on to our children.

We need legal study too. We live under Federal law and the state has partial jurisdiction as well, and local city laws apply to us when we are off the reservation in the nearby towns. We never know what laws they're going to apply on us next, because they manipulate the laws and do whatever they feel they need to do with us. We've got to understand those laws and the mentality behind them to help us deal with them. We've got to go back to the reservation and start fighting for our people back there. The fighting isn't new, but we need the "tools" to fight. Many Indian men are in prisons now and a few years from now, there will be even more there. The percentage is very high, and it's wiping out our race. It's wiping out our race because Indian men are in prisons, or else they have no jobs and they become alcoholics or else they just kill themselves. It's not only the men, but the Indian women as well. Our suicide rate is high because of the conditions that we're living under and the dictatorship that exists.

We'd like to change laws, which are not made for us. Even the Constitution of the United States, which says that all men are created equal, was made for white men at the time it was written, and didn't include any "3rd world" people. The Constitution has not included us, as history will bear out. It's hard for us to look around and see all the destruction that has happened to our country and feel good about it. Every day that we go over on the boat, we can see all that garbage and junk that's in the water, and it makes us sad. The air that is being polluted around us covers the sun and the sun is our giver of life and without the sun, there will be no life on this earth. Part of us is being taken away by this destruction of nature. If you destroy everything around us, then you are destroying us. Maybe other people who are living in this country will have more respect and pride for the home that they are living in if we bring this to their attention.

We want to establish a center on ecology, as part of our cultural complex. The cultural complex also involves the tradition of our religion. The base of anything we do is our religion. We must have a place for our spiritual leaders and our medicine men to come. We also plan to have our own library and archives to help us document the wrongs which have been done in this country and the wisdom that has been lost. Also, we plan to have a place where we can practice our dances and songs and music and drums, where we can teach our children and not let this die, as it's dying on the reservation today.

Our parents were forbidden to speak their own language, or dance their own dances, and they were pushed into government boarding schools that were trying to teach them how to be "civilized," which meant losing their own identity. We have been forced to fit into a pattern which had been thought out a long time ago, not by us, but by the government that was over us. When there's no employment on the reservation, the only jobs that you would get were with the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the government and in this way, they can continue to indoctrinate the Indian people on the reservation by holding money in front of their faces. Because the non-Indians live in another world where they have cars and clothes and food to eat, they can always use that as a lure to get our people to want the same things and by doing this, then they can brainwash our people the way they want them to be so that they would eventually work against their own Indian people. This is what has been happening when the Bureau of Indian Affairs set up the mock tribal governments on reservations. Since the Civil Rights law has passed, it hasn't affected the Indian that much because they've only taken down the signs that say "No Dogs and Indians Allowed." The feeling is still there.

We feel that the Island is the only bargaining power that we have with the Federal government. It is the only way we have to get them to notice us or even want to deal with us. We are going to maintain our occupation, until the Island which is rightfully ours is formally granted to us. Otherwise, they will forget us, the way they always have, but we will not be forgotten.

Alcatraz isn't any different from the reservations or the ghettos that we were living in. Sure, we don't have that much water, but there are reservations that don't have any water, and their water has to be brought over as well. But, now that we are here, we would like to try to make our lives on Alcatraz as pleasant as possible, with some of the facilities that other people have ordinarily and wouldn't even think about. Naturally, we'd like to have electricity and heat because of our children.

Running an Island operation for 100 people is like trying to run an entire village. We need a boat which can commute back and forth to the mainland and enable the students who are still in school to keep on with their classes, and enable us to keep in touch with the outside world. We don't want to isolate ourselves entirely. We'll need a water barge too eventually because the last time the government official was here, he said our water barge had only two or three more trips to make and after that, there was no other barge on the west coast. We'll need generators to hook up our electricity on the Island. We need stoves. We need furniture. We need supplies to fix up the Island with as best we can. The Island was in bad shape when we got here. The government really did a lousy job of getting rid of their garbage—they just dumped it over the cliff and all over the Island, so we have to clean that up as well as trying to make our living quarters as best as we can. It's very difficult to do without the necessary equipment and tools.

We need a good pickup or jeep on the mainland to carry garbage and we'd like to have a garbage scow come to the Island because we're not going to dump it in the Bay the way everyone else has. And we need food supplies. Most of the food that we have are C-rations and we need fresh fruits and vegetables, meat and fresh milk and things like this. And, we need medical supplies for our clinic. For our nursery we would like to have things for our children, like a playground set. We don't need everything for them because the things they seem to enjoy the most are the little things, like boxes or pots and pans, just simple things. But, for the children and for the school, we'll need books and paints because our children love to paint, and blackboards, and for our arts and crafts, we could use materials that we can make our Indian outfits out of. We can't hunt any more . . .

The Alcatraz encampment is governed by all the residents. The residents select seven Indian brothers and sisters to serve on the Council, which oversees everything that the Island is doing. It's a big job, and it's hard to do when maybe you've never had that type of experience before, but it's also educational. It's learning the operation and the functions of a whole new government and city. Each Council member has ninety days as their term in office and if the general membership should elect them back, then they will be back there for another ninety days, but it's not the type of situation where people will remain on the Council forever unless their people want them to be there and figure that they could handle the situation.

The present members of the Council are: Al Miller, a student at San Francisco State, is Seminole from Oklahoma. Stella Leach, a nurse, is Sioux, originally from Washington. Judy Scraper is a Shawnee from Oklahoma. Charles Dana, past secretary of the San Francisco American Indian Center, is Choctaw, from Oklahoma. John Trudell, a student, is Sioux, originally from Nebraska. Vernon Conway is a native California Indian. La Nada Means, a student at the University of California, is Bannock from Idaho.

We'll probably have three advisory boards on the national level, a national advisory board composed of Indians to provide advice on general policy, an advisory board of Indian educators, to focus on the university and cultural complex, and an advisory board of lawyers, to focus on our legal problems and plans.

Our people want to start a university for Indians, a cultural center, an Indian bill of rights, and a vocational training and rehabilitation program, which will involve major reforms in the way this country deals with the Indians. These are very big tasks. They require a lot of planning.

We think the planning phase will take a year. It can be broken down into three phases. During the first phase of four months, we will recruit outside volunteers and consultants. We want the best people in the country to help us and other Indians throughout the country plan for the Indians' future. What educational experiences can we develop for our children? What should we do with the Bureau of Indian Affairs? Should Indians have separate laws, which should apply only to us? What about our religion? Dances? Our culture and heritage long suppressed? We want to answer these questions ourselves. We want to meet with our people and decide for ourselves what we should do.

At the end of four months, we want a gathering of all tribes on Alcatraz and have representation from different tribes throughout the U.S. to talk, to review the prelimi-

nary plan which has been developed, to ask questions, to outline the plans for the future. If the tribes should care to stay longer, that would be good too. If Indian people feel like it's much too formal to sit around a table and discuss things and they would rather be in a more relaxed atmosphere, then maybe later on, after the day is over, we can sit around in a very informal type atmosphere and talk about what's happening on the reservation and sing Indian songs and really get the feel of Alcatraz, the people that are there and the people that have come in from different reservations and discuss our long range views as to what types of things we would like to see happen.

The final eight months, after working with our consultants, we will prepare detailed plans for our university, our cultural center, our bill of rights—a beginning, one beginning, of the answer to the question: What Are We To Become? Make no mistake about this. The day is over when non-Indians can answer this question. Now, after Alcatraz, we, and the countless other Indians in this country, will decide our future.

PROGRAM

The Alcatraz Council is the governing body of Indians of All Tribes Incorporated, which consists of seven council members.

The Council will be responsible for coordinating the efforts of three major component groups which are: (a) Service; (b) Planning; and (c) Organizing.

Three Council members will work in Service, three in Planning and one Council member in Organizing. They will receive the same minimal stipends as the people who are working in the major component groups, excluding professional staff personnel. All persons working for Alcatraz will report to the governing Council, who, in return, reports to the people of Alcatraz and their constituency.

A. *Service.* This will involve one hundred (100) Alcatraz residents who will receive minimal stipends for maintaining Island operations. These jobs will involve Indian people and provide service for: (1) Nursery; (2) Pre-school; (3) School; (4) Adult Education; (5) Medical Clinic; (6) Motor Pool; (7) Legal Workshop; (8) General Maintenance; (9) Kitchen; and (10) Security.

B. *Planning.* Planning will be conducted over a one year period and has three phases. Phase I of four months will involve preliminary planning. We will recruit personnel, staff and consultants, including Indian educators; select advisory boards; research and develop major components; collect pertinent data; schedule programming for Indian workshop; and produce a preliminary budget for the uses of Alcatraz. Phase II of one week will be a workshop on Alcatraz for Indians of different tribes from all over the United States in which they will express their ideas and compile their plans together with their professional Indian and non-Indian resource people. Phase III—eight months: the processes of Phases I and II will merge and actually develop into an extensive and specific proposal for the uses of the Island during this time.

This year of planning will include five areas of development: (1) higher education and curriculum development; (2) cultural complex, including museum and archives; (3) ecology center; (4) plan for Indian legal rights; and (5) vocational training and rehabilitation programs.

C. *Administration and Organizing.* Community organizing is necessary in order to promote the general welfare of all Indian people. Alcatraz Indians working in this area will establish a national advisory board; contact reservations and other Indian people to keep communications open with Alcatraz; handle public relations to the outside world; consult with other Indian and non-Indian groups; and manage the finances of the corporation.

BUDGETARY PRINCIPALS

(1) Island residents who are employed are called "staff." Outsiders, whether full or part time are called "consultants."

(2) All Island residents who are staff will make the same salary, whether or not they are on the Council and whatever the job they do.

(3) Where both husband and wife are employed, an adjustment will be made by the Council, so no family is paid beyond their needs.

(4) Food and lodging will be provided for residents, and need not be paid out of individual salaries.

(5) In addition to salaries, travel and work expenses will be paid for staff members, when needed for Alcatraz business only.

(6) To the greatest extent possible, outside help will be secured on a volunteer basis, but, where volunteer help is not available, experts will be paid as consultants.

(7) The number of paid consultants will not be estimated in the budget. Rather, the amount of money needed for consultants in various areas will be set forth.

(8) All property acquired by the corporation of Indians of All Tribes will become the property of the corporation.

(9) Travel funds will be provided for the mid-year conference, to enable non-Island Indians to journey to the Island.

BUDGET

	Amount
Planning:	
Higher education and curriculum development, cultural complex, ecology center, Indian legal rights, vocational training and rehabilitation program:	
Consultant fees for non-Indian volunteers, including travel and living costs	$20,000
Consultant fees for Indian consultants, including travel and living costs	22,000
Total	42,000
Services:	
Nursery and preschool:	
Playground and recreational equipment	1,500
Educational materials	2,500
Subtotal	4,000
School:	
Student recreational equipment	1,500
Educational materials	2,500
Subtotal	4,000
Adult education:	
Recreational equipment	2,500
Educational materials	2,500
4 conference tables at $150 each	600
50 folding chairs at $15 each	750
Subtotal	6,350
Library	2,500
Clinic: Standard clinic supplies and portable emergency equipment	7,500
Legal workshop: Miscellaneous supplies	1,000
General island maintenance:	
Maintenance supplies and equipment	5,000
Portable sanitary equipment	2,000
Emergency service not supplied by volunteer tradesmen (plumbers, electricians, etc.)	2,000
Subtotal	9,000
Kitchen:	
Equipment—2 refrigerators, 2 freezers, 2 stoves, restaurant size	6,000
Utensils	1,500
4 tables and benches	1,000
Maintenance supplies	1,500
Subtotal	10,000
Security: Equipment and supplies	1,500
Motor pool:	
Maintenance tools and equipment for 3 pickup trucks	1,500
Gas and oil	1,500
Subtotal	3,000
Boat: For travel between island and mainland—cost, including maintenance and fuel	15,000
Island resident's salaries: 100 Island residents at $25 per week each, $2,500 per week × 52 weeks	130,000
Total	184,850
Administration and organizing:	
Administrative offices: Rental of dockside space at $350 per month	$4,200
Office machines, furniture and fixtures:	
8 IBM Selectric typewriters at $460 each	3,744
1 Monroe printing calculator	625
1 A.B. Dick stencil cutter	995
1 A.B. Dick mimeograph machine	450
2 Stenorette dictating/transcribing machines at $250 each	500
16 Filing cabinets, 4-drawer, legal size, at $75 each	1,200
8 Typewriter stands at $15 each	120
8 Desks and chairs at $90 each	720
8 Side folding chairs at $15 each	120
Miscellaneous accessories	500
Rental of No. 914 Xerox machine at $150 month	1,800
Subtotal	10,774
Consumable supplies:	
Stationery and office supplies	2,500
Postage	3,000
Subtotal	5,500
Telephone—installation and monthly service	6,500
Insurance	2,500
Auditing and financial services	800
Newspaper publication:	
Paper and printing supplies and equipment for 8,000 circulation issued semimonthly	15,000
2 tape recorders, 1 portable, 1 stationary, and supplies	750
Postage	7,000
Subtotal	22,750
Miscellaneous	5,000
Travel expense for 3 individuals, local and out-of-State travel	4,500
Photographic equipment and supplies	750
2 portable tape recorders, at $150	300
Subtotal	5,550
Total	63,574
Grand total	299,424

CARL C. CASWELL

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sorrow at the departure of my good friend, Carl C. Caswell.

Cas, as he was affectionately known, built a reputation as one of Iowa's most distinguished journalists. He did not limit himself to writing alone, however, but was also a cartoonist, photographer, editor, and publisher. Over the course of his long, 40-year career, he earned many honors in all of these fields.

He was a pioneer in the field of news photography, introducing the photoengraving process and inventing a deep-acid etcher for use by the Clarinda Herald Journal at a time when newspaper photography was extremely rare in Iowa. His column won many national awards and in 1954 he received the Iowa Master Editor-Publisher Award. He served as president of both the Iowa-Nebraska Editorial Association—in 1946—and the Iowa Press Columnists in 1948. He was best known in the community, however, for his original cartoons of local people called "Events in the Lives of Folks You Know."

