

Salzman, Richard S., July 1962 to December 1967, Civil.

Sand, Leonard B., 1953-55, Assistant U.S. Attorney, South District of N.Y.; Assistant Solicitor General.

Schlei, Norbert A., August 1962 to March 1966, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel.

Sexton, John J., 1954-58, Tax.

Silk, Thomas, 1964-68, Tax.

Silver, Laurens H., 1963-65, Criminal.

Silver, Lawrence B., 1963-67, Tax.

Sisk, Marcus W., Jr., July 1964 to February 1965, Civil Rights.

Slawson, W. David, 1965-67, Office of Legal Counsel.

Smith, Jeffrey L., October 1966 to October 1969, Civil Rights.

Solomon, Richard A., February 1958 to May 1962, Antitrust.

Sonnenschein, Marco S., March 1964 to January 1969, Tax.

Spritzer, Ralph S., 1947-68, Office of Solicitor General.

Steiner, David A., October 1967 to May 1968, Civil Rights.

Stern, Gerald M., June 1961 to February 1964, Civil Rights.

Strout, Arthur, 2½ years, Tax.

Taylor, Leigh H., June 1966 to September 1968, Civil Rights.

Terris, Bruce J., 1957-65, Office of Solicitor General.

Terry, Joseph Ray, 4 years, Civil Rights.

Tirana, B. R., 1962-64, Civil.

Turner, Donald F., 1965-68, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust.

Van Alstyne, William, 1958-59, Civil Rights.

Vinson, Fred M., 1965-69, Assistant Attorney General, Criminal.

Wasserstrom, Richard, 1963-64, Civil Rights.

Weinstein, Les J., 5 years, Antitrust.

Weissman, William R., 1966-69, Antitrust.

Wertheimer, Richard J., September 1960 to February 1965, Antitrust.

Wilkins, Roger W., April 1966 to January 1969, Director, Community Relations Service.

Wright, Robert, 15 years, Antitrust.

Zimmerman, Edwin M., July 1965 to January 1969, Antitrust.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I believe that these men speak from a background of knowledge and understanding, and that should persuade Members who have

had less association and, therefore, less experience with the difficulties that are thrown in the road of the Department of Justice personnel seeking to protect all of us equally in this country. This counsel is most helpful. I know it will be given very thoughtful consideration.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received, and which I understand other Senators have received, from Mr. John W. Gardner, chairman of the Urban Coalition Action Council, signed also by Andrew Heiskell, A. Philip Randolph, Whitney M. Young, Jr., and W. D. Eberle.

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

THE URBAN COALITION
ACTION COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1970.

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are writing to urge you to support the Scott-Hart voting rights bill. We believe it is vital that the 1965 Voting Rights Act be extended without amendments that would allow many states to revert to discriminatory practices which prevented minority citizens from registering and voting.

We simply must not slow down in our efforts to insure that every citizen has access to the ballot box. If we tell our minority citizens to support the democratic process and work within the electoral system, then we must insure that they have full and free access to the voting rolls.

The 1965 Voting Rights Act was landmark legislation that has been remarkably successful in assuring the right to vote to hundreds of thousands of people. A change in this historic Act at this time would be a drastic step backward for the cause of human rights and the democratic process.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. GARDNER,
Chairman.

On behalf of the Urban Coalition Action Council and its Co-chairmen:

Andrew Heiskell, Chairman of the Board, Time, Inc.

A. Philip Randolph, International President-Emeritus, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Whitney M. Young, Jr., Executive Director, National Urban League.

W. D. Eberle, President, American Standard.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I should think that the very dedicated men who have sent this letter can serve as an important guide to us. John W. Gardner's dedication to this country is particularly distinctive as is his concern about our future, his understanding of our cities, and understanding of people who live in those cities.

I believe the action of the Senate today and in recent days in standing firm on voting rights legislation which has been adopted in the past, successfully implemented and judicially upheld, must be very encouraging to him. It should also be encouraging to all Americans who believe in equal rights of expression and equal voting privileges, rights which are fundamental to our form of government.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 10, 1970, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 9, 1970:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

William D. Brewer, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mauritius.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

VFW CONGRESSIONAL AWARD TO SENATOR JACKSON

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, a former Member of this body who is a distinguished Member of the Senate will be honored tomorrow night by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. The 7th annual VFW Congressional Award will be presented at the 1,500,000-member organization's annual congressional banquet at the Sheraton-Park Hotel. I know that the great majority of Members of both the House and the Senate will be on hand to honor our distinguished colleague.

According to VFW Commander-in-Chief Ray Gallagher, of Redfield, S. Dak., the VFW chose "Senator JACKSON because of his studious and hard-working approach to the Nation's problems

during his nearly 30 years in Washington. Senator JACKSON was prominent in passage last year of legislation for the antiballistic missile system. During Senate debate he warned that the Soviet Union is a 'dangerous, unpredictable opponent'."

Senator JACKSON was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1940. He served six terms and was elected to the Senate in 1952. In 1960, he was chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Presently, he serves on three major Senate committees, plus a joint committee. He is chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and has long fought pollution and for conservation of the Nation's natural resources. As a member of the Government Operations Committee he is chairman of a Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations, and a ranking member of the McClellan Investigations Subcommittee.

The Senator serves on the Armed Services Committee and is a member of the

subcommittee which oversees the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on Atomic Weapons of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He also serves as ex officio member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Commander Gallagher said:

I feel that we could not have made a better choice to receive the Congressional Award than Senator Jackson. He certainly embodies the aspirations for our Nation held by all members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The congressional award is the highest honor presented by the VFW. It was first awarded to former Senator Carl Hayden of Arizona in 1964. Recipients since have been: Speaker of the House JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, former Senate minority leader Everett McK. Dirksen of Illinois, Representative WILBUR MILLS of Arkansas, Senator RICHARD RUSSELL of Georgia and in 1969, Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE of Texas.

Gallagher said in his announcement:

By awarding this honor, the VFW seeks to dramatize the importance of the role of a freely elected legislature to serve the great ends of the Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I speak for all of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives when I congratulate the junior Senator from Washington and the VFW for choosing him to receive their coveted award.

BUSING TO ACHIEVE RACIAL BALANCE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Northern Virginia Daily of Strasburg, Va., on March 7 published an editorial based on a colloquy which I recently had with Under Secretary Veneman, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I believe the editorial, entitled "Many Hats," makes some important points on the subject of busing to achieve racial balance.

The editor of the Northern Virginia Daily is James J. Crawford.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

MANY HATS

Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. is a member of the Senate Finance Committee. Recently, Undersecretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Veneman appeared before the committee, at which time he was interrogated by Sen. Byrd.

The senator's questions to Mr. Veneman had to do with problems which had arisen in Newport News, in which HEW had threatened to withhold federal funds to force the busing of children to achieve integration in the schools.

The exchange which followed, which we reprint below, shows quite clearly that federal bureaucracy wears a number of hats, and apparently is not always entirely sure which one it has on:

"Senator Byrd: Now, Mr. Veneman, the Secretary has repeatedly been quoted as stating that your department, HEW, does not force localities to bus school children to achieve racial balance. Is that correct?"

"Mr. Veneman: That is correct.

"Senator Byrd: But is it not a fact that your department has refused to approve desegregation plans of individual school districts while at the same time indicating that plans involving busing would be acceptable?"

"Mr. Veneman: As a means of achieving desegregation.

"Senator Byrd: Would you in your capacity have an appropriate official in the department communicate with the city of Newport News and tell them that you have no right to require them to bus students?"

"Mr. Veneman: We do not have a right to require them.

"Senator Byrd: Let me ask you this: What is the difference, legally or morally, between ordering busing to achieve racial balance and issuing rulings which, in effect, leave the community with no choice but to bus to achieve racial balance or lose federal funds? What is the difference?"

"Mr. Veneman: The Department—I really would like to make this clear. The Department has not required the transportation of students to achieve racial balance. And I do not think there is a court decision on that as yet.

"Senator Byrd: Well, would you indicate what is different, legally or morally, between ordering busing to achieve racial balance, which you say you do not do, and issuing rulings which, in effect, leave the community with no choice but to bus or lose federal funds?"

"Mr. Veneman: I do not think we have issued that ruling that leaves a community with no choice, Senator."

From the undersecretary's answers to Sen. Byrd's pointed questions we would judge that the particular hat HEW wears in any given circumstance is apparently dictated by the requirements of that occasion, geographical or otherwise.

Though, by the undersecretary's own admission, HEW has no right to require communities to bus students in order to achieve racial balance, it certainly acts as though it does. HEW officials have come into Virginia, and into the communities of other Southern states, and in Sen. Byrd's words, "... have browbeaten the local officials into thinking that HEW has a right to force them to bus all the way across cities and counties, for the purposes of achieving racial balance."

So, while a high official of HEW denies that his department requires busing, and in fact acknowledges that under the law HEW has no such authority, he cannot deny that this kind of pressure has been used countless times to force reluctant school districts into line.

LONGFELLOW NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to authorize the establishment of the Longfellow National Historic Site in Cambridge, Mass. I am hopeful that speedy consideration will be given to this bill, and that in the very near future, the Longfellow house will be a national historic site.

Henry Wadsworth Longfellow is probably the favorite poet of schoolchildren throughout our Nation. Through his poetry, an historical event becomes a reality in the minds of children. Longfellow's description of the "Midnight Ride of Paul Revere," I am sure, means much more to a child than any historical account of the event, no matter how well written. His poetry gives us a feeling of an age gone by, the type of life encountered by those people who came to settle and build our Nation.

In 1843, Longfellow's father-in-law, a Boston merchant, bought the house at 105 Brattle Street in Cambridge and the adjoining ground as a gift for his daughter and her bridegroom. The Longfellow family lived there until 1882 and their descendants occupied the house thereafter. It was while sitting in that house that the inspiration for the "Children's Hour" came to Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, the father and the poet. In 1913 Longfellow's descendants conveyed the property and an endowment fund to a

board of trustees who were obliged to keep the house as it was during the poet's life. It stands in Cambridge today with the same furnishings, filled with Longfellow's possessions and his works.

It is the wish of the trustees to transfer to the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior the Longfellow House so that it may be preserved for future generations of Americans as a national historic site. The bill I have introduced today would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the donation of the Longfellow house and a sum of \$200,000 for the Longfellow National Historic Site.

It was my honor and great privilege to serve as a member of the Boston Historical Sites Commission during the 86th and 87th Congresses. I know the intrinsic value of this property, and more importantly the historical and cultural value it holds for all Americans and for generations of Americans to come.

The board of trustees of the Longfellow house, Messrs. Parkman D. Howe of Boston, Henry L. de Rham of New York City and Brooks Beck of Boston, have asked my cooperation in this endeavor. I am very happy to work with them, and I commend them for this action.

I include the following description of the Longfellow house from the National Park Service:

PROPOSED LONGFELLOW NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE—CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, beloved American poet, scholar and teacher, lived for 45 years in the old colonial house at 105 Brattle Street in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Here he resided from the time he was appointed Professor of Modern Languages at Harvard University in 1837, until his death in 1882. It was here that he composed most of his renowned works; here that his six children were born; here that he regaled the local school children with his stories of the American Revolution; and here that he entertained the Nation's great.

With fanciful and lively imagination, Longfellow created literary myths and figures that remain today as vital keys to the early American scene. Quotations from his poetry are familiar household expressions both in America and abroad.

Through the music of Longfellow's poetry, Paul Revere achieved immortality, as did the imaginary Village Blacksmith, Priscilla and John Alden, and Hiawatha. Many feel that Longfellow achieved his finest moment in the picture story of *Evangeline*, and few readers can forget Lake Atchafalaya—where lovers passed, each unaware of the other's presence.

In 1759, a wealthy young Royalist, Major John Vassall, built the imposing mansion known today as the Longfellow House. In 1774, his home on the street then known as "Troy Row" was surrounded by Revolutionists, and Vassall fled to Boston, and later to England. The house was next occupied by General George Washington, two weeks after his arrival in Cambridge on July 2, 1775, to take command of the Continental Forces. Here he made his headquarters as Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army during the siege of Boston.

At the close of the Revolutionary War, the mansion changed hands several times. In 1791, Andrew Craigie bought the house, enlarged it in 1793, and enhanced the estate in other ways. He died in 1819, ruined by hard times and his own extravagance. To pay off debts, his widow rented rooms to Harvard students.

It was from Mrs. Craigie that Longfellow rented lodgings when he came to Cambridge. In 1843, Longfellow married Miss Frances Appleton, daughter of a Boston merchant, who bought the Craigie house and the grounds immediately adjoining as a gift to the bride and groom—and later added land across the street, reaching to the Charles River.

Since Longfellow's death in 1882, the house has been occupied by his descendants who, in 1913, conveyed the property and an endowment fund to trustees who were to keep it as it was during the poet's life. Today, the furnishings are the same, and the house is filled with first editions of the poet's works, his letters and books, mementos of his travels, portraits, and gifts from the world's leaders and noted men of letters.

Longfellow's Georgian house is presently located on approximately two acres of land in a fine old neighborhood of Colonial Greek revival and Victorian style homes. Most notable feature of the House is the ground floor study where in a far corner stands the high desk at which Longfellow stood to compose much of his poetry.

Behind the mansion is a well-preserved two-story carriage house and barn designed and built by Longfellow in 1845. To the rear of the well landscaped grounds is a formal garden designed by the poet to resemble one he had visited in Italy. In front of the house, and across Brattle Street, is a small formal park owned by the City of Cambridge extending almost to the Charles River. It was once a part of the original Longfellow property.

As early as 1940, the Secretary of the Interior's Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, declared the Longfellow House to be of national significance and a fine example of 18th century architecture in this country. In October 1962, the Board recommended that the Longfellow House be established as the Longfellow National Historic Site. Establishment of the area may be accomplished either by an Act of Congress or designation by the Secretary of the Interior. The Longfellow House Trustees, with whom title to the site now rests, and the heirs of Longfellow, have offered to donate the property to the Federal Government for administration as a national historic site.

As the Nation's principal conservation agency, the Department of the Interior works to assure that non-renewable resources are developed and used wisely, that park and recreational resources are conserved, and that renewable resources make their full contribution to the progress, prosperity and security of the United States, now and in the future.

The National Park System, of which the Longfellow National Historic Site would be a unit, is dedicated to conserving the natural, historic, and recreational heritage of the United States for the benefit and enjoyment of this and future generations.

JAYCEES ACT TO PREVENT VANDALISM

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, a very public spirited campaign in my State of Arizona has come to my attention. It is a project of the Glendale Jaycees, and I believe it deserves the attention and

emulation of many, many other Americans.

Faced with continually increasing acts of vandalism, particularly in our parks and other public recreational areas, the Glendale Jaycees decided to do something about it. The result is a campaign called SAVE—Sportsmen Against Vandalism Everywhere.

Mr. Timothy J. Hicks is the chairman of this project and has written me a letter including some informational material that explains the purpose and work of this program.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the enclosed information be printed in the RECORD so that others may be informed of this highly worthwhile project. Perhaps other communities and organizations will find it worthwhile to start such a project on their own.

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

GLENDALE JAYCEES,
Glendale, Ariz.

DEAR SENATOR PAUL FANNIN: It is now approaching that hour each and everyone of us must start to police the outdoors against acts of vandalism and take action against those we observe committing these acts.

The Glendale Jaycees are taking action against vandalism with the S.A.V.E. (Sportsmen Against Vandalism Everywhere) program. The idea of the SAVE campaign is to combat the vandalism problem; to promote a better sportsman, landowner relationship between the users of these lands in pursuit of their sports, hobbies, vacations recreation and other activities and the administrators of public and private lands.

We are taking this program nationally through every means available to us to help SAVE, Inc. promote and educate the public how to combat all acts of vandalism. This letter is being mailed to congressmen, Game and Fish directors of the United States, all Jaycee state presidents and other interested persons.

Basically the SAVE kit is being used to promote the SAVE campaign. This kit includes a SAVE window decal, a SAVE button, a pledge card and a letter explaining how each individual can stop vandalism. The proceeds from these SAVE kits are used to continue educating the public and to sustain the prosecution fund. This prosecution fund is maintained to pay only individual's expenses for lost time and wages to testify in court against acts of vandalism.

Other sources used are SAVE posters, signs, through game and fish department, television shows, state fair booths and various other ways.

The SAVE campaign has been judged 2nd in National competition in a public relations program the only reason it was not first is it did not receive enough national publicity.

You can help us. Promote Sportsmen Against Vandalism Everywhere (SAVE) with a local SAVE project of your own. Tomorrow may be too late our public and private lands are closing today. Stop vandalism now. Order your SAVE project materials today.

Yours truly,

TIMOTHY M. HICKS,
SAVE Chairman.

THE SAVE CAMPAIGN: SPORTSMEN AGAINST
VANDALISM EVERYWHERE

The SAVE Campaign came into being in Arizona in 1963. Mr. Robert Hirsch was the originator of the idea and a member of the Arizona Varmint Callers. The slogan originated at that time, with the distinctive stop-sign emblem and the SAVE Kit coming

later. The "Idea" of the SAVE Campaign was to combat the "Vandalism-Littering" problem; to reduce it to promote a better "Sportsman-Landowner" relationship between the users of these lands in pursuit of their outdoor activities and the owners or administrators of private and public lands.

It was through the promotion and efforts of the Arizona Varmint Callers Ass'n, Inc. (AVCA), that the aims and objectives of the SAVE Campaign have borne fruit to date. In 1963, the SAVE Campaign won second place in national competition in "Public Relations Program". The only reason it was not first was lack of national publicity. It has won a number of awards since.

The 25¢ SAVE Kit has been the main source of revenue to carry out the SAVE Campaign, plus other donations from time to time. The SAVE Kits, Posters, and Signs, plus word of mouth have spread the SAVE message across the nation. Over 20,000 Kits and over 30,000 SAVE Posters and Signs have been distributed to date by interested Sportsmen and Sportsmen groups. The SAVE Buttons have sprouted as bolo ties, key chains, and etc. The SAVE Campaign has been a rallying point for those *Who Want to Do Something* about the *Vandalism-Littering* problem.

The Arizona Varmint Callers Ass'n, Inc., realizing that they neither have the manpower nor funds to perpetuate and promote the SAVE Campaign nationally and extend it in Arizona, has licensed and released the SAVE Campaign to SAVE, INC. to conduct and transact its business. SAVE, INC. was chartered in Arizona on May 13, 1969 as a non-profit educational organization. The directors, officers, and committees are selected from statewide and nationally affiliated organizations or groups in Arizona.

THE SAVE COMMITTEE.

THE SAVE CAMPAIGN

Here is a sampling of costs nationally: Over \$500,000.00 is needed each year of yours and my tax monies for vandalized areas of recreation and their facilities in this nation, as well as litter clean up on these areas, too. The National Forests budgets \$2.5 million dollars each year for vandalism-littering acts. The National Parks and Monuments budgets \$1.5 million dollars each year for this blight (since hunting is not allowed on these areas, it is hard to blame the hunter for these acts). Utah: One Ranger's area has over \$500.00 each week in vandalism damage (\$26,000.00 annually). Speaking of forests, Weyerhaeuser Lumber Company in the state of Washington has a vandalism-littering expenditure of over \$150,000.00 annually on their lands and are considering the closure of their free camping areas or charging for their use.

Here is a sample of what it costs state highway departments due to vandalism and littering problems: State of Washington, \$500,000.00 annually. Arizona, \$250,000.00 annually. Maricopa County Highway Department replaces between 500-800 highway signs each month at an average cost of \$15.00. Over \$10,000.00 annually. They are spray painted, knocked down, chopped up, and shot up (each bullet hole costs an average of \$35.00 each. Each piece of litter picked up costs (10¢) ten cents from the highway.

It cost the taxpayers of Arizona for Easter week-end vandalism in their Buckskin State Park over \$1,200.00. Sprinkler heads, \$25.00; towel dispensers in cabanas, \$50.00; trees (3) \$125.00; manhours of rangers \$1,000.00 worth; plus more repairing and painting to be done when legislature appropriated more funds.

I hope that you understand why we can no longer afford or tolerate this evil and drain of our tax monies. This UN-necessary EVIL is a waste of your and my tax monies that could have been put to better use for more recreational areas and facilities in our great outdoors.

SAVE MEANS: SPORTSMEN AGAINST VANDALISM EVERYWHERE

IMPORTANT!—PLEASE READ THIS TWICE

Public access to Arizona's outdoors is in danger. Each year more and more "No trespassing" signs go up—largely as a result of someone's thoughtless attitude. In recent years the use of our outdoors has more than doubled. Incidents of Vandalism, littering and other disrespect have risen accordingly.

We in Arizona are fortunate in having free access to vast areas of public lands. *But this could change!* You need look no further than nearby states to see a much smaller percentage of public land, and a much larger percentage of posted areas. In many areas of the West hunting and fishing privileges are available only on a fee basis.

Thank you for your support of the "SAVE" movement. By signing the pledge card you are joining in a giant effort by all the users of our priceless outdoors to keep Arizona lands open to use by this and future generations.

WHAT CAN YOU DO TO HELP?

YOU are the most important person in the fight against vandalism. Here are a few simple rules: if everyone follows them the problem can be licked!

1. Be sure your personal behavior is above reproach. Let farmers and ranchers know you're on their side. Treat their land and improvements with the same respect you'd expect a visitor in your home to show you.

2. Set a high standard for children to follow. They're our hope for the future, and they usually assume all adult actions—right or wrong—are the correct thing to do.

3. Go ahead and criticize a member of your own party if he does something you both know is wrong. He may be angry at first, but later he'll respect you for speaking up.

4. Finally, if you witness an act of vandalism, help protect your rights by doing whatever you can to help enforcement officers. Write down the license number and description, if a vehicle is involved, along with a description of the criminal (that's right, "criminal"), the location, and any other information that may be helpful. Turn this over to the first officer you can find, whether he's a game ranger, sheriff or city policeman. If you don't find an officer before you return home, call the Game and Fish Department (271-4781) and give them the information you have collected. If you're willing to sign a complaint and testify against the vandal in court, you can almost guarantee a conviction. These offenses, though serious, are legally classed as "misdemeanors" and unless the officer sees them happen his hands may be tied without your help.

Without your cooperation, all the posters, decals, hat buttons and other publicity won't mean much. The real need is to let the small percentage of vandals in our population know that the rest of the world will not tolerate their actions any longer. By wearing the hat button when you go on an outing, displaying the decal on your rear car window and following the above rules you'll truly be helping to "SAVE" your outdoor heritage.

The "SAVE" Committee: Arizona State Varmit Callers Assoc., Arizona Farm Bureau Federation, U.S. Brewers Association, Inc., Arizona State Parks Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service.

U.S. Soil Conservation Service, House Fish and Game Committee, Arizona Legislature, U.S. Forest Service, Arizona Cattlegrowers, Maricopa Parks and Recreation Dept., Glendale Jaycees.

Mountain States Telephone Company, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Arizona Highway Department, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Arizona Conservation Council, Arizona Public Service Company.

SUBURBAN PROBLEMS

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I pose this question: Is concealment a disease of the executive department of our Government?

More and more it appears to me that it is, for week by week the Congress has to almost forcibly pry some information from representatives of the executive department.

Even we are not successful at times and we must rely on enterprising and diligent news reporters to get us information we are unable to get.

Through placement in the RECORD of a series of articles I will cite one most recent example of how the news-gathering and reporting fraternity again has been of help to us and the people we represent.

The articles, which will follow, were written by Mr. Edward J. Flynn and Miss Sharon Rosenhouse of the Record of Hackensack, N.J. They bring to light the findings and recommendations of the President's Task Force on Suburban Problems, which have been locked within the inner-inner circles of the present administration and its predecessor administration.

I expect all will agree that the articles are most timely and Mr. Flynn and Miss Rosenhouse are to be congratulated for their work and enterprise in bringing to light the hidden report and placing valuable information before the public and the Congress. Their newspaper, the Record, also merits our gratitude for publishing the informative and helpful articles.

The articles were carried by the Record of Hackensack, one of New Jersey's top-ranking daily newspapers, in its editions of March 2, 1970, under a copyright and permission has been granted me to have them reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The articles follow:

REPORT UNVEILS SUBURBS CRISIS

(By Edward J. Flynn and Sharon Rosenhouse)

A confidential report to former President Johnson shortly before he left office warns of a quiet crisis brewing in the suburbs and details a national strategy to cope with the mounting threat.

The seven-volume report—never publicly released—lists 15 major recommendations of the President's Task Force on Suburban Problems.

It suggests state and federal financing of local education and welfare costs, massive technical aid to guide suburban development, and financial support for long delayed municipal projects.

These solutions are addressed to the dozens of problems the Task Force finds in suburbia today, including:

Land prices are rising faster than consumer goods.

The countryside is being raped; air and water pollution are rampant.

Low density and helter-skelter development results in frenzied hours of commuting.

Escalating costs and scarce mortgage funds push housing prices higher, slow production, and substantially exclude low-income and minority groups.

Growth carries a high price tag, forcing hard choices between increasing taxes or reducing public expenditure.

These problems amount to a quiet suburban crisis, reports the Task Force.

"And this in itself is a problem. The 'typical' suburbanite perhaps senses some dissatisfaction with his life style and is disturbed at mounting costs and taxes. . . .

"He is virtually unaware of the hidden costs of sprawl, has little interest in patterns of human settlement or metropolitan growth, and has the normal human trait of worrying more about immediate family problems than planning for the civic future, especially if this planning seems not to involve or affect him."

The Task Force report, marked "Administratively Confidential," was submitted to President Johnson on Dec. 2, 1968, a few weeks before he left the White House. He appointed the study group on Oct. 11, 1967.

One Task Force proposal—creation of an urban development bank—was incorporated into President Johnson's final State of the Union Message to Congress. Urbank, as it's called by the Task Force would issue taxable bonds to finance projects at reduced rates to the municipalities.