Carl was also active in a variety of business and civic affairs. As owner and publisher of the Clarinda Journal—which merged with the Herald to become the Herald-Journal—he was of course a prominent member of the community. But he made the most of his

position. He served as the president of the chamber of commerce in 1947, and of the Kiwanis Club in 1949. In 1951, he was a member of the advisory committee of the American Businessman's Research Foundation in Chicago, and in 1952, he served on the Clarinda Municipal Hospital advisory committee.

The list of his associations and of the worthy endeavors he engaged in could be extended almost indefinitely. It could also serve as a classic example of how a man of broad talents and wide interests cannot only carve a fascinating career for himself, but can also turn his creativity to good use for the community. Being a good journalist and a good businessman did not prevent Carl Caswell from being a good citizen. In fact, his concern for and commitment to the life of the community was an integral part of his career.

In addition to his public career and private vocation in journalism, this energetic and versatile man cultivated a number of avocations. In his youth, he delighted to entertain as a ventriloquist and a chalk talk artist throughout the Midwest. Later in life, he was prominent as an artist and art teacher and exhibitor. His oil landscapes won a number of awards in State and local art shows.

As is evident from such a catalog of achievements, Carl Caswell was a man whose whole life affirmed this country's traditional reliance upon its rural heartland to produce citizens of great vitality and generosity, citizens whose creative contributions to their world must be experienced to be truly appreciated.

Following is the Clarinda Herald Journal's farewell editorial to Cas:

[From the Clarinda (Iowa) Herald Journal, Feb. 23, 1970]

CAS' INFLUENCE TO CARRY ON

Activities at the Herald Journal this Monday morning were different than they have been for 40 years—Carl Caswell was missing. He always was around the shop before 6 a.m. and after returning home for breakfast passed his jovial greeting around the gang as he "showed up for work" an hour after the others.

His activities with the Clarinda Herald Journal were closed Sunday after 40 years. He was business manager from the very first, handling employment and production problems to have a growing circulation and advertising patronage constantly—through depression, wars, hard and good times.

Never has there been a written contract between partners—the Caswells and Woolsons—and seldom has there been serious differences. He was positive, whether it be in business matters or of morals. His employees found him entirely fair and he was proud of the record which employees who had gone on to other places have made.

His most recognized work by readers of the Herald Journal has been his "Off Square" and his "Events in Lives" cartoons. He was a champion of temperances, whether liquor, cigarettes or many habits of life. He tried never to use a story in his column or cartoon which would offend the person involved. But he didn't pull punches with the political wrongs, the way he taught about riots, Communism and such.

Folks perhaps did not know of his long working hours. He always said he couldn't sleep, so came to work or took his paints and canvas to get started for the day at 5 a.m. or so. That's one reason he knew so much about birds, always feeling folks missed so much by not seeing day break with all its beauty.

Many noticed his absorbed manner on the streets, some inquiring if he did notice people. His manner was far, far from unsocial! He has a wonderful family of his own, appreciated when others accomplished and had pleasures. His generosity to others went beyond that of most. Until recent years, he did not back away from any community task, either in his writing or his active support on committees or task force. His ventriloquism widened his acquaintance to rural schools and communities where he was constantly featured on programs.

His death came as he had expected, quickly from his heart condition.

For about two years he has talked to those close to him that his time was limited, especially since his serious heart condition last April. But seldom, when he was able, did he not show up at the HJ office at from 5:30 to 6:30 am. He was business manager for the Clarinda Journal, Clarinda Daily Herald and Clarinda Herald Journal the complete two score years, and had not recently missed a day.

He had been companion of his grandson, Chris, Saturday night and had taken a good beating at chess before bedtime. He had taken his shower Sunday morning, and his wife heard him fall in his room at about 6:30 am.

Well, Carl. Your HJ gang will carry on. You'll be with them with the ideas and fine principals you have left behind!

CHILD-CARE FACILITIES

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted at the very strong support which has come forward for H.R. 15776, the Comprehensive Headstart Child Development Act. I introduced this legislation last month along with Congressman DELLENBACK, the chairman of the Republican Research Task Force on Education. Since that time, 39 have joined us in cosponsorship of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great need for expanded child-care facilities throughout the Nation. As we move in the direction of expanding our day care programs, I believe there are several concepts which we should keep in mind.

First, we must maximize the human resources of the communities to which services are being extended. We simply do not have enough professionally trained personnel to provide those services on an outside basis—we must use the resources available within the communities. Indeed, the facts available show that many underemployed or unemployed women in the ghetto have the abilities and interests which are characteristic of the best child-care workers and we must concentrate more efforts in training them and making them a vital part of our child-care system.

In Washington, Baltimore, Chicago, Milwaukee, and many other cities there are women being trained and successfully employed in services to children. This attempt to maximize human and community resources has been extremely successful and should be expanded and encouraged by Federal support and appropriations.

Another attempt to maximize community resources is found in experiments to organize family care. Group care has been the major organized vehicle for delivering day-care services and can be administered and regulated with relative ease. Historically, family care has not had these assets. However, the family is the basic resource for services to children in the Nation. Thousands of children are cared for in every community by a neighbor, relative, or friend.

There are now some few attempts to make this resource more viable for organized and competent day care. I have been in contact with the Protestant Children's Home in Toronto, Canada, and the Child Care Center's project in Milwaukee about their development of organized family care as a supplement to group care. My assessment of their experiments is one of cautious optimism.

The assets of supplemental family care are many. Family care is generally a neighborhood operation. Children are not transported large distances to a center. Parents have immediate access to the people working with their children. The children's peer groups remain intact. The child has a consistent adult with whom to relate as opposed to the frequently changing staff in institutional settings.

Family care is a financial commitment to people. There is no tremendous expense for facilities and there is no need for bus or car transportation. Community residents are paid for services to their own communities. Employment is given to people with the greatest need. The people providing services are responsive to their community needs. And the status of child rearing can be upgraded for the entire community.

Mr. Speaker, our legislation can clearly encourage or dicourage the development of local human resources. We focused on stimulating local resources in drafting this bill. I hope this principle will be used as a measuring stick by my colleagues in evaluating all proposals for expanding services to children.

MAFIA MAINTAINS GRIP

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, organized crime continues to operate at the ports of entry in this country. On February 19, I brought to the attention of the House the failure of the New York/New Jersey Waterfront Commission to drive organized crime from the Port of New York.

In today's Washington Post, in an article by Jack Anderson, the grip of organized crime at Kennedy International Airport in New York is described. I have received a letter from Will Wilson, Assistant Attorney General and head of the Criminal Division of the Justice Department, responding to my remarks concerning crime on the waterfront. With the thought it would be of interest to our colleagues, I am setting forth the

article by Jack Anderson and the letter from the Department of Justice, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, March 2, 1970.

Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We have received a copy of the remarks you made on February 12, 1970, regarding the Waterfront Commission and related situations. A copy of your statement has been sent to both the New York and New Jersey Strike Forces of the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Department of Justice.

At present, a full-scale investigation is under way by the New York Strike Force, in co-operation with New York state and city police officials. This investigation is centering its attention on the involvement of organized crime in the waterfront area.

Your efforts in this regard are sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

WILL WILSON,
Assistant Attorney General.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 4, 1970]

MAFIA HAS ITS GRIP ON NEW YORK AIRPORT

(By Jack Anderson)

A confidential case history, now on Attorney General John Mitchell's desk, describes how the Mafia has gained a stranglehold on the air freight industry at John F. Kennedy International Airport in New York.

FBI agents and Justice Department attorneys, who have summarized their investigation for the attorney general, charge that gangsters not only have been able to blackmail big airlines but "no doubt" could shut down the nation's greatest air terminal.

The Justice Department is known to be preparing indictments, some of them based upon the antitrust laws that forbid unfair competition.

The confidential case history, obtained by this column, alleges:

"Our intelligence information indicates that organized crime has moved into both the ranks of labor and the air freight trucking industry. There are racketeers allegedly in control of several trucking firms, and many other firms have suspected racketeers on their payroll, who apparently do not perform any service . . .

"There has been formed at Kennedy an association for truckers, called the Metropolitan Import Truckers Association, which is allegedly controlled by racketeers who have brought pressure to bear on all air freight truckers to join the association if they wish to do business at the airport.

"This pressure is increased through the aid of Teamster Local 295. Harry Davidoff and his criminal associates are well in control of this Teamster local . . .

THREATS AGAINST AIRLINE

"It has been alleged that threats were made by Davidoff to at least two major airlines that he would shut down Kennedy, and it appears that Local 295 could no doubt succeed in attaining this end."

The Justice Department report suggests that Mafia infiltrators are in a position to pick and steal goods shipped by truck from the Kennedy airport and therefore, are partly responsible for the airport's annual $3.3 million loss.

States the report: "The District Attorney, Kings County, who has a continuing investigation of organized crime, is of the opinion that many thefts at the airports are undertaken by organized racketeering elements. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has resident agents at the airport who are primarily concerned with interstate thefts. Thefts may be but a small portion of the illegal Cosa Nostra activities at Kennedy."

The alleged Mafia takeover of the truckers' association serving the Kennedy airport is also spelled out in the report.

"MITA was chartered in 1958 in New York and at its inception was apparently under the control of the truckers who handled deliveries to the waterfront piers," according to the report. "Sometime in the early 1960s another trucking association called the Jet-Stream Association was formed to organize truckers delivering air freight to and from Kennedy.

"In 1964 Vincent Dionisio, a friend of Harry Davidoff, formed another air freight truckers association named Cargair Trucking Association. Cargair merged into Jet-Stream in June 1966 and, in turn, Jet-Stream merged with MITA . . .

"The president of this new Jet-Stream division of MITA was Salvatore Cirami, owner of the Air Freight Haulage Co. Cirami is one of those truckers who is believed controlled by organized crime.

"DUES GO TO HOODS

"In 1966, Jet-Stream of MITA had about 80 trucking firms as members. It was financed through the payment of monthly dues and through initiation fees. Most of its income wound up in the hands of convicted felons . . .

"In 1966, Cirami was president of MITA and at that time he had Joseph Curcio on the payroll of his trucking company at $175 per week. Curcio had just recently been released from Atlanta where he was a cellmate of Joseph Valachi, former member of the Genovese 'family' of the Mafia, now serving life for murder.

"Curcio is a long-time associate of Johnny Dioguardi, well-known labor racketeer. Cirami placed Curcio on his payroll at the behest of Philip Giaccone who owns Air Freight Haulage Co. and who is a member of MITA. Philip Giaccone has a criminal record which includes convictions for rape, assault, and gambling.

"The person who actually controlled MITA during the 1960s was John Maisello, a member of the Genovese 'family.' He was convicted of smuggling in 1956, and is reputed to be a major loanshark.

"He was listed as a labor consultant to MITA until 1965 when he turned over the organization to Anthony DiLorenzo, also a member of the Genovese 'family.' DiLorenzo's criminal record includes seven arrests and convictions for grand larceny of auto and assault.

"With respect to MITA, DiLorenzo had the power to hire and fire MITA employees. In 1965 and 1966, he hired as field representatives men with long criminal records. They include John Jack DiAmico, Morris Schoenfeld, both convicted bookmakers, and Milton Luban who is also connected with John Maisello in the East Coast Trucking Co."

PRESIDENT POMPIDOU'S VISIT

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the Congressman from Alaska, HOWARD W. POLLOCK, has written a literate, courteous letter to the President of the Republic of France, the Honorable Georges Pompidou. The message of this letter so clearly states the position of the people of the United States, the pain they feel over the discourtesy shown President Pompidou on his visit to our Nation, as well as their distress over the sale of French planes to Libya, that I think the whole Congress will want to share it.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1970.

Hon. GEORGES POMPIDOU,
President of the Republic of France, Palais de l'Elysee, Paris, France.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As one concerned American who cherishes France as the oldest ally of America, and who has great admiration for you personally, I wish to apologize on behalf of all Americans for any demonstrations or other protestations manifested in your presence as a protest to your decision to sell French planes to Libya. I so keenly feel the embarrassment and concern of every thinking American who wishes to warmly clasp the hand of friendship you so graciously extended in search of mutual understanding.

Of course, I recognize the impropriety in protocol in my discussing affairs of state with you as a Congressman. This is a proper responsibility of the President and the Secretary of State. However, I write not merely as a United States Congressman but as a citizen vitally concerned that you understand that a handful of discourteous demonstrators do not represent the 200 million Americans who deeply appreciated your visit, and who, as you, were offended because of the demonstrations. We all join our great President Nixon in his desire for continued close friendship and understanding between the Republic of France and the United States of America.

While I know you were angered by the pro-Israeli demonstrations, I am not sure that you fully understand the deep-seated feeling of most Americans in attempting to preserve the existence of the free nation of Israel. Americans listened intently when you spoke to the Congress, as on other occasions, to seek a clue as to the basic reasons which prompted France to sell these implements of war to Libya. We honestly considered that as an unfriendly act to a free nation and, accordingly, an unfriendly act toward the objectives and aspirations of the United States.

Discerning Americans are aware that Libya has not been involved in the continued harassment and belligerency against Israel so common among the other Arab nations. Thus, the French decisions to sell military aircraft to Libya may well be a move by France to increase its influence in the Mid-East, and thus reduce the reliance of Libya upon Soviet support. But, my distinguished friend, you did not say that, nor did you offer any explanation to your friends in America. I listened intently as you spoke before the Joint Session of the United States Congress, hoping for a clue which would assuage our anguish about the French decision.

I am confident that President Nixon adequately explained the prevailing American attitude toward the crisis in the Middle East, but as a Congressman in the United States House of Representatives, I was not privy to his conversations with you, of course. Therefore, as one American concerned that France, the oldest ally of America, truly understand our feelings, I take this presumptuous means of speaking out. Whether or not you can be persuaded to concur with the deep-seated concern of most Americans I do not know; however, it is of paramount importance that you at least understand why we feel as we do.

In the view of most Americans there will never be peace in the Middle East until the Arab governments fully, finally and forever give up their dream of destroying Israel and accept the reality of the existence of this thriving young nation in their midst.

Accordingly, it is difficult for America to be objective and impartial when the obvious intent of the Arab states is to destroy Israel as a nation.