In a letter accompanying the report, Charles M. Haar, Task Force chairman, said to the President:

"Our findings and proposals . . . make clear that beneath the popular image of the suburbs as middle class, happy and affluent, there is a quite crisis that threatens the quality of life to be enjoyed by millions of Americans."

Haar, then the Department of Housing and Urban Development's assistant secretary for metropolitan development, continued:

"Nor is the threat limited to the one out of four of us who live in the suburbs.

"The interdependence of our urban society makes it certain that the problems of our central cities cannot be fully resolved without finding answers in the suburbs."

The report advances specific proposals to meet the suburban challenge.

The Task Force recommends a new banking agency—a federal-state-local-private partnership—to accelerate the economic and social development of the nation's communities.

There are plans for public purchase of land to guide growth and to prevent suburban sprawl, a national urban waste management program, and measures to deal with the acute housing shortage, transportation, conservation, and crime.

The presidential study group offers its blueprint for change against a backdrop of crisis, the result of the proliferation of the suburbs.

The stereotyped suburb—"A manicured bedroom community with well-built homes owned by affluent, young, white Americans"—is particularly valid in the Northeast. However, the Task Force cautions:

"No general statement may be accurately used to define or classify the suburbs."

The report's extensive statistical data, most of it based on the 1960 census, indicates there are more white, wealthy, educated, young Americans in suburbs than in cities.

But this doesn't mean that suburbia is without problems. It has, explains the Task Force, substantial poverty, Negro ghettos, substandard housing, blight, increasing welfare rolls, crime—all commonly associated with the urban crisis.

The Task Force concludes that problems of city and suburb can't be considered separately:

"Parts of the central city often look like its suburbs and vice versa. Furthermore, a metropolitan area has a physical and economic unity despite the forces that generally seem to be dividing it."

The report finds the nation's future in its suburbs:

"It is in the suburbs that industrial development increasingly will take place, buoyed by construction of new highways and beltways which support the decentralization of employment.

"It is here that growth is supported by federal policies of aiding and encouraging home ownership, and aiding such public improvements as parks and water and sewer facilities.

"And it is here, finally, that the dreams of a mobile population are most nearly met."

In his letter to President Johnson, Haar, now a Harvard Law School professor, comments:

"Fortunately there is still time to act . . . Choices and alternatives still are available to us."

The Task Force, in introducing its recommendations, says: "America has a chance in suburbia to avoid repeating the mistakes we made during the rise of the cities.

"We can, if we will, learn from the planlessness, overcrowding, slums, crime, pollution, dirt, noise, traffic and unjust treatment of minorities."

Specific suburban problems are sorted into the general categories of land, housing, public facilities and finance, and management.

While the supply of suburban raw land may seem inexhaustible, it is, in fact, a scarce resource and land values have risen steadily for the past 20 years.

Rising costs and tight money have priced many people out of the housing market. And soaring prices are reinforced by zoning and building regulations.

"Consciously or not," the report says, "zoning has been used to keep out people at the low end of the income scale."

At the same time, suburban locations for low-priced housing make sense because industrial growth is shifting from the cities to suburbs.

"The suburbs are only too willing to scramble for a share of the industrial and commercial tax base but are not at all anxious to assume the attendant costs of housing and education for the unskilled employes," comments the Task Force.

Property taxes are skyrocketing in suburbs and the presidential study group calls the suburban tax base a major source of irritation and worry.

Suburban management—the job of running a municipality—is big business, exceedingly complex, and requiring the support of specialists. But the Task Force finds:

"The policies, techniques, and procedures used in running little communities in the unhurried simple life of bygone years are totally unsuited to the needs of concentrations of mass society in the ever-expanding metropolitan areas."

HOUSING ILLS LOOK TO SUBURBIA

Any attempt to solve the nation's housing crisis must involve the suburbs, says the President's Task Force on Suburban Problems.

"Suburbia is where the land is, where costs can be kept within reason," the Task Force report says.

Apart from urging suburban sites for new housing, including homes for low-income families, the study group recommends measures to aid veterans, senior citizens, and current homeowners.

Here's a close look at the Task Force's housing program:

Vietnam veterans are younger than their World War II or Korean counterparts, often unprepared to compete in today's skilled job market, and they face historically high mortgage rates. Says the Task Force:

"Aggravating the problem today is the higher percentage of Negro veterans whose

housing choices and employment opportunities are further limited by the discrimination, especially in suburban areas."

The Task Force proposes:

—Amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 to give veterans with low incomes increased mortgage assistance.

—Federal grants of \$200 to a school district for each veteran's child in kindergarten through ninth grade, an attempt to avoid municipal fiscal imbalance so communities won't be reluctant to accept veterans' housing.

The Task Force also analyzed the senior citizens housing problem.

"For the senior citizen homeowner, his home equity usually represents the bulk of his savings and his greatest asset," the report says.

"At present, however, there is no way by which he can continue to live in his own home and utilize these desperately needed savings to supplement his meager income. These assets remain frozen until death, unless he sells his home before that time."

ANNUITY SUGGESTED

The Task Force suggests senior citizens be able to convert equity in a home to a lifetime annuity, a program partially developed by the President's Council on the Aging:

—The homeowner signs a note to the insuring agency, secured by a mortgage, agreeing to a decreasing obligation against the property payable to the agency on death.

—In return, the homeowner receives a guaranteed monthly income for the rest of his life and continues to live in his own home. The income would range from \$15 to \$50 a month.

Another recommendation would amend the Internal Revenue Code:

At age 55 a taxpayer could sell a home owned for at least 5 years without having to pay capital gains taxes on the first \$20,000 of the sale price. The limit now is age 65.

Perhaps the most controversial measure deals with insurance against the loss of property values due to racial integration. Says the Task Force:

"An important factor in the initial reluctance of whites to sell to Negroes, and an even more significant factor in panic selling by whites after the first Negro families move in, is the fear that property values will decline because of the presence of Negroes.

"While this fear is real enough, numerous studies show that it has no foundation in fact. Even in those neighborhoods that do 'tip,' any decline in values is temporary and is actually a product of white panic."

The Task Force proposes that homeowners be able to buy such insurance with premiums based on a property's value and its actual sale price.

But the study group, aware the plan could aggravate fear by emphasizing the problem, cautions:

"Such adverse consequences can probably be avoided through appropriate and carefully developed public information programs.

"If however, further and more broadly-based considerations of this proposal should indicate that the danger of these side effects is substantial, this proposal should not be adopted in its present form."

Because of the tight money market, the Task Force recommends a plan to remove some blocks to housing mobility. Home loans would become transferable from property to property moving with the homeowner.

A homeowner with an unpaid loan on one house could transfer the unpaid balance to a new home. The remaining cost of the new home would be financed by a second loan.

So that the proposal would be palatable to lending institutions, federal guarantees are proposed for the second mortgage.

The Task Force would also reduce closing costs on the purchase of a home, such as title searches, title insurance, and surveys.

SUBURBAN CURE IS PRESCRIBED

The President's Task Force on Suburban Problems offered 15 major proposals to solve suburbia's quiet crisis. Here's a summary of the recommendations:

FINANCING

The Task Force isolated as the most urgent problem is the need for planning, building, and paying for community facilities—housing, schools, sewers, libraries, and hospitals.

To meet the challenge, it recommends a new partnership to help pay the bills, an Urban Development Bank (Urbank) to provide loans and technical assistance to communities.

Stockholders would be the federal, state, and local governments and private investors. Urbank's loanable funds would be obtained by issuing bonds in the private capital market. Communities could borrow at reasonable rates from Urbank just as underdeveloped nations borrow from the World Bank.

"In summary," the Task Force says, "the bank would represent a modernized way of making available an adequate and continuing supply of capital funds for community development at rates of interest and terms appropriate to this field."

LAND ACQUISITION

Legislation is urged to form a Federal Urban Parklands Corporation to buy substantial amounts of land for future parks and recreational areas. Within 20 years the land would be sold to state and local public agencies at cost. Land leasing would be allowed for interim periods and surplus land could be sold to private developers at fair value.

Grants and loans to State Land Development Corporations are proposed to acquire land in areas threatened by urban sprawl.

"Under public ownership, these sites can be saved, planned, and disposed for development as town centers, including such uses as shopping facilities, community colleges, public buildings, and apartments."

U.S. INSTALLATIONS

Noting that the timing, scale, and location of major federal installations often run counter to local development goals, the Task Force urges a presidential order to establish sounder planning procedures.

Federal project planners would be encouraged to follow existing local plans for urban development; recognize local views; and provide housing, transportation, and services for low-income workers.

HOUSING

To supplement existing legislation, the Task Force proposes:

Mortgages and rent subsidies to Vietnam veterans and federal grants to school districts to supplement costs of educating veterans' children.

A program whereby senior citizens can convert home equity to a guaranteed life-time income. Another proposal would reduce from 65 to 55 the age for receiving tax breaks when selling a home.

An experimental program of homeowner insurance would guard against property value losses when a neighborhood is integrated.

All homeowners would get an option to transfer an existing mortgage when moving to a new home.

TRANSPORTATION

Federal assistance would be given to aid lower-density areas, emphasizing access to employment centers, schools, shopping and recreation. Grants would be offered for technological breakthrough.

COMMUNITY CENTERS

Federal grants are proposed for community centers, including assembly halls, swimming pools, and libraries to supplement existing school and recreation facilities.

CONSERVATION

Federal support would be given to regional urban conservation programs, including subdivision controls to preserve open spaces.

SOLID WASTE

A national urban waste management program is outlined with federal grants for developing effective collection and disposal systems.

AIRCRAFT NOISE

Airport owners would pay local property owners affected by aircraft noise with funds from airport revenue.

SCHOOL-WELFARE

Instead of relying on federal aid to local government, the Task Force would:

1. Transfer educational and welfare costs directly to state and federal governments.
2. Allow payment of state and local taxes as net income deductions against federal income taxes.

The Task Force notes:

"A by-product of this proposal is that it would reduce the relative burden of the property tax on the poor—which is the principal tax of local governments."

STUDENT LOANS

A national loan fund would be established for higher education studies and living expenses. Students could borrow money regardless of family income and pay no interest until they complete their studies. Repayment would be based on annual income.

CRIME

The Task Force would beef up the Safe Streets Act to encourage crime-control planning on a metropolitan area basis.

PERSONNEL

To close the gap between the supply and demand for trained municipal manpower, grants would be offered to local and state governments. State and local agencies would be encouraged to recruit and train the hard-core unemployed.

RESEARCH

A sharp increase in federal support for research and development is proposed to increase efficiency and economy of urban services and facilities.

The Task Force proposes calling a White House conference on urban growth, to include international representation.

NIXON'S COUNSEL SAYS REPORT JUST MULTIPLIES THE PROBLEMS

An aide to former President Johnson says the report of the Task Force on Suburban Problems was never meant to be made public.

Mrs. Willie Day Taylor said: "The report was for his use in formulating programs. It had been a long-standing rule that task force reports are not made public."

In a telephone interview with The Record from Johnson's Austin, Tex., office, Mrs. Taylor said task force reports are designed to circulate within high government circles. The reports' main purpose was to allow Johnson to excerpt what he wanted to articulate as policy.

Clark R. Mollenhoff, deputy counsel to President Nixon said the President has taken no action on the seven-volume study.

He explained if Nixon were to release the report, the document might appear to have the President's stamp of approval.

Referring to recommendations in the report, with which Mollenhoff said is familiar, he said: "They're laudable goals, but from a practical standpoint they can cause more problems than they solve."

Frederick A. McLaughlin, who was executive director for the Suburban Task Force, said approximately 100 copies of the report were printed. Except for copies to task force members, McLaughlin noted:

"The copies were bundled up and delivered to the White House."

McLaughlin, director of plans, programs, and evaluation for the Housing and Urban Development Department, estimated printing costs were about \$5,000. The total cost for the project was set at under \$50,000. Most of the money was spent for special reports and for consultants' trips to Washington.

The report was given to Johnson Dec. 2, 1968, shortly before he left office. Today it is marked "Administratively Confidential."

This means it is under study and for use within an agency which requested it—in this case the White House.

Grady E. Clay, a task force member, told The Record he wanted the report made public. When asked why it is secret, he said: "I wish to hell I knew."

Clay, the editor of Landscape Architect Quarterly in Louisville, Ky., said: "I'm unhappy that a piece of work like this gets buried."

When asked to speculate on the secrecy, Clay offered a guess:

"Nixon is easy. Why should he fool with anything put out by his predecessor? He's not bound by it. He's got his own plans."

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Former President Johnson named a 10-member Task Force on Suburban Problems on Oct. 11, 1967. The study group's findings were given to Johnson on Dec. 2, 1968.

The Task Force members and their affiliation at the time were:

Charles M. Haar, assistant secretary for metropolitan development, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Grady E. Clay, editor, Landscape Architect Quarterly, Louisville, Ky.

Dr. A. Neil Galluzzo, superintendent, Inglewood Unified School District, California.

Phil G. Hammer, chairman, National Capital Planning Commission; president, Hammer, Greene, Siler Associates, Inc.

William F. Hobby Jr., president and executive editor, the Houston Post Company, Texas.

Everett Mattson, senior executive, vice president, Lomas and Nettleton West, Inc., Houston, Tex.

General James McCormack, chairman, Communications Satellite Corporation, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Jean Picker, member, U.S. Delegation to the United Nations General Assembly; vice president, Interchange Foundation, Mamaroneck, N.Y.

Walter H. Shorestein, president, Milton Meyer & Co., San Francisco, Calif.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Edward J. Flynn and Sharon Rosenhouse know urban-suburban problems.

Flynn, a veteran reporter on the urban beat, has wrestled with more regional studies than most professional planners. Miss Rosenhouse won a fellowship and studied urban problems at Stanford University for six months. These two reporters were working on a long range tax and zoning study which led them in part to a confidential and unpublished federal report on suburban problems.

The seven-volume study addresses problems that are real from Bergen County, N.J. to Orange County, Calif.

WE STILL NEED TRAINS

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, since imminent action is expected by the

Senate Commerce Committee on legislation to guarantee some form of national passenger railroad service, either on a comprehensive bill to be reported out by the Commerce Committee, or on the long-awaited administration plan, the following article, "The Train, Alas," from the Christian Science Monitor of Saturday-Monday, March 7-9, 1970, seems appropriate at this time, and I commend it to my colleagues for their consideration:

THE TRAIN, ALAS

(By Erwin D. Canham)

It is undoubtedly significant to read in the same day's paper of the last-minute and highly unusual congressional moratorium on a strike against the nation's railroads, and the plan of the Penn Central to abandon all its New York-Chicago and New York-St. Louis passenger runs.

Sad, isn't it, what has happened to passenger trains? And is it really inevitable? Can nothing be done to restore the tempo of American life in which train travel was not only acceptable but delightful? On some runs, of course, vast expenditures may make high-speed trains possible. It is not yet clear that even such trains will be fully successful. But such rebuilding of roadbeds is hardly practicable over the whole continent.

In our concern with the environment, can we ever possibly disengage ourselves from the illusion of speed? Aren't comfort, and time for relaxation, of some value? Is it absolutely certain that never again will there be enough people to support long-distance train travel?

RIGHTS OF WAY REMAIN

Of course, the need for trains—as adapted into rapid-transit systems—is absolutely urgent for daily commuting in great urban areas. New York is the most massive example, but Boston, Chicago, and a few other cities still can do a great job with mass transport on rails. Other cities, such as Los Angeles, bitterly regret not having the available rails and rights of way.

There they are: the great transcontinental railroad systems, which have played such a vital role in the development of a nation. They still carry a lot of freight, much of it profitable, and effectively tied in piggy-backwise with road transport. So presumably the railroad rights of way will be there for a long time yet.

Is it beyond our talent, and our taste, to revive a practicable and pleasant form of long-distance passenger service? Has the human emotion formed such an alliance with the automobile and the airplane that there is no place for trains?

CLEAN AND COZY

Of course, deterioration has been going on for a long time. It takes a stretch of memory to recall the really good old days, when the diners were first rate, the sleeping accommodations clean and cozy, the daytime travel comfortable and interesting. The last remaining examples were, naturally enough, the trains that went in the most beautiful places, from Chicago west. Every few months another run is abandoned. There's very little left.

Like most readers over, say, 40 I could paint a sentimentally nostalgic picture of how nice it was on the great trains of old. My own exposure came frequently on the campaign trains of American presidents or candidates for that office. These were special trains, of course, but not greatly unlike the crack trains that crossed the continent for anybody who had the fare. It was a far easier way for candidates and correspondents to campaign, of course, than on the jet planes of today. A candidate couldn't get to quite as many places, but he could get some rest and relaxation along the way. It was a good and reasonable system.

SCALE AND TEMPO

I have nothing against the planes, of course. When they can keep their schedules, and that is much of the time, they are adequately comfortable and wonderfully swift. You save a lot of time. Whether you spend well the time you save is another matter. That's up to you. And that raises again the question of values.

Is it essential, and right, to cram so much into modern life? In our efforts to protect the environment, may we not also consider the tempo at which people live? Have we not a very great need for reflection? For meditation and quiet? For simple relaxation?

The problem of our time is not only scale, but tempo. Nobody proposes going back to the stagecoach, or to the horse and buggy. But the train is somewhere in between the SST and the hiker. It's revival might help us restore to life certain values of which we are being robbed. With the population rise, there will be ample need for various forms of transport. The air is crowded, new and immensely costly airfields are demanded, and the great railroad terminals are crumbling down. Does all this make sense?

NIXON NEWS COVERAGE

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I waited so long to bring this up, but my feelings of sympathy for the Democratic Party, due to the terrible way the press treats it, have overwhelmed me until now.

Here I had gone along all these years watching the Kennedys and the Humphreys and the Johnsons and even lesser lights get headlines every time they so much as opened their mouths. I have seen the adulation for these men in the eyes, the voices, and the typewriters of many of those who disseminate the unbiased truth for the Nation's unintimidated news media.

And I had felt sorry for us Republicans.

But now that attitude is changed, because I see what I saw was merely a mirage, a figment of my imagination. All this time, I now learn, the press has quietly been pushing the Nixon line.

I learned this, I must hasten to add, from an impeccable source, the chairman of a committee of Democratic Senators who will, in the words of the Washington Post, try to counter an imbalance of newspaper and television coverage in favor of—you guessed it—the Nixon administration.

The Post—that longtime proponent of unbiased—tells us that there is concern among my friends on the other side of the aisle, because the television networks have curtailed the practice of analyzing President Nixon's speeches immediately after they are broadcast. Because the networks are afraid of SPIRO AGNEW.

Mr. President, I am truly disturbed. As a Republican, I cannot bear to see the media fawning on my party. I cannot stand to see each Democratic Senator not get equal coverage with the President of the United States. I cannot bear it when the President is not second-

guessed, belittled, and sneered at, because this is necessary if the people are to get both sides.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have no control over the news media. They have made these decisions without consulting our party. We are nearly helpless. Mr. Speaker, I offer my sympathy to those so cruelly betrayed. I have nothing else to offer.

RESOLUTIONS FROM MASSACHUSETTS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of submitting two resolutions to the Congress from the Great and General Court of Massachusetts. One of these resolutions requests the Federal Government to take action to prevent damage to the Atlantic coastline by oil leakage. Another memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation expanding the medicare program to include drug costs.

I believe these are worthy of the attention of my colleagues as they address themselves not only to issues affecting the Commonwealth but the entire Nation. The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION EXPANDING THE MEDICARE PROGRAM TO INCLUDE DRUG COSTS

Whereas, Millions of recipients of Medicare incur great and heavy financial expenses due to the high cost of drugs; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation expanding the Medicare program to include drug costs; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State Secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, February 4, 1970.

NORMAN L. PIDGEON, Clerk.

House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, February 9, 1970.

WALLACE C. MILLS, Clerk.

Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

RESOLUTIONS REQUESTING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO TAKE ACTION TO PREVENT DAMAGE TO THE ATLANTIC COASTLINE BY OIL LEAKAGE

Whereas, During World War II and at other times many tankers carrying large amounts of oil products have been sunk off the Atlantic Coast of the United States; and

Whereas, It now appears that due to the effects of rust and corrosion some of these tankers may be leaking or about to leak substantial quantities of oil; and

Whereas, The recreational use of beaches of the Atlantic Coast, especially those in Massachusetts, may be endangered by this oil; and

Whereas, The ecology of our coastline sea birds, shellfish beds, fish life and marshes may be seriously endangered or even wiped out; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of Massachusetts expresses its grave concern over the dangers presented by these large quantities of oil in such sunken vessels and respectfully requests the President and the Congress of the United States to direct the appropriate department of the federal government to take such action as may be necessary to prevent further damage to our beaches and the ecology of our coast by said oil; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth be requested to send a copy of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, February 9, 1970.

NORMAN L. PIDGEON, Clerk.

Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

TRIBUTE TO OUTSTANDING BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the business and professional women of this Nation are honored each year with the observance of National Business Women's Week.

I would like to give special recognition at this time to several outstanding professional women of California, whose activities have been called to my attention by Business and Professional Women's Clubs in my district.

For their accomplishments and worthwhile contributions, it is a real privilege for me to pay tribute to these women.

The Torrance Business and Professional Women's Club honored Mrs. Clifton Moore of Torrance, by selecting her to receive their 1969-70 Woman of Achievement Award in recognition of her contributions toward the physical and recreational development of the city of Torrance. She serves as office manager and supervisor of scheduling of recreational activities for the Torrance City Parks and Recreation Department and also participates actively in local school, church, and community youth organizations.

Mrs. John Kamboor of Wilmington, is a past president of the Wilmington Business and Professional Women's Club and has held all offices within the club—presently serving as the personal development chairman. In addition to her responsibilities as legal secretary to the law firm of Gorham, Wonder & Horn, of Wilmington, she works closely with the local YWCA.

She received the Outstanding Achievement Award in November of 1969 from the Wilmington Business and Professional Women's Club.

Mrs. John Conshafter of Lomita, office manager of the State Farm Insurance Agency in Lomita, has served as past president of the Lomita Business and Professional Women's Club and was honored by the club as their Woman of the Year for 1961. Mrs. Conshafter was

formerly president of the Narbonne High School PTA and is currently serving as chairman of the Student Scholarship Committee for the Lomita Business and Professional Women's Club. She and her husband have been instrumental in forming a youth's employment service in Lomita, and consistent with their great interest in youth, in 1961 housed an American Field Service Exchange Student from Brazil as part of the foreign student exchange program.

Mrs. Pete King of San Pedro, was presented the Torrance Business and Professional Women's Club Woman of Achievement Award for 1969-70 for her outstanding participation in various humanitarian and civic organizations. She has worked on drives for both the YWCA and the YMCA, the Red Cross, retarded children, and others. She is a member of the San Pedro Chamber of Commerce, the San Pedro-Wilmington Insurance Association, and the San Pedro Women's Club. In addition to being past president of the San Pedro Board of Realtors, regional vice president for the California Real Estate Association, member of the Real Estate Certificate Institute, and the current president of the "30-Year Club of San Pedro," she is owner of the Hards Realty Co. Mrs. King is currently recognized in "Who's Who of American Women."

Mrs. Robert Helmschrott of Redondo Beach, was selected by the Torrance Business and Professional Women's Club as the Woman of Achievement for 1969-70 for her outstanding achievement in working with church and youth groups in the realm of educational and religious activities. In addition to her regular church responsibilities in the Immanuel Lutheran Church of Redondo Beach, she served for 4 years on the Speakers' Bureau of her District Missionary League, wrote "Women with a Mission," and for several years served on the Zone Board as contact chairman and program chairman. At her own expense, she attended conventions of the International Missionary League in order to bring back the proceeds to her local league. Mrs. Helmschrott has not served exclusively in her church; she has actively supported the YWCA and YMCA programs and the Children's Home Society of California Adoption Service.

Mrs. Lowell Dryden of Redondo Beach, was presented the Woman of Achievement Award for 1969-70 by the Torrance Business and Professional Women's Club in recognition of her outstanding community services in the fields of citizenship, social service, and fund raising activities for the Los Angeles Children's Hospital. She is a charter member of the National Charity League, a member of the Board of the Women's Division of the Los Angeles Chapter of the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, a member of the Committee of Fifty for the Los Angeles Heart Association, and an organizing volunteer worker at the Torrance Memorial Hospital. One of Mrs. Dryden's outstanding accomplishments is that of the Portuguese Bend National Horse Show, licensed by the American Horse Show Association. From

this show, contributions are given to the Los Angeles Children's Hospital. She was named by the Great Lakes Properties—landowners and developers—Inc., as the South Bay Citizen for the month of September 1969.

Mrs. C. B. Mitchell of Torrance, Calif., has rendered capable leadership in numerous youth and women's organizations. For her accomplishments, she was recently awarded the Woman of Achievement Award for 1969-70 by the Torrance Business and Professional Women's Club. Her various activities have included being president of the youth group of the Methodist Church in Torrance; treasurer and president of the Torrance Woman's Club and the Pilot Club of Torrance, a member and former treasurer of the Provisional Board of Directors of the YWCA, and she is presently chairman of the Advisory Board of Torrance YWCA, a group of community and business leaders who act as advisors.

Mrs. O. R. C. Grow of San Pedro, was recently awarded the Woman of the Year Award by the Torrance Business and Professional Women's Club for her contributions to philanthropic, beautification, and civic improvements in the South Bay area. Since 1932, she has lectured and taught flower arranging of sight therapy arrangements—feel and touch—and taught remedial reading for retarded children. She has written a newspaper column on gardening for the San Pedro News Pilot since 1943, received the State award for civic participation at the 1965 Conference of Garden Clubs, spurred the San Pedro beautiful campaign in 1968-69, and instigated the Lighted Christmas Homes Contest. She has devoted much of her time to the YWCA, serving continuously on its board of directors since 1934, and is a life member and former president of the San Pedro branch. She is a member of the San Pedro Assistance League, the San Pedro Woman's Club, and the National Federation of Republican Women. She also participates in the Long Beach Chapter of National Pen Women, the National League of Pen Women, the San Pedro Art Association, Rotary Anns, Friday Morning Study Club, the Chamber of Commerce, and has been a gray lady at Harbor General Hospital for 7 years. She is listed in the current edition of "Who's Who in American Women."

Mrs. R. O. Young was presented the title of Woman of the Year for 1969-70 by the Torrance Business and Professional Women's Club in recognition of her extensive contributions to the religious activities of youth organizations, her endeavors in "Creation of a Garden" for the benefit and enjoyment of her fellowman, and for the educational and literary programs for civic beautification in which she is engaged. To make possible the realization of her personal campaign, to make "South Bay a Garden Spot," the motto of the South Bay Garden Club of which she is a member, she became a founding member of the "Los Angeles Beautiful." She consults manufacturers of garden products, lectures, and writes many articles for local, regional, and national publications as a beautification expert and is listed in

"Who's Who of American Women" as a gardening and beautification personality. In the late 1950's, she organized eight new garden clubs in the South Bay area and was also responsible for conceiving and developing the Los Angeles County Garden. Mrs. Young was president of the South Coast Botanic Garden Foundation from 1961-69, and for her efforts and numerous services, she has received over 100 awards, including one from the White House.

NEW FOOD PRODUCT SEEN AS BREAKTHROUGH

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, with today's alarming high rate of death due to heart disease, the diet-conscious public will continue to seek more acceptable foods and suppliers will be hard put to meet this need. The American Heart Association says "the way to a man's heart is through his stomach." I wish to commend to you and my colleagues a notable breakthrough in food processing. Tillie Lewis Foods, Inc., an industry located in my congressional district, recently added a new food product which I believe is worthy of your attention at this time and expands a use for a valuable basic agricultural commodity.

"If you define a group that most needed to be reached by nutrition and health programs, it would be Members of Congress." This statement attributed to Dr. Jean Mayer, President Nixon's consultant on nutrition and health, in testimony before Chairman JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI's House Administration Subcommittee on the House Restaurant, gives us cause to pause, look to the belt-line, caution us to hold the line, and reassess our daily diet. The doctor made other reservations to indicate that Members of Congress could make a substantial contribution to the rest of the country in setting an example by adhering to a low-calorie, low-cholesterol diet, exercising, drinking less coffee, and smoking fewer cigarettes.

Mr. Speaker, I share Dr. Mayer's views and recently one of my most valued and successful constituents, Mrs. Tillie Lewis, introduced nationally a new product. Under the trade name of Eggstra, this new food product stirred interest among dietitians, doctors, nutritionists, food scientists, and food editors throughout the country. It was brought to their attention in the journals of the American Medical Association and the American Dietetic Association. For those persons now on special diets, Eggstra has less cholesterol than fresh or dried eggs, less fat and can claim less calories. An egg product marketed in dry-mix form, Eggstra, the fruit of 3 years of intensive research and testing, presents an effective response to the long-voiced demand by simpler, easier, less costly means and method to gain the functional influence

and benefits of eggs in mass food processing and quantity meal preparation. A new market has opened up for egg producers by the development of this food product. It requires approximately one half whole egg and 2½ egg whites to market a serving equivalent to two fresh eggs of this new dietary food.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who might ask, who is Tillie Lewis? The success story of this remarkable woman and her story of rags-to-riches could fill volumes and I am sure my colleagues will enjoy the human interest side of Mrs. Lewis' life, but I would prefer to limit my comments to a few of her major achievements and contributions to our country.

The name Tillie Lewis has come to mean many things to many different people.

To the consuming public she is "First Lady of the Larder," "Duchess of Diet," "Most Famous Woman in Food."

For persons with a higher than average level of cholesterol and for persons with heart problems, her latest achievement is the addition of a new dimension in food, an egg product with 80 percent less cholesterol, 80 percent less fat and 50 percent fewer calories, "Eggstra."

In 1952, 600 women's page editors of the Associated Press voted her "Woman of the Year" in business.

To millions of Reader's Digest readers she is "Tillie of the Valley" as a result of a story which appeared in that magazine concerning her almost single-handed efforts in building a \$40 million business in the canned food industry, starting only with a conviction that the pomodoro—the Italian pear-shaped tomato—could be grown in America.

To many she exemplifies the fact that America's frontiers have not yet been reached.

Her home, the city of Stockton, and San Joaquin County, Calif., publicly recognized her major contribution to the agricultural development by proclaiming a "Tillie Lewis Day."

To members of the satellite countries who heard her broadcast over the Voice of America program, she is a symbol of the American way of life, and the free enterprise system afforded by our great country.

Her story of achievement has been distributed to 21 countries, in 21 different languages, to show the opportunities that exist in America for women as well as men.

Tillie Lewis is a modern day pioneer. From time to time she went against all advice of agricultural experts, and planted Italy's zesty pomodoro in California's San Joaquin Valley—parlaying her conviction into Flotill Products, Inc., one of the largest tomato canning plants in the world—she has never waited for opportunity to knock. On the contrary, this woman with a will has gone right out, taken it by the hand, and led it through the door.

By 1937 she was sole owner and manager of Flotill Products. In 1941 she added a plant in Modesto in 1946 another in Stockton.

In 1951 Tasti-Diet Foods Division of Flotill Products was organized to produce the first artificially sweetened products.

The line included not only low calorie fruits and vegetables, but salad dressings, puddings, gelatins, jellies, preserves, and—later—such delicacies as chocolate topping, pancake and waffle topping, and pie filling.

In 1960 Mrs. Lewis acquired a can manufacturing plant in Stockton. In 1961 Flotill Products, Inc., changed its name to Tillie Lewis Foods, Inc., and "went public." In 1962 Mrs. Lewis added the Andersen Soup line and in 1963, the Patterson Canning Co., a subsidiary. That same year she added at the Stockton main plant the first hydrostatic cooker to be manufactured in the United States.

In 1966 she joined her ever-expanding company to one of the most important of the billion dollar multimanagerment companies, Ogden Corp., headquartered in New York City. Now, in addition to being a member of the Board of Directors of the Ogden Corp., she is chairman of the Ogden Food Products Corp.

In September of 1967 Mrs. Lewis went back to Italy. She's been there dozens of times but this time the trip was to Rome by appointment and request of the U.S. Department of State. She was the only woman advisor member of the American delegation to the third annual international conference being held to study and to raise the food standards of countries throughout the world. In October of 1968 she attended the F.A.O. Conference in Rome, again as an appointee of the U.S. State Department.

In June of 1968, Mrs. Lewis added another "first" to her list of achievements—she was appointed by the Stockton City Council to serve a 4-year term on the Stockton Port Commission, thus becoming the only woman serving on a governing board of a major port in the United States.

Does she believe that women have a future in big business? Definitely, yes; but it takes a lot of courage, fortitude, and stick-to-it-iveness.

In her opinion, however, there is only one major difference between men and women in business. "When a man makes a mistake," she will tell you with a smile, "it is accepted. With a woman, it is expected."

ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, in the quest to improve the quality of our environment, many knowledgeable people are speaking out on the various aspects of pollution control. Recently, I had the good fortune to read a speech delivered by Mr. Keith Krause, executive director of the Water Resources Board for the State of Kansas. Mr. Krause delivered these remarks on "Environmental Pollution" to a student convocation at Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kans. They are thoughtful, they are factual, and they are provocative. I am sure my colleagues will appreciate the op-

portunity to acquaint themselves with the observations of an official who has been actively working in environmental matters for the past 35 years. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Krause's speech on "Environmental Pollution" in the RECORD:

ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION

The environment has suddenly emerged from the wings of the stage to become the star of the production, but this production is unique because it also calls for the full participation of the audience. The audience has an uneasy feeling that it doesn't know its role, much less its lines. Hopefully, our exploration today will shed some light on that role if not on the lines.

The first thing we must do is define the terms that we are going to use. My definition of environment is that highly integrated and complex system of physical and social conditions which envelop us as individuals or as groups and influence our well-being. If you accept this definition, it follows then that environmental pollution is anything within this envelop which has an adverse effect upon our well-being. This definition may be considerably broader than any which you may have been exposed to, but our environment is an exceedingly complex system of which man still has only a superficial knowledge.

Environmental pollutants might be considered in three categories: (1) waste products, (2) intentional or unintentional additives, and (3) natural materials. Waste products are those remnants of materials expelled or lost from a process. Waste matter is usually lower in either the energy scale or the value scale of both than the process inputs. Wastes may be organic or inorganic, alive or dead; large or small.

Intentional or unintentional additives are those such as pesticides, drugs, or they may be additives as the result of accidental spills, explosions. These represent the body of chemicals and biologics which man has developed, some portion of which have "gotten out of bounds."

Natural pollution stems from natural materials "out of place" and constitutes both living and inanimate matter. Bacteria and silt might be examples of such pollution.

Man has induced changes in his environment with little knowledge or thought of the consequences and usually for what he hopes will be gains. Man is beginning to realize that small changes in the environment affect the stability of the whole system. For a little better insight, we might compare the environment to that of a complex algebraic equation which, if it is to remain in balance, changes must be introduced at the proper points in the equation on both sides of the equal sign; or the 2nd law of physics—an unbalanced body tends to accelerate in the direction of the thrust. Left alone nature eventually balances the forces. (Example, longevity)

It is my hope this morning to point out to you what has given rise to our concerns and what we as individuals and as collective groups may be in a position to do about the adverse effects of a changing environment. First of all, I would ask the question, "Is pollution of our environment anything new?" The answer is definitely "No!" History records many catastrophic events such as the great plagues which decimated whole populations during the middle ages; and an explosion of Krakatua Island in the Indonesian Archipelago on May 26, 1883, resulted in climatological changes over the entire world which caused snow in July in Massachusetts. The salt in the ocean is a result of the leaching of the land masses by water with the result that the ocean becomes a repository of these minerals. These are examples of environmental pollution of vastly

differing origins. Your next question might logically be, "Well, if it is not new, why are we becoming so concerned about it now?" I believe the reason can be readily demonstrated. The complexity and volume of wastes and additives have increased proportional to the increase in numbers of man's activities and his technology. May I again use analogies to illustrate what is happening. One of these involves man's ability to propel himself. We know, for example, that for thousands of years of recorded history, man could travel no faster than the speed of a fast horse, which was something in the order of 35 miles per hour. This was true up until about 1840. Then came the steam locomotive, and by 1900 the speed increased to about 125 miles—a 3 fold increase in 60 years. Then came the propeller driven airplane and the speed jumped from 125 miles to 450 miles an hour by 1943. Another 3 fold increase in 40 years. Then came the jet engine and the speed of the plane leaped to 2,000 miles an hour within 15 years. The rocket engine came on the heels of the jet engine with almost unlimited capability. If we were to draw a line through these points of reference, we could readily see that the curve sharply increased from representing man's ability to propel himself in the early 1940's and is now climbing almost vertically. The change which took place within 30 years is vastly greater than any in recorded history. We have telescoped centuries into years! This great speed has resulted from the flood of new technology, the application of which has resulted in uses of our energy and other resources at an enormously accelerated rate. The same type of picture results from an examination of the growth of the world's populations. This, too, has been the result of technological advances in the medical and nutritional fields, which have enabled the reduction in the number of infant deaths, and the increase in longevity of the adult.

This knowledge explosion has resulted in our use of the natural resources at an unprecedented rate and unfortunately with unprecedented waste. Science and engineering have also produced and introduced the additives to our environment. Society accepted most of these as being beneficial in the absence of knowledge as to what their adverse effects might be. We cannot quarrel with the fact that millions of lives have been saved by the use of DDT. DDT can be accredited with stopping typhus epidemics in Europe and Asia during the 1940's which well could have devastated nations. Yet, we now know that there is a price to be paid. Our present concern and problems, therefore, stems from the fact that we have concentrated more activities into 30 years than in all the previous recorded history of man and we are still accelerating! We are wasting our resources at an unprecedented rate and we are polluting our environment at the same time and because of this, we may be approaching the overload limit of our environment. The situation might be compared to that of a man waving a two-edge sword with wild, uncontrolled swings.

Although there has been more knowledge generated and greater increase in man's activities in 30 years than occurred in the sum total of the entire previously recorded history of the earth, we well may find that the decade of the 1970's will again produce as much scientific advance as the previous 30 years did! This will further complicate our lives and further challenge our environmental systems.

You would be quite logical in asking whether we are capable of controlling our environment and if so, how?

I believe the answer to the question of whether we can be the master of our environment is *yes*. The *how* part of it depends on many things including our willingness to undertake the task.

If we go back to the classification of pollution, which I have used, the objectives of environmental control becomes those of stopping the waste of our resources; controlling the additives so they do not "get out of hand"; and keeping the natural matter "in its proper place".

Unfortunately, these words do not convey the enormity of the task required to reach these objectives, but fortunately we do have some precedence. Environmentalists of the 1920's and 1930's considered communicable disease control the goal to be reached. Pneumonia, smallpox, scarlet fever, diphtheria and polio were all too common. Today, most of you are unaware of the fear that gripped the average family when an epidemic threatened. Bacteria and virus are pollutants "out of place" in the human body. They have been conquered for all intents and purposes at least in our nation. To achieve this goal, however, it was necessary that we all participate—the scientists, the physician, and particularly, you and I. We bore the pain of the shots, etc. which immunized us against the bacteria or destroyed them after they had already entered our bodies.

To curtail the waste of our resources necessitates a realization on the part of each of us that such inefficiencies exist. Because wastes often have their energy levels reduced, or the economic value impaired, society has in the past, thought that it was cheaper to throw the residue away than to recover it. We are beginning to realize that it is economic fallacy to load up the scavenger systems beyond their assimilative capacity. In doing so, we do pay the price in many subtle ways. Once this is generally recognized, we can then begin to function rationally and concentrate on greater and greater recovery and use of our resources. By doing so, we reduce the pollution and increase the resource base upon which life depends. We dull the two-edge sword and still its swing!

Increasing the efficiency of resource use necessitates a dedication by science and technology to as much or perhaps more effort to recover degraded materials than needed in the original development. For example, plastic containers, what does one do to reclaim them after their principle function has been accomplished. Not nearly enough people are thinking about this problem. As a result, the plastic containers go into our solid refuse disposal problem which is already of great magnitude. In my opinion, the cost of development must also include the cost of reuse or reclamation so that the cost of disposal does not become a public tax burden. I use this only as an example. There are thousands of items which are being handled in the same way. This will be changed only when each of us—whether he produces, transports, sells or buys—efficient use of the material resource.

Controlling the additive which "gets out of hand" is an equal challenge to society. These materials have, for the most part, large and immediate benefits. The increased life span of man has come about as the result of many of these additives. We are learning, however, that they, too, are not all good. The medical sciences have probably come farther than any other in developing means of evaluating the adverse effects of environmental additives than anyone else, yet the real effects may not show up amongst those exposed for 3 or 4 generations. It may take that long for the biological magnification to concentrate the materials to levels which "are out of hand". Nature's scavenger system is a beautifully efficient system, but it can be overloaded and it requires time to degrade the materials to their original elements or to reach the sinks where they are deposited. Some of our new additives require hundreds, and even thousands, of years to

degrade. If we are throwing nature a curve, the result will be a penalty against mankind. In my opinion, control of additives will necessitate a responsibility on the part of developers transcending even the best of motives, to determine all possible bad effects on mankind and to determine the risks of use involved. If this is not done at or before the additive is placed in use, the result may be irreversible and the real cost paid by future generations. One of science's greatest challenges lies in developing evaluation techniques which can encompass these two requirements. The individual is not spared from challenge either. Do you smoke? Probably no air pollution problem is known to have more serious consequences than smoke. It is up to you to determine as an individual whether you stop or not. Stopping could be one of the most important environmental controls for the benefit of mankind which any generation could provide. Are you willing to participate? Those of you who developed the habit know the personal dedication involved in quitting. I use this example because so many of us are inclined to point to the industry, or the government or our neighbors and say it is *their* responsibility, not mine. Unless we take these challenges personally, we as a society are not likely to succeed.

Controlling natural "additives" requires a massive effort. We will succeed to a high degree if man's efforts result in restricting the dislocation of the natural materials to the levels existing prior to man's meddling. It's been demonstrated that under certain conditions, man can control the erosive processes which cause the dislocation of materials. Again, success in this field requires the cooperation of every enlightened individual, some will have more responsibility than others but who knows when it will be our turn to do a bit for the control of the natural part of the environment to prevent its dislocation and subsequent classification as a pollutant.

The basic requirements of environmental pollution control is a recognition of the problem and a motivation to become a party to its solution.

Recognition requires knowledge. It's my opinion the awareness of the need to recognize and evaluate both the good and bad in the material would be essential. This philosophy can be introduced through the educational system. We have attempted to do this in a moral sense, but somehow forgot that while science and technology are amoral, men still employ them for their own gains generally without indepth analysis of the consequences. We must begin by teaching the teachers the principals of evaluating the consequences of decisions before they are implemented. I wish I could tick off these principles. Unfortunately, I know of no one who can. I can only illustrate what I mean by examples.

I will start with a somewhat facetious one, but it will illustrate the point. I once had a professor in industrial medicine, who during a class discussion of the health and care of the skin, advised that we would all be better physically if we took only one bath a week. He made this statement as a scientific fact, contrary to the exhortation of some of our better known advertisers.

Now, to illustrate an approach to evaluating the decision not to take a bath more than once a week. Obviously, each of us would save about 10 gallons of water 6 days out of 7; we would save one bar of soap per week; we would save the cost of the water and the soap; we would save the cost of treating the water together with its soap or detergent content; we would reduce the level of the residual phosphate and sulphates in the treated water returned to the stream; we would save the paper the soap is wrapped in; we would save the energy needed

to treat and heat the water. On the other side of the coin, we might offend our close associates; we would probably increase the use of deodorants. These are things which would occur to us as individuals. But now let's multiply the effects of this decision by 200 million, the population of the United States—the effect becomes staggering. Almost every facet of manufacturing, transportation, communication, and agriculture would be affected. People would be thrown out of work and a considerable sector of our economy would be dislocated. The stock market would certainly react, probably unfavorably, but we would increase the efficiency of our use of the resources without jeopardizing our physical well-being, and we would have prevented a degree of environmental pollution. Will you continue to take a bath everyday of the week?

But now—suppose you just invented the bath, how would you evaluate the consequences of the employment of your idea? Could you foresee the good, the bad, and the risks? Could you determine the optimum use? This is where we seem to need a great deal more attention from our scientists than we are getting.

In recent years, the decision to develop atomic energy probably received more attention than any other of record—yet so many things have happened which indicate the developers were, and still are, unable to fathom the depth of the consequences. I am sure it isn't because we do not wish to, it is because we do not know how! It is called lack of foresight!

You have probably noted, by now, that I have almost entirely directed my attention to environmental pollution, as it directly affects the human. It might surprise you to know that wastes and additives, and natural pollutants affect the purity of commercial and industrial products, life in the air and in the water, and on the land, other than the human. These uses and organisms are very often far more sensitive to pollutants than are humans, therefore, if we set up a standard for the human only, we are likely to find that he will shortly become the victim of secondary or tertiary effects resulting from the concentrations of the pollutant by the biological and physical processes which serve him.

I am sure you have grasped the complexity of the problem which faces us and, to some degree at least, the kind of attention in the scientific and in the social field required for its control. A great deal of progress has been made in the 35 years I have been interested in the environment. I can see the many advances made in pollution control. However, I am fearful that we have not yet been truly motivated to make the necessary hard decisions and to apply the discipline necessary to control those waste products and additives which man has introduced into the environment. However, environmental control, as I said earlier and I repeat, has been made necessary because we waste more of our resources than we use in achieving our progress. Increased efficiency of resource use in the long run may be our only solution to environmental waste control. We must stop wasting our resources. We must evaluate the additives and then determine whether we are willing to accept the level of risk which the best scientific evidence indicates.

Education seems to be the best means albeit a long term process, by which the message relative to the waste of our resources and the risks involved in the utilization of additives can be emblazoned in the minds of this and future generations. The scientific knowledge explosion has been a wonderful thing. Its application, however, leaves something to be desired. Every scientist and every executive, either in industry, on the farm, and in government, must strive to stabilize and equalize the environment through an

evaluation of the consequences of every technological advance. This may call for an entirely new concept of scientific progress and may call for an entirely new concept of what the word "progress" means.

May I say in conclusion, that in spite of the dire predictions made by many writers about the sorry conditions of the environment, most of these predictions are not backed up by scientific fact. There is sufficient evidence, however, to stir larger and larger segments of scientific community to an awareness of the necessity to come to grips with the problem before the point of no return is reached. The decade of the 1970's will be a crucial period within which we will have to make some critical decisions. Many of them will be individual decisions and do-it-yourself type environmental control. Emotional response is not enough. We must be constructively concerned.

The past three decades will probably be known as the golden age of science, but it may also be known as the age of intellectual irresponsibility. Let's not let the intellectual irresponsibility continue into the 1970's.

JURISDICTION OF OCEAN FLOOR

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1970, the Honorable Robert H. Quinn, attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, spoke before the National Association of Attorneys General here in Washington. Attorney General Quinn is held in high regard, I know by the entire Massachusetts delegation, and it is pleasing to all of us, I am sure, to know that he has the respect of his peers in the National Association of Attorneys General and the Atlantic Seaboard Conference of Attorneys General.

On November 19, 1969, I introduced two bills at the request of Bob Quinn and the Atlantic Seaboard Conference of Attorneys General. The first of these is H.R. 15285, which would establish a marine resources conservation and development fund and provide that the revenues obtained from the lease of the Outer Continental Shelf be divided on a 60-40 basis, 60 percent going to the States. The second of these bills would grant to each coastal State mineral rights in the subsoil and seabed of the Outer Continental Shelf extending to a line which is 12 miles from the coast of such State. I was joined in sponsorship of these bills by Congressmen PHILBIN, BOLAND, HELSTOSKI, KEITH, GETTYS, SIKES, CHAPPELL, KYROS, HATHAWAY, FRIEDEL, MORSE, HARRINGTON, BURKE, ADDABO, PODELL, ST GERMAIN, TIERNAN, WATSON, DORN, MANN, DOWNING, ABBITT, POFF, MARSH, SCOTT, WAMPLER, BROYHILL, FUQUA, FALLON, WHITEHURST, DONOHUE, SANDMAN, CRAMER, FREY, CONTE, and Congresswoman HECKLER.

In his speech on February 5, the attorney general of Massachusetts explained the purposes of this legislation and the need for both of these bills. I would like to bring his speech to the attention of my colleagues for its informa-

tion and because Bob Quinn demonstrates his interest not only as the attorney general of our State, but also as an individual, for a quality environment and a feasible and sensible approach to the development of natural resources.

From the earliest days of our federal system, it has been shown that in certain areas, the Federal Government can more efficiently and more easily accomplish the goals of the Nation, but in other areas, we know that it is the States that must have the primary responsibility. I believe these bills address themselves to one of those instances where the State can better protect the rights of its citizens. In terms of pollution control, I believe the citizens of a State can more easily influence decisions of a State legislature and State authorities to prevent the tragic and wasteful destruction of environment that we have seen all too often in our history. I believe that if the State had control over the offshore drilling in California, the Santa Barbara disaster would not have occurred and certainly would not be allowed to continue.

I urge my colleagues to consider Attorney General Quinn's statement. His remarks follow:

REMARKS OF ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT H. QUINN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Gentlemen: I appreciate very much your kindness in permitting me to speak to you on the common effort of the Atlantic Seaboard states to increase and to clarify their jurisdictions over the ocean floor.

This being the decade of the environment there are few subjects within the powers of Attorneys General of more long-range importance than the ocean jurisdictions of our respective states. Man has not yet destroyed completely his ocean environment. If we act wisely this rich resource can be both developed and preserved.

If we act unwisely or do not act at all, then this beautiful, natural asset, this storehouse of useful minerals and necessary marine life will be despoiled as we have already despoiled so much of our land and so many of our rivers. This—our country and our people can no longer afford. As Adlai Stevenson said wisely and well, "We are passengers on a space ship; and our only resources are those we have on board."

The moral is clear: we use our resources wisely or we perish. We must declare an end to the days of the wanton rape of resources. It is my hope that Attorneys General can play a leading role in enforcing the old and new laws to protect the environment, and that we can recommend the new legislation that is needed to conserve and develop the riches of the sea.

We in New England and along the Atlantic Seaboard have been attempting to do this with the organization of the Atlantic Seaboard Conference of Attorneys General. For two years now, we have worked with remarkable harmony and unanimity to test our legal rights in the United States Supreme Court and to extend our legal rights through legislation now on file in Congress.

I have asked to talk to you today, because we want to make our cause your cause. We want the work of the Atlantic Seaboard Conference, of which I now have the honor to be president, to become the mission of the National Association of Attorneys General, and of other national and coastal groups who share our purposes.

First, may I bring you up to date on *United States v. Maine, et al.*, which is destined to be one of the great landmark cases of original jurisdiction in the United States

Supreme Court. It is only the 35th in the history of the court; we still hope it may be one of the most important.

The United States has begun this action to force the coastal states to accept the inequities of the Submerged Lands Act of 1953. This act says to the coastal states: your jurisdiction over your adjacent ocean floor is limited to three nautical miles, except for Florida and Texas which are granted nine nautical miles. This measure became law in 1953 because the Atlantic Coastal states were asleep to the possibilities of their off-shore resources.

We are not asleep now. After the Santa Barbara Channel disaster off California, we can make a good case now that the adjacent state governments are better able to weigh the diverse interests and better able to protect the people's resources than a far-away federal government in Washington, D.C.

In addition, the possibilities of natural gas and oil beneath our ocean floor are impressive. The immediate usefulness of seabed sand and gravel is all too apparent, and the need to protect our shores and marine life from indiscriminate dumping and from oil spills is urgent.