Israel, a bulwark of democracy, faces extinction if defeated by the Arab states which surround it. It is a nation born in a unique and fragile situation, and its determined and dedicated people have been steeled by two decades of war and peril. It is no wonder that the besieged nation feels compelled to lash out at its tormentors with such fury and effectiveness. The small, tough democratic state of Israel asks nothing but to be left in peace, and yet it must be geared for war if it is to survive.

In my humble opinion, America must leave no doubt in the collective mind of the Communist world as to where we stand in this issue. It is hypocritical for us to pretend to be objective and impartial, for we are not. Any military assistance given to its neighboring Arab states to wage war on Israel is an act of hostility toward that great little nation. Each time France or the Soviet Union or any other country provides the materials of war to the nations dedicated to the destruction and extinguishment of the nation of Israel, in my view, the United States can have no alternative but to provide additional arms to Israel as a means of its survival.

We are all only too keenly aware that at any time this conflict threatens to explode into a major war which could engulf France, the Soviet Union and the United States.

Mr. President, Americans admire you and know that neither you nor France is anti-Semitic; yet, we have such great difficulty in searching out and understanding the basic reasons for your aiding and abetting the enemy states which seek to extinguish the existence of Israel, a proud and productive nation created by the collective decision of the world powers in the United Nations a few short years ago. The tenacity and capacity of this determined young democracy, and its economic and social successes in the midst of continuing conflict with its belligerent and aggressive neighbors, stands as a testimonial to the character of its people, and provides a hallmark in history for the determination of the oppressed to preserve their identity as a nation and their dignity as a freedom-loving and God-fearing people.

May God love you and guide you and the great Republic of France.

Cordially, and with great respect,
HOWARD W. POLLOCK,
Congressman for Alaska.

POSTAL REFORM

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am getting a little tired of the bleedings and misrepresentations which are being aired and published about our Nation's postal service and the current efforts to bring about meaningful reform.

Yesterday, on page 6051 of the RECORD, I cited for the House the misleading half-page advertisement published by the Citizens Committee for Postal Reform which called for a postal reform bill containing four key elements.

The citizens committee and its highly paid staff had failed completely to do their homework because the reform bill now nearing completion in our Post Office and Civil Service Committee already contains three of the four "key elements." We have not reached the part of the bill dealing with the fourth element—it should come up next week.

Why has progress been slower than we hoped?

Ask the incumbent Postmaster General who sits behind the big desk in the ornate headquarters office at 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue NW.

DOES HE REALLY WANT REFORM?

The Postmaster General has sought repeatedly to thwart our committee's efforts. He seems not interested in postal reform per se—only his own narrow version.

Why is it that he was excluded from postal reform conferences at the White House between the President, his staff and a key union leader? Obviously because those people, at least, have become aware that the Postmaster General is stubborn and completely uncompromising and uncooperative on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, the unyielding and naive approach to this legislative matter by the Postmaster General and his staff was understandable a year ago. Then, they were new and inexperienced. But now they have been in office a year or more and should have some understanding of the responsibilities of the legislative and executive branches of Government.

Our committee today completed action on title V of H.R. 4 and we already have provided the postal service with administrative and fiscal independence such as it has never had before.

FOLLOWS KAPPEL RECOMMENDATIONS

The bill to date follows very much the line of the Kappel commission report, except for keeping the postal service as an arm of the Federal Government rather than as a public corporation.

Postal reform? Certainly. Right down the line: Removal from politics, control of rates, control of finances, administrative latitude.

Those, including the Postmaster General, who criticize our work are simply not doing their own homework. They cannot see the woods for the trees in postal reform—and do not want to.

Mr. Speaker, another example of crass misrepresentation was exhibited the other day by the Wall Street Journal, one of the Nation's largest beneficiaries of postal subsidy and special treatment. The newspaper accuses me of pushing a reform measure which would provide "little or no change at all" from present law.

H.R. 4, as approved so far by my committee, makes as much change in the law as today's front page in that newspaper is different from yesterday's—in content, not format, that is. Indeed, maybe it is the newspaper's never-changing format that blinds its editors to changes that the average perceptive and objective person can see.

Mr. Speaker, we are proceeding with markup of a meaningful postal reform bill and I hope we can complete action in the next week or 10 days.

With my remarks, I include the text of the aforementioned newspaper editorial:

MR. DULSKI'S POSTAL PLAN

As might have been expected, taking politics out of the Post Office is proving extremely difficult. A plan proposed by Rep. Thaddeus J. Dulski, chairman of the House Post Office Committee, points up just how troublesome the task really is.

The Administration has urged that the Post Office be turned into a public corporation or authority, which would have power to set rates and postal wages. The Post Office, after all, is a huge business, with more than 500,000 employees and annual revenues exceeding $7 billion, and no business can function very efficiently with no control over its own prices and labor costs.

At present, of course, postal rates and pay are fixed by Congress, often for political reasons rather than for any considerations of sound management. It's actually astonishing that the agency functions as well as it does when it is subject to the whims of so many bosses.

Postal workers stand to gain more than anyone else from reform that turns the agency into an efficient organization, one that they can be proud to represent. But most of the postal unions appear to prefer the present setup, which allows them to lobby wage increases through Congress.

Many members of Congress favor meaningful reform. Mr. Dulski, however, is pushing his own measure that would continue Congress' power over postal rates and wages—in other words, little or no real change at all.

No one can be certain that a postal corporation could cope effectively with the rising demands on the Post Office. But everyone can be certain that a do-nothing approach will assure a continued steady deterioration of service.

NEW YORK CITY HEARING ON ATOMIC ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 6, my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. WOLFF) and I cosponsored in New York City a public hearing on atomic energy and the environment. I would like to include in today's RECORD the statements of three of the witnesses at that hearing, Mr. James Y. Paulding of Chappaqua, N.Y.; Mr. Herbert Lippmann of the American Institute of Architects; and Mr. Charles A. Wallerstein. The material follows:

STATEMENT OF JAMES Y. PAULDING

Congressman Reid: Thank you for the opportunity to appear before this Hearing. I am here as a resident of Westchester County. I have been involved with nucler energy for approximately 15 years, initially as a member of the insurance industry that helped form underwriting pools to provide coverage for nuclear power plants. During part of this time I was directly involved in radiation safety and pollution control surveys. In 1966, I was one of the founders and officers of a nuclear service company providing waste disposal, decontamination, health physics and related services in connection with the handling of radioactive materials. This firm was, and is, headquartered in Westchester County, and is licensed to perform these services by the Atomic Energy Commission and the State of New York. For the past two years. I have been an independent management consultant serving financial institutions, insurance companies, and

industrial firms interested in the nuclear field. This is the experience on which I base my comments today.

The Federal Radiation Council, with statutory authority from Congress, provides guidance for Federal agencies in the promulgation of radiation protection standards, and in this work draws upon the National Council for Radiation Protection and Measurement. The Atomic Energy Commission has statutory responsibility for licensing the peaceful use of source, special nuclear and byproduct material, and establishing regulations for exposure to and emission of radioactivity from such licensed activities. The Atomic Energy Commission has performed its regulatory responsibilities with diligence, and the resultant excellent safety record of the nuclear industry is without parallel. The technology of light water reactors is established and the procedures for their operation are proven. I can confidently state that I would not fear for my well-being to have a nuclear power plant as a neighbor, and that it is quite possible that such a plant would be a good neighbor—that is, quiet, industrious, and unobtrusive.

However, the emerging public concern for environmental quality is valid and thus legitimate questions have been raised on the siting and operation of nuclear power plants. Large size fossil fuel and nuclear power plants discharge enormous amounts of waste heat. The possible ecological effects of such discharges must be evaluated for each proposed plant site, and provision made for control of possible adverse effects, and the development of the possible beneficial effects.

We have come to realize that our biosphere is limited, and even though specific discharges of pollutants may be well below the levels which result in detectable biological effect, such discharges are added to the total environment. Thus it is desirable to keep pollutants, including radioactive effluents, to the lowest practicable level.

Since the dose rate levels resulting from allowable discharge of radioactive effluents are well below where there is any measurable biological effect, the decision on lowest practicable level is a subjective value judgment which must include consideration of power requirements to sustain our man-made quality of life, the costs of such power, and the effects of the generation of this power on the quality of our natural life. Decisions of this kind require consideration of the alternatives, and the problems of such alternatives, such as the pollutants from fossil-fuel power plants, including sulfur and flyash, and the ecological effects of a hydro-electric plant. In a broader sense, we now realize that there may also be a problem from the increased concentration of CO_2 resulting from combustion of fossil-fuels, and in this case, the power plant as a polluter is less important than all of us with our automobiles. Thus decisions on nuclear power must be made in the context of our whole existence.

In summary, I want to stress that decisions relative to site selection of nuclear plants, must be made with a sense of unity. Our citizens don't want to stop driving their autos, they don't want to stop using their appliances, and yet the energy required for these conveniences has a significant impact on our environment. The residents of Rye on Long Island Sound, and the residents of Tarrytown, on the Hudson, may both need more power, but quite understandably, neither wants the nuclear power plant in their community. No single government agency, nor any single community, should any longer make decisions that affect all of us. Nuclear power holds great promise as one of the solutions to the dilemma of equating the man-made quality of life with the natural quality of life. However, the development of nuclear power should be within the framework of a national policy on the environment which is based on all of our scientific knowledge, and reflects the consensus of a concerned and informed public.

STATEMENT BY HERBERT LIPPMANN, AIA, ARCHITECT

The New York Chapter of the *American Institute of Architects* has issued a Policy Statement expressing its concern about the planning and location of atomic power plants, particularly the contemplated 17 reactors which would surround our own City and Chapter area with radiation dangers, thermal and air pollution and power unreliability. Many of the proposed and constructed plants have been dangerously close to metropolitan areas, in contrast to the Atomic Energy Commission's often stated policy.

The AIA Chapter's statement also expressed concern that locations, such as that planned by Consolidated Edison at Fort Slocum, might endanger parks, boating, fishing, swimming and interfere with other community projects. The Statement further called for thorough investigation of atomic safety precautions, in a national survey of all power plant siting, followed by a master plan *prior* to further construction.

Serious reconsideration of the function and authority of the AEC and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy was proposed by Senator Thruston Morton of Kentucky, in a Bill reintroduced in April 1969 by his successor, Senator Harlow Cook (Senate Joint Resolution 91), supported by Senators Cooper, Mansfield, Metcalf, Williams (N.J.), Packwood, Stevens, Schweiker and Randolph. This proposal to establish an independent Federal Review Committee free of connection with the AEC and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee was in accord with the previous AIA Chapter statement.

Architects who must depend on rigid specifications to insure the quality of their work, are amazed to find that construction of reactors and their housing are not specified in a totally binding manner. This was indicated in the testimony of the AEC Director of Reactor Development, Milton Shaw, who said: "Let us remember that the reactor manufacturer has the option to change material and quality assurance procedures . . . on the nuclear plant he is proposing to build for the utilities." Such practices could have contributed to the failure of several large atomic power plants which have been taken out of operation.

Treatment plants and nuclear "burial grounds" are other devices of the national nuclear system, the construction of which is rife with faulty design and building. Leakage from waste tanks in the Hanford Burial Grounds is a continuing problem. In 1968 Congress appropriated $2,500,000 for "replacement of failed or failing tanks." Rochester, N.Y. scientists verified the fact that the reprocessing plant at West Valley, New York was discharging enormous amounts of radioactive contaminants into the creeks and rivers of that section. 1000-megawatt nuclear plants are being recommended today without *any* experience whatever. Many eminent scientists, such as Teller, Weil, Commoner and Rickover have seriously criticized current development of nuclear power.

In my opinion, a *moratorium* on all such plants should be ordered by the Government, and attention should be concentrated on alternative sources of power. This would be consistent with the AIA Chapter's stand for a national survey of all power plant siting *prior* to further construction, and reaffirms the Policy Statement I summarized at the start.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES A. WALLERSTEIN

Our constant need for more electric power has created a situation that needs clarification and evaluation. The installation of nuclear power plants in heavily populated areas has some very serious drawbacks.[1] This new type of plant, with its discharges of radioactive gases and contaminated water into the surrounding water ways in addition to the discharge of smoke and fumes from existing oil, coal and gas burning power plants would make life more unbearable in the community.

The entire concept of building power plants in local communities is as antiquated as using a horse and buggy for transportation. Our patchwork of plant installations in this region created a situation that caused the famous "blackout" of November 9, 1965. This was the result of poor planning and the lack of coordination among the participating members of the circuits.[2]

A positive illustration—we owe a debt of gratitude to the foresight and planning of the members of American Gas Association who in 1949 introduced natural gas to the Northeastern region. This fuel was piped through several thousands of miles to our major cities in the North eliminating the old "gas works" with its odors of burning coke and soft coal to make "gas". Just imagine this condition today if each borough, town and hamlet had to have its "gas works."

Have we exhausted all the means that are available for producing and transmitting electric power? We have not.

1. *Hydro.* The Federal Power Commission Report in 1967 Table No. 767—We have developed water power: 45,826,000 KW (capacity of actual installations only). In the next column—Estimated Underdeveloped Water Power 130,444,000 KW.[3]

The late Charles P. Steinmetz in the 20's predicted and displayed plans in a Sunday Supplement of the old "NEW YORK WORLD" that he could electrify the eastern half of the U.S. from the Mississippi River to the Atlantic Ocean using the electric power plants at Niagara Falls.

2. *Coal and oil* available in the mining and oil producing areas of Pennsylvania which is approximately 100 miles from New York City. This would be an ideal area to build several steam plants to feed into an integrated circuit.[4]

Illustration: The T.V.A. has ten steam generating plants—two of which are the largest in the country. This is in addition to the water generating facilities.[5]

3. *Nuclear Plants.* Install them 100 miles away from any populated area. These can hook-up into an integrated circuit.[6] There should be no Nuclear Plants on the Atlantic or Pacific Coasts for security reasons.

The power potential reserves (regional or national) in plants strategically located in the hinterlands (approximately 100 miles from any populated city) could be controlled through integrated circuits, with all safety controls incorporated in power control centers utilizing computerization.

The existing local power plants can be kept in reserve and maintained for stand-by emergencies until they are phased out.

This "power potential program" can only be accomplished through research and development. A coordinated effort by all the utilities, public and private, forming a "Power Council" consisting of a number of engineers from each company. This could

---

[1] (Environmental factors and safety) "The Careless Atom" by Sheldon Novick Houghton Mifflin Co. Boston 1969.

[2] "National Power Survey," Federal Power Commission 1964, Part I. p. 200.

[3] Statistical Abstracts of the United States 1969, National Data Book 90th Ed., Sec. 19 "Power."

[4] (Fuel Availability—"Mine-Mouth") National Power Survey 1964, Part I. p. 73.

[5] "A Short History of the T.V.A. 1933–1968," by the Tennessee Valley Authority 1968 p. 11.

[6] "Integrated Power System," by Philip Spora, McGraw-Hill, N.Y. 1950.

be done to anticipate the need for the next two decades.

(Note:—According to the Federal Power Commission Table #755:[7] Consumption of Energy Use 1967, 1,222 Billion KW; Estimated Consumption of Energy Use 1990, 5,852 Billion KW.

In conclusion:—We can fully utilize our natural resources and place our plants in the hinterlands near our sources of fuel. With proper control in the distribution through integrated circuits to supply the demands. The proper coordination of all the utilities both public and private would be necessary. The problem of power supply could well be taken care of until 1990 without building a single power plant in the area.

It can be done.

TRIBUTE TO DON DILLON

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS OF California. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow night, March 6, in the beautiful city of Fremont, Calif., the leading citizens are gathering at a dinner to honor one of their city's most distinguished citizens, Councilman Don Dillon.

The celebration will be especially delightful for me, Mr. Speaker, because Mr. Dillon also happens to be a close personal friend. His charming daughter, Mary Helen, worked in my office here in Washington, D.C. as an intern in the summer of 1967. And in the tradition of the family of Don and Mary Ann Dillon, she made a marvelous contribution to our staff.

Don Dillon has been a leader in Fremont public life for more than 15 years. When he and his family moved to Fremont, it was a sleepy village of 22,000 people. Today it is an elegant city with a population of more than 100,000.

During the major period of this fantastic growth, Don Dillon has worked diligently and skillfully with his fellow citizens to insure that Fremont would be a place of beauty and sophistication where children could be brought up with the benefit of an excellent educational system, where the businessman and professional man could earn a suitable income without miles of commuting and where all of the people were assured of a continuation of the same climate and natural beauty that first encouraged their settlement in Fremont.

Don Dillon was first elected to the Fremont City Council in 1962, becoming mayor pro tempore in December of that year. In August 1963 he was elected mayor and was reelected in 1964, 1965, and 1966. He was the first city councilman to be reelected in the city's history. He served also as chairman of the Alameda Mayor's Conference in 1966–67 and since 1962 he has been Fremont's representative to the general assembly of the Association of Bay Area Governments.

Mr. Speaker, Fremont, and indeed all of California are better places because of the devoted work of Don Dillon. It is fitting that he is being honored tomorrow night by his fellow citizens. My congratulations go to him, Mary Ann his wife, and to his three children, Mary Helen, Debbie, and Dee.

[7] Sec. No. 3.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, each year we see the continuing contribution of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy Contest. This contribution is evidenced in the character, personality and thoughts and ideas of the young men and women who participate in this program.

This year the contest theme was "Freedom's Challenge," and I was pleased to learn that the Virginia winner was Miss Martha Kent Bell of Forest Hills, Harrisonburg, Va. Miss Bell is a constituent, and I am honored to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the attention of my colleagues her winning speech:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

How many times a day do you stop to consider that your are free? That you are a free American and that you are a free nation, The United States of America, where the people reign as a democracy and freedom challenges every citizen.

In 1776 the constitution of the United States was born, laying down the guidelines to a free, democratic society. Each succeeding generation of Americans has inherited the task of preserving and perfecting that government. Why is it so important to preserve our Democracy? Because Democracy is Freedom.

In our vast population it is difficult to comprehend the importance of the individual, yet every American must realize that he is one very vital part of the Democratic System. Awareness, too, has it's place. Everyone must be kept constantly alert to the current events of our country as well as to the structure of our Democracy. But the most important contribution a citizen can make to his country is the least practiced—take an active part—be part of America! Apathy is fatal to Democracy and Freedom, but more importantly individual support and concern is essential. The rather worn-out phrase "write your Congressman" isn't as hollow as it sounds. Your opinion does count!

The vote is an integral part of Democracy and a means of envolvement which is sorely neglected by many adults. And ironically young people are clamoring for the right to vote, but until they are afforded the privilege, they can express themselves just as effectively in other ways—if they'll try! Just waiting to be voiced, fresh, new ideas are brewing in the high schools and colleges of America as well as constructive criticism which is a requisite ingredient in the improving Democracy.

As students the best way to put freedom to use is through education. This phase of freedom has brought man out of a cave and set him on the moon. Education magnifies the possibilities of freedom, while man's knowledge of his world multiplies every day. Yet, in the back of their minds many Americans are troubled by War. 1775—1942—1970. America is 200 years old and still fighting for the cause of freedom. War is the most spectacular defense of freedom, but it may have to be defended in your own backyard. Just remember the wise words of Henrik Ibson, "You should never wear your best trousers when you go out to fight for freedom."

The United States of America won the Revolutionary War, and the World Wars because they were exactly that—unified in the call for freedom. This same unity has a responsibility to itself as well as to the rest of the world. Democracy has existed for over 2000 years and still needs to be improved. Americans must work together to perfect our government and in turn our freedom.

Americans must use their freedom to maintain justice among men and nations. It could prevent a world war or a playground brawl but like medicine, it does no good until used.

Peace is man's goal. It can be defined only in the terms of personal desire. Freedom allows this search for peace.

Peace is nurtured by freedom, freedom is essential to Democracy and Democracy is found in America.

Freedom is a great and wonderful responsibility. As citizens of the United States of America we have a duty to that freedom—that democracy, and never before has there been a more urgent need for Americans to accept the challenges of freedom. Join hands with George Washington, Abe Lincoln, John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon. Be American and be free!

VAN DEERLIN BACKS OTTINGER ON NEWSMEN'S PRIVILEGE ACT

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be a cosponsor of Congressman OTTINGER's bill to protect both the sources and confidential information of newsmen from Federal investigators.

I understand that 15 States, including California, now have laws making privilege the confidential sources of news media. Congress itself should now respond to the threat to media independence implicit in recent statements and actions by certain ranking officials of the executive branch.

The harsh criticism from the Vice President, the talk of subpenas in the Justice Department demonstrate just how shaky the underpinnings of press freedom have become in our Nation's Capital.

As a former newsman, I was appalled a few months ago by published reports that one or two reporters and photographers had been engaged in undercover sleuthing for Federal agencies while on the payroll of bona fide news organizations.

But at least in these instances the collusion between newsman and Government was voluntary, if also thoroughly reprehensible. What is particularly ominous about the current moves with the administration is apparent attempt to force the media, through court action or plain intimidation into an unacceptable degree of cooperation with the Government.

None of us likes everything that is written or said about us in the papers and on the air. But by the same token, none of us, I imagine, would be pleased at the specter of a press controlled or unduly influenced by the Government.

Many newsmen would rather go to jail

than identify their sources or turn over sensitive information to Government interrogators.

And understandably they are concerned at the prospect of their sources drying up as a result of unseemly collaboration with officialdom.

The Ottinger bill probably would not open up any additional sources for newsmen. But it would at least curb the zeal of would-be manipulators of the press, and put Congress firmly on the side of press freedom.

In a way, I regret that such a bill has become necessary. But it clearly is.

THE PREVAILING WAGE RATE DETERMINATION ACT OF 1969

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill entitled "The Prevailing Wage Rate Determination Act of 1969," whose purpose is to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees.

Because the number of wage board employees exceeds 765,000, this bill is of vital concern to one-fourth of all employees of the Federal Government. It directly affects their wages, their own individual rights and obligations as well as the rights and obligations of their union representatives who are bargaining for them and who represent them on the various wage board committees established by this bill.

Basically, my bill is intended to bring order and system out of the chaotic situation which now exists in the Federal Government's procedures for fixing the rates of pay of employees working under the so-called prevailing wage rate system. The information which I have been receiving for some time showed such a great discrepancy between rates of pay for wage board employees performing the identical functions and working in the same community that I found that the presumption of serious inequity and injustice could not be excluded.

This bill would reduce such a possibility of inequity.

While remedying abuses, the bill will preserve, nonetheless, the concept and procedures of the prevailing wage system. It thus is not a modification of the wage board system itself but simply a measure to eliminate injustice and inequity by providing new mechanisms to establish basic regulations, to conduct wage surveys, and to adjudicate or arbitrate differences.

The most important single improvement in my bill over the present arrangement is that it will give a statutory foundation to improved procedures for wage board rate determinations. The principal instrumentality provided by the bill to assure that such a policy is pursued is a newly created "standing committee" within the Civil Service Commission, to be known as the National Wage Policy Committee.

Composed of 11 members, the National Wage Policy Committee will have as its Chairman a person who shall be from outside the Federal service and who shall be appointed directly by the President and shall hold no other office in the Federal service during his tenure as Chairman.

To assure that the Chairman is objective, my bill provides that he will serve exclusively at the pleasure of the President of the United States and that his compensation will be $75 for each day spent in the work of the policy committee.

In addition, the policy committee will have five Federal employee union representatives and five management representatives.

The Federal employee union representatives will be appointed as follows:

Two by the president of the AFL–CIO; and one each appointed respectively by the president of the Federal employee union representing the first largest, the second largest, and the third largest number of Federal employees subject to this act.

The five employer representatives shall be appointed to the National Wage Policy Committee as follows:

Two management representatives will be appointed by the Secretary of Defense, at least one of whom shall be appointed on a rotational basis for a period of 2 years from the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force;

One management representative from the Veterans' Administration will be appointed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

One management representative from the Civil Service Commission will be appointed by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission; and

One management representative will be appointed, on a rotational basis for a period of 2 years, by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission from Federal agencies which are leading employers of employees subject to this act.

In addition to establishing the National Wage Policy Committee, my bill will require each Federal department or independent agency designated by the National Wage Policy Committee to establish an Agency Wage Committee, composed of five members. The role of the Agency Wage Committee will be to assure the implementation within the Agency of the wage surveys through the functioning of the local wage survey committees.

A most important feature of my bill is the inclusion under its wage rate system of all employees who are now paid from so-called nonappropriated funds. These employees will no longer be considered outsiders to the wage board, or prevailing wage rate system. They will be assured equity and justice in the same manner as if they were receiving their pay from appropriated funds. Certainly, it is improper that an employee should receive less money for his work simply because his employer or manager draws his checks on a different bank account.

As with all legislation, I realize that this bill may emerge in somewhat different form when it is finally enacted. However, on the basis of my experience, I am sure that the final statute will not be very much different in its essentials than the bill which I introduced today.

WHY I LIKE HEADSTART

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to submit for the RECORD a testimonial to the Headstart program, sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity which has recently undergone a great deal of criticism. The following is a firsthand account of how much this program can accomplish for parents as well as for children.

I do not consider this to be an isolated case. On the contrary, I believe this particular success story to be one of a great many which pays tribute to the fine efforts of the OEO staff in focusing on social problems.

The testimonial follows:

WHY I LIKE HEADSTART

(NOTE.—A career development story told in the words of Naette Sharp as interviewed by Nancy Munro.)

Naette Sharp's first contact with Head Start was through welfare. She was an ADC mother whose third child, John, enrolled in the Head Start program in the fall of 1967. This fall she worked 15 hours a week as nutrition aide, and her fourth child, Joan, is a Head Starter. She was unanimously chosen by the Missoula Career Development Committee to attend the leadership classes in Kansas City as the aide most able to bring back useful information.

What has Head Start done for me? It's getting me out of where I was. I'm not just getting a welfare check every month and that's where it ends. The next month would be just like this month. When I first started Head Start I said I'd give anything to get out of this mess.

What bugs me is there's not enough to take everyone with me.

I'd been moving in a crowd where it was not unusual to get picked up. I was a square; I'd never had a ticket.

Anti-social? No, they were social. They had their own rules. They know the rules of society better than most others and played games with them. It was not wrong to break the rules; it was wrong only to get caught.

I was afraid to get close to anyone. I wouldn't let them have a weapon against me. To know me well was to give a weapon.

I tried talking to others, to get into a diffent crowd. For a while everyone I talked to went to jail, even though innocent. Trouble followed me. I jinxed everyone. I had difficulty getting into a new crowd. I don't understand why.

With four small children, what choices did I have? I would make less money working than I get from welfare. You don't have much choice if you want to feed your children. Your marriage has failed. Everything failed. I found I couldn't work without giving up the kids.

Welfare is set up so a mother can stay home and raise kids. You don't know what you give up. They take it for granted the minute you walk in that door that you're a thief and a prostitute.

Maybe I'm too proud. I figured I could support myself. I could support myself. I could support myself and three children. Three's

tough—you can make it if you don't run into snags. With four you cannot make it.

But if you're on welfare you don't have to work. Having no problems is as bad as having too many. With no problems you're not worth anything. It's OK when the children are little and you're busy taking care of them. But when they're in school, you get up and make the beds and sometimes do the dishes because you have all day to do them.

That was until I started riding the bus. Someone had to ride the Head Start bus and make the kids behave. No one else would do it, so I did it. Then I got up, got my work done so I could ride the bus at eleven o'clock.

I had someplace to go that was important. I got $1.50 every time I did.

And every time welfare deducted $1.50. But I was earning that money and it was different. Now even though I was working, I could still feed the kids and pay the rent. (It's different now, you can keep some money.)

Did I meet a new crowd in Head Start? I was scared to death of them. You wonder if they're judging you. Was I guilty by association?

If I spoke up and said something, I'd either say nothing or too much. I felt if I said something, I'd be wrong. I couldn't have good ideas, because all I'd done was wrong. I'd really messed it up.