Most of the Atlantic States have hired the Washington law firm of Covington and Burling to present our case to the United States Supreme Court. We have just filed a motion urging that we be permitted to submit our substantial historical evidence to a master. We expect to file our brief by June of 1970 and to be heard in oral argument in the Fall of this year.

We hope that the Court can be persuaded that the coastal states are entitled to the ocean jurisdiction which they exercised when they entered the Federal Union, and we are satisfied that it was considerably more than three miles.

The able Chairman of our Litigation Committee has been Attorney General James Erwin of Maine, and he and I have been assisted from time to time by General Sills of New Jersey, General DeSimone of Rhode Island, General Burch of Maryland, General Bolton of Georgia, and staff members of other offices along our coast.

The relationship has been friendly and co-operative to a remarkable degree. We hope that it will be productive as well.

At the same time, our Atlantic Seaboard Conference has made the deliberate decision that corrective legislative action is required. We are not convinced that there was ever any moral justification for Congress to award to Florida and to Texas three times as many seaward miles as to the other coastal states. Under the Constitution, the several states are entitled to equitable treatment from the Federal Union; this equitable treatment has been lacking, in our view, in the enactment of the Submerged Lands Act of 1953.

We feel that the ocean boundary of all the states should be set in the same manner, and that any benefits to be derived from mineral exploitation should be shared in the same manner. We seek to achieve these goals in two bills which have been filed in Congress by our Legislation Committee, which is chaired by General Burch of Maryland.

HR 15285 asks the Federal Government to share its mineral revenues with the adjacent states on a 60-40 basis, 60 percent going to the adjacent state.

H.R. 15286 asks Congress to amend the Submerged Lands Act from three nautical miles to twelve, to set an official coastal baseline in accordance with accepted international standards, and to determine lateral ocean boundaries between the states and between the United States and Canada, and the United States and Mexico.

We are grateful to Congressmen O'Neill, Donahue, and Conte of Massachusetts, Fallon of Maryland, Whitehurst of Virginia, Sandman of New Jersey, and Fuqua, Cramer and Frey of Florida for joining us in filing

this legislation. The bills have been referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary, and we would welcome an early public hearing.

Particularly, I call your attention to the need for establishing once and for all along our coast an official coastal baseline, in accordance with the technical standards developed at the Geneva Convention on the Law of the Sea in 1958, a convention to which our country was a party.

We seek the benefits of the 24-mile bay closing lines agreed upon at that convention in article 7, section 4:

"If the distance between the low-water marks of the natural entrance points of a bay does not exceed twenty-four miles, a closing line may be drawn between these two low-water marks, and the waters enclosed thereby shall be considered as internal waters."

Such a baseline would permit Massachusetts to exercise jurisdiction over all of the northwesterly portion of Massachusetts Bay and all of Cape Cod Bay. There would be similar benefits to other coastal states with heavily-indented coastlines.

We have reached unofficial verbal agreements on this technical question with the United States Geodetic Survey and the National Geographer of the State Department, but we want the provision written into Federal and State laws. Also, we want this written into the decision to be rendered by the United States Supreme Court.

And then we hope that physical markers can be placed along this baseline, at the expense of the Federal Government.

We bring this information to your attention today, because we want you to know of the progress that has been made, and we want you to know the possibilities that can be realized with your support.

The spaceship that Adlai Stevenson talked about is getting more crowded all the time. Its destination is more uncertain; the life-sustaining capacity of its limited cargo becomes more questionable.

We, the Attorneys General of the several states of this country, in a very real sense are the astronauts of this spaceship. We are at the controls, the vital controls of legislation and litigation. The stakes, as on a real spaceship, are human survival.

Speaking on behalf of the Atlantic Seaboard Conference of Attorneys General, representing the states from Maine to Florida, I solicit your interest and your support.

OIC DINNER

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune and exciting experience to attend the first annual "key dinner" of OIC of Dauphin County, Inc., on Friday, March 6.

OIC stands for Opportunities Industrialization Center and the Harrisburg center is one of 86 such centers in the Nation, founded originally by the Reverend Leon H. Sullivan in Philadelphia as a training program for the disadvantaged. In its short lifespan of about 6 years OIC nationally has trained and upgraded more than 35,000 of our disadvantaged citizens—certainly a remarkable figure—which indicates the driving force and dynamic appeal of this realistic approach to jobs. The rapid strides of

this movement are an appropriate testimony and tribute to the tremendous drive and accomplishments of the Reverend Sullivan, a big man—6 foot 5 inches—with a brooding, intense, imaginative, and orderly approach to one of our great urban problems—meaningful jobs.

OIC's purpose is to instill desirable work habits, teach job training, develop marketable skills, and encourage self-confidence without regard to race, color, or creed. Rev. Sullivan adds:

Too long our people have been dependent. I want them to be self-dependent and proud. I don't want them to be beggars.

His motivation:

I believe God wants me to help men to live better on earth.

It is evident that he is trying to carry out this mandate, and certainly OIC's formula seems to be effective. Before nearly 500 religious, industrial, business, Government, and civic leaders, five recent graduates of the Harrisburg OIC arose and told the audience of their self-improvement as a result of their training by OIC. Here were five people who admitted to their previous insufficiencies to compete in society; who with an honest, soul-baring, direct, uninhibited statement told of their new faith and ability and accomplishment. They reached their audience dramatically and the emotional appeal of their forthright honesty and humility was a moving experience I shall not soon forget. Here was a great example of social uplift and a meaningful benefit for people who needed and received help.

Several times previously I have indicated my strong conviction of the great help that OIC continues to be in upgrading people through job retraining, and during our recent hearings and executive sessions in our Ways and Means Committee on the administration's welfare recommendations I have expressed my confidence that through agencies and organizations such as OIC we will be able to keep our commitment to the underprivileged and disadvantaged.

The first annual dinner of OIC in Harrisburg on March 6 confirmed my faith in this fine organization. Congratulations to the Reverend Leon Sullivan and his Harrisburg chapter, and its directors and staff. They are doing a tremendous and effective job in a difficult and troubled area.

SHALL WE MAKE PEACE WITH NATURE?

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Owen Phelps, associate editor of the Brown County Chronicle which is published in my district, recently wrote a perceptive column about President Nixon's remarks in his state of the Union address on the need to solve our environmental problems.

Mr. Phelps points out that man has won his age-old battle with nature. He writes:

The problem is and has been for almost a century, that man has not realized he is reigning over a conquest. Instead, man lives as if he is still at war with nature, and because nature can no longer resist, man's ruthless wartime activity has left nature in a shambles.

Because Mr. Phelps has so cogently described the challenge facing us, I believe that the full text of his column will be of interest:

[From the Brown County Chronicle, Feb. 4, 1970]

STYX AND TOMES
(By Owen Phelps)

"Shall we surrender to our surroundings or shall we make peace with nature and begin to make reparations for the damage we have done to our air, our land and our water?"

The question is President Richard Nixon's, and it may be the most important thing he has ever said.

In his State of the Union address to Congress, Nixon made it clear that he regards environmental quality a very important issue in the next decade. But, even more important—and prior to any real "war on pollution"—is that we understand the terms of the question Nixon has put to us.

We must either make peace with nature or we must surrender to her. How ironic—for the situation comes not as it does in Vietnam, where we are at a stalemate of sorts, but on our own terrain, where a clearcut victory over nature was never more apparent.

Our alternatives in dealing with nature—peace or surrender—are the result of our winning man's age old battle over the old lady. There is no stalemate; there has been none for almost a century. We are the undisputed victor, and it is precisely in the lopsided victory that our alternatives are rooted.

For centuries man waged a battle with nature, expending to the very last his daily energy just trying to keep alive.

Unremittingly nature opposed his survival, destroying his crops, flooding his lands, freezing his limbs, breaking his plow and expending his cattle.

A few tornadoes, a couple of blizzards, a little disease and nature had her way. Man lived where nature permitted—in her river valleys in the temperate zone.

Her power was the most revered in the universe, and men knelt and worshiped her. Sometimes nature was kind, other times she was ruthless. But always she had her way.

Gradually, however, man expanded his arsenal of weapons with which to battle nature. He made clothes, he discovered the wheel; he learned to communicate, and thus share with others his wisdom and experience.

Man domesticated animals with more strength and endurance than his own. He made tools and used them to build houses to protect him from nature's climatic whims. He learned to harness the power of fire, neutralizing these whims.

Man refined and re-refined his tools, his knowledge, his power. He made progress—progress in his war with nature. But the battle remained a stalemate until the industrial revolution.

The rise of industrialization and mechanization were to man's war with nature what the atom bomb was to America's war with Japan. Mass production ended the conflict. Now man could call all the shots.

Today, with centralized heating on the one hand, and air conditioning—even in baseball parks—on the other, with the power of the atom, of electricity, of gasoline, and of a thousand other things, nature is no longer a master. Indeed, she is hardly an adversary at all; she is a conquest.

The problem is, and has been for almost a century that man has not realized he is reigning over a conquest. Instead, man lives as if he is still at war with nature, and because nature can no longer resist, man's ruthless wartime activity has left nature in a shambles.

In our earnest and greed we have plundered and pillaged the very things we once hoped to possess.

Like the over-greedy, unenlightened despot, our very power stands to eventually bring about our demise. And "eventually" is not far off. If our ruthless reign continues we will be turned over to our conquest—and she will enjoy an equally ruthless reign, at our expense.

Fortunately, and unlike many despots, we know the end is near unless we move to prevent it. A little enlightenment here, a little tribute there, and we can continue to reign in peace.

As Nixon so astutely observed—it is that or surrender.

THIS IS A FARMER

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the American farmer has made the United States the best-fed, best-clothed nation on the earth.

Our superabundance which has been shared with most of the nations of the world is due in great measure to the productivity and dedication of the American farmer.

Because of the decreasing number of American farms many elements of our society tend to overlook the overall importance of American farms.

However, the American farm is one of the real keystones to our economy and this will become increasingly apparent as the world population rises.

Mr. Oscar B. Smith, of Rural Route 5, Frankfort, Ind., has sent along an article concerning the American farmer which I believe is excellent.

In order to share this informative and philosophical assessment of the American farmer, I offer the article for the RECORD.

The article follows:

THIS IS A FARMER

This is not the first time this column has appeared in print—and it's pretty sure not to be the last. The original author is unknown but whoever he (or she) is, he knows a thing or two about farmers.

Farmers are found in fields plowing up, seeding down, returning from, planting to, fertilizing with, spraying for and harvesting if. Wives help them, little boys follow them, the Agriculture Department confuses them, city relatives visit them, salesmen detain them, meals wait for them, weather can delay them, but it takes Heaven to stop them.

When your car stalls along the way, a farmer is a considerate, courteous, inexpensive road service. When a farmer's wife suggests he buy a new suit, he can quote from memory every expense involved in operating the farm last year, plus the added expense he is certain will crop up this year. Or else he assumes the role of the indignant shopper, impressing upon everyone within earshot the pounds of pork he must produce in order to pay for a suit at today's prices.

A farmer is a paradox—he is an "overalled"

executive with his home his office; a scientist using fertilizer attachments; a purchasing agent in an old straw hat; a personnel director with grease under his finger nails; a dietitian with a passion for alfalfa, animals and antibiotics; a production expert faced with a surplus; and a manager battling a price-cost squeeze. He manages more capital than most of the businessmen in town.

He likes sunshine, good food, state fairs, dinner at noon, auctions, his neighbors, Saturday nights in town, his shirt collar unbuttoned, and above all a good soaking rain in August.

He is not much for droughts, ditches, throughways, experts, weeds, the eight-hour day, helping with the housework, or grasshoppers.

Nobody else is so far from the telephone or so close to God. Nobody else gets so much satisfaction out of modern plumbing, favorable weather and good ice cream.

Nobody else can remove all those things from his pockets and on washday still have overlooked: five "steeples," one cotter key, a rusty spike, three grains of corn, the stub end of a lead pencil, a square tape, a \$4.98 pocket watch, and a cupful of chaff in each trouser cuff.

A farmer is both Faith and Fatalist—he must have faith to continually meet the challenges of his capacities amid an ever-present possibility that an act of God (a late spring, an early frost, tornado, flood, drought) can bring his business to a standstill. You can reduce his acreage but you can't restrain his ambition.

Might as well put up with him—he is your friend, your competitor, your customer, your source of food and fiber, and self-reliant young citizens to help replenish your cities.

He is your countryman—a denim-dressed, business-wise, fast-growing statesman of stature.

And when he comes in at noon having spent the energy of his hopes and dreams, he can be recharged anew with the magic words: "The Market's Up."

THE DEMOCRATS—IN MEMORIAM

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, many a true word is often spoken in jest. I believe this is the case with the attached column by humorist Arthur Hoppe. I am sure my friends in the Democratic Party will find the following article as funny and enlightening as I have:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Feb. 23, 1970]

THE DEMOCRATS (IN MEMORIAM)

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Scene: The headquarters of the Democratic National Committee. Its members are gathered to interview applicants for the now-vacant job of Committee Chairman.

Enter an applicant, Homer T. Pettibone. He is wearing a Brooks Brothers suit, a Southern planter's straw hat, a psychedelic shirt, a string tie and cowboy boots. In one hand he carries a lunch pail, in the other hand a vellum-bound collection of T. S. Eliot's poems.

FIRST MEMBER (admiringly). I like the cut of your jib, Pettibone. Something about you tells me you may be just the man we're looking for to take over and unify the party.

SECOND MEMBER. Not so fast, Al. He may look good. But who's he backing for top banana?

PETTIBONE (proudly). I'm a founder of the Humphrey - Muskie - McGovern-Kennedy-Eastland-or-Whoever-May-Turn-Up for President Club.

THIRD MEMBER. I'll say this for him. He can pick a winner.

SECOND MEMBER. Maybe. But where do you stand on the issues our great party, faces today, Pettibone?

PETTIBONE. Oh, I'm for States' Rights, sir. South of the Mason-Dixon line. Elsewhere, I feel that only increased Federal spending on an increasing number of Federal programs can solve the problems that beset the Nation.

FIRST MEMBER (approvingly). A chip off the old FDR bloc. What about racial equality?

PETTIBONE. Oh I'm for equality, sir. Integrated equality up North; separate equality down South. We Democrats must keep the uppity Nigras in their place in Biloxi and support the aspirations of all Americans, black or white, in Gary, Indiana.

SECOND MEMBER (grudgingly). Not bad. But what about the war in Vietnam?

PETTIBONE. I've hewed to the party line on that for years, sir. I wasn't one of those Nervous Nellies who wanted to cut and run from President Johnson's glorious crusade to stem the tide of Communism in Asia.

SECOND MEMBER (slyly). You're for the war, eh?

PETTIBONE (shocked). Oh, not now. Now I'm for Nixon getting us out of this rotten war of his immediately. With honor, of course. But if he lets Vietnam go Communist, so that our brave boys died in vain, he's in trouble.

THIRD MEMBER. Spoken like a true Democrat. But do you think you can sell the party's program to the voters?

PETTIBONE (modestly). As a lad, I built a profitable summer resort business, selling cans of worms to fishermen.

FIRST MEMBER. An ideal background. But you realize the party's \$8 million in debt. We need a sharp fund-raiser.

PETTIBONE. If you'll check my resume, sir, you'll see that I was instrumental in arranging the financing for the manufacture of the Edsel.

SECOND MEMBER. By golly, Pettibone, you've convinced me. Do you want the job?

PETTIBONE (eagerly). I certainly do, sir. I can't think of a more challenging, rewarding position, I can't wait to get started.

(At this, the members go into a huddle. There is much frowning and head-shaking. At last, they break).

FIRST MEMBER. I'm sorry, Pettibone, you just won't do.

PETTIBONE (surprised). But, sir, I'm loyal, experienced and eager.

SECOND MEMBER. I know. But we figure anybody who'd want this job must be some kind of nut.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, all Americans have a continuing interest in an able and independent Federal judiciary. In recent years it has become fashionable in some quarters to condemn the Federal Constitution as being out of date. Others have centered their attacks on the independence of Federal judges, arguing that Congress has both the power and duty to enact

legislation to give some administrative agencies power to second-guess the House and the Senate, which have the sole constitutional power to impeach Federal judges for lack of good behavior, and evade the constitutional safeguards by an administrative determination respecting the tenure of office, judicial philosophy, or other characteristics of Federal judges under the guise of a determination of his "good behavior."

Legislation of this kind is now pending in the Congress, and the following statement of the District of Columbia National Republican committeeman, Carl Shipley, recently published by the Washington Post in response to an editorial supporting such legislation, is worthy of consideration by Members of Congress:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 17, 1970]

THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

(By Carl L. Shipley)

Associate Editor Merlo J. Pusey's recent article on the question of whether judicial councils established by Congress to supervise certain housekeeping and administrative activities of Federal District Courts in each of the judicial circuits can defrock a federal judge by ordering him not to hear cases is misleading.

Mr. Pusey suggests that Congress has the power to authorize some administrative agency made up of other judges to pass on the fitness of a sitting federal judge. Mr. Pusey refers to the case of Chief Judge Stephen S. Chandler of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, who was denied the right to hear cases by the Tenth Circuit Judicial Council on the grounds he was "unable or unwilling" to carry on the duties of his office. Mr. Pusey says "Judge Chandler was not removed from his office." While technically true, the duties of the office were removed from the judge, which is a distinction without a difference.

The men who wrote our Federal Constitution tried to guarantee an independent national judiciary by providing that judges shall hold office during good behavior, and that they cannot be intimidated by having their salaries reduced. The Colonial Declaration of Rights of Oct. 14, 1774, complained that judges were "dependent on the crown." A complaint in the Declaration of Independence was that King George III "has made judges dependent on his will alone for the tenure of their office." Our forefathers had a long and bitter quarrel with the king about the position of judges in the American colonies. The colonists wished them to hold office during good behavior to escape control by the crown. When the King of England demanded the surrender of colonial charters, the colonists resisted. A proceeding in *quo warranto* was commenced in the English courts (inquiring by what warrant they claimed rights) and it terminated predictably against the colonists by judges serving at the pleasure of the king.

Against this background of history, Randolph of Virginia proposed an independent national judiciary to serve during good behavior (i.e., for life) at the 1787 meeting to amend the Articles of Confederation. Dickinson of Delaware moved to make the tenure of judges terminable by the President on demand of both houses of Congress, similar to the British system, but the proposal was rejected, and the Federal Constitution was adopted in its present form.

It provides a special court made up of all members of the U.S. Senate, specially sworn on "oath of affirmation," to try judges who have been impeached (charged) by the House of Representatives for lack of good behavior.

It takes two-thirds of the members present to convict, the President cannot pardon a convicted judge, who upon conviction can be removed from the office and disqualified for life to hold any other office of honor, trust or profit under the United States. Also, a judge may be tried criminally in addition to impeachment. A judge may be impeached for "treason, bribery, or other high crimes, and misdemeanors." The manager of the impeachment of President Andrew Jackson defined the scope of the language in the Constitution: "an impeachable crime or misdemeanor . . . may consist of a violation of the Constitution, of law, or an official oath, or of duty, by an act committed or omitted, or without violating a positive law, by abuse of discretionary powers from improper motives, or from any improper purpose." In short, the Constitution protects the independence of federal judges consistent with the lessons of history, yet provides a special court to protect against judges who are unfit, or even "unwilling or unable" to fulfill the duties of office. Indeed, the House Judiciary Committee report from which Mr. Pusey takes his highly selective excerpts recites numerous cases of federal judges being impeached for misdeeds from drunkenness to bribery, and outlines how well and quickly the constitutional safeguards work.

The report indicates that Congress has no power to circumvent the Constitution and pass on the fitness of judges until the Constitution is amended. It would be a grave undertaking for Americans to diminish the independence of the federal judiciary, which has been the one great bastion standing between oppressive and arrogant officials and the civil rights of citizens.

FIGHT AGAINST LOAN SHARKING

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, an excellent presentation published in the March 5, 1970, issue of the *Machinist*, the official publication of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, points up the outstanding job done by my colleague, JOSEPH McDADE, in his fight against loan sharking. This is proper recognition, well deserved, of a lot of hard work and effective legislating on Congressman McDADE's part, to combat a practice that had become too widespread and harmful over our entire country.

The item follows:

TWO CONVICTED, 36 AWAIT TRIALS IN DRIVE ON LOAN SHARKING

A Federal campaign to stamp out loan sharking is picking up steam all over the country.

Loaning money at exorbitant interest rates collected by beatings or threats of physical harm has been a Federal offense since 1968. Congress added it, as an afterthought, to the Truth-in-Lending Act.

So far, the Feds have indicted at least 41 persons in nine states on loan-sharking charges. Two have been convicted under the new law; one was acquitted and two indictments have been dismissed. The other 36 cases are awaiting trial.

The constitutionality of the anti-loan-sharking law was upheld last month by the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in Illinois. The law had been challenged by Michael Biancofiore of Chicago, the first loan shark convicted under Federal law.

According to Rep. Joseph McDade of

Pennsylvania, whose bill was the basis for the legislation, the new law was directed against organized crime that preys on the poor who cannot find credit through normal channels.

ONE THOUSAND PERCENT INTEREST

Under the law, it is illegal for anyone to use or threaten violence in making, financing or collecting a loan. The Congressman explained that when direct evidence of violence is available, nothing else is required to prove the crime.

Congressional hearings revealed that a loan shark may charge up to 1,000 per cent interest a year and that loan-sharking is a multi-billion dollar source of income annually for the underworld.

Biancoflori, whose conviction was affirmed in Chicago, had been found guilty of making threats to collect a debt from George Wright and sentenced to seven years in prison. Testimony in that case showed how loan sharks operate.

According to the testimony, Biancoflori loaned Wright, a snack shop employee, \$200 in November, 1967, telling him, "You know, this is a juice (high-interest) loan." Wright was required to pay \$14 interest a week, payable every Tuesday.

This amounted to 364 per cent a year! Biancoflori also warned Wright: "Don't try to leave town on me, or the boys will find you and you'll be sorry."

In December, 1967, Wright was again in financial trouble and borrowed an additional \$200 from Biancoflori.

Two months later, Wright and Biancoflori formed a partnership in a painting and decorating business, M&G Home Improvement. Biancoflori supplied \$1,000 cash needed to start the enterprise and controlled the books. He deducted Wright's payments from his wages. Wright got two more loans shortly after the partnership was formed, borrowing a total of \$75 from Biancoflori. His weekly interest payments amounted to \$53.

In August, 1968, Wright stopped working for M&G. When Wright was unable to make interest payments, he and his family were harassed by Biancoflori.

Wright complained to the Federal Bureau of Investigation that Biancoflori repeatedly made threats of violence, in person and over the telephone. On a day a collection was scheduled, agents hid in Wright's apartment, overheard the threatening remarks and made the arrest.

Investigation of the Biancoflori case led Federal agents to smash what was described as "the largest blue-collar loan-shark ring in the country." Eleven men were indicted on charges of using or threatening violence in extending credit.

FIVE HUNDRED PERCENT INTEREST

The ring, which was based in Cicero, Ill., a Chicago suburb, netted an estimated \$50,000 a week, loaning money to persons who lost heavily gambling. The victims, including some factory workers, were directed to loan sharks by bookies, agents said.

The loan sharks extended credit at interest rates of five to ten per cent a week. This would be an annual rate of about 250 to 500 per cent.

The victims were told they would be harmed if they did not meet payments, according to the indictments. Biancoflori operated as a collection agent for the lenders.

The second loan shark to be convicted under the new law is Alcides Perez. He was sentenced to 18 months in prison on Mar. 19, 1969, for threatening violence to collect a debt. Here are the facts in his case:

The victim opened a butcher shop in New York State. He borrowed money from Perez after he was unable to obtain credit from a supplier. Within four months the victim paid Perez three times the amount of the original loan and was still in debt. His business failed.

As a result of Perez's threats, the victim and his wife were forced to move out of their neighborhood. Eventually they reported the threats to authorities and testified at Perez's trial.

In another case, not yet come to trial, Eugene C. Dawson of Jersey City, N.J., charged that he was obliged to pay a loan shark 260 per cent interest on a debt. He had borrowed \$400 to pay outstanding bills. A month later, he borrowed an additional \$300. He was then required to pay \$35 a week interest until he could repay the \$700 lump sum.

When Dawson began to fall behind in his payments, he was driven to a store to "straighten out his loan." When Dawson explained that he had no money, he was beaten on the arms and hip with a heavy piece of wood.

Next day, Dawson entered a hospital with a broken elbow. He was hospitalized for 11 days.

Another victim of the loan sharks, Frank Gscheidle of New York City, told authorities he borrowed \$1,000. Six months later he had repaid the loan plus \$400 interest. Yet, the lenders told Gscheidle he still owed them \$1,350. When he refused to pay up he was threatened with pistols and beaten with fists. Three men have been indicted for using violence to collect that loan.

The Justice Department has launched an investigation of underworld figures who are financing loan-sharking operations. According to officials, the new law has "provided a real deterrent to this type of activity."

FBI AIDS LOAN SHARK VICTIMS

Under Federal law, a loan shark is any money lender who threatens you or your family with beatings or other physical harm if you fail to make the payments. The penalty can run to \$10,000 and 20 years in jail.

If you are victimized by a loan shark who threatens bodily harm, call the nearest office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The nearest office should be listed in the front pages of your telephone directory.

THREE AWARDS FOR HAVRE DE GRACE RECORD

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Havre de Grace Record has always done an outstanding job of presenting news and editorial comment to its readers. This year the paper has received recognition of its efforts by the Maryland-Delaware-District of Columbia Press Association, Inc.

I wish to honor the editors and the staff by including the following article in the RECORD:

THREE AWARDS FOR THE RECORD

The Havre de Grace Record was notified Monday that the newspaper has won three important prizes in the 1969 editorial contest of Maryland-Delaware-D.C. Press Association, Inc.