I didn't associate with them too much. It took me a year to learn that Ted Lashley (Head Start psychologist) really wanted to say hello to me. I thought he said hello because he was supposed to say hello.

It was not until I was in the hospital and he was upset because I was paying a baby sitter when he knew I didn't have the money to pay a baby sitter, and sent a message that he had a big house and he and his wife would keep the kids that I believed he wanted to talk to me. He invited us out to his house. We sat in the yard and talked.

I invited them here. Later he stopped me in the office and asked, "You know that picture over your bed?"

(In my mind I was indignant; when were you in my bedroom? Why do you say that in front of all these people?)

He kept on, "Where did you get the picture of feet?"

Then I remembered he'd put their baby on my bed. At least he appreciated my sense of humor.

He and his wife accepted me. I felt I would make no problems for him by talking to him.

I quit riding the bus because the kids started behaving themselves.

All by themselves? OK, maybe I had something to do with the improvement, but I didn't see it that way.

Head Start needed lunches carried. I didn't think I could. First of all you have to go into St. Pat Hospital's kitchen. That's formidable.

I was not used to working. You've got to be on time. What if the car isn't working. You have to sort out those foods.

The big problem was—look at the mess I've made of my life and they want me to do something for those kids?

Sure there were mix-ups in lunches, but Joyce didn't think the world would come to an end.

You believed I could do it, and I did.

And Ted. If I had a problem, he didn't expect anyone to be perfect. He accepted me. If I make a mistake, all right, he said, what are you going to do about it?

Then I started coming to the Food Committee. I was helping make decisions! We planned our own program.

I started working two hours a week as nutrition aide. I transported mothers to the cooking club. When I started working with parents, I found other parents felt the same way I did. I could walk down the street the same as anyone else; I had as much right to be there as anyone else.

I could understand why parents did not want to be pushed. I'd go to their place often enough so I'd be familiar. I'll talk to them so they'll go to a meeting where I am. I am an equal, and I accept them, and the accept me, so I felt I could be good at the job. I could make boo-boos, but I was out to learn to do it right.

You made me feel I could do it. You didn't say I did things wrong; you said when I did things right. You were interested in my ideas. You made me feel I could do something if I really wanted to. You believed my bragging.

Molly (the Head Start teacher in charge of Career Development last year) asked me if I wanted to take a class at the University. I said I would take anything. I was afraid if I chose the wrong thing I'd lose the chance. I almost walked out of that class because I thought I was the only non-professional. (I wasn't.) I kept at it because I had told Dad and he was happy and I wanted his approval. Dad always wanted us to finish what we started. I got a B; with all those professionals I thought that was pretty good.

I took another course, in communications. I had success with school! Then I really got serious about school.

Talk about incentive. Handing someone an income is not enough. You have to find the right button to push for each person. For me, it was school.

Then at five o'clock—I remember the exact time—you brought papers from the University. We worked out a loan-grant-work-study program with the University. Head Start paid for school last summer. Now I go full-time. Got all A's last quarter, and worked too.

The Day Care Center is important in this. They take care of Joanie. They're steady and they don't beat the kids. They provide more equipment and professional care than I ever could. Joanie doesn't like it if I pick her up too early.

Now I know I'm capable. I know I can do a good job. I still can't believe it.

I'm not as depressed. I can talk to people.

The University furnishes reasonable financial aide. I can go to a show if I want to. I've earned the right to have a few minutes on my own without depriving anyone when I do it.

I've made friends, women I consider friends that I can trust.

My kids are happier. My kids are proud of me—that makes a lot of difference to me, and to them.

I see in my work that people don't eat well; they don't seem to be able to do things they want to do. I saw a girl a year younger than I that looked older, was set in her ways, moved older, was less interested. Food has something to do with that. I worry about a kid that sits quietly for two hours in a chair. My nutrition work is important.

I learned that if you can get one to ride with another, then they get to know each other. Friends like to get together on any pretense. We get together at the cooking club. In the cooking club you don't need to talk, there's something to do—cooking—but if you're friends you can argue about what's good to eat.

Having more money is different. I'm easier on the kids. We can buy an orange each and don't have to cut it in half. If they ask for an orange I can say OK. The children have what they think they need and want. They can go to the show like other kids (for a quarter each and a bread wrapper on Saturday afternoon—that's a dollar). They had been to the show once a year before that. They can make friends easier and do things other kids do. I can go swimming with them now. (Kids swim for free, adults pay 50¢).

There are so many opportunities right now I'm confused. Many choices—it's nice to savor each one. I can get a degree in home economics. I can be a teacher, or work with families like I do now. Parent involvement. I'm going to this leadership course in parent involvement in Kansas City. I'll be a specialist. I can use that to teach nutrition. I could even be a doctor that specializes in nutrition.

I've learned enough that I can now point out places to other people to go to get help—to point out possibilities to other people.

I know where I'm going. It's a long road, but that doesn't mean I can't enjoy it. I'm living instead of existing.

POLLUTION CONTROL AND THE POPULATION CRISIS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, two of the most important domestic problems of this decade relate to pollution and the population crisis. Possible solutions of these developments are attracting all segments of our society, even the younger generation. This is a good sign because in a democracy progress usually follows in the wake of aroused public interest.

It is most commendable that a class in Memorial High School, in San Antonio, is presently showing special interest in these matters. Let us hope the idea of school participation of this nature catches on and this activity is multiplied many times throughout the country.

The following students in Memorial High have recently written about these issues: Rose Marie Solis, Stella Hale, Lucy Flores, Rosalinda Rodriguez, Rosa Ortiz, Larry Camp, Rosa Duarte, Georio Jean, Adolpho Rodriguez, Marion Lopez, Mary Jane Gonzales, Maria Monzon, Michael Gomez, Cruz C. Pastrano, Robert Lira, Tony Luna, Anna Herrera, Agetha A. Luna, Naman Galvan, Carlos Guenero, David Granado, Elsa Salazar, and Richard Galvan.

POPULATION EXPLOSION

Mr. Speaker, the population crisis is extremely critical. If the present growth rates continue, the 3½ billion men and women on earth today will double in 30 short years—and by the turn of the century there will be 7 billion. And then 30 years later there will be 14 billion, then 28 billion, then 56 billion, and so it will go, on and on.

Can you imagine the day when 100 billion people will inhabit this planet? Surely mankind is smart enough to prevent this, but unless effective control measures are employed we are moving like a tornado in that direction.

The question, posed by Mr. William H. Draper, Jr., honorary national chairman, Population Crisis Committee, is whether the people of the world are going to stop this madness ourselves by using God-given intelligence and our own willpower, or whether it will be stopped by brutal weapons, diseases, and mass starvation. There is simply no way of escaping that day of reckoning.

Here in the United States our population now exceeds 200 million. In another three decades, at the present rate, the total will exceed 300 million.

Fortunately, there are many public and private organizations, and many individuals, who are seeking better answers to this problem. The Congress recognized the urgency of the issue several years ago. Only 2 years ago $35 million of foreign aid funds were earmarked for population control. Last year $50 million was earmarked, followed by $75 million and $100 million—all earmarked for use in this worldwide battle.

Here in this country the budget request for next year adds up to $120 million for domestic planning services and research. This is not enough, but we are moving in the right direction.

Indeed, unless something dramatic is done, and done soon, world famine is a possibility by 1975, according to a recent study on population trends and food production. The fact is that food production is not keeping pace with the increase in numbers of people. While food production has increased by 2 percent per year, population growth has been on the order of 3 percent.

This, Mr. Speaker, is everybody's problem. We need a crash program and we need a crusade to arouse the people to the urgency of what must be done.

POLLUTION

Mr. Speaker, another serious problem is pollution of air and water. This is manmade, and will be much easier to control than the population explosion. That is, if effective steps are taken and if there is full public support. We have made significant progress in right recent years. Federal commissions have been established, and most of the States have done likewise. President Nixon delivered a special message on the problem, and recommended an outlay of $10 billion over a 5-year period. During the current fiscal year about $1 billion was made available, on a matching basis, for Federal-State pollution control and clean water projects.

This pollution problem can and must be effectively dealt with—by both industry and governmental action. There is no time to waste.

RESPONSE TO PROPOSAL

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have been very gratified by the nationwide response received since I suggested last week that the Chicago "7" be exchanged for American prisoners of war being held in North Vietnam.

This suggestion was made in the light of North Vietnamese intimations that the Chicago "7" were being treated as political prisoners because they oppose U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

A Navy veteran from Indiana wrote:

I am contacting my Representative and urging him to support your suggestion.

A businessman from Chicago said.

I'm with you 100 percent.

A group of firemen from New York City stated in their letter:

Your idea of sending the Chicago 7 to North Vietnam in exchange for American prisoners was terrific.

A judge from the Bronx wrote:

I have just heard that bail was granted to those bums. What a shame! I do hope the next time they decide to speak against this country they do it at this Judge's house.

A Georgia man stated:

Personally, my opinion wasn't that lenient, but I'll endorse your proposal.

An Illinois public official made this comment:

My best wishes to a Member of Congress that knows how to think for Americans!

The telegram from the wife of a flyer missing in action merely read:

I'm with you.

Mr. Speaker, I bring these comments to the attention of my colleagues because I believe that sentiments such as of the American people are shocked, dismayed, and disgusted at the type of bethese constitute an affirmation of my firm conviction that the vast majority havior that the Chicago anarchists, their attorneys and fellow travelers have displayed before this country and the world. These individuals bring no credit to themselves or America by their actions; those who believe different are guilty of the worst sort of self-deception.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITY STUDENTS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Vice President SPIRO AGNEW recently attacked the "supercilious sophisticates" at our Nation's colleges and universities who have been responsible for making the opportunities of higher education more readily available to minority students.

That disastrously misguided attack has now been effectively and eloquently answered by the distinguished Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

I strongly recommend to my colleagues the commission's report, excerpts of which I include here:

THE CHALLENGES AND THE GOALS

Higher education is in a period of conflict and crisis brought on, in part, by the determination of increasing numbers of young Americans to obtain advanced education. Efforts to meet their needs will be costly, difficult, and time-consuming, but they must be made.

The challenge for higher education is not how to avoid the crisis. It is, instead, how to emerge from the crisis with institutions of high quality that offer increasing opportunities for education.

Higher education is also in conflict about who should go to college and what standards in college will be met by those who do go. The American system of higher education has always been an "open" system. There has been a place at some college for everyone who wanted to go and could afford to go.

The difference now is that more want to go and can afford to go. This report accepts and endorses the concept of an "open" system as against those who would now wish, for the first time in our history to close it.

We believe that the system should remain open and, additionally, that the barriers to access inherent in economic deprivation should not, in fact close it to some. At the same time, we believe that each college should maintain, the qualifications for its degrees, recognizing that these qualifications are quite diverse. We seek to maintain and improve a diversified system of higher education that has contributed so fruitfully to American life.

The transcendent goal is that inequality in one generation should not, inevitably, be a legacy of succeeding generations.

GOALS FOR 1976

That all students with the motivation and ability to gain access to and complete higher education should receive the financial aid they need to do so; that economic barriers to college and university access be removed.

That all inequities that are found in curricula, policies and facilties of our colleges themselves be removed so that all ethnic groups may be adequately served.

GOALS FOR 2000

That all remaining barriers to equality of educational opportunity that are subject to public policy be removed so that ability, motivation and individual choice are the only determinants of college attendance.

THE PATH TO HIGHER EDUCATION

The commission recommends that the first priority in the nation's commitment to equal educational opportunity be placed upon the increased effectiveness of our pre-elementary, elementary, and secondary school programs.

ELIMINATION OF SEGREGATION

The harmful effects of racial and socioeconomic segregation on academic achievement are now widely recognized, but the most effective ways of restructuring our precollege educational systems to eliminate de facto segregation are not clear. Institutions of higher education have an important responsibility to contribute to the solution of this problem by performing research on alternative approaches to desegregation, by providing consultants to local school officials who are seeking patterns of school attendance that best fit community needs, and by helping school systems to evaluate the results of desegregation efforts.

In communities where effective desegregation of local school systems has not been achieved, institutions of higher education should offer their resources of research and consultation to local school administrator and other community leaders.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY CENTERS

Information centers have been established in some metropolitan centers (e.g., Milwaukee) so that parents and students may obtain information and advice about career possibilities and opportunities for higher education. These centers serve both a counseling and recruiting function.

An educational opportunity center combining the features of tutorial work and advice could:

Provide study space and tutorial help.

Clarify vocational and educational goals.

Conduct complementary testing for level of achievement, aptitude, and interests.

Provide information concerning financial and academic support available at local colleges.

Prepare detailed documentation for use by admissions and financial aid officers.

Many of these functions could be performed by college students supported by work-study funds.

The Commission recommends that institutions of higher education, either alone or in conjunction with local school districts, establish educational opportunity centers to serve areas with major concentrations of low-income population.

VERBAL SKILLS

Because of academic and environmental factors associated with low socioeconomic status, some students find it extremely difficult to develop the verbal skills that are required both for college entrance and for completion of college courses. Although academic success is also determined by mathematical skills, these, too, require verbal skills for proper development.

The commission recommends the establishment of experimental programs for the early development of verbal skills, to be sponsored and administered by institutions of higher education with active participation from members of the community; and of programs for remedying verbal skills deficiencies at the secondary and higher levels of education.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACCESS

We do not believe that each young person should of necessity attend college. Quite the contrary. Many do not want and will not want to attend, and it cannot be shown that all young persons will benefit sufficiently from attendance to justify their time and the expense involved.

We should resist efforts to create a "captive" audience in our colleges. We should avoid pressures from family and society which impose college attendance on young people who would not voluntarily choose to attend.

We therefore oppose universal attendance as a goal of American higher education and believe that noncollege alternatives should be made more available and more attractive to young people.

We favor, on the other hand, universal access for those who want to enter institutions of higher education, are able to make reasonable progress after enrollment, and can benefit from attendance.

We note that universal access has been the historic practice of American higher education. All who have wanted to go to college and had the funds to permit it have gone to college at one or another of our very diversified colleges, beginning with Colonial days.