Editor J. Clark Samuel of The Record was awarded first place for the best editorial. The editorial was concerned with closed meetings of public bodies and the people's right to know.

The Record also won first place for the best editorial page makeup. This was a staff effort.

The Havre de Grace Record also won second place for the best front page makeup and

headlines, which was a staff effort. First place in this category was won by the Dorchester News of Cambridge, Md.

This marks the third consecutive year that the Havre de Grace Record has won first and second awards.

Certificates and plaques will be presented to winners at the annual awards luncheon this Saturday in connection with the annual winter convention of the Maryland-Delaware-D.C. Press Association at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington.

THIRTY SPINAL MENINGITIS CASES AT ARMY TRAINING POST

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent a letter to Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, calling his attention to a very serious situation at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.

As you probably know, press reports this weekend state that three servicemen have died from spinal meningitis and 30 men are sick with the disease at the present time. Yet the Department of the Army, having this information, still intends to go forward with its plans to bring young men from all over the country to Fort Leonard Wood for basic training and reserve duty. I think this is an abominable situation. Twenty-seven members of the Massachusetts National Guard and an undisclosed number of Army Reserves from the Greater Boston area are destined for Fort Leonard Wood sometime this month.

When I spoke with an officer of the Department of the Army this morning, there were no plans to change the site for this training. I think the Army is only courting disaster. I am sure that the site for this training could easily be changed with little effort and expense on the part of the Army. However, even if the expense and effort were great, it would be worth it to prevent the spread of this disease and to possibly save the lives of more young men.

I include here in the RECORD a copy of my letter to Secretary Laird protesting this action and asking for a change in the Army's plans:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1970.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I called your office today to register a protest with regard to Army policy, and my call was returned by a member of the staff of the Secretary of the Army.

It is my understanding that three men have died and 30 are sick at the present time with spinal meningitis at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri. As you may know, the Sunday New York Times had an article to this effect. Since that article appeared, my Boston Office has been inundated with calls by concerned parents, and I received many calls at home over the weekend. It is presently planned that 27 members of the Massachusetts National Guard and an undisclosed number of Army Reserves from the Greater Boston area will be sent to Fort Leonard

Wood this month for basic training and reserve duty. I called your office to protest this action. The explanation I received from the officer to whom I spoke was absolutely unsatisfactory. I doubt that any explanation could be satisfactory as to why young men should be sent there now in the middle of an epidemic.

Personally, I think this is a ridiculous way to run an Army—to send additional men to an area where there is known to be an extremely serious and fatal disease. I understand that young men from all over the country are being sent to Fort Leonard Wood for their basic training. I think this is foolish. I am sure they could be sent to other camps with very little effort on the part of the Army.

I urge you to investigate this immediately and to make provision for the holding of basic training at another Army installation.

I look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

With best wishes from your old colleague,
Sincerely,

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,
Member of Congress.

TESTIMONY CALLING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A POLICE EMERGENCY NUMBER

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning I testified before the House Judiciary Committee urging the establishment of an emergency telephone number in order to facilitate citizen participation in the war against crime.

The text of my testimony and of my proposed amendment to the Safe Streets Act follows:

THE UNIFORMED EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBER "911" ACT OF 1971

(By Congressman JOHN V. TUNNEY)

Last August when Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, issued his annual report on crime in America, his statistics—as was expected—told a grim story. The report, covering the year 1968, showed that there was a 17 per cent rise in serious crimes over 1967. In a follow-up report issued in September and covering the first six months of 1969, Mr. Hoover revealed that while the overall crime rate appeared to be leveling off, crimes of violence were still on the rise.

Confirmation of this trend toward crimes of violence has come from the Los Angeles police department—the largest police jurisdiction in my home State. In the first eight months of 1969, homicides increased by 15.4 per cent and forcible rape by 20.1 per cent. While the overall increase in crime in Los Angeles during the period was below the national average, these statistics make clear that the safety of the city's people is still threatened by violence.

It is because of this threat to the citizens of Los Angeles and the other cities and towns across California, and the need of police authorities for greater resources to provide our people with protection, that I have come to testify in favor of greater funding for the Crime Control and Safe Streets Act.

The roots of crime go very deep into our society. They can be traced to the inability of our institutions to cope with a massive shift of our population into the cities, to the rootlessness of some of our youth because

of a lack of preparedness for urban lives, to attitudes toward authority that have developed in a period of moral uncertainty, and to frustrating conditions in our urban ghettos. These roots will not be eradicated by the money we appropriate this year, nor next year, nor the year after.

But we can, by appropriating three-quarters of a billion dollars requested for the Safe Streets Act, give our people a greater sense of security in knowing that the resources required to control crime are being committed to the task. In my testimony, I want to focus on an amendment that I am offering to the Safe Streets Act, an amendment which can enhance this sense of security and which could be funded from the expanded appropriations under discussion here today.

My proposal is a simple one. It is based on a belief that there is a relatively inexpensive action we can take to give our people a greater sense of security at a time when crime rates are continuing to escalate.

My proposal is that our citizens have the security of knowing that by telephoning a simple three-digit number "911" that they can immediately contact the police authorities having jurisdiction over their area. Quick communications can reduce police reaction time and thereby capture or deter criminals who otherwise would expect a leisurely getaway while victims fumble for a seven-digit police number or wait for an operator to answer.

During peak crime hours, telephone company switchboards become jammed as citizens try to reach an operator—some to make long-distance calls, some for information, and some frantic to get police or fire departments to help them. Operators, facing rows of blinking lights, can't tell an emergency from a request for the time of day.

Even when she does answer, the operator must take precious minutes to dial a seven-digit number, and in sprawling metropolitan areas like Los Angeles and the San Francisco bay, there are so many different numbers that she is unlikely to be familiar with all of them.

The 911 emergency number has been installed in over 50 cities ranging in size from New York City to Ilva, Oklahoma. Although this range covers a vast spectrum, there are some common features about these cities that make installation of 911 easier for them than other areas. They have a single police authority having jurisdiction over an entire Metropolitan area and a single telephone service that is co-terminous with this jurisdiction, the task is usually the simple action of supplementing an existing seven-digit police number with the easier-to-remember three-digit number.

In sprawling metropolitan areas like those in California, the 911 emergency number is extremely difficult to install because telephone service areas rarely are co-terminous with police jurisdiction and because of the enormous problems of establishing tie-lines or referral mechanisms between one jurisdiction and another.

But these difficulties are all the more reason why the 911 emergency number needs to be installed. These problems of communication are at present obstacles to the citizen being able to contact the appropriate police authority. For instance, in Los Angeles County there are 90 different seven-digit numbers for 47 separate city police departments, the county sheriff, and the state highway patrol. These are 102 telephone service areas spanning three area codes and having as many as eight police jurisdictions within one service area.

Because of the enormity of police communications in the Los Angeles area, I believe that if 911 can work there, it can work anywhere in America. Consider these facts:

Los Angeles County is unique in that it has a population of 7.2 million people resid-

ing in a 1,500 square mile area. This is a population greater than that of 42 states and an area that is not only half again as large as Rhode Island but also large enough to encompass the combined areas of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Pittsburgh, St. Louis and Denver. The communications problems presented by the sprawling metropolis are obvious.

The police authorities of the Los Angeles area recognized early that an emergency number system could be of tremendous benefit in crime control. But the technical difficulties have also been tremendous and the necessary funds hard to acquire locally.

A pilot project using 911 was due to begin on March 1, 1970 but because of an adverse vote in the Los Angeles City Council the program has been delayed. I sincerely hope that the council will reconsider its actions and vote to support the project.

Because I am aware of the substantial financial and technical difficulties that localities in California's sprawling metropolitan areas face in instituting the 911 number, I am today introducing an amendment to the Crime Control and Safe Streets Act which would provide matching funds for the installation of the 911 number. My bill would authorize \$50 million in the upcoming fiscal year. I believe this is about half the total amount required to establish the 911 number in every city in America. Another \$50 million would be authorized for the next fiscal year and then a smaller amount would be authorized for operations and maintenance once the major installation expenses had been met.

Since the problems of installing 911 in Los Angeles County are the most extreme of any area of either California or elsewhere in America, I have earmarked in my bill an authorization for \$5 million for assistance to localities in this metropolitan area.

I believe that 911 will make a decisive difference. That is why I have investigated the need for this legislation. I was moved to act by a criminal incident that occurred in my home town last summer which could have easily been avoided if the victim and the bystander had had the speed and motivation of a three-digit number.

But before introducing my bill I wrote to police chiefs in the Los Angeles area to ask their opinion of 911. Of those who responded, about 90 per cent were strongly enthusiastic and about 10 per cent cited local conditions that would keep the system from being an advantage.

Nearly all of the responses cited the difficulties involved. Chief Robert McGowan of the Pasadena Police Department talked of the "technical magnitude of the undertaking." Chief Walter Koenig of the Torrance Police Department referred to "monumental problems." Chief Duane Baker of the Glendale Police Department was concerned about the routing of calls between different police jurisdictions, while Chief Rex Andrews of the Burbank Police Department pointed out that the telephone companies had emphasized expensive equipment requirements. And Chief Louis Sunyich of the Redondo Beach Police Department offered the important suggestion that 911 should be coupled with the capacity for dialing the number from a pay phone without depositing a coin.

All of these law enforcement officers were enthusiastic in their support for the 911 emergency number. And because of their support, I believe that I am right in saying that the expenditure of the money I am calling for in my uniform emergency telephone number 911 act will give a greater sense of security against crime to our citizens than any other comparable expenditure we will make under the Crime Control and Safe Streets Act.

In summary, I believe that there could be greater public safety and more effective citizen action against rising crime if all com-

munities switched to the 911 universal police and emergency number.

Dialing this number from any home or public phone would immediately connect a citizen with a police switchboard, this would do away with the agonizing slowness of asking an operator who has to look up the number of the police or fire department serving the caller.

Few areas of the United States need the 911 system more than metropolitan Los Angeles and San Francisco. In Los Angeles county, there are over 150 seven-digit numbers for police and fire departments and in the San Francisco Bay area, there are over 50.

Under the 911 system, which communities could adopt only if they wanted it, a call for help would automatically be routed to the police and fire department serving the caller.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity of presenting this proposal of vital concern to Californians to this committee for its consideration.

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act to provide grants for the establishment, equipping, and operation of the emergency communication facilities to make the national emergency telephone number 911 available throughout the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this section shall be known as the Uniform Emergency Telephone Number 911 Act of 1971.

That the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended by redesignating title XI as title XII and by adding after title X the following new title:

"TITLE XI—GRANTS FOR EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTERS ESTABLISHED TO MAKE AVAILABLE THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBER 911

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"SEC. 1101. (a) Congress finds that greater citizen participation is a critical necessity to halting the alarming rise in crime in the United States.

"(b) That at the present time, a major obstacle to citizen involvement in the war against crime is a lack of rapid communication with local law enforcement authorities, especially when numerous law enforcement jurisdictions exist within major metropolitan areas.

"(c) That to improve the coordination of law enforcement agency response in metropolitan areas and to establish more responsive facilities for citizen involvement this Act provides funds to establish the uniform emergency telephone number 911.

"AUTHORIZATION OF GRANTS

"SEC. 1102. (a) The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (referred to in this title as the 'Administration') is authorized to make grants under this title to assist State governments and units of general local government in meeting the costs of establishing, equipping, and operating emergency communication facilities to make the national emergency telephone number 911 available in the areas served by such facilities. Grants under this title shall be allocated by the Administration among the States for distribution among the counties, cities and political subdivisions on such basis as the Administration determines will most effectively carry out the purposes of this title.

"(b) Grants under this title may only be made to an eligible State planning agency for disbursement to counties, cities and political subdivisions therein. The planning agency of a State that receives a grant under this title shall make the funds provided by such

grant available to the government of that State and the units of general local government in that State in such manner as the chief executive of said State shall by regulation or executive order prescribe.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 1103. (a) The amount of any grant made under this title to establish, equip, and operate emergency communications facilities shall not exceed one-half the cost (as determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administration) of establishing, equipping, and operating such facilities.

"(b) Not more than one-half of any grant made under this title may be expended for the compensation of personnel. The amount of any such grant expended for the compensation of personnel shall not at any time exceed the amount of State or local funds actually expended for the compensation of personnel employed in such facilities.

"(c) Because Los Angeles County and its political subdivisions have, as do certain other metropolitan areas of California, complex police and emergency communications problems, at least \$5 million in fiscal year 1971 should be earmarked for the use of Los Angeles County in a demonstration project.

"(d) The provisions of sections 509, 510, 511, 514, 516 (a), and 521 of this Act shall apply with respect to grants made under this title.

"(e) The Administration may prescribe such regulations as it determines are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 1104. As used in this title—

"(1) The term 'eligible State planning agency' means an agency of a State created or designated in accordance with section 203 of this Act which (A) has on file with the Administration an approved comprehensive State plan (not more than one year of age) which sets forth policies and procedures designed to assure that the national emergency telephone number 911 will be made available in the State; and (B) has made an application for a grant under this title in such manner as the Administration shall by regulation prescribe. (C) Provided, however, that if the eligible State planning agency does not have an approved plan on file, then a particular county, city, or other political subdivision may submit a plan directly to the Administration.

"(2) The term 'State' means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 1105. For the purpose of making grants under this title, there are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; and \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 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?

OF CONCERN TO PARENTS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, parents who are concerned, and rightly so, by the attitudes toward God and country evidenced by some young people these troubled days, ought to interest themselves in what literature is prescribed reading in the school systems of our land. An example of this situation in a Manchester, N.H., high school, is reported in an interesting editorial in the Manchester Union Leader of last week.

A balanced perspective requires exposure to both sides of any controversy. There is little that is "balanced" in the menu reported in the following editorial:

[From the Manchester Union Leader, March 6, 1970]

FOR PARENTS WHO CARE

The paperback books shown in the above photograph, although dissimilar in the scope of the issues discussed, have many similarities.

The authors are all left-of-center, ranging from far left to extremely liberal. There is nothing wrong, per se, with that.

The books are all highly opinionated. There is nothing wrong with that; we prefer people with strong convictions to those who have no definite views on anything.

The books are among a carefully selected group either being used, or originally scheduled for use, in a course in "Contemporary Problems" in a Manchester high school. There is nothing wrong, in itself, with that; a course in "Contemporary Problems" quite obviously should consider the views of those who hold provocative opinions on contemporary issues.

As a matter of fact, there would be nothing really remarkable about the use of these books in a classroom were it not for three additional considerations:

1. Textual material by authors who hold differing points of view are effectively barred from this course currently being taught at Immaculata High School.

2. This philosophy of "education"—we see it as indoctrination—is endorsed by the school administration.

3. The School Board has gone on record with "a vote of full confidence" in the school administration's endorsement of this incredible situation.

Although the general tenor of the books is undoubtedly familiar to many of our readers, particularly high school and college students, perhaps a brief summation would be helpful to an understanding of the basic issue we are raising. Again, we're NOT protesting the use of the books; our protest is directed to the fact that books representing opposing points of view are not being used. Thus, the students are denied access to a wider spectrum of opinion.

"The Black Panthers," a Ramparts Book, is authored by Gene Marine. The author, who admits that he is sympathetic to the Black Panthers, informs his readers that the press has lied about the Panthers. (In one chapter, he criticizes the Sacramento Bee, San Francisco Examiner, San Francisco Chronicle, Berkeley Gazette, Los Angeles Times and Oakland Tribune!) The truth, the author states, is that the Black Panthers are NOT racist—any more than the National Liberation Front or the Pathet Lao are Communist! The author, who attacks "white racist America" for supporting law enforcement authorities, says he has "no valid arguments" to offer against the Panthers' "simple neces-

sity" to kill "policemen, to kill Uncle Toms, to kill anyone, ultimately, who stands in the way of black liberation."

"Confrontation on Campus," by Joanne Grant, author of "Black Protest," is a sympathetic account of S.D.S.-led riot at Columbia University in the Spring of 1968. The author excuses vandalism, obscenities scribbled on walls, even the destruction of files in President Kirk's office. As in the case of "The Black Panthers," the book contains repeated and vicious condemnation of the police. She quotes sympathetically a Columbia professor's comment: "They (the police) rank at or near the low point of every scale of personality characteristics deemed desirable by most academicians."

"Growing Up Absurd," by Paul Goodman. Another anti-Establishment book, critical of our society in almost every respect and sympathetic only to the malcontents. The author, who favors the liberalization of sex laws and standards, concludes that the answer to the problem of delinquency is "not to get them to belong to society" but rather for society "to accommodate itself" to the delinquents. Other views: Service in the armed forces is a "demented enterprise, with personnel and activities corresponding." The governors of our states "are likely to be men of mediocre humane gifts." The author quotes favorably the late Bertrand Russell's contention that it is better if students have sex—so they can give their undivided attention to mathematics.

"Chemical and Biological Warfare, America's Hidden Arsenal," by Seymour Hersh. (Former press secretary for Senator Eugene McCarthy who quit and said that McCarthy is part of the "Establishment" and not really sympathetic to "the revolution"). The book is a one-sided view accusing the United States of excessive use of chemicals and gas in Vietnam. The author is critical of the use of tear-gas—even to save the lives of innocent civilians used as "human shields" by the Communists. Uses the propagandist's familiar technique of quoting un-named sources—critical of the United States—throughout the book.

"The Free World Colossus," by David Horowitz. A critique of American foreign policy in the Cold War. The author contends that virtually everything the United States has done is wrong—in Vietnam, in Korea, in Cuba, in Turkey, in Iran, in Greece, in Guatemala. Author is critical of our anti-Communist stance since World War II and of former President Kennedy's view that "The cause of all mankind, is the cause of America." Instead, the author cites favorably the opinion that America is "the leader of a world-wide anti-revolutionary movement in defense of vested interests."

"Abuse of Power," by Theodore Draper. Criticism of U.S. policy of resisting Communist aggression in Vietnam, Cuba and the Dominican Republic. In Vietnam, the author would settle for an "independent" Communist nation a la Tito's Yugoslavia. (Tito, incidentally, has never rescinded his pledge to march "shoulder to shoulder" with the Soviet Union to fight "U.S. imperialism.")

Other books used include "The Soviet Union, the Fifty Years," by the editors of the New York Times, and "Sick Cities," by Mitchell Gordon. The latter is a good, largely ideologically neutral book; the former is about as close to a middle-of-the-road view as is permitted in the textual material used in the class at Immaculata. Books by authors who are right-of-center, or at least more moderate, on the issues cited above are not used. On the Vietnam issue, for example, the students could receive at least exposure to another point of view by reading one of the following: "No Exit from Vietnam," by Sir Robert Thompson, principal architect of the British victory over the Malayan Communist guerrillas, "Why Vietnam," by Professor

Frank Trager, or the late Marguerite Higgins perceptive analysis, "Our Vietnam Nightmare."

In fact, there are competent authors, liberals as well as conservatives, who have presented opposing points of views on all of the issues cited above, ranging from criticism of the Black Panthers and S.D.S. to, for example, Mario Lazo's excellent tome, "American Policy Failures in Cuba."

However, their works are not permitted in this course on "Contemporary Problems" at Immaculata High School.

This newspaper has raised the issue, and that discharges our responsibility to our readers. It remains for others, hopefully including concerned parents, to determine how such a weird philosophy of "education" could be condoned by the Immaculata school administration.

SECURITY FOR WHOM?

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, ever since entering Congress I have been concerned with the problem of excessive Defense spending which does not contribute to our national security. As you know, I seek only to eliminate waste and not to jeopardize our national security.

Although this problem has existed for a considerable length of time, I am pleased to see that efforts made by my colleagues and me have begun to elicit results. We are beginning to realize that a lean Defense budget can aid our ailing economy without starving our national security.

This does not mean, however, that our work with the Defense budget is now complete. For there are still unnecessary and misappropriated funds being granted to the Defense Department.

One area which still bears considerable neglect is Government contract bidding. The no-bid, nonnegotiation bids still threaten to undermine attempts to place the Defense budget in its proper perspective. Too often these contracts become a gravy train for those who seek to make a profit at the public's expense.

It is for this reason that I fully support the recent recommendation of the General Accounting Office that all Defense contracts be placed under a uniform accounting system. In this way, there will be a reliable guideline to determining where costs and savings lie in granting certain companies the right to obtain contracts.

Since this matter is important to all of us, I would like to extend my remarks to include a recent Times editorial on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would also like to note that my support of eliminating excessive Defense spending does not mean I can condone the severe and biased Defense cutbacks that New York State has been experiencing. Pruning the Defense budget need not be synonymous with wiping out the Defense jobs of a disproportionate number of New Yorkers.

Let there be prudent Defense spending, but let our Defense Department stop

using the State of New York as its whipping boy.

The editorial follows:

SECURITY FOR WHOM?

Almost exactly 90 per cent of the contracts let by the Department of Defense are non-bid, negotiated contracts which guarantee the contractor a profit over and above costs. The various contractors follow various methods of calculating their costs and, since there is no uniform accounting procedure, there is no effective governmental audit of these contracts.

Some contractors have been detected padding expenses in order to further increase their profits. Is it any wonder that defense costs have risen all out of proportion to the nation's security requirements—from only \$13 billion before the Korean War, to \$50 billion before the Vietnam war and to \$80 billion today?

The recommendation of the General Accounting Office that all defense contractors follow uniform accounting procedures should be translated into law. To bring some reason into an irrational, runaway defense budget, Congress will have to arm itself with the expert knowledge required to weigh, to question and to challenge the proposals of the military-industrial complex for launching new weapons systems. As it is, Congress is almost wholly defenseless against the assertions by interested parties that any new weapon is essential to American survival.

The relationship between the weapons manufacturer and the military establishment has been, as some critics have charged, an unhealthy cozy one. The military may dream up the need for a weapon and then the manufacturer tools up to supply the need—at a profit. Or the manufacturer may dream up the idea for a weapon, suggest the need to the military and then tool up to supply it—at a profit. This mutually beneficial, backscratching arrangement excludes any effective check on the arms race.

Several possible checks have been suggested: expansion of the House Appropriations Committee to include staff experts on military matters; setting up a separate research think-tank operation, along the lines of the legislative reference service, which would be available to any member of Congress; establishing a new wing of the General Accounting Office to conduct effectiveness studies of weapons systems and make expert analyses of military proposals.

The subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee now looking into defense spending, with Senator Proxmire serving ably as chairman, can be counted on to come up with its own recommendation. The nation must have an accurate audit of military spending to prevent profit-gouging, wasteful cost overruns and plain chicanery. It must also have some independent, expert opinion on whether proposed new weapons systems will really contribute to its security or only to that of the defense-related industry slated to get a contract.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great admiration that I rise today to pay tribute to the Estonian people. Although, for 30 years they have suffered the degradation and suppression of occupation, these undaunted people have never lost hope of regaining their freedom and independence.

A free man is one who lives without fear of deprivation, oppression, and slavery, and all men are not free until each man is free. February 24 marked the celebration of the 52d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia. I share their concern for their self-determination and human dignity and I strongly support these principles.

PHIL ROWE SPEAKS ON FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, Phillip David Rowe of Hot Springs, Ark., has won his State's contest for his speech on "Freedom's Challenge." The contest is part of the annual nationwide competition sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary, in the Voice of Democracy program. More than 400,000 students took part around the country. The winners from each State compete in the national finals for five scholarship awards.

Phil Rowe's parents are Dr. and Mrs. L. V. Rowe of Hot Springs. He has a younger brother and an older sister. Phil plans to attend the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, and to follow a career in broadcasting.

At age 17, Phil has compiled a noteworthy record. He has won many public speaking contests, served as governor in a statewide model youth government program, narrated religious pageants, made many public speeches, and works professionally as a radio broadcaster in his hometown. He is a member of Gov. Winthrop Rockefeller's Youth Council.

I congratulate Phillip David Rowe for his winning speech, and commend to my colleagues his thoughts on Freedom's Challenge:

A room! Silence! As I sit in this studio with sound proofing and recording equipment that reproduces and amplifies my voice and holds my thoughts for all to hear, I say to myself, "I must use these facilities to express my moods and feelings toward America."

My instruments are simple. They have been with us from the beginning of civilized history. The voice and the almighty power of words! The instrument that has been with us for not such a long time is one that is most neglected; the freedom to speak at all.

To have imagined vainly that I in my few short years have had the freedom to speak and am just now becoming aware of it! I look to myself for the lack of feeling or emotion, the lack of interest and concern, the indifference. I look to myself and find the answer is myself.

Why, how many times have I looked at the flag of my country with no more respect than for a common piece of cloth? (Many!) How many times have I failed to speak my opinion on issues that directly concern me? (The answer again, many!) And sometimes I think of the many times I have showed disrespect to my father and mother who bore me in a world of disrespect. (The answer is myself.)

And now that I have discovered the beat of America's dilemma, shall I continue in the

same key or write a new composition. The latter seems the best.

As we think of a new song I would like to encourage all youth to tune to the spirit of a winner, to understand our noble heritage. The crimson skies at Bunker Hill, the smoking cannon at Gettysburg, the bloody deep of Pearl Harbor, the standing flag at Iwo Jima; all the battles of "Orchestrated Hell," making the music of a terrible symphony! A symphony that has made us free! Our noble heritage!

The underlying theme should be cognizance that differences of opinion are not necessarily differences of principle, and not that all blessings are produced by superior wisdom and virtue of our own.

Democracy can perform longer than two centuries! Its theme endures. The test of a nation is in the growth of its people physically, intellectually, and spiritually.

Technology, great as it may be, must not stagnate our progress making us repeat the same notes with a sickening repetition. Youth must provide the catalyst to the ancestral components to prevent the demise of freedom's classical concert that we fought so hard to continue to play.

Character, the improvisation on the theme, once obtained is the sweet and pure note with which much care must be taken to keep the infamous monotone of apathy from disrupting the symphony of solidarity of that developed character.

Freedom's challenge! Whose challenge? My challenge! I'm tuning up right now for America. I'm beginning my symphony of character. Are you?

SUPERMARKET MATH—A POEM FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one does not usually turn to the Wall Street Journal for poetry. But today, that journal of applied mathematics carried a delightful item in its "pepper and salt" humor section on the editorial page, dealing, appropriately, with the subject of mathematics.

The author of this gem has apparently found the Truth in Packaging Act of 1966 not quite fully effective in solving her dilemma. Unfortunately, most of the teeth of the bill introduced by Senator PHILIP HART of Michigan were largely extracted on the way to enactment. The Wall Street Journal item, printed as humor, shares one of the characteristics of much humor in that it is so close to pain. All of us who shop in the supermarkets share the sentiments of the articulate writer of the following complaint:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 9, 1970]

SUPERMARKET MATH

A plump, juicy chicken is easily bought; Selection of apples requires little thought. But foods which are bottled or packaged or canned

Are measured in fractions, not easily scanned. You're likely to feel mathematically inadequate,

Unless, of course, you are an MIT graduate. Shopping per se, doesn't make me sick— It's all that fifth grade arithmetic!

—Annie Komorny.

AN EXAMINATION OF IDEALS

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, this generation of Americans is one often noted for its many material advantages, but it is more significantly one lacking in too many assets of the spirit. Foremost, it seems to lack genuine ideals. So much of the present confusion seems to reflect this frustrating search for ideals in the final analysis. That there are many aspects of present American values which no longer suffice is obvious. What to replace them with is less obvious.

I believe one essential means to develop these new ideals is to have a firm understanding of our old ones. If we can understand what raised the sights of those members of past generations, maybe we can help formulate goals that will uplift us now.

At a time when it is not fashionable to look to the past, or to listen to differing viewpoints, I offer an article which invites us to do both. It is an article composed by Robertson Page, a freelance writer, with a true gift for expressing deeply felt emotions. I commend it to my colleagues and I feel it lucidly renders views that must be understood if we are to deal with the present division in our country:

A MARINE SPEAKS OUT

(By Robertson Page)

(NOTE.—The views of the author are presented here, as he put it, "as one who enlisted in World War II, who remembers the gallantry, the hope, and the tears.")

Hey you! Yes, you with the beard and long hair and marijuana! Sorry, I didn't know they called it "grass" these days. You see, I just haven't been around much lately. Not since I was killed more than 25 years ago at a place called Wake Island.

You might say I'm on temporary leave from my grave. I've heard a lot of things about you and I wanted to see you for myself.

For example, I understand you accuse my generation of hypocrisy. Therefore, I assume you mean me.

Could be, Long Hair, I really don't know.

What I do know is that I was plenty scared when that Jap lunged at me with a fixed bayonet. Because that was the end of everything for me.

I also admit to being a little scared when I enlisted in the Marine Corps in wartime. But I did enlist—because I loved my country.

Now I learn that you don't care much for my country! I hear you have a demeaning word for it—something about "the Establishment." And that some of our newspapers support you in your infamy.

More than 30,000 tides have washed over the sand beaches near my grave at Wake, and 25 years is a long time. But I never expected this. Not in America!

I further understand that you burned your draft card and ran for the sanctuary of a church. That others fled to Canada to escape the draft.

All in the name of *Idealism!*

It also has come to my attention that some of your bearded friends burned the American Flag in New York's Central Park That must have been a real blow at hypocrisy!

Perhaps I'm too severe on you. It just so

happens that my grave is quite shallow and I hear many things.

For one, I understand you have led violent demonstrations for the right to use four-letter words. That's a joke, pal! We Marines invented them! But, I'll tell you one thing we didn't do; we never regarded them as a constitutional right.

And I hear you demand a voice in running the universities. Gosh! I guess you must be pretty smart to know more than the professional educators!

I also hear that in the summer of 1969 more than 400,000 of you went to a "rock festival" in the Catskills, living off narcotics and group sex and having a real ball, while your peers were getting killed fighting Communists in Vietnam.

You know, it used to be that people back home rolled bandages for the men up front. I don't think I like your response very much. But forget that. I knew so many dedicated, wonderful guys who died for their country at Wake—and at Anzio and Iwo Jima and Omaha Beach and Bastogne—that I can't get very upset over a draft card burner.

But I'll tell you one thing that I find repulsive.

In all of the disruptive protests you have fomented on the campus, you have consistently tried to destroy those institutions that have made the United States strong against its enemies—ROTC, military recruitment, and research to strengthen our national security.

It makes me wonder about you. Are you an unwitting pawn of the enemy? Or just unthinking?

That's for someone else to decide. Right now, my moment is up and I must get back to Wake Island; this time for ever.

In parting, I like to think that my death was not a waste; that in supporting my country on this narrow strip of sand I defended something worthwhile for a new and better generation of Americans.

But now that I've seen you, I begin to wonder. Perhaps I should have fled to Canada!

On second thought, I'm glad death came when it did.

You see, when I left this world I held a special belief, something you idealists would call square. It consisted of a deep-seated reverence for my God, for my heritage, for my parents, and for my country.

No one can take this from me. Not even in death.

I pity the fact you choose not to share this belief, to express this simple faith in America.

TRIBUTE TO ELLIOT MARTIN

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the cultural explosion which is helping to make America one of the world leaders in the arts can be credited to a handful of dedicated people who believe that the public is receptive to the best in the performing and graphic arts, and who strive to bring it to them.

One such person in my State of California deserves a special tribute for turning Los Angeles into an important theatrical center against historical odds. He is Elliot Martin, director of the Center Theater Group, which presents its plays in our beautiful new civic music center.

For too many years, and in spite of

the professional, as well as public, interest inherent in the many thousands in our motion picture and television industries, Los Angeles has been content to consider itself a third-rate theatrical town. We were content with road companies of hit plays, almost always long after the original companies had finished their New York runs. Many of the New York and European stars never came to Los Angeles. We accepted New York as the American theatrical capital without any attempt to share that position on the west coast.

Elliot Martin is the one man to whom we are indebted for altering this condition. In less than 3 years, he has made the Center Theater Group one of the most important in the country, and has turned Los Angeles into an international theatrical center.

This fact was made very evident when Elliot Martin recently persuaded Sir Laurence Olivier to bring his renowned National Theater Company of Great Britain to Los Angeles for the first and only time in this country. It is a known fact that David Merrick had been trying to bring them to New York for the past 5 years, but Olivier chose to come to Los Angeles because of its healthy new attitude toward the theater which was largely created by Elliot Martin. The presentations of the restoration comedy, "The Beaux' Stratagem," and of Olivier's own production of Chekhov's "Three Sisters" were resounding artistic, social, and financial successes, attracting a wide segment of the southern California population.

The remarkable aspect of the success of the Center Theater Group is that it did not have to go through a long period of growth, but that under Elliot Martin's direction it was successful at its very beginning in September 1967. Mr. Martin at that time induced Ingrid Bergman to make her debut for them on the Los Angeles stage. Although Miss Bergman had long been associated with the Hollywood motion picture industry, and appeared on the stage in other theatrical centers, she had never before considered such an engagement in Los Angeles.

For her vehicle, Mr. Martin chose another "first," the Eugene O'Neill play, "More Stately Mansions," which had never before been performed in the United States. This American premiere of a play by a historically important playwright, and the debut by Miss Bergman on the Los Angeles stage was a great departure from the warmed-over Broadway hits with road company casts which had constituted most of our theatrical fare for many years. It found a ready and eager audience.

By establishing an immediate reputation for imaginative theater, devoid of any restricting set pattern, Elliot Martin was able to bring to the Center Theater Group a 6-week engagement of England's Royal Shakespeare Company. They were so delighted with the results and the responsive audience that they returned the following year for another engagement.

Another long neglected and untapped area which Mr. Martin entered was his use of the tremendous amount of resi-

dent talent in our motion picture industry. His first attempt at this brought Greer Garson to the Center Theater stage in a run of George Bernard Shaw's "Captain Brassbound's Conversion." Now he is preparing to present Jack Lemmon in "Idiot's Delight."

With the whole world and his hometown as sources of talent, and an open mind on the choice of plays, new and old, comedy and drama, modern and classic, Elliot Martin's talent in combining imaginative ingredients has resulted in drawing the eyes of the world to Los Angeles as an important audience for living theater.

Mr. Martin is deserving of high commendation not only for his service to my State in bringing international attention to Los Angeles as a world theater center, but also for adding to the cultural luster of America as a whole.

PROPOSALS FOR REDUCING BUDGETED 1971 SPENDING

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, over the years those of us who work for economy in Government and the reduction of unnecessary spending have had both a staunch ally and an expert adviser in the person of Eugene F. Rinta, research director of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce.

Mr. Rinta has just released his annual report on reducing the budget. It contains specific proposals that would cut 1971 appropriations by \$4.8 billion and 1971 expenditures by \$2.9 billion, thus assuring a budget surplus in 1971 even if the Congress fails to accept some of the revenue programs proposed in the budget by the President. Without endorsing the specifics of the report, I include it in the RECORD and recommend its serious consideration by all Members of the House.

The report follows:

PROPOSALS FOR REDUCING BUDGETED 1971 SPENDING

A budget surplus in 1971 is a keystone of the Nixon fiscal policy for the period ahead. The surplus is needed for two reasons, one psychological and the other economic. Psychologically, the budgeted surplus is intended to provide assurance here and abroad that our Government's finances are under control and that fiscal policy will continue to bear in the fight against inflation. For economic stability, the surplus will relieve the money market of any net demand for borrowing by the Treasury and will encourage relaxation of monetary controls to avoid a recession.

During the weeks since President Nixon submitted his fiscal 1971 budget to Congress, there has been little public dissent as to the need for a surplus. While there are some who believe the budgeted \$1.3 billion surplus is inadequate under present economic conditions, few have questioned the need for some surplus. But, unfortunately, the surplus in the Nixon budget is based on expectations that stand small chance of being fully realized.

On the spending side, protection of the surplus would require concurrence of Con-

gress in: (1) \$2.1 billion of reductions of outlays in existing programs through program terminations, restructuring, or curtailment; (2) \$1.2 billion savings in net postal outlays to result from proposed postal rate increase and other actions "under study"; and (3) postponement from July 1, 1970 to January 1, 1971 of Federal civilian and military pay increases at a saving of \$1.2 billion in 1971 outlays. Additionally, the surplus is dependent on sufficient easing of the credit market to permit a doubling of the sales of Government held loan assets from the \$2 billion level of 1969 and 1970 to \$4 billion in 1971. The receipts from these sales are recorded as offsets against outlays.

These budget items which require affirmative Congressional response or more favorable economic conditions than now exist to produce the indicated outlay reductions total \$6.5 billion. The probability that at least one-third of these outlay reductions will not materialize is great. That alone

would more than eliminate the surplus. If one-half of these \$6.5 billion outlay reductions failed to materialize, the \$1.3 billion surplus would become a \$2 billion deficit.

Moreover, protection of the surplus on the receipts side of the budget also appears shaky, particularly with respect to corporation income taxes. The revenue estimate assumes a reduction of only 5.6% in calendar 1970 corporate profits before tax as compared to the \$94.3 billion 1969 total. Based on current indications, a more realistic estimate would be a reduction of at least 10% in corporate profits which would cause a revenue shortfall of at least \$1.7 billion below the estimate.

Finally, there is the distinct possibility that major "uncontrollable" costs in the budget—such as interest, social security, medicare, public assistance, veterans benefits, and farm price supports—will run significantly higher than estimated. This is certainly the record of recent years.

From the foregoing it is clear that the currently budgeted surplus of \$1.3 billion for 1971 will very likely become a deficit of at least a few billions unless taxes are increased or budgeted outlays are reduced. The Federal expenditures and taxation committee of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce believes a tax increase at this time is both politically impractical and undesirable. On the other hand, the committee believes substantial budget reduction is feasible and necessary. For this purpose it makes the following recommendations for reducing and controlling budgeted spending in fiscal 1971:

PROGRAMS TO BE HELD AT 1970 LEVELS

It is proposed with respect to 28 budget line items that obligations in 1971 be held at the 1970 program levels. This limitation could be accomplished in most instances by appropriation reductions in amounts equal to the proposed cuts in budgeted 1971 obligations. The total of the reductions proposed in this manner is \$762 million.

Programs	Program levels, in millions			
	Actual, 1969	Estimated, 1970	Budgeted, 1971	Proposed reduction
Department of Agriculture:				
Cooperative State research.....	\$58.8	\$62.6	\$72.5	\$9.9
Cooperative extension work.....	97.1	131.7	171.6	39.9
Watershed works of improvement.....	64.3	66.7	74.3	7.6
Department of Commerce:				
Industrial development loans.....	50.0	50.0	56.4	6.4
Environmental Science Services Administration, salaries and expenses.....	117.8	130.0	146.7	16.7
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:				
Food and drug control.....	60.4	74.3	89.5	15.2
Comprehensive health planning and services.....	166.1	223.5	251.5	28.0
National Institutes of Health, research institutes and divisions.....	1,008.6	958.6	1,035.5	76.9
Civil rights education.....	10.7	14.0	24.0	10.0
Rehabilitation services and facilities.....	396.3	542.4	571.6	29.2
Department of Housing and Urban Development:				
Grants for neighborhood facilities.....	33.0	41.0	48.0	9.0
Comprehensive metropolitan planning grants.....	41.7	52.2	60.0	7.8
Model cities.....	249.2	571.2	670.0	98.8

Programs	Program levels, in millions			
	Actual, 1969	Estimated, 1970	Budgeted, 1971	Proposed reduction
Department of the Interior:				
Geological Survey.....	\$91.0	\$100.2	\$106.0	\$5.8
Office of Coal Research.....	13.5	14.1	17.6	3.5
National Park Service, construction.....	11.6	8.8	20.0	11.2
Bureau of Reclamation, construction.....	181.1	135.0	197.8	62.8
Department of State: Educational and cultural exchange.....	31.4	32.1	40.0	7.9
Department of Transportation:				
Coast Guard, operating expenses.....	371.0	408.7	426.6	17.9
Coast Guard, R. & D.....	3.9	14.6	24.0	9.4
Civil supersonic aircraft development.....	93.8	184.0	290.0	106.0
Traffic and highway safety.....	28.8	32.3	53.8	21.5
Atomic Energy, operating expenses.....	2,221.3	2,165.0	2,238.9	73.9
Civil Service Commission, salaries and expenses.....	45.1	52.0	57.0	5.0
Corporation for Public Broadcasting.....	5.0	15.0	22.5	7.5
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.....	9.0	13.2	19.0	5.8
National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.....	12.9	23.1	42.0	18.9
National Science Foundation.....	432.6	461.4	511.3	49.9
Total.....				762.4

SPECIAL SITUATIONS

Foreign Economic Assistance.—Last year Congress cut the \$2,285 million Nixon request for 1970 grant and loan programs to \$1,425 million, or \$82 million more than was approved for 1969. This Council's Committee had proposed a reduction in the Johnson budget request which would have allowed \$1,348 million for 1970. The request for 1971 is \$1,913 million. It is suggested that this request be cut by \$563 million, thus permitting program operations for another year at almost the current level, pending recommendations of a Presidential task force on foreign aid.

Economic Opportunity.—The 1971 appropriation request for all Office of Economic Opportunity programs is \$2,079 million. This is an increase of \$137 million over 1970 appropriations and \$134 million over 1969. Of the total 1971 program, \$881 million is for work and training programs including \$192 million for the Job Corps. It is recommended that the Job Corps be abolished, leaving \$689 million for O.E.O. work and training programs. An additional \$747 million is budgeted by the Labor Department for its manpower development and training program. These two amounts totaling \$1,436 million compare with the combined Labor Department and O.E.O. work training programs in 1970, including the Job Corps, amounting to \$1,483 million. Thus, with the Job Corps abolished, all other work and training programs would be increased \$145 million in 1971, as provided in the budget.

The 1971 program level budgeted for O.E.O. community development programs is \$790 million. This is an increase of \$86 million

above the 1970 program and \$103 million above 1969. It is recommended that these activities be held to the 1969 level for a reduction of \$103 million.

Food Stamp Program.—The 1969 appropriation for the food stamp program was \$280 million. The 1970 request in both the Johnson budget and the Nixon revisions was \$340 million. In acting on the 1970 appropriation the House approved the \$340 million as requested. The Senate, however, voted \$750 million and the Conference Committee agreed on \$610 million for 1970. Now the Nixon budget for 1971 proposes an appropriation of \$1,250 million, or more than double the 1970 appropriation and more than 3½ times the original budget request for 1970. It is suggested that this request be cut by \$500 million, which would be the same amount as the Senate approved for 1970 and would be an increase of \$140 million above the amount Congress approved for 1970.

Rural Electrification.—Budget plans call for approval of \$345 million loans for electrification purposes in 1971, the same amount as in 1970 and 1969. Based on most recent experience, it appears that about \$100 million of this total is intended for power generating and transmission facility loans and the remainder for power distribution facility loans. It is recommended that funds for G & T loans be denied.

Corps of Engineers—Construction.—The overall program obligations level for Corps of Engineers civil works projects in 1968 was \$952 million. The level was cut back to \$795 million in 1969 for budget control and anti-inflationary reasons, and a further reduction to \$725 million was effected by the Nixon

Administration for 1970. But now a substantial increase to \$1,015 million is budgeted for 1971. Because of the availability of an estimated \$194 million of unobligated appropriations from prior years, the 1971 appropriation request is only \$821 million. It is recommended that the 1971 appropriation be held to the same amount, \$712 million, as Congress approved for 1970. The reduction of \$109 million would still permit a 1971 obligations level of \$906 million which would allow an increase in construction activity over 1969 and 1970, even with the inclusion of inflationary cost increases.

Family Assistance.—The budget proposes initiation in 1971 of a new Family Assistance program to replace the existing program of aid to families with dependent children. While the 1971 program level is budgeted at only \$600 million, the first full-year cost is estimated at \$4.4 billion in excess of the present Federal cost of aid to dependent children which is estimated at \$2.5 billion in 1971.

This Council's Social Security Committee presentation to the House Ways and Means Committee on the Family Assistance program urged reform of the present AFDC program rather than its replacement by the Family Assistance program. Based on cost estimates of the Administration for various features of the Family Assistance program, the features recommended in the Council presentation as reforms to the present program would not exceed \$1 billion in annual cost. If the Council's proposed reforms were made effective July 1, 1971—a reasonable date to permit the States to make necessary changes—there would be no cost in fiscal

1971, and the full-year budget cost would be only \$1 billion as compared to \$4.4 billion for Family Assistance. It is recommended that Congress adopt the Council proposals and eliminate the \$600 million Family Assistance budget item for 1971.

Recreational Land Acquisition.—An appropriation of \$189 million for 1971 and a supplemental of \$7 million for 1970 are budgeted under proposed legislation to authorize land acquisition for recreational purposes. This would be under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Interior Department. It is suggested that appropriations for this purpose, if found justified by Congress, be deferred at least to fiscal 1972.

Urban Mass Transportation.—Obligations under this program are expected to rise from \$135 million in 1969 to \$180 million in 1970, and a \$214 million level is budgeted for 1971 with advance funding already having been provided by Congress last year. An additional \$105 million obligations are planned in 1971 under proposed legislation which would authorize \$2.8 billion as an initial increment for the first five years of a 12-year \$10 billion program. It is recommended that the 1971 program be held at the \$214 million level already funded and that the remaining \$105 million budgeted for 1971 be deferred to 1972.

Federal-Aid Highways.—This program has been held at levels in 1969 and 1970 which are lower than existing authorizations and highway user revenues would permit both for expenditure control and anti-inflationary purposes. The obligations level was \$4,660 million in 1969 and \$4,016 million is estimated for 1970. A substantial increase to \$4,900 million is budgeted for 1971. It is recommended that the 1971 level be held to \$4,500 million for a reduction of \$400 million. This would provide for a \$484 million increase over 1970 but would still be \$160 million under the 1969 level.

Military Personnel.—The budget plans for a reduction in military personnel strength from an average of 3,321,571 in fiscal 1970 to 3,005,160 in 1971. This is a cut of 316,411 personnel, or 9.5%. The funding of military personnel costs, however, reflects a reduction of only 6.5% from \$22,491 million in 1970 to \$21,033 million in 1971. The 1971 amount does not include anticipated military pay increase costs which are separately provided for in the budget. It is recommended that the budgeted appropriation be cut to 9.5% below the 1970 amount for a reduction of \$679 million from the 1971 budget. This reduction contemplates absorption through greater efficiency of cost inflation in the relatively minor expenditures for transportation, clothing, and subsistence.

Military Family Housing.—Congress approved \$125 million last year for construction of family housing for military personnel in 1970. This compared with \$48 million for 1969 and \$159 million for 1968. The request for 1971 is \$220 million. It is suggested that the 1971 appropriation be held at the 1970 level of \$125 million for a reduction of \$95 million.

Military Construction.—In almost every year for some years the Congress has been able to reduce the budget requests for military construction funds by at least 10% and often much more. The request for 1971 is \$1,416 million as compared to \$959 million approved for 1970 and \$1,168 million for 1969. It is recommended that the 1971 request be cut no less than 10% for a reduction of at least \$142 million.

Revenue Sharing.—Initiation of the Administration's revenue sharing program is proposed in the budget, with the first distribution of revenues to be made to the States in the fourth quarter of fiscal 1971. This initial payment would be \$275 million and the first full-year cost would be about \$1.1 billion. By the fifth year the cost would be over \$5 billion a year. It is recommended that this program not be initiated.

Recapitulation of proposed budget reductions—Cuts in proposed 1971 appropriations

[In millions]

Reductions from holding certain programs at 1970 obligations levels.....	\$762
Foreign economic assistance.....	563
Economic opportunity:	
Job Corps.....	192
Community action programs.....	103
Food Stamp program.....	500
Rural electrification—G. & T. loans.....	100
Corps of Engineers civil construction.....	109
Family Assistance program.....	600
Recreational land acquisition.....	189
Urban mass transportation.....	105
Federal aid highways.....	400
Department of Defense:	
Military personnel.....	679
Military family housing construction.....	95
Military construction.....	142
Revenue sharing.....	275
Total reductions.....	4,814

EXPENDITURE LIMITATION

In 1968 Congress imposed a spending limitation with respect to the fiscal 1969 budget which applied to spending decisions of both the Congress and the Administration.

The limitation required reductions from the budget estimates in the amounts of \$10 billion in new spending authority and \$6 billion in actual expenditures. It was applicable only to relatively controllable programs and, thus, exempted such relatively uncontrollable budget items as interest, social insurance trust funds, veterans benefits, public assistance, and farm price supports. The 1968 limitation was fully effective in limiting controllable costs, with both new spending authority and expenditures being reduced more than the required \$10 billion and \$6 billion, respectively.

Last year, however, Congress enacted a flexible spending limitation with respect to the 1970 budget and applied its constraints only to the Administration. This ceiling proved to be a virtual failure in controlling spending.

It is recommended that Congress enact limitation provisions with respect to the 1971 budget, similar to the 1968 limitation, which would require reductions in appropriations and expenditures budgeted for relatively controllable programs. The limitation should require minimum reductions of \$4.8 billion in appropriations and \$2.9 billion in expenditures (60% of the appropriation cuts).

This Council's Committee urges Congress to support the President's budget proposals for reducing spending on existing programs by \$2.1 billion. It further urges Congress to effect the appropriation reductions recommended in this report and to enact the proposed expenditure limitation for 1971. The Committee believes that favorable action by Congress on both the President's spending reduction proposals and the Committee's budget will be balanced in 1971.

EUGENE F. RINTA,
Research Director.

NARCOTICS SMUGGLING

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the current drive to cut down on the smuggling of narcotics and dangerous drugs, including marihuana, the Bureau of Customs is moving ahead rapidly to beef up its coverage of the bor-

ders and other ports of entry into the United States, making use of the most modern methods of enforcement and investigation.

A lucid exposition of how the Bureau is doing its job, utilizing the \$8.75 million supplementary appropriation approved by Congress for this purpose, was the subject of an address by the U.S. Commissioner of Customs, Myles J. Ambrose, recently, at a meeting of the Exchange Club in Tarrytown, N.Y.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the text in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY U.S. COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS
MYLES J. AMBROSE

I am delighted to be among many old friends and neighbors whom I have known for years.

The other day, our Public Information Officer at the Bureau of Customs asked me whether Tarrytown was the same town described by Washington Irving in his famous "Sketch Book." I told him, of course, but I hasten to add that it is no longer Sleepy Hollow where the headless horseman rides by night.

I assume from my good friend and fraternity brother George Barron I'm here to say something about the Bureau of Customs which I have the honor to head.

It is a remarkable service, if I must say so myself, with deep roots in American history. We go back not only to the Revolutionary War, but even before that—to the time when His Majesty King George collected the hated duty on tea in Boston Harbor.

Like Tarrytown, we in Customs have had our share of famous authors—Herman Melville was Collector in the Port of New York for 20 years. He spent so much of his time writing books, that he all but forgot about his job with Customs. Then, one fine day, out came one of the masterpieces of American literature—"Moby Dick" and all was forgiven.

Another one of our gifted Customs employees who received the munificent sum of \$1,200 per annum, was Nathaniel Hawthorne—who was a weigher at Salem, Massachusetts, where his job consisted of measuring coal, salt and other bulky cargo on foreign vessels. His hand-written invoices and manifests show that he was a far better author than he was a Customs officer. You recall that his novels, such as "Scarlet Letter," "House of Seven Gables," "Tanglewood Tales," and so on, were the rage of their generation.

We even produced a President of the United States. This gentleman was appointed Collector of the Port of New York by Ulysses Grant in 1871 and was fired in 1878 by President Hayes for refusing to abstain from active political work. He was elected with Garfield and later became President when Garfield was shot. His name was Chester A. Arthur, and he is remembered, not for his work with Customs, but as the father of the modern Civil Service.