The great current increase in college attendance has meant that the supply of places has, probably for the first time in American history, fallen behind the demand of students for them on any continuing basis, and access to higher education is now limited in some areas by the inadequate capacity of institutions of higher education and the resulting need to reject students who meet their admission standards.

In 1960, California, recognizing the new demand for college places, adopted a policy of providing an opportunity within its total system of higher education for each high school graduate or otherwise qualified persons. New York City has adopted this policy for 1970. It is also being accepted by New York State, Washington, D.C., and Hawaii, among other jurisdictions.

We believe this will become, and even should become, general policy of all states. As we accept universal access by a more diverse student body, offerings of post-secondary education will need to be continually adapted, as may be necessary, so that they may benefit and be enjoyed by persons for whom the conventional undergraduate neoclassical education is inappropriate.

The idea of open access is quite different from that of acceptance on the basis of ethnic or socioeconomic quotas. The quota approach has not been the historic practice of American higher education and we do not recommend it. We do believe at the same time, that our historic approach of open access should not be abandoned just when minority students are arriving in larger numbers. We should not close the door at this juncture in history.

An unusually heavy burden of universal access now falls and will continue to fall on colleges.

The greatest deficit of opportunity for currently disadvantaged groups is now at the graduate level, and particularly at the graduate professional level. In our medical schools, less than 3 per cent of the students are black. Among lawyers in the United States, less than 2 percent are from minority ethnic groups.

A very special responsibility lies upon the universities to seek out graduate students from disadvantaged groups. The greatest single handicap the ethnic minorities face is their under-representation in the professions of the nation.

The commission recommends that:

Each state plan to provide universal access to its total system, but not necessarily to each of its institutions, since they vary greatly in their nature and purposes.

Community colleges or equivalent facilities be established within commuting range of potential students in all populous areas.

Four-year colleges generally be prepared to accept qualified transfer students and give them appropriate credit for the work they have already completed.

All institutions accept responsibility to serve the disadvantaged minorities at each of the levels at which they provide training, and that universities accept a special responsibility to serve a substantially greater representation of currently disadvantaged minorities in their graduate programs.

Each institution issue an annual report on its present and potential contributions to equality of opportunity.

ETHNIC CONSIDERATIONS IN CURRICULUM

The commission does not believe that post-secondary education is the best level at which we should begin correcting the ethnic imbalance of the curriculum. If a lack of ethnic self-awareness and a sense of inferiority begin in elementary school, then we must begin to attack these problems there.

From kindergarten on, every student can benefit from learning the history from his own ethnic group and those of his classmates, and about the rich diversity of his nation's culture. Such study is not a substitute for the development of basic verbal and mathematical skills, but students deserve the opportunity to study ethnic experiences and to use the intellectual resources of their schools to seek an understanding of problems of their own communities.

All students, at every educational level, and with whatever vocational goal, must be made fully aware of the wide variety of backgrounds and values of their fellow citizens.

It is important that introductory courses be offered at the college level concerning the varieties of minority experience, and that they be open to all students and faculty.

Not every institution of higher education, however, has the facilities and the staff to offer comprehensive instruction in ethnic studies.

Granting demands for majors, departments and colleges which do not have the finances, other resources or staff to conduct an effective program, exacerbates campus tension in the long run.

One solution to this problem is to develop cooperative programs for groups of neighboring institutions. Another solution is to refer students who want to specialize in ethnic studies at the undergraduate level to campuses that have the resources to develop an adequate program in that field. Also, campuses which have well-developed ethnic studies programs might make them available in the summer to students from other institutions.

Cautions about specialized degree programs should not be assumed, however, to rule out the possibility of an individualized ethnic studies major at any campus. Although there may be a shortage of faculty to staff a degree program for ethnic studies, there is often enough flexibility and interest to allow, through the use of tutorials and independent study, the construction of faculty-sponsored and supervised individual major programs to fit the interests and academic standards of students and instructors.

After examining many ethnic studies programs across the country, some established for years and others just begun, the commission has been most impressed when colleges and universities which have the appropriate economic and academic resources offer a program leading to a joint degree in ethnic studies combined with another related academic discipline. Precedent for such practice exists in interdepartmental undergraduate programs such as comparative literature and area studies.

Ethnic programs should be staffed by qualified personnel regardless of race and attended by qualified students regardless of race. Academic standards of factual accuracy and careful analysis of information apply here no less than in other areas of study.

Research and advanced study are needed to prepare teaching materials and teachers for ethnic studies. Concentration of such effort in a relatively few institutions where scholars have been assembled and where relevant materials have been gathered is desirable. A number of institutions, including several predominantly black colleges, already have established comprehensive institutes for this purpose.

New centers of advanced * * * but with great care, and only when competent Staff and adequate library resources are available.

Years ago, the major foundations supported the establishment of centers for Latin-American, Slavic, and Asian studies. Today they have a comparable obligation to respond favorably to proposals for the study of American Indian, black American, Mexican-American, southern Appalachian, and Puerto Rican history and literature at carefully selected centers.

ACADEMIC STAFF

The degree to which our suggested directions for ethnic studies and many of our other proposals for equal opportunity succeed will depend, in part, on the availability of minority teachers at all levels. Their availability in turn depends upon the elimination of barriers to higher education and particularly to graduate and professional training.

Minority staff members are urgently needed not only or even primarily for ethnic studies programs. Minority groups are underrepresented throughout the academic community.

Until we can produce a more representative ethnic distribution of persons with advanced degrees, the commission urges that interim alternatives for hiring faculty be sought by educational institutions. All those with the desire to teach classes for which they are qualified by talent and experience should be allowed to do so. The conventional standards of competence are not always relevant.

CONCLUSION

Years ago, when economic and cultural well-being for most people did not depend so heavily upon college training, questions of advanced educational opportunity lacked both the relevance and the impact that they have now. Today, the denial of equal opportunity for higher education is also the denial of equal access to full partnership in American society.

In the last decade we have witnessed a significant expansion of educational opportunity, but the evidence of our present distance from the goal of equal opportunity for higher education is distressing.

THE YEAR 1976

By 1976, the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, the commission proposes:

That all economic barriers to educational

opportunity be eliminated, thus closing the present probability differentials for college access and completion, and graduate school access and completion, among groups of equal academic ability but unequal family income level.

That the curriculum and the environment of the college campus not remain a source of educational disadvantage or inequity; that questions of cultural balance no longer be a source of eruptions.

That substantial progress be made toward improvement of educational quality at levels prior to higher education, and toward provision of universal access to higher education.

THE YEAR 2000

By the year 2000, the commission believes that opportunities can and must be totally free of the last vestiges of limitations imposed by ethnic grouping, or geographic location, or age, or quality of prior schooling.

It should not be necessary for colleges and universities in the year 2000 to provide compensatory educational programs or to struggle over flexible criteria for admissions and grading. The residual academic liabilities of racial discrimination and environmental deficiencies must not be allowed to influence educational opportunities in the 21st century.

By the year 2000, there should be no barriers to any individual achieving the occupational level which his talent warrants and which his interest leads him to seek. Equalizing educational opportunity for the individual citizen could lead to a percentage of minority persons at the higher occupational and professional levels generally roughly equivalent to their percentage of the population. Such a situation would be a most important signal that society was meeting its commitment to equality, and that education was fulfilling its particular role.

The total number of individuals comprising the many institutions and agencies addressed in these recommendations and comments is vast. But the problem is society-wide, and the Carnegie Commission is convinced that the response must in turn be society-wide.

The total cost to the Federal and state governments and public and private institutions will be high. But the cost of social services needed to cope with the consequences of educational disadvantages far outruns the economic support necessary to confront the sources of deprivation. Inequality of opportunity must not continue to sap the strength of our nation.

Money is not the only resource needed to solve these problems. In fact, it will be easier to provide the financial support necessary than it will be to create the ethical and political atmosphere which would ensure the achievement of these goals.

With a national commitment, we have met other immense challenges. Today we can no longer place any domestic priority for unmet needs above the elimination of inequality of opportunity of the United States.

The commission believes that a commitment to adequate support for better educational systems, to comprehensive student aid, and to removing the consequences of discrimination is truly basic to the nation's future. The greatest asset of any nation is its people.

THE MEN OF "B" COMPANY

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a grave article from the first issue of Scanlan's Monthly, published in March of this year. The author, who served in Vietnam for 12 months with a combat infantry unit and who was decorated with a Bronze Star, has returned to civilian life to tell a story which is in no way a pleasant one, but which should, I believe, be brought to the attention of my colleagues, as I am bringing it to the attention of the Department of the Army. The article follows:

THE MEN OF "B" COMPANY

(By James D. Henry as told to Donald Duncan)

INTRODUCTION

Upon my return from Vietnam as a civilian correspondent in 1968, one of my first visitors was James D. Henry, Specialist Fifth Class (equivalent to Sergeant). He also had just returned from Vietnam after serving for twelve months as a medic attached to a combat infantry unit. He was angry and he had a mission: he wanted to indict the United States on charges of aiding and abetting murder.

Civilian attorneys at the time thought him too ambitious. After reading his story you may agree with me that his aim was on target. This story was to have appeared in 1968 to coincide with his formal charges against the Army. Henry explains here why the charges were not made, and to anyone familiar with what is known as military justice, the reasons will be understandable.

The names of those involved in the story have been purposely deleted. Henry is not trying to "get" individuals who may themselves be the ultimate victims of their own acts. He feels nothing can be served by embarrassing the families of these men, and we agree. The names will be released only to a responsible investigative body. The United States Army already knows.

When the men of "B" Company, 1st of the 35th Infantry, rolled from under their dewy ponchos the morning of Feb. 8, 1968, the apprehension in our bivouac area was almost tangible. It was obvious I wasn't the only one who had the familiar, hated gnawing in his gut. There was a collective sullenness as we went about packing bed rolls, opening "C's" (canned rations) and putting our gear in order. Like "A" Company, we had been in the field too long, too many times, taken too many losses to gain too little.

Our bivouac perimeter, judging by the time it took to fly to the area, was about 15 miles northwest of the battalion base, LZ (Landing Zone) Baldy, situated beside Highway 1 near Cau Lau. We had retired to this perimeter the day before after some very heavy fighting. The battalion was in the fourth or fifth day of what had seemed a relatively uneventful search-and-destroy sweep. The day before, however, the 1st, 2d and 3d platoons had been ordered to attack into a tree-line.

It was at this point that the captain called up the 4th platoon—it had been left at some distance to provide mortar support for the others. I was with the 4th and came along with it; our arrival coincided with the third assault. On the way to link up with the company we cross the river, notably only because on one bank there was the body of an old man who had been shot recently. As we pressed forward we were passed by any number of fleeing women and children at least as terrified as myself and the others.

Twice the company penetrated the trees only to be thrown back. Once in the trees it was difficult to maintain control, not to mention impossible to see the enemy—there was nothing to shoot at. Attempts to flank were thwarted by heavy and extremely accurate sniper fire. Our company commander asked the colonel, who was hovering above the battle in a helicopter, for napalm and support from "A" Company. He was refused on both counts, the colonel maintaining that only a few snipers were holding up the company. The captain was ordered to continue the assault. One of the reasons given for no air support was that a helicopter sent in to evacuate our wounded had been downed and battalion did not want to risk causing it further damage.

The assault on the tree-line was absolute chaos. When we got into the trees, it was almost impossible to see any of the other men or to keep in line, and the invisible enemy seemed to be firing from every direction. The assault faltered like the others. With no help from the other company, and battalion more interested in saving a helicopter than saving soldiers, nobody, least of all the captain, had any desire to get themselves or their buddies killed in a fourth useless attempt—and so we fell back and set up the bivouac perimeter. All we had to show for our efforts were our wounded and eight of our company killed, including two lieutenants, the leaders of 1st and 2d platoons.

There was much bitterness among us because of the losses and the lack of support, and we agreed that it was a stupid maneuver, i.e., attacking against a defended tree-line. Those men who were near a radio operator, rightly or wrongly, directed their bitterness at the colonel. They felt he couldn't accurately evaluate the situation from his throne in the sky; nor did they appreciate him giving the captain orders such as, "Tell your men to keep their weapons on semi-automatic"—men, most of whom had spent six months in the boonies. Others, not knowing he was only following orders, blamed the captain.

The captain's RTO (radio operator) called the base for a sling team to come in and lift out the downed chopper, and then the company moved out to set up security around it. We were perilously close to yesterday's contact zone, so we were quite tense and nervous and the time required to hook and extract seemed endless. To our great relief it came off without incident and we withdrew again to our perimeter.

We were no sooner within the perimeter than our distant artillery began pounding yesterday's contact zone. Again our stomachs tightened and we took last pulls from our canteens and drew jerky puffs from cigarettes—the artillery always announced the beginning of another sweep. In our minds was the forlorn hope that the pounding would have more effect on the enemy today than it did yesterday. The captain gave a final briefing to the platoon leaders from the 3d and 4th and to the two sergeants filling in for the dead lieutenants from the 1st and 2d platoons. We moved out.

About 100 meters out of our perimeter we moved into a line formation with a platoon of 4th Division APC's (Armored Personnel Carriers, full-tracked, lightly armored vehicles for carrying troops) which had been attached to us the night before, dispersed along the line. When we were about 200 meters from the contact zone we started a recon-by-fire (firing at suspect areas in the hope that an enemy will return the fire and thereby reveal his position), using the 50 caliber machine guns on the APC's and our own small arms. When no fire was returned, we advanced, firing as we went, and moved into the area. A thorough search of the area produced only one enemy body, empty cartridges and our own bloody bandages from the day before.

You could almost feel the frustration sweeping over the men of the company—frustration at finding so little to justify the death of eight men, friends, the day before; a frustration at finding nothing to smash or destroy in retaliation. The mood of the company turned extremely ugly as we continued the sweep, a mood that shortly was to have terrible consequences.