We are one of the major bureaus within the Treasury Department and older than our parent department by at least one month! Our agency was created by the 2nd Act of the First Congress of the United States on July 1, 1789. The First Act of the First Congress was an Act to Regulate the Time and Manner of Administering Certain Oaths.

But the Second Act passed on July 1, 1789, laid a duty on goods, wares and merchandise imported into the United States and thus created Customs.

For over 125 years after that, we provided the U.S. Government with its chief source of revenue . . . until IRS came along to steal that dubious "privilege" away from us!

We may be small in size but gigantic in scope and in responsibility. Our personnel strength is under 10,000 nationwide (and we are a rather large nation). And may I add parenthetically that we have only recently overtaken the number of people we had in Customs during the administration of Calvin Coolidge 45 years ago.

We collect more than 3½ billions in revenue each year on a miniscule budget of about \$125 million. To those of you who like to invest in good companies, we return \$30 for every operating dollar we receive, a profit of about 96 percent! Unfortunately, we can't go public!

We enforce many laws that have been assigned to us by Congress. We even enforce some of the navigation acts on intercoastal waters. We have a sea-going flag. As Commissioner I am entitled to fly a flag on those occasions when someone gives me a boat.

We enforce the Neutrality Act which prohibits exportation of arms and ammunition without proper licensing. It is our job to try and keep some of our devoted friends who have arrived here from Cuba in the last 5 to 7 years from re-invading their homeland. You may be sure that this is not an easy task.

We also enforce the export control laws, and the food and drug laws, agriculture laws, and an unbelievable number of other statutes. One of our major problems is how to cope with the tremendous increase in international passenger traffic, as well as international trade in cargo of all sorts.

We are also required by law to do our best to prevent the smuggling of illicit narcotics, guns and ammo—contraband—into the United States. Most of you are particularly concerned with narcotics.

Last year we seized 623 pounds of hashish, and though this may not sound like much to the uninitiated, you should know that it takes about 625 pounds of marijuana to make one pound of hashish. It would take 389,000 pounds of marijuana to equal the amount of hashish we seized.

That may give you some idea of the problem we face. It is one of staggering proportions. It has now become the bane of our national existence.

The increased use of marijuana, narcotics, and dangerous drugs has been well publicized. This increased demand has generated increased smuggling. Customs has the responsibility for covering hundreds of border crossing points and thousands of miles of border. We have literally thousands of miles of docks, wharves, and seaport areas to cover, as well as many international airports. We have to process hundreds of millions of persons entering the United States and tremendous quantities of cargo and numbers of carriers. The statistics indicative of these increases are awesome and the growth will obviously continue.

In the past, we simply have not been able to do a really effective enforcement job. There is no doubt that much of the increased smuggling has been induced by the low level of Customs enforcement effort. Unfortunately, drugs will be used when they are available. "Operation Intercept" on the Mexican border has demonstrated that much of this smuggling can be stopped by an increase in our enforcement efforts. Certainly, after its inception, Mexican marijuana was virtually unobtainable in major cities throughout the United States. It also had a significant impact on the entrance of heroin into the United States from Mexico. While we don't pretend that we can now interdict all marijuana and narcotics entering the United States, we have proven that we can substantially reduce its availability to juveniles and others. Operation Intercept met all our planned objectives.

A cautious assessment of these objectives taught us many lessons, which we are apply-

ing to our stepped-up enforcement program now being developed.

The success of the action should not be measured only in kilograms of contraband seized at the border, nor in the number of arrests of would-be smugglers during the three weeks of intensive surveillance at ports of entry.

Nor should it be judged by the unpleasant but inevitable side effects of the operation—the strain on tempers, the high blood pressure reports, the drop in patrons at the casinos and game rooms.

The real measure of effectiveness of Operation Cooperation, the name to which Intercept was quite appropriately changed, is what it accomplished in the broad framework of our nation's critical drug problem.

One direct and immediate accomplishment is that the United States and Mexico have, following intensive conferences and study, by mutual consent agreed to crack down on the illicit growers, in the hills and mountains of Mexico itself, as well as on organized crime syndicates which are pushing and peddling the Stuff.

As a participant in these conferences, I can say that I have every confidence in and hope for the continued cooperation of the Mexican Government authorities.

President Nixon has shown his deep concern with the curse of heroin addiction in the United States by making it a basic policy of his administration to end the illegal cultivation of the opium poppy and the manufacture of heroin anywhere in the world.

To this end, the President has sought the cooperation of the Presidents of Mexico, France and Turkey in joint action to stop the flow of this insidious drug into this country.

I have just returned from two weeks of conferences in the major Western European countries whose cooperation is essential in our war against narcotics.

They are our necessary allies in this effort for the simple reason that 80 percent of the heroin smuggled into the U.S.A. starts out as raw opium in Turkey, and is refined into heroin in clandestine laboratories in or near Marseilles, France.

Fifteen percent is grown and produced in Mexico. France has pledged its help by sending narcotics officers to the United States for training, and by stamping out the underground labs.

Turkey has promised to put a stop to the cultivation of poppies. This is an important step.

Now, what are we doing to meet this problem?

Congress recently passed a supplemental appropriation bill that gives the Bureau of Customs eight and three-quarter million dollars. We will use this money to recruit and train over 900 new employees. Over 400 will be inspectors. About 400 will be agents. The remainder will be necessary back-up help that keep things moving.

We will purchase planes to beef up the observation of smugglers who bring in narcotics, marijuana and dangerous drugs by air. With only one plane in fiscal 1969, Customs made 25 arrests, seized over 4,000 pounds of marijuana, 12 pounds of heroin, two pounds of cocaine, 11 vehicles and three aircraft. With more planes and trained pilots, we will increase those seizures, and put a stop to the rapidly increasing air traffic in forbidden merchandise.

We will utilize more boats to keep a better watch on the shorelines where goods can be brought in and dropped to be picked up later.

We will activate an intelligence system that will make lookouts and other information readily available to Customs people everywhere.

Our inspectors will make more examinations, not only of baggage, but also of mer-

chandise arriving. Every possible effort will be made to put a stop to this trade in drugs that is responsible for so much of the crime and the miseries of the present day and incidentally the country will derive additional revenues as a side benefit from these efforts.

In his July 14, 1969, Message to the Congress on the Control of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, President Nixon stated:

"The Department of the Treasury, through the Bureau of Customs, is charged with enforcing the nation's smuggling laws. I have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to initiate a major new effort to guard the nation's borders and ports against the growing volume of narcotics from abroad."

Secretary of Treasury David M. Kennedy told me when I was sworn in as Commissioner of Customs that my first order of business, the item of the highest importance was to carry out this directive from the President. I pledged that I would do my utmost to carry out this order. I will do this to the best of my ability.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, this year's Voice of Democracy contest, conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, has produced a thoughtful and well-written message from the State of Delaware.

The author of the speech, Miss Roxann L. Wright, of Smyrna, is a student at John Bassett Moore High School. Her speech, on the subject of "Freedom's Challenge," stresses two very important points.

The first challenge, Miss Wright says, is to become involved in civic affairs. The second challenge is to use a most basic part of our heritage, the ballot box, and to vote on the basis of facts, not emotions.

As Miss Wright says, it is not always easy to meet freedom's challenge. But I do share her belief that this is the most important task we face if, in her words, "the United States is to continue to be the most esteemed and majestic nation on the earth."

I would like to insert Miss Wright's remarks at this point in the RECORD so my colleagues can share her thoughts. It follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

We are all very fortunate to be living in a free society, yet how often do any of us show our gratitude for being able to worship, speak, gather, and exercise our other prerogatives, without restraint? These freedoms are taken for granted all too often with little or no consideration given to the consequences. Meeting freedom's challenge is not always a simple or an easy task. No one claims it to be so. Yet it is one of, if not the, most important challenges we must meet, if the United States is to continue to be the most esteemed and majestic nation on the earth.

How can we meet this challenge? By taking an interest in civic affairs. Do you attend meetings of your town council, school board, and state legislature? How often have all of us said, "Gee, I know I should go, but I'm

too tired." We all need to take an active part in local affairs and government. Don't be afraid to speak out on an issue of interest in your community, or for a candidate for public office. Remember, our government is "of the people, by the people, and for the people." If we, the people do not speak out, who will?

Another important challenge of freedom is exercising our right to vote with intelligence and concern. Don't elect a man because he has an engaging smile, or tells amusing stories. Use your vote to its full extent, by exercising your right to its full power. We cannot expect to continue as the most respected country unless each individual cares sufficiently to vote, and for the most able man.

How can I as a student meet freedom's challenge? First of all, by learning as much as I can about our form of government, and its workings. How can I be expected to carry out my responsibilities as a citizen unless I understand just what those responsibilities are and how I can carry them out?

Secondly, I can begin listening carefully to what politicians have to say, not the way they say things. I should begin to learn to separate fact from emotionalism. The expert politician is adept at playing on people's emotions and convincing the public to cast its vote for him whether or not he is capable of doing the best job.

The real way to meet freedom's challenge is simply for everyone to think for himself; then, carry through his own beliefs by voting for the man he has decided, through careful sifting of facts, to be the most capable, and to learn as much as he can about the politics of his community.

After we have learned to think for ourselves, we need to read, listen, and study. None of us could be expected to be as informed on matters of national concern as the men who are already our national leaders, for we do not have the information and facts at hand to which they have access. Thus, we must listen to what these men have to say, believing only the facts which many leaders agree on. There is an old adage, "Believe a quarter of what you read and only half of what you see." Thus, by reading, and listening to a broad spectrum of views, we obtain our own opinions from a conglomerate of others.

No two people ever agree completely on every political view, but this is what is so great about our form of government. As long as we have reached our opinions by an intelligent process of reasoning, and are considering what is best for the majority, the right is ours to differ in opinions. One fallacy of which we must beware, though, is downgrading another because he has a different opinion. He has every right to our respect, just as we expect his courtesy. One other thing to remember is not to be unyielding in our opinions; not only a woman is allowed the prerogative of changing her mind. If everyone forms his or her opinion intelligently, our land will long remain the great dominion it is today.

PRISONER OF WAR IN VIETNAM

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the plight of another brave American who is currently being held as a prisoner of war. That brave American's name is Maj. David H. Duart. He has a wife and

three small children who need him very much and are deeply concerned for his safety.

I have introduced legislation with many of my colleagues in the House, calling upon the President, the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and all other concerned departments of the U.S. Government, the United Nations, and the people of the world to appeal to North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam to comply with the requirements of the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war, to require the government of North Vietnam and its allies to identify the prisoners they hold, to release seriously sick or injured prisoners and to permit the free exchange of mail between families and prisoners.

I have today requested the Department of State and the Department of Defense to provide me with information regarding any responses they have received concerning the welfare of these prisoners which will allay the anxiety of their loved ones.

THE NEWSMEN'S PRIVILEGE ACT

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, as many of us are, about an insidious situation which is developing between the institutions of government and the press—a situation which has threatening implications for the right of each of us to learn and to know.

Censorship is not the issue. I know that American journalists have too much energy and too much integrity to ever allow overt censorship to stifle the flow of their news.

What concerns me instead, is intimidation of those journalists—directly or indirectly—which brings about a censorship of its own: a self-censorship, the reluctance of a newsman to write or report information because he must be wary of personal, legal, or financial consequences to himself, his employer, or his sources. It is this situation—a Government-inspired mind-set which inhibits the journalist's work—which disturbs me, and should disturb all of us.

Since this country's inception, it has been a singular right of the American people to enjoy a free and unhampered press. But today, because of the subtle and not-so-subtle interplay of fear and governmental intervention, the press is no longer unhampered. And if we as legislators, and as citizens dependent on accurate and widely based information, do not stand up now, the press may soon not even be free.

The indirect forms of intimidation of newsmen by the Government came distressingly to light last November 13, when Vice President AGNEW spoke out against the practices and "monopolistic power" of broadcast commentators.

He reminded them, ostensibly in pass-

ing, that they were "sanctioned and licensed by Government." Did he really feel that the meaning of those words would go unnoticed by the very newsmen he was goading?

And when, later in the week, Government officials called for transcripts of the networks' coverage of President Nixon's Vietnam speech of November 3, the event which had provoked the Vice President's wrath, did they not realize the defensive posture they were forcing on the commentators involved.

These tactics have worked. The nature of political reporting on the national television networks, both in content and style, has clearly changed since November, and the explanation is just as clearly this intimidation; velvet gloved, self-effacing maybe; but intimidation, nonetheless.

And the direct threat goes even deeper. In Vietnam, military newsmen who chose to tell accurate stories have been harassed, dismissed, transferred, and charged with court-martial offenses.

Here at home, Federal grand juries have subpoenaed the unedited notes, tapes, and films of newsmen investigating the activities of certain politically controversial groups. This practice is something very new—not seeking specific information pertaining to criminal actions or legal proceedings, but going on "fishing expeditions" with facts and background material elicited by aggressive reporters—and a very serious threat to the journalistic profession.

As Ralph Graves, managing editor of Life magazine pointed out in a recent editorial:

It appears to make the press an arm of law enforcement agencies, which is not its role. In some cases, indeed, we believe that law enforcement agencies have found it convenient to force the press to supply them with information that they should have obtained themselves.

We clearly understand that our obligation to cooperate with judicial procedures is the same as that of any organization or citizen.

It is our opinion, however, that the press has served the public interest on many occasions by publishing material that could not have been obtained without interviews conducted on a confidential basis between the reporter and his subject. The threat of frequent and indiscriminate subpoenas endangers that confidential relationship and could seriously undermine the ability of the press to search out and report the news.

That threat is not a small one. The assurance that a reporter will protect the identity of his sources and the confidential nature of his information is often his greatest asset in pursuing an investigation in the public interest. If notes, tapes, films, and files can be so easily tapped by governmental agencies, how long will this assurance be valid? Even a reporter of known integrity will lose the trust of his sources, and, as readers and viewers, our access to news will become narrow and one sided.

Could this indeed be the intent of recent harassment of members of the news media? Is the Government pursuing a head-in-the-sand attitude toward news reporting, hoping that the blind will follow the blind?

Vice President AGNEW appears to be-

lieve this. Just this week he was quoted as saying:

The overwhelming majority of Americans will follow the lead of their governors and other elected officials if we will just launch a campaign to exert the force of public opinion to drive these bizarre extremists from their pre-emptive positions on our television screens and on the front pages of our newspapers.

This attitude is an affront to the standards and ethics of journalism. The press is not supposed to be an agent of the Government or what it would like to see as news, but a service to the public, a source of the truth.

The job of the news media is not to be policemen, to seek out retribution or convictions, but to be teachers, to inform and to educate.

I feel very strongly that this function must be upheld, though it very often will be at the discomfort of those in power and those who would like to evade the truth. But if it is to be upheld, and if the flow of information is to remain free, even at the expense of those in power and those with narrow minds, we must act to insure the protection of the tactics and aims of journalists.

Therefore I am anxious today to express my support as a cosponsor of H.R. 16328, the Newsmen's Privilege Act. I think all of us owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER) who is the principal sponsor. Senator MCINTYRE is introducing an identical bill in the other body.

This bill provides that newsmen may not be forced by any Federal official—in a court, grand jury, agency, commission, department, or the Congress—to disclose confidential information or the sources of their information.

Such shield laws exist today in a variety of forms in many States, but I feel there is a definite need for a uniform, trustworthy yardstick by which a reporter and his informant may judge the "safety" of their exchange, anywhere in the country.

This bill does not exempt the reporter from revealing information sources which are: First, libelous; second, illegally obtained; or third, a threat to human life or the national security. It does, however, protect him from the "fishing expedition" into his files, and the unwarranted harassment he may suffer on what appears to be strictly ideological grounds, which could dry up his sources and destroy his effectiveness as a journalist. It is a necessary congressional implementation of the first amendment's free press guarantee.

The provisions of this bill are straightforward. But the protection they offer can assure us all that the methods of investigative reporters will be secure and the independence of the press can be upheld.

In a democratic society, the press is the watchdog for the public. The recent blanket issuance of subpoenas as well as the more indirect forms of intimidation could very well muzzle that watchdog, and that is a risk none of us can afford.

I urge my colleagues to consider carefully the need each of us has for the services of an informed and independent

press, and in so considering, support the Newsmen's Privilege Act.

AMERICA'S RECORDING INDUSTRY

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, many people have attained great success in the recording industry. For some of them, it has simply meant another aspect of their careers; for others it has meant the focal point of their entertainment lives; for still others it has represented the only real chance that they ever have to utilize their creative abilities, their natural talents, to improve their station in life, their quality of living.

The number of people who have made the trip to Hollywood in my home State of California, New York, Nashville, Memphis, or Detroit to record a record and break into the limelight; the number of families that have made the trip from oblivion and hardship to success and economic stability via the recording industry are legion.

The recording industry in America is immense. Its impact is felt throughout our country and the world. American music has bridged the continents, crossed the Iron Curtain, and defeated the language barrier. For many people, our music represents our country; our artists represent our people. In short, it is an aspect of American industry that has long been overlooked and underestimated. Unfortunately, today, the recording industry is in the throes of a major crisis, one that threatens its very base, its stability.

This is the result of a nationwide counterfeiting process that has enveloped the industry and has drastically curtailed the incomes of both artists, composers, publishers, and producers. A counterfeiting process that might well destroy some individual record producers as well as negate any chance at financial success that some artists have only once in their life time, for many bitter years of deprivation go into the making of an overnight success. The total income of the recording industry last year was nearly \$1,100 million. In this same year, there were more than \$186 million worth of counterfeit records that were processed and sold through the tapings of unauthorized personnel. And it is believed that another \$50 million worth of fraudulently duplicated tape cartridges of fully one-half of the industry output are pirated and sold to the unsuspecting consumer, who unwittingly becomes a member of the long list of victims already enumerated. This counterfeiting figure encompasses only the cases that the industry knows of; untold millions are probably counterfeited each year without its knowledge. Tape cartridges and records can be reproduced and sold by anyone with a little ingenuity, a tape recorder and a few other resources.

When a person is caught selling these

illicit products, he is subject to a minimal fine, one which can be easily paid from the large profits that he will accrue through selling his illegal products at a heavily discounted rate, through his own outlets or directly to unsuspecting record dealers. In an attempt to solve this growing problem a group of prominent artists, publishers, and executives within the recording industry itself, recently formed the Ad Hoc Committee for Legislative Protection of Artists, Publishers, and Recording Companies. Sean Downey of Washington, D.C., is the group's legislative representative. Under the wise leadership of Mr. Downey and Florence Greenberg, president of Seepster Records and Mr. Al Bell, the president of Stax Records of Memphis, Tenn., this group is investigating the feasibility of legislative action which would correct this situation; a problem that in the past 20 years alone has deprived artists and companies of untold billions of income and royalties, and the Government of millions in anticipated tax revenue. The solution, as spelled out by Mr. Downey, could come from the institution of a Federal tax stamp imprint placed on the records and tape cartridges prior to its release to prevent any counterfeiting when it gets to the open market. If a record or a tape were then counterfeited it would become a Federal offense subject to the same fines and/or imprisonment that counterfeiters of our currency, our cigarette stamps, or our liquor stamps are faced with.

In any event, I look forward to the course of action that Sean and the members of this committee outline for I am sure that it will go a long way toward amending a situation that has for too long gone unnoticed, for too long gone unpunished, for too long deprived the artists, composers, publishers, and producers of their fair and full livelihood, and for too long bilked the American consumer of the original recording quality he believes he has purchased.

KING: MONTGOMERY TO MEMPHIS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 2 years since Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was shot down on the porch of a Memphis motel. But even today, there are few of us who do not remember vividly this courageous leader who worked so passionately for the peaceful brotherhood of all men.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s impact on America was tremendous while he lived, but that impact has grown even greater since his death. Not only or even because he was a martyr—rather because the clarity of his vision and the strength of his determination have become more essential to us as we try to walk toward a single society.

On March 24, 1970, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference is going to present a nationwide tribute to

the memory of Dr. King, commemorating his life and his work and making a commitment to the perpetuation of his goals.

On that night, in hundreds of movie theaters across the country, Americans will join together to see "King: Montgomery to Memphis," a documentary film prepared especially for this unique occasion.

The entire proceeds from this tribute will go to SCLC's Martin Luther King, Jr. special fund, established to continue Dr. King's intense struggle for nonviolent social change, through scholarship aid for young people and such economic action programs as Operation Breadbasket in Chicago. I urge every person hearing or reading this to go to see "King: Montgomery to Memphis" on March 24.

It is especially fitting and proper that this motion picture of Dr. King's life should be shown at this time of doubt and that in seeing it we can rededicate ourselves spiritually and dedicate the Martin Luther King, Jr. special fund financially.

The direction of the quest for human equality among all races, among the rich and the poor is often cloudy, often blocked. Perhaps by viewing and pondering "King: Montgomery to Memphis," we can all begin to find the road together.

We need the encouragement that a review of Dr. King's life will give to all who still believe that people "will one day live in a Nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character."

RESPECT FOR VETERANS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about a newly instituted policy that limits military participation in funeral ceremonies for veterans buried in national cemeteries.

This new policy is a shameful way of treating these brave men who have served our country with great courage.

I have written to the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs about this situation and would like to include that letter in the RECORD so that all the Members may know of this unfortunate situation:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1970.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House of Veterans' Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express my strong objection to the new policy, instituted this week, that limits military participation in veterans' burials at our national cemeteries.

As Chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs you are well aware of the great sacrifices and fundamental contribution to our country made by the men who have served in the armed services. These men de-

serve our everlasting gratitude and any benefits we are able to provide them.

Discontinuing the traditional honor guard of pallbearers and the playing of taps at graveside ceremonies for most veterans is a shameful disregard of the debt owed the men who have served our country. The money saved in discontinuing these services is insignificant when weighed against the importance such ceremonies hold for veterans and their families.

The regrettable cutback in funeral participation is compounded by the fact that the policy discriminates against those men who do not remain on active duty until retirement. The fact that a man may have fought for his country and been wounded in action receives no consideration in the inequitable practice of providing funeral assistance for some veterans and not for others.

I would hope that your Committee, which has always shown compassion and understanding toward our deserving veterans, would investigate this situation immediately with the goal of restoring the minimal funeral ceremonies that mean so much to veterans and their families.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. Kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER L. WOLFF,
Member of Congress.

**HOUSING CRISIS IS INTOLERABLE,
AND SOLUTIONS DO EXIST—
ADDRESS BY CONGRESSWOMAN
SULLIVAN TO NATIONAL HOUSING
CONFERENCE**

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges of serving on the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency is the opportunity it provides me to meet from time to time with members of the National Housing Conference, an organization which for 39 years has been developing imaginative new ideas for achieving the goal of a decent home for every American family. Many of the effective innovations in national housing programs of the past four decades have originated in this organization or among its members.

Yesterday afternoon, it was my pleasure to participate with Senator JOHN SPARKMAN of Alabama, chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and of its Subcommittee on Housing, in a discussion of housing legislation at the opening session of the 39th annual convention of the National Housing Conference held at the Statler Hilton Hotel. The president of the NHC, who served as chairman at the session, is Nathaniel S. Keith, who has testified often before the House and Senate subcommittees. Another speaker was William L. Slayton, executive vice president of the American Institute of Architects, formerly Commissioner of Urban Renewal in the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

WE CANNOT JUST WAIT FOR SOMETHING TO HAPPEN

Mr. Speaker, I believe the housing industry in this country is in a crisis which

requires government solutions. We just cannot continue to wait, as we have been waiting ever since the new administration took office, for tight money or some other economic magic to end inflation so that mortgages once again can compete for investment funds in the capital markets. If we do merely wait for that time to arrive, I am afraid we will see a "solution" for the housing shortage in the form of high unemployment and soaring rates of foreclosures. It is not just the low-income family which is blocked by high interest rates from obtaining better housing at this time—the middle-income family is in a similar situation.

Today, I understand that Bank of America announced it is reducing its yield on Government-insured or Government-guaranteed FHA and VA mortgages by a drop of 2 discount points on such mortgages—in other words, reducing the "points" from 6 to 4. On a \$20,000 mortgage, that means that the seller—the buyer cannot legally pay these points under FHA or VA programs—would now have to pay Bank of America only \$800 instead of \$1,200 as a side payment in order to persuade the bank to issue a fully guaranteed or insured mortgage to a prospective home buyer at the legal maximum rate of 8½ percent. Of course, I welcome this reduction by one bank in its "points," but this is not the signal for a revival in housing. We must find means of channeling billions of additional dollars into housing.

In my remarks to the National Housing Conference on Sunday, I outlined some of the steps we can and should take, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MRS. SULLIVAN

In the 16 years I have been serving on the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, beginning with my second term in the Congress, I am not sure how many times I have met with the members of this organization, but I do know we have met often—here at your annual meetings and also in our hearings on housing legislation. And it is always gratifying to me to know that we can sharpen our ideas on each other.

For, in the whole field of housing, you are the people who care—and do. You are the social conscience of housing, the innovators, the idea people. Some of you, perhaps, are still fuddy-duddy in the concept of public housing of the 1930's, as I indicated in the article I wrote for the annual Yearbook of your organization, and some of you perhaps still think of urban renewal in terms of the late 1940's or 1950's, and then there are undoubtedly some young militants among you here who feel that everything done in the 30's and the 40's or 50's was either so long ago as to be irrelevant or too dumb to be taken seriously. But most of you are in between those views, and thank heavens the majority here is not a silent one.

I like to come and visit with you because this is where the new ideas often come from—this organization. And we desperately continue to need new ideas in the housing field because I am convinced we will never—as long as we have a growing and dynamic country—ever solve these problems entirely.