Thirty minutes after a noon chow-break, two of our men discovered a Vietnamese hiding in a spider hole (a camouflaged hole large

enough to conceal one man). Dragged from the hole, he was repeatedly asked if he were VC or if he knew the whereabouts of the enemy. Out of fear, lack of comprehension or whatever, he gave us no information. He had no weapon and was dressed in common peasant clothes, but that hardly made him less suspect of having fought us yesterday or, at the very least, of having helped those who fought against us. The latter was quite probable since there were no Vietnamese in the entire area the least bit friendly toward U.S. troops. With the mood the company was in, however, it would have mattered little had the man belonged to the Rotary Club and been sufficiently fluent in English to plead his innocence and loyalty. He was Vietnamese and he was there—that was sufficient to mark him for death.

There were any number of ways to kill the man—shoot him, even give him a running start. Evidently these were too easy and not quite satisfying enough to the two men holding the prisoner. One asked the other, "Why don't we run him over with the track?" (They were right in front of one of the APC's.) His partner grinned and looked up at the driver, who gave his O.K. by ducking back in his hatch and revving the engine. Sensing his fate, words tumbled from the man's mouth. Struggling, he was thrown to the ground in front of the treads as the track lumbered forward. The roar of the motors blanketed the sound of bones being crushed and broken, but they weren't loud enough to block out the tortured screams. The two captors cursed when the APC rolled clear—the body was still twitching and jerking. The track was ordered into reverse and this time the treads finished their job. The agony was over, the body was still.

Few of our men took much notice of the incident. Even those of us who disapproved of such acts had seen so many of them that our reaction, if any, was one of apathy. Compared to many of the things I had seen or heard of in my six months with "B" Company, the incident was relatively minor. For instance, it hardly compared with the night in October when the 1st platoon set up in night-ambush position, captured five women, gang-raped them and then murdered all five.

Feb. 8 was the four-month mark of my first firefight and one month short of my first anniversary as a draftee. I had been trained and assigned as a medic but I was not a pacifist; like the rest of the medics, given the choice, I carried a weapon—two, in fact, an M–16 and a .38 pistol—and, also like the others, when in battle I used them. Regardless of religious beliefs, the medics, once in Vietnam, had all found one way or another to rationalize why they should carry and use weapons.

In fact, after my first firefight, it was a medic from Texas, whose rank was Sp–4 (equivalent to corporal), who gunned down a 12-year-old boy. I was resting with a group of men when some of the others brought the boy to us. The lieutenant was sitting atop a huge boulder resting like the rest of us. He looked down and asked which of us wanted to kill the boy. I thought he was kidding, but three men volunteered—and then one gave the kid a vicious kick in the stomach. The Texan prevailed and without hesitation led the "prisoner" around to the other side of the lieutenant's rock. He emptied an entire magazine from his M–16 into his back.

On the 5th of this same February, I walked into a small hootch house and found an old man who had just been murdered. I asked one of the men outside who had done it and was told, "The doc shot him . . . with his .45." The doc was a medic from San Francisco.

These acts, like the one this day, were all distinguished by the fact that they occurred other than in the heat of battle. I might have thought I was with a company of aberrants but for the stories told by men of other units over a longer period of time. One soldier from our sister "A" Company described innumerable atrocities performed by his outfit and commented that if a village wasn't VC before "A" Company got there, it damned sure was after it left.

Those of us opposed to the mistreatment, abuse or murder of civilians and/or prisoners could find comfort only in the knowledge that those who did so brought bad luck to themselves and invariably got zapped. Call it superstition or coincidence but it happened so often you could make book on it. The 2d platoon thought it sport to do such things as put a prisoner in a cave and use him for target practice—they took heavy casualties. The 1st platoon, however, was generally acknowledged to be the most notorious of the company for committing atrocities—and they invariably sustained the heaviest casualties. The platoon leader was known as a person who killed every Vietnamese he could—regardless of circumstances. He was killed.

On another occasion the company happened upon a large, uniformed, logistical unit of the enemy. They were on a supply run and many, if not most, were not armed. It became quite obvious that they weren't even fighters. Instead of trying to capture them or, since we had them surrounded, giving them a chance to surrender, the company engaged in what can only be described as a turkey shoot. Helicopter gunships were called in and started nosing down. Those who survived *that* onslaught were cut down by the ground troops. Picking off men as they scurried for nonexistent cover and ran around in confusion was considered a great game and in short order the whole group was wiped out. Some of the men started collecting souvenirs from the bodies. Fourteen men stripped the belts from as many bodies and wore them as trophies. A short time later all 14 were killed or wounded. It's probably safe to assume that many of the men in the company opposed to murder and other atrocities were motivated as much by superstition as by any moral or humanitarian considerations.

After we left this, the latest atrocity, we continued on for another hour until we came upon one of those countless small settlements found throughout Vietnam. Not even big enough to be considered a hamlet, it consisted of eight or ten hootches. We entered it without any opposition. Most of the company stayed in the jungle as a security force. About half the houses were partially hidden by the trees and bamboo and the remainder were located around a clearing perhaps no more than 50 or 60 meters at its widest.

The captain ordered a rest break and I went inside a half-demolished brick hootch on one side of the clearing with some other men and lit a smoke. The 1st platoon RTO sat next to me and as I rested I half-listened to the traffic coming over his set. One of the routine reports was from the third platoon leader who said he had rounded up 19 women and children from the immediate area. It was just part of the normal procedure of collecting civilians to interrogate them as to the whereabouts of any NVA or NLF forces. It was so normal we barely gave the report any attention.

A short time later, however, that lieutenant called back to ask the captain what should be done with the 19 civilians. The captain asked him if he remembered the operation order received from battalion that morning and then repeated the order: "Kill anything that moves." With that the lieutenant "rogered" and went off the air.

Those lounging in the hootch did a double take. Startled, I got to my feet and started from the hootch toward the captain who was across the clearing, about 30 meters away. As I left I could hear the captain's voice on the radio frantically trying to call back to the lieutenant. I felt somewhat relieved—evidently the captain realized that he might just carry out the order and he wanted to countermand it.

As I approached the captain's position I turned to look in the direction of the 3d platoon's 1st squad. The lieutenant was with the squad about 50 meters away, a position within the clearing on slightly rising ground near one of the hootches. As I looked, two of the squad dragged a young girl from the hootch. The girl was completely naked and I felt a sickness in my stomach. I hadn t seen anything but it was safe to assume that she had been sexually molested—since that too was "normal" procedure.

A few yards away the remaining women and children were herded together, squatting on the ground, closely watched by other men of the squad, their M–16's at the ready. The two men dragging the naked girl threw her forcibly among the squatting people, knocking a couple of women sprawling in the dirt. I started to shake my head in disgust—how unnecessary, how absolutely stupid—when, at the instant the girl's body hit the ground, four or five of the guards opened fire.

Chunks of flesh and spurting blood spewed in every direction. The screams went unheard in the terrible din of the rifles firing on full automatic. It was over in a few dreadful seconds—the explosive chattering stopped almost as suddenly as it had started. A silence that seemed to hurt fell over the entire area. I was completely stunned as were many of the others—it was inevitable, yet unexpected. We stood there trying to disbelieve the terrible, irrevocable finality of what we had seen. But it had happened. The proof was there in the still, mangled forms in the bloody dirt. Nineteen women and children. Slaughtered.

The silence and my inertia were broken by the motors of the APC, which had been at the bottom of the small rise, as it lurched forward the short distance to the bodies. Both tracks locked, stopping the vehicle so suddenly it rocked on its suspension. The lieutenant in charge of the APC detachment (he had not been present earlier at the spider-hole scene) looked down from his hatch. His eyes moved from the bodies to the lieutenant and the other men, his face showing digust, loathing and great anger.

I heard later that he reported the incident and demanded an investigation. If so nothing ever came of it. Likewise when we returned to our night perimeter a lieutenant who had remained with the APC carrying the 4.2 mm mortar was in a terrible rage. He had listened to the whole thing over the radio and, like the APC leader, was furious and disgusted. He also wanted to report it but, if he did, again nothing came of it.

Without orders, without a spoken word of any kind, we picked up our packs, turned our backs on the tangled corpses, and continued our sweep. A few of us left vowing to do something about this mass murder but the vows and their cause were soon lost in the intensity of the war. One of the witnesses to the massacre called the lieutenant scum, to his face—and damn the court-martial. For most of us it was but one day in a 365-day tour.

This must be emphasized: it was not a unique day—only the numbers made it different. I personally know of at least 50 civilians executed by our company and with as little provocation as on this day, not in the heat of battle or from air or artillery strikes—deliberate murder. And then there were the rapes and the cases of torture (without even the pretext of trying to gain information), such as Texas boy from the 2d platoon torturing a woman with a red-hot knife blade. Nor was ours a freak company; it was just one more company subjected to too many firefights for too little reason and the odd strains of an odd war. Other companies I knew of committed more crimes and, of

course, I also knew of others which committed fewer.

My telling this story is not prompted by any desire to see any individual punished—that would serve no purpose. Nor is it prompted by the My Lai/Song. My disclosures—I first told this story in Sept. 1968, long before Song My came to light. There is, however, an apparent attempt to make the incidents reported at Song My look like rare and unusual events and the men who were involved "different." This must not be allowed, for a very straightforward reason—it just isn't true. The contrary is.

I had just returned from Vietnam when I first told this story. Perhaps I was naive, but I wanted to indict the U.S. Army and I wanted to do it while I was still in uniform. The men of "B" Company, like the men at Song My, did what they did because of what the U.S. Army did, or didn't do, to them. My sole motivation was and is to stop the atrocities and to stop the taking of otherwise average young Americans and transforming them into people capable and willing to perform atrocities. This can't be done by singling out a few individuals for punishment, for they are as much the victims as those they murdered.

I strongly doubt there is one soldier who deliberately killed a civilian believing that by doing so he was furthering the cause of freedom and democracy in Vietnam. I knew damned few soldiers who believed that *anything* they were doing was to that end, regardless of what they believed when they first arrived in Vietnam. Such acts are committed out of frustration, fear and hate. Growing disillusionment with our Vietnamese "allies" and their government (an inevitable process for any aware person more than three months in-country) gives men less and less reason to get themselves killed or wounded and yet, without a cause, the same men are sent time and again to become targets. The growing belief that the death of your buddies is for nothing and that it could be your turn next must ultimately lead to a raging hate which requires something to fix on.

To someone not in the situation it might seem that the logical object to fix on would be the person or persons who time after time order the men into the positions of grave danger. But who? The captain who is only passing on the orders of the colonel who is only passing them on from someone else . . . and on and on? No. The object of hate becomes the people shooting at you and anyone you think is helping them shoot—the Vietnamese, the "gooks," the "slopes." When your life is in danger it's not sufficient to say, "If we weren't here shooting at them they wouldn't be shooting at us." You *are* there and once there you will shoot—and get shot at. And the more frequently it happens, the more friends who are killed, the less there is to die for and the greater is the potential within each individual to commit an atrocity. Such is the frustration, the fear—and the nature of the hate that grows from them.

And to hell with DOD (Department of Defense) directives from on high. Neither as an individual nor as part of a group was I ever told, either by NCO's, platoon leaders or any other officer, not to kill civilians in Vietnam. On the contrary, most atrocities are performed with the tacit approval or permission of officers, and, as often as not, with an officer in attendance or leading the way. True, no body should have to be told not to kill unarmed civilians or prisoners, but when the rage and hate is there along with an opportunity to vent it with no fear of reprimand or danger to oneself, it will happen. I point this out not to justify murder and other atrocities, or to alibi for the men involved, but to explain why and how such acts are committed.

As I said, I wanted to indict the U.S. Army, more specifically the Pentagon and the military and civilian leaders who give the orders on the one hand and hide what is happening from the American people on the other. I want the people of this country to know what their sons are doing in the name of freedom and democracy, what they are becoming or have become.

In Sept., 1968, I reported in at my new duty station at Fort Hood, Texas. As soon as I got settled in I went to the Judge Advocate's office to get a lawyer's advice on how to proceed with the indictment. The lawyer I talked with was an officer, but for all that I assumed that our conversation would be privileged communication and he assured me such was the case. Yet while I sat in the office the office-lawyer excused himself and left the room. When he returned he gave me, instead of help, the advice not to do anything until I was out of service—and then directed me to the CID (Criminal Investigation) office. As soon as I entered, the man in charge started a bullying interrogation based on the conversation I had had with the lawyer. My instincts told me not to tell the agent anything—I hadn't survived Vietnam only to fall victim to somebody trying to protect the clubhouse. The session ended with thinly veiled threats as to what could happen to me if I pursued my stated course of action.

Next, on the advice of Davis Bragg, a civilian attorney from Killeen, Texas. I sent a registered letter to Congressman George Brown of Los Angeles. In the letter I gave him a brief sketch of the story and told him of my intentions. I wanted only to get some backing from a public official so I could proceed and not end up in the bowels of Leavenworth while doing so. His reply was that I was not in his constituency and recommended that I write Ed Reineke, then a state representative and now the Lieutenant Governor of California. Mr. Reineke wrote back that he would investigate the matter and contact me as soon as he had any information. Whether he investigated or not is speculative but I've never heard from him since. Given the lack of support by civilian representatives and the heat from the military at Fort Hood, my lawyer recommended I sit on the story until I was out of service.

Well, I'm out.

I swear that the above story is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

JAMES D. HENRY.

JANUARY 11, 1970.
Witness: Marilyn Moorehead Smith.
Witness: Donald W. Duncan.

LOCAL PARK PROBLEMS HAVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the advent of the seventies seems to be heralding public awareness of the need to preserve our environment. Often the issues at stake are of vast impact on an entire city or region, or involve great sums of money. But frequently what is at stake is of relative significance to only a small segment of a community.

Such an issue is at stake in Queens Village in my district where residents are fighting to preserve a lovely pond standing in the way of an expanding highway.

I think it is commendable that local community newspapers—often the only media outlets for such issues—publish stories about these problems. The public-spirited Queens County Times is such a community newspaper that deserves praise for highlighting the environmental issue in a recent story on the possible doom of Pea Pond. I would like to call my colleagues' attention to this superb article:

PARKWAY WIDENING AND APPROACHES MAY DOOM WATERLESS PEA POND

Plans are shaping up for Pea Pond, Grand Central Parkway entrances and exits at Springfield Boulevard, and the paths on both sides of Grand Central Parkway in Queens Village, as a result of highway work presently being planned and under way to improve the geometry and safety of Grand Central Parkway just east of Bell Boulevard to the City-line.

Pea Pond, which lies south of 86th Avenue at 218th Street, north of Grand Central Parkway, has been used in the past for fishing by the youngsters in summer and ice skating by the community in winter. This has been a valuable community resource. C. Sidamon-Eristoff, Transportation Administrator Designate of the City of New York writes that "The natural storm water drainage tributary to this low lying area has been depleted over the past ten years by physical improvements on Bell Boulevard and adjacent streets. A recent inspection showed that the Pond site no longer contains free standing water."

William R. Ginsberg, First Deputy Administrator of the New York City Parks, Recreation and Cultural Affairs Administration, writes that "In connection with the widening of Grand Central Parkway now being done by New York State, Mr. Jerry Merzon, our Assistant Administrator for Capital Projects wrote to Mr. Arthur Asserson, Chief Engineer of the Bureau of Arterial Highways, Planning and Coordination of the Department of Highways, on May 21, 1969 confirming 'our request that the area known as Pea Pond, in the vicinity of 218th Street, which no longer receives sufficient water to maintain a pond, be investigated by the State to determine the feasibility of filling to street grade, topsoiling and seeding.'"

In reference to Grand Central Parkway entrances and exists Sidamon-Eristoff writes that "A new entrance to westbound Grand Central Parkway will be constructed within the parkway right-of-way between Union Turnpike and Springfield Boulevard and consequently such entrance will have no bearing on Pea Pond."

In a letter from J. F. Toth, Regional Design Engineer, by H. Parks, Associate Civil Engineer, of the New York State Department of Transportation, "The present entrance to the westbound Parkway at Springfield Boulevard will be removed and replaced by an entrance ramp just west of Union Turnpike. Access to and from the parkway in both east and west-bound directions will be obtainable at Union Turnpike upon completion of the Parkway reconstruction."

In reference to the paths on both sides of Springfield Boulevard being refurbished Sidamon-Eristoff writes that "Maintenance and improvement, if warranted, of the pedestrian and equestrian paths on either side of Springfield Boulevard is the responsibility of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Affairs Administration. Although these paths appear to be in disuse, they will be protected and if need be replaced during the parkway reconstruction by the highway contractor."

Ginsberg writes that "Rehabilitation of the pedestrian paths and bridlepaths along both sides of Grand Central Parkway at Springfield Boulevard must await the availability of funds. Such a project may be included within a future over-all development of the Kissena Corridor."

And Toth by Parks writes that "The path system along the Parkway is also under the jurisdiction of the Park Department. As a part of the highway project the path entrances to the underpasses at Union Turn-

pike and Springfield Boulevard are being closed and the path system fenced off.

"In accordance with agreements reached with the New York City agencies, the bridle paths will not be destroyed; however, because criminal actions and vandalism has taken place along the birdle paths and in the underpasses, and the difficulty of maintaining and policing this facility, the above action is being taken.

"This treatment will permit the City of New York at some future date to re-open the facility with the proper maintenance and safety."

Pea Pond and the paths on both sides of Grand Central Parkway should not be allowed to become inactive. Now is the proper time for us to make our wishes known so that our needs can be included in the planning now taking place on the widening of Grand Central Parkway in Queens Village. Should Pea Pond be filled in or be kept as a pond for fishing in the summer and ice skating in the winter? If it should be kept as a pond, from where will the water come? Can a parkway storm sewer empty into Pea Pond and an old overflow pipe rehabilitated?

Should the paths be rehabilitated and built from Bell Boulevard across Springfield Boulevard and Union Turnpike to the old Motor Parkway, which connects to Alley Pond Park? Should these paths be refurbished to allow us to walk in the woods? Should these paths be refurbished to allow us to walk on a terminal moraine and look out over southeast Queens? Should we retain a bit of nature?

Any suggestions or comments about this bit of nature and ways to keep it will be appreciated by Thomas F. Schweitzer, 89–19 218th Street, Queens Village 11427, HOllis 8–4831 and by James A. Trent, 242–29 90th Avenue, Bellerose 11426, FIeldstone 7–3820.

MIDWAY AIRPORT NEEDS TO BE REACTIVATED

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which was recently broadcast over WMAQ–TV, one of Chicago's stations, emphasized the need for another major airport in the Chicago area.

Present facilities at O'Hare, the world's busiest airport, are woefully inadequate and the advent of jumbo jets and the supersonic transport will make a bad situation even worse. The existing noise and pollution problems will be aggravated if the pressures on O'Hare are not promptly relieved.

The editorial follows:

A few weeks ago, we did an editorial about the airport situation in the Chicago area. We said that there is a need for a third airport, but the idea of putting it out in Lake Michigan was a little silly.

We also said that, until we do get a third airport somewhere southwest of the city, that better use could be made of this place here, Midway.

At least Mayor Daley agrees with us on this point. He's pushing hard to get the airlines to move 438 daily flights from O'Hare down here to Midway. Now that's a good idea, but there's a problem involved.

Air travel has become a complex web of connecting flights. And you can't just move a piece of the web from one airport to another. This place is a no man's land because too many passengers have found out that, wherever they're going, they can't get there from Midway.

So, no single airline wants to move a lot of flights down here from O'Hare and end up with a load of empty seats.

Now if the airlines could get together and agree to move an entire pattern of flights to Midway, flights with enough connections to attract the passengers, this airport would be back in business.

But there's a hitch. The anti-trust laws prevent competing businesses from making these kinds of deals with each other.

United Airlines has a possible solution; that the Civil Aeronautics Board intervene and pave the way for the airlines to huddle and come up with a Midway plan.

We strongly urge the C.A.B. to do this. O'Hare Field is overcrowded and it's just common sense to get some flights down here at Midway, especially after a 12 million dollar remodeling job.

And maybe the thing could be moved along faster if Mayor Daley gave the airlines free landing access for a while here, so they could commit the money necessary to cover the expense of using two airports.

There's no reason why Midway shouldn't be humming again. All it takes is a few intelligent men to say yes to each other.

SAN JOAQUIN WILDERNESS—IT WILL BENEFIT ALL THE PEOPLE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have been heartened by the tremendous response of the people of California to a proposal sponsored by 16 Members of the California congressional delegation to designate some 43,000 acres of national forest in the Sierra Nevada as the San Joaquin Wilderness Area.

Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters and petitions from concerned citizens from San Diego to the northern part of the State urging prompt action on this bill in order that the natural integrity of the Sierra Nevada and the John Muir Trail can be preserved from planned development.

I recently received a copy of an article by George Whitmore, chairman of the conservation committee of the Tehipite chapter of the Sierra Club, which gives an excellent indepth look at the issue before us.

The article follows:

SAN JOAQUIN WILDERNESS: IT WILL BENEFIT ALL THE PEOPLE

"The most openly beautiful . . . the grandest scenery and the grandest trees on the continent" was John Muir's description of the Sierra Nevada. And it extended "southward from the Yosemite National Park to the end of the range."

For the better part of two hundred miles this gentle wilderness extended in a magnificent sweep down the crest of the range, crossed only by a few primitive foot trails.

Creation of the National Forests and National Parks established the principle that this was a resource which belonged to all the people of the United States. No longer would the Sierra be destroyed by commercial interests, nor squandered by self-seeking politicians.

But the battle was not to be won that easily. Over the years there have been several proposals to utilize the Mammoth Pass-Minaret Summit area for commercial purposes. Consequently this area, even though it originally had been included within Yosemite National Park, was removed from the Park in 1905, supposedly to permit mining activity.

When the original Forest Service Wild and Wilderness areas were designated during the 1930's, this area was still left out because of a road proposal.

When the wilderness boundaries were revised in the early 1960's, the area was again left out—this time there was talk of dams and reservoirs.

The commercial interests have had ample opportunity over the past sixty-five years to try to make their case, and they have failed dismally. The only proposal which still persists is that for a Minaret Summit highway which would cut across the John Muir Trail, bisecting the Range of Light into two fragments. This highway has been discussed at all levels of government and by all parties concerned for more than forty years. The only significant support it continues to receive is from certain commercial interests in the Fresno-Madera area. The "arguments" used by these interests are incredibly weak, but they attempt to compensate for this with persistence.

It is high time this nonsense was put to an end. The mineral deposits are not of commercial quality or quantity. The timber is of such poor quality that the loggers don't want it. The hydroelectric proposals are not economically feasible, and are becoming less so with the passage of time.

On the other hand, this area is eminently qualified for wilderness status. There is scenic grandeur—probably best epitomized by the rugged gorges and granite walls rising above the rivers to culminate in Balloon Dome. Of this Muir said, "The beautiful San Joaquin (Balloon) Dome in the canyon of the San Joaquin . . . shows remarkable resemblance to the Yosemite Half Dome."

Along the gourges there are a few small wooded vales formed by glacial action—"yosemites" as Muir called them; they provide a friendly contrast to the more-awe-inspiring sweep of granite surrounding them.

Within the gorges lurk trophy-size trout, their perpetuation ensured by the ruggedness of their surroundings.

On slopes and benches above the river lie virgin forests of red fir and lodgepole—fortunately not of commercial quality. Scenic meadows are scattered throughout the forest, and alpine slopes lead up to the summit of Iron Mountain, eleven thousand feet above sea level.

Lying off the beaten track, the wilderness of the San Joaquin offers a greater measure of solitude than do many other back country areas. Solitude is becoming increasingly hard to find even in our wilderness areas, and many visitors to the San Joaquin value it for this quality.

In essence, this is a de facto wilderness. The U.S. Forest Service management criteria for the area are already consistent with wilderness classification.

Cross-country travel with motor vehicles is prohibited, and no motor vehicle "trails" have been approved. No timber sales or other developments are planned, and consequently there are to be no Forest Development roads. Most of the area is being designated as a Management Unit, and one of the management criteria will be to exclude roads.

The U.S. Forest Service is to be commended for protecting the de facto wilderness in these ways. However, *if* the Minaret Summit highway were to be built, then the Forest Service would be forced to reevaluate its management of the area. There are indications that the area would be logged, even though the timber is of poor quality. Accompanying the logging would be a network of forest development roads, and the desecra-

tion would extend far beyond the shoulders of the main highway.

Even though the highway proposal has been thoroughly discredited, the continual comercial agitation for it will be with us for all time. The issue will never be resolved by waiting. In the meantime, the San Joaquin Wilderness needs statutory recognition in order to give it a greater degree of protection. It is time we closed the gap in the Sierra Nevada Wilderness. From Yosemite to Sequoia the only unprotected portion of the crest is on the San Joaquin's North and Middle Forks.

Congressman Jerome Waldie has introduced legislation to accomplish this. It is H.R. 15019—a bill to establish the San Joaquin Wilderness. He was joined by fifteen other California congressmen who co-sponsored the bill. All of these gentlemen deserve our thanks and our fullest support.

SENATE—*Friday, March 6, 1970*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose glory fills the universe, we thank Thee for this new day, for life and liberty, for work to do and strength with which to do it. Grant unto us to waste none of its hours, to soil none of its moments, to neglect none of its opportunities, to fail in none of its duties. Bring us to the evening time undefeated by any temptation, at peace with ourselves, at peace with our fellow men, at peace with Thee, content to have served this Nation in this place.

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read a communication to the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 5, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13300) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to provide for the extension of supplemental annuities and the mandatory retirement of employees, and for other purposes.

This message also announced that the House passed the bill (S. 2910) to amend Public Law 89–260 to authorize additional funds for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1970

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Later in the day this order was modified to provide for an adjournment to 11:30 on Monday.)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN) will be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that, after the Senator from Wyoming has completed his remarks, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements by Senators therein limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 30 minutes.

TASK FORCE REPORT ON OIL IMPORTS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, first, I should like to express my very real appreciation to the distinguished majority leader for his continuing courtesy and consideration toward me.

Mr. President, the recommendations of the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control are, to me, alarming in more respects than one. First, as I have attempted to emphasize on other occasions and will continue to do, is the national security risk involved in what I consider to be the basically unsound conclusions reached by the task force or rather the majority of the task force. A separate or minority report by the Secretaries of Interior and Commerce and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission questioned the analysis and the judgments which the task force presents in support of its conclusions. The minority report noted that the task force report stresses the uncertainties of the future and the importance of judgments in shaping its conclusions. But the report fails to convey fully either the magnitude of probable errors in judgments which have been drawn by other recognized authorities, or the significance of these differences.

The minority report says:

We are particularly concerned, (1) because our own judgments on every major issue differ significantly from those of the "Report," and point to a different set of conclusions; (2) because we are acutely aware of unusual uncertainties which currently affect the future of our oil supplies, e.g., important recent tax changes, international unrest, undetermined potentials of frontier producing areas; (3) because changes based on erroneous judgments would subject the U.S. to serious national security risks and would be most difficult if not impossible to reverse; (4) because proposed changes directly affect our designated areas of Departmental responsibility.

Our principal disagreements center around these points:

(1) The national security issue is inadequately anaylzed and presented by the "Report." Data and assumptions are most optimistic and not realistic. United States dependence on unreliable Eastern Hemisphere sources of foreign oil and the probabilities of supply interruptions would be appreciably greater than the "Report" suggests, if imports were to be substantially increased.

(2) The economic issues are not adequately covered in the "Task Force Report," although they are relevant considerations under the national security clause of the Trade Expansion Act. Large scale waste of oil and gas resources would ensue if the "Report's" recommendations were implemented. Various sectors of the economy and parts of the country would be badly hurt.

(3) The cost to the consumer of present oil import controls is grossly overstated in the "Task Force Report."

(4) Fixing the price of oil, a prime objective of the "Task Force Report's" recommended program is impractical and inconsistent with the broad policies of the Administration.

(5) The "Task Force Report's" criticism of State prorationing is inappropriate.

(6) The balance of payments impact of increased imports resulting from the "Report's" recommendations would be increasingly adverse over time.

(7) Technological advances would be retarded by the program proposed in the "Task Force Report."

Mr. President, I agree wholeheartedly with the concern of the heads of the three Government agencies most directly concerned with the Nation's energy resources and the continued development of those resources to meet future needs of the American people.