SOLUTIONS TO OLD PROBLEMS BRING NEW PROBLEMS

Each partial solution leads to new problems in subsequent years—and that's all right as long as we have people and groups

and organizations willing to try to cope with them as human problems rather than merely as exercises in making some money, not that there is anything wrong with making money legitimately. But in the housing field, the profit motive is only part of the motivation which is needed. And you people provide much of the humanization of the process.

So I want to thank you for what the National Housing Conference has contributed to America, and particularly to urban America, in the fateful 39 years of your existence, and to express my appreciation for being invited. It is always a great pleasure for me to renew friendships which have grown up over the years with so many of you. In company with all of you, I miss Mr. Charles Abrams this time, a man who always provoked us in the Housing Subcommittee into using our brains and thinking. Testimony during our annual hearings often tends to run to a pattern and be repetitious but Mr. Abrams never bored anyone.

MASTERS OF ARTS OF LEGISLATING

I am particularly pleased this afternoon to share the platform with Senator John Sparkman, who, in his gentle and courtly fashion has been a steel-driving man in the Senate in getting through some of the most important legislation in a generation. He never seems to raise his voice or evidence anger, but, oh what power there is within that man's quiet demeanor! As a Ranking Member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I am usually a conferee from our side on the major bills from our Committee which go to Conference, and I can attest to the effectiveness of the gentleman from Alabama in persuading us to do some things, dissuading us from doing other things, and, if we are not careful, and do not read each word twice and keep track of where it is on the page, we sometimes find later we have agreed to something we hadn't ever planned to agree to. He never tricks us—he just lulls us into thinking that perhaps we are as smart as he is, and if we ever succumb to that theory we are lost. Watching John Sparkman, as chairman of the Senate Conferees and Wright Patman as chairman of the House Conferees operate in a Conference Committee is an education in Alabama peanut shelling and Texas cattle rustling techniques engaged in simultaneously by two of the sharpest horse traders south of the Mason-Dixon line. The results show in the law books in a manner which does honor to both of them.

GOOD HOUSING IDEAS CAN WIN ACCEPTANCE

What with seniority—and it has its advantages—and with some good luck, and the help of men like Congressman Patman and Barrett, and former Congressman Albert Rains, and our Committee staff experts, and with the cooperation also of the able Senator from Alabama, I have had the great satisfaction of writing into the housing laws some of my own pet projects and programs, such as 221 (h) and its successor, 235, for low-income home ownership, the single-person eligibility of elderly persons for public housing, family counseling and social services in public housing, and so on. As many of you know, I am now intent on seeing carried out the language of the Conference Report on the 1969 Housing Act on management and tenant responsibility in public housing, to rescue the whole concept and save the program from political disaster before it is too late.

I have learned from these experiences in back-of-the-scenes horse trading and log-rolling that a good idea may simmer for a while on the legislative back-burner but a good idea in the housing field never has to die. Sometimes you just have to bide your time and find an appropriate vehicle to hitch

it on to as a trailer. So I never become discouraged when, on the first go-round of legislative hearings, an idea which I feel has merit doesn't set off any sparks of popular acclaim. There will always be other opportunities.

SHOULD WE JUST WAIT FOR INFLATION TO END?

We recently completed nearly a month of hearings in the full Committee on a series of emergency measures to try to revive and revitalize the home construction and the home financing industries. Much of the testimony was discouraging. Just wait for inflation to end, we were told,—just wait for interest rates to decline in response to the Nixon Administration's tight-money policy—and we will once again have some new housing being built. That was the theme of all of the Administration witnesses, and some of the others, too.

We heard the same thing—exactly—all of last year in the Commission to Study Mortgage Interest Rates—a Commission assigned the task of developing new programs for assuring adequate supplies of mortgage money for the average income family at reasonable rates of interest. The principal solution proposed by a majority of the members of that Commission consisted of taking the ceiling off FHA-VA mortgages and thus making these mortgages more "competitive" in the market place with other forms of investment. Congress did not repeal the FHA-VA interest rate ceilings, but it suspended for an additional two years the period in which the 6% ceiling could be breached—but then the rate went from 7½% to 8½% with almost as many "points" now being charged the sellers as had been charged when the ceiling was 7½%, or 6¼%. Yet, we still aren't getting FHA or VA mortgages written in any volume.

But Secretary Romney tells us just to wait and be patient, and one of these days—or years—the tight money situation will solve the inflation problem and we will once again be able to build housing for the middle income family.

COMPETITION FOR LIMITED FUNDS

Patience and passivity are not characteristic of the American people when problems become intolerable while solutions are available which do not do violence to our basic principles. The housing crisis is socially intolerable and solutions do exist. So what are we waiting for? Let's get busy, now!

Fundamentally, the housing crisis rests in the great competition for limited funds. Unfortunately, housing competes poorly in today's investment market. I am speaking now of shelter, not opulence—I have heard no complaints about inability to get financing for Shangri La's and Watergates, or co-ops like the one President Nixon relinquished in New York when he upgraded his housing. Upgrading is not available to most families today, however, when the new construction is largely in the neighborhood of \$30,000 or more.

Of course, there are always mobile homes—if you consider that a solution for the average sized family. While not many Americans grew up in the same size family I did—9 children—I think most families are still a bit large for mobile home living.

We can wring our hands and deplore the housing squeeze, as everyone does, and we can counsel patience in waiting for inflation to come to a halt, as the Administration urges, or we can recognize the situation for the crisis it really is and confront it head-on with practical solutions now. Short of a deep recession in which millions of wage earners are thrown on the unemployment compensation rolls and foreclosures start to soar, I do not see any early prospect for reversing the housing trend under a continuation of present economic pressures and national policies.

PREPAREDNESS OVER THE LONG RANGE

Twenty years ago, after we had junked much of our World War II government-owned industrial equipment and sold the rest at bargain rates to expanding corporations, the nation found itself suddenly in a new wartime situation—the Korean War—for which it was totally unprepared. There was a frantic rush to shape the necessary instruments of military power and economic defenses—including all kinds of anti-inflation measures, such as higher taxes, credit controls, and wage, price, salary and rent controls. Machinery was also set up for allocations, priorities, incentives for expansion in the basic industries, and for achievement of long range production goals in such areas as electric power. The legislative authority for all this was provided with remarkable speed between the time of the June 26 attack on South Korea and the enactment of the Defense Production Act of 1950 by September 9, and while not everything worked as well as hoped in that effort to redirect national priorities, most of these programs worked amazingly well in terms of the setting of production goals and their eventual achievement.

Most of all, however, we decided then that it was possible to maintain a state of defense preparation in the production and stockpiling of essential materials, the planning of power expansion, and so on. With reasonable effectiveness, we have continued ever since then to plan and project our defense support needs so as to be able to adopt the policies which would enable us to achieve them.

But it was twenty-five years after the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946 calling for the setting of employment and economic goals, and 19 years after the enactment of the Defense Production Act of 1950 calling for the setting of industrial capacity goals, that we finally adopted a similar device for projecting our housing needs year by year and into the future. But we are still leaving to chance the availability of financing for those housing objectives—to the vagaries of the investment market. Experience in the past year tells us this is not practical. Money is not flowing into housing—it must be drawn into it, either by pumping it or siphoning it.

PROPOSALS FOR ENDING MORTGAGE MONEY FAMINE

Congressman Patman and I, in our dissenting views in the report of the Commission to Study Mortgage Interest Rates, suggested a variety of means to accomplish this purpose—primarily by a redirecting of national priorities in the use of our limited investment funds. We suggested tapping public and private pension funds, and the tax and loan accounts maintained by the Treasury in various banks, and using Federal Reserve assets and mutual funds—in other words, financial resources controlled by, or dominated by, or protected by or influenced by the Federal Government.

As was pointed out in that report, only 1 additional percent of our Gross National Product, if directed into insured housing paper, could assure achievement of our national housing goals. We also suggested that for that segment of the population which is worthy of mortgage credit but cannot obtain it through conventional lending institutions, we must provide direct government loans at reasonable rates—such as we do under the Farmers Home Administration and the Veterans Administration.

And those are the proposals to which the recent hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency have been directed. One of the bills being considered is H.R. 13694, which I introduced on September 9, 1969, with the co-sponsorship of Congressman William A. Barrett of Philadelphia, chair-

man of the Subcommittee on Housing. I am very optimistic about the chances of this legislation being passed this year, either on its own or, more likely, as part of a broader housing bill. I hope you will help me in promoting it and advancing it.

PROPOSED HOME OWNERS MORTGAGE LOAN CORPORATION IN H.R. 13694

The bill creates a new policy-making agency, the Home Owners Mortgage Loan Corporation, oriented toward the housing needs of the average family, and composed of a Presidentially-appointed and Senate-confirmed board of directors of 8 members, plus the Commissioner of FHA. The board would administer a revolving fund capitalized at \$10 billion—created by appropriations of \$2 billion a year for five years—to issue 30-year direct loans up to \$24,000, at no more than 6½% interest, to "credit-worthy" moderate income families not able to obtain mortgages from other sources at reasonable rates of interest.

The target group mentioned in the bill is those families with incomes of \$12,000 or less, but the maximum income limitation could be raised or lowered by the HOMLC based on changing conditions.

The Corporation would have little staff of its own and no lending offices; instead it would utilize the existing district offices of the Federal Housing Administration to process loan applications, so there would be no need for any new housing bureaucracy. Existing lending institutions could service the mortgages perhaps at ½%, which would entail profitable use of their bookkeeping equipment.

This new agency would have as its main responsibility the constant monitoring of the home market to determine when—during recurring periods of tight money or other barriers to home ownership by the average family—the government itself must step in as lender of last resort, in order to assure adequate supplies of mortgage money at reasonable rates of interest. This agency is needed, of course, right this moment—right now. If it did exist right now, its first year allocation of \$2 billion certainly wouldn't meet and solve the mortgage needs of the unserved middle segment of the population all by itself, but it would have an impact, I am sure, far beyond the loans it handled directly. It would establish a Federal yardstick of what is a reasonable rate of interest on home mortgages during periods like the present for families usually able and willing to pay their own way in a normal market situation—the mailman, the milk man, the department store salesman, the bus driver, the public school teacher, the policeman.

PAY-THEIR-OWN-WAY FAMILIES NOW FROZEN OUT

These are the hard-working middle class families which not only pay their own way but, through their taxes, help pay for many of the social services for less advantaged Americans. No one is helping them today to obtain better housing—today's housing market completely passes them by.

They cannot afford the monthly payments on a mortgage pegged at 8½% or higher, even if they could find a seller willing to absorb the seven or eight points required as a sidepayment to the lender in order to obtain a mortgage fully guaranteed or insured by the government of the United States.

The savings and loans are certainly not the villains in this tight-money situation; they, too, are strapped for funds and what they can obtain for home mortgages is obtainable only at premium rates which must be reflected in the rates they charge.

Perhaps the interest rate bubble will suddenly burst and the prime rate will fall precipitately. A few small banks have volun-

tarily cut back to 8% or even 7½%—for which they deserve praise; but they are probably not really the trend-setters in this field. Government must exercise its power to *push rates down*, unless we are willing to resign ourselves once again to a repetition of the boom-and-bust cycle as our only device for economic readjustment. No field of economic activity in the United States has a greater stake in the outcome of this crisis than housing—not just low-income housing, not just assisted housing, but housing for the families which normally *never* have to depend upon the other fellow for their needs, but which today cannot provide themselves with the most basic of all family requirements, a decent home in which to live.

THE RUSTING TOOL OF CREDIT CONTROLS

Regardless of the degree of commitment with which the Administration faces up to this problem—and so far we have had nothing but expressions of sympathy and vague promises of future action from the Administration—I hope the Congress will act soon to provide some effective new tools which can be used to dig us out of this morass.

One of the most effective tools which could be used is already law, but it is rusting in disuse in the Executive Office of the President. It is an economic weapon of vast power—more power than was ever given to any President, even in the midst of all-out war, to control interest rates and the use of credit in this country. It is a law we passed last December, giving the President the power to ask the Federal Reserve to regulate any form of credit—including business credit such as commercial IOU's—when any form of credit is being extended in so excessive a manner as to be inflationary.

Perhaps there is no need for a crackdown on all forms of credit. Consumer credit outstanding is very high, up 8% over 1968 and up 19% over 1967, but with the doldrums in the automobile business, perhaps we don't need to limit the terms of consumer credit right now. But you in the housing field know where the inflation-causing funds are flowing, and into what kind of investment activity. If you want money for housing right now, it must be diverted to housing from credit channels not nearly as socially important or economically defensible at this time. The President can now, as of this minute, ask the Federal Reserve to take action to redirect some of this money from less essential purposes to the terribly vital area of housing.

EXISTING HOUSING PROGRAMS DIE FOR SUSTENANCE

The longer the President delays in using this vast power to solve the housing famine, the more urgent it becomes for the Congress to devise additional means to help solve the problem. If you have ideas we can use, pass them along. If you like our ideas, such as my Home Owners Mortgage Loan Corporation bill, please help us make them known, and get them through.

If we sit this one out—this latest in a recurring series of credit crunches destroying the prospect for housing the American people—the bills you ask us to pass for new housing programs will merely add a new crust of futility to what is already the greatest array of unused and unusable housing programs in history.

Almost every day, new bills go into the House and Senate hoppers proposing an improvement of one sort or another in our housing laws—a little bit more subsidy here, expanded income eligibility for another program over there, and so on.

Meanwhile those programs we have—the programs already in law—die for sustenance.

As I said earlier, the American people are neither patient nor passive when problems

become intolerable while solutions are available which do not do violence to our basic principles. Am I wrong in thinking our housing crisis is *now* intolerable and must be solved by deeds and action rather than merely wringing our hands over them? If I'm wrong, then please let me know, because I have no desire to exaggerate a problem for political purposes. But, if you think I am right in my assessment of the dimensions of the crisis, then let's get going on some solutions before another month or year goes by. Thank you for the help you have given in the past. But forget past triumphs now—what's on the menu for the next course?

CONNECTICUT VETERANS' HOSPITAL

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently directed my efforts toward the development and maintenance of adequate facilities and program in the Veterans' Administration hospitals to meet the continuing requirements as they relate most specifically to veterans with service connected wounds and disabilities. I have recently discussed the question of improving facilities in Connecticut's two VA hospitals with representatives of Connecticut veterans groups, and I have received word from Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee that he is planning to hold hearings on this subject and planning action to help relieve some of the serious problems.

I have assured Chairman TEAGUE of my desire to cooperate with his committee and to assist him and Hospital Director David Anton, of the West Haven Veterans' Administration hospital, and Hospital Director Joseph M. DiPietro, of the Newington Veterans' Administration hospital, in the stated objective.

In this connection, Chairman TEAGUE has issued a statement which I include herewith:

FUNDS AND STAFF SHORT IN CONNECTICUT VA HOSPITALS

Congressman Olin E. Teague (D-Tex.) Chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee said today that the Connecticut VA hospitals are not receiving sufficient support to provide the kind of medical care needed for its patients.

The House Veterans Affairs Committee Chairman said that searching in-depth hearings will get underway early in the second session of the 91st Congress on operation of the nation's 166 Veterans Administration hospitals. As a forerunner to the hearings, the Committee has recently undertaken an inquiry in an effort to learn whether VA hospitals are sufficiently staffed and funded to provide America's ex-servicemen and women with "second to none" medical care. Chairman Teague said that he was "seriously concerned about recent reports from a variety of sources indicating that many VA hospitals were being caught in an impossible squeeze between higher medical and drug costs and rising workloads without receiving proportionally higher funding and staffing allocations." "If this is true," Teague said,

"such policies, if allowed to stand will wreck the VA hospital system and undermine the veterans medical program to the point of dangerous dilution in quality."

Chairman Teague said that the Veterans Administration is attempting to provide first class medical care with an inadequate staff. Teague pointed out that 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. According to Teague, the university hospitals operated in connection with medical schools are even higher, and have a staff ratio of over 3 employees for each patient. Teague has written to President Nixon and advised that he expects to seek a minimum staffing ratio for the Veterans Administration of at least two employees for each patient in most VA general medical hospitals, and a one for one ratio in psychiatric hospitals.

The Veterans Affairs Committee investigation of Connecticut Veterans Administration hospitals in December 1969 revealed funding deficiencies in fiscal year 1970 or over \$1.2 million to operate about 975 hospital beds serving 429,000 Connecticut veterans.

In Connecticut, Veterans Administration hospitals are located at Newington and West Haven.

The investigation conducted by the House Veterans Affairs Committee in December revealed that under the hospital staffing formulas advocated by Teague, Connecticut VA hospitals are approximately 325 positions short of needed staff. A few of these positions would be difficult to fill at current VA salary rates, but most are recruitable. Connecticut VA hospital directors also reported they were underfunded approximately \$135,000 in the community nursing home care program. This program provides nursing care in private nursing homes at VA expense for veterans who have received maximum hospital care and are no longer in need of expensive hospital care. A projected deficit for timely issuance of fee basis authorizations for dental care totalled approximately \$96,000, mostly for Vietnam veterans.

Hospital Director David Anton at the West Haven hospital reported the largest fund deficiency in December 1969. He reported that he was underfunded for 56 full time positions and 36 part time positions in his personnel ceilings, and that funds in the amount of \$650,000 was required for these positions. Anton reported a shortage of \$125,000 in other operating supplies, materials and services, and \$185,000 was needed to restore funds diverted from new and replacement equipment and maintenance and repair services. Anton said to meet his funding deficiencies in salary and other operating expenses he would have to divert approximately \$185,000 from much needed equipment and maintenance funds.

Director Anton reported that the community nursing home care program was underfunded by approximately \$95,000. At the beginning of the fiscal year there were 28 patients remaining in community nursing home care facilities, but Anton stated in his report that "our community nursing home care program will be practically terminated by the end of the fiscal year unless additional funds are provided to support continued replacements for the remainder of the year."

To achieve the minimal staffing ratios of 2.0 staff for each hospital patient as advocated by Teague, Anton reported 245 more positions at an annual cost of \$2.2 million would be needed. The staffing ratio at the West Haven hospital as of September 30, 1969, was 1.51.

The West Haven hospital received supplemental funding support in January 1970 in the total amount of \$188,512. Of this amount, \$175,000 would be applied to the personnel

salary deficiencies to sustain current on duty employment. The remaining \$13,512 received would be applied toward the reported \$95,000 deficiency in the community nursing home care program.

In December 1969, hospital Director Joseph M. Di Pietro at the 213 bed Newington VA hospitals reported funding deficiencies at his hospital totalling \$311,000. Of this amount, \$211,000 was needed for staffing shortages and the remainder was needed in the community nursing home care and fee dental program.

To meet funding deficiencies in personnel salaries, Di Pietro said he would divert approximately \$107,500 in new equipment and maintenance and repair funds.

The community nursing home care program was underfunded by approximately \$40,000 according to Di Pietro. The fiscal year allotment provided for an average of approximately 25 patients in community nursing home care facilities during the year if sufficient funds were provided.

To achieve minimal staffing ratios for the Newington hospital Di Pietro reported that 80 more positions at an annual cost of \$733,000 would be needed. The staffing ratio as of September 30, 1969, was 1.4 at the Newington hospital.

Director Di Pietro notified the Veterans Affairs Committee that he had received additional funds in January 1970 in the amount of \$67,500. He stated that funds in the amount of \$17,500 were restricted to apply toward a deficiency in the fee basis dental program, mostly for Vietnam veterans, and the remainder, \$50,000 would be utilized to restore amounts previously diverted from the new equipment and maintenance repair funds.

Chairman Teague emphasized that the Veterans Administration hospital system has long been considered among the best of government-operated medical facilities. "VA has been doing an exceptionally good job in operating its medical program, but they are not able to keep up with greatly increased workloads and vast improvements which are being made in medical treatment and technology under current funding and staffing formulas," Teague said.

Teague cited statistics indicating that:

In FY 70 VA will treat 780,000 patients—38,000 more than it did in FY 66—with almost 17,000 fewer hospital beds than were in operation in FY 66.

In FY 70 outpatient visits will total about 7,425,000, an increase of 1,243,000 over FY 66.

VA provides some training for about half of the nation's 7,500 new doctors which are graduated each year.

VA employs 4% of all doctors in the United States and is the world's largest employer for more than 10 different medical professions—including nurses, clinical and counseling psychologists, dietitians, medical and psychiatric social workers, physical therapists, and occupational therapists.

Conducts over 6,000 research projects covering almost every field of medicine.

Teague said that "the fine accomplishments which the VA medical system has achieved cannot be allowed to deteriorate so that they become a part of a second rate system."

Some curtailment of VA funding and staffing has been blamed on the "war on inflation" Teague stated. "I take the position the Vietnam veteran has contributed enough when he fights the shooting war and that he should not be expected to fight the inflation war also at the expense of his health," Teague said. "This nation has prided itself in its service to those who have borne the burden of battle. A bi-partisan attitude has long prevailed in Congress in the funding of an adequate medical program for America's veterans, and in providing for the educational and housing needs of returning

servicemen. We in Congress of both parties have always acted in the belief that the finest medical care should be made available to those who served their country in uniform, and especially to those who returned home suffering wounds and service-connected disabilities," Teague stated.

"I do not intend to sit idly by and allow shortsighted policies to destroy a medical program that is absolutely necessary to care for America's veterans," Teague said, "and that's why we're conducting this survey so we can make a determination if we are doing all that needs to be done to properly and promptly serve America's ex-servicemen."

POLITICS AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, this last month Edward C. Craft, past Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and one of the great environmentalists of our time, addressed an audience at the University of California, Berkeley, on politics and the environment. In his remarks Mr. Craft very ably put his finger on the major problems legislative bodies will be presented with the instituting effective antipollution programs. Mr. Craft's thoughts have needed saying for a long time, Mr. Speaker, and for the benefit of us all, I insert his address in the RECORD:

POLITICS AND THE ENVIRONMENT

This is not a partisan political talk. Its purpose is to persuade you that politics, not science, is the real key to environmental management. Possibly the President's recent State of the Union Message has done this already.

Environment has become a big political issue, but so far it has been more rhetoric than action. Environment has been a "motherhood" issue because the toughness and costs necessary to be effective have not been realized. Environment and ecology are today's catchwords, just as conservation was for yesteryear.

Politicians talk and make programs. Yet existing laws have been unenforced and underfinanced.

Major industrial polluters such as auto, oil and airlines are important financial contributors to both political parties. This is where the crunch comes.

The political business and social push for growth, jobs and profits means highrises, shopping centers, highways, and other environmental intrusions.

Clean air and water will cost billions. No one—neither the politician, corporate head nor man on the street—has really faced up. The industrialist is unwilling to share the cost and thus reduce profits. He is willing simply to pass on added costs to the consumer.

No one in power has yet proved willing to make the jolting revision of national priorities—foreign, domestic, and economic—that is necessary to get the job done. Unfortunately, in our governmental system of checks and balances, perhaps no one has the power to get the job done.

The issues are fraught with power politics of a high order, and the tough action required possibly is suicidal to the activist politician. When profits or key political support clash with environment, the latter usually goes down the drain.

Until there is gathered together at the

same time in the power structure of American politics both the consensus and courage to truly reassess our national destiny, there will continue to be much talk, little do, and disillusionment.

These remarks point the finger at the Administration, Congress, Governors and State Legislatures, county and municipal councils, courts, public executive agencies, corporate directors, and indirectly, at affluent suburbanites—and yourselves.

This is neither a technical treatise nor a doomsday talk. There is no soaring rhetoric, just plain words. Neither are the remarks California-oriented, although environmental pollution appears to be a top issue in the upcoming California political elections.

The talk is an assessment of man's confrontation with nature. It outlines some basic truths about environmental degradation. It names the chief offenders. And it states the enormous price of man's living in peace with nature. It points out that—as with most major national problems—both initiative and leadership lie with the top political structure of the Nation, starting with the President and the Congress. Then comes the States, industrialists and labor unions.

The press, radio and TV have come alive at long last to world-wide environmental dangers. Such attention-getting titles as "Threatened America," "Last Chance to Save the Everglades," "Peaceful Atom Sparks a War," "Kill the Hill—Pave That Grass," "Oceans—Man's Last Great Resource," "Alaska—The Great Land Under Massive Attack," "Pesticide Pollution—An Assessment," "America the Beautiful," "The Garbage Can Crisis," "Northwest Passage to What?" "Noise—More Than a Nuisance," "The Ravaged Environment," and "Standing Room Only on Spaceship Earth" are intended to catch public attention and are succeeding.

Such well-known journals as Life, Look, Newsweek, Reader's Digest, Time, The Saturday Review, U.S. News and World Report, and practically all conservation magazines are speaking up. Leading papers like the New York Times, Christian Science Monitor, National Observer, Wall Street Journal and a host of others are running almost daily news reports or features on auto pollution, the Florida Everglades, municipal waste, environmental litigation, Lake Erie, the atmospheric sink, and so on ad infinitum.

A new magazine, "The Environment," published by the Committee on Environmental Information of St. Louis, and the "Environmental News letter" by the Conservation Foundation deserve special mention. They are scholarly, judicious, across-the-board and authoritative.

All this has started to awaken the national conscience. It has created a national awareness and lofty generalities, but not much downright concern when measured against willingness to pay more taxes, higher utility bills, or to accept lower profits or dividends. We are pretty much at the stage where environmental improvement is the thing we are for, provided it doesn't interfere with our own personal way of life.

Despite all the attention, only a handful of National leaders really understand and are prepared to accept the traumatic action that is necessary if the environmental crisis that is crashing down on the United States is to be weathered. In such situations we must accept that habits essential or acceptable in one age of the Nation's history—such as large families—may become disastrous in another.

In the meantime, environmental evangelists and students give vent to their beliefs and frustrations in speeches and teach-ins. Scientists disagree among themselves. Many politicians, industrialists and other men of power stay silent, go about their anti-social business as usual, or issue soothing statements and programs in reports to voters and stockholders.

TEN BASIC TRUTHS

There follow ten basic truths about environmental decline, which we would do well to ponder and accept.

1. *Man's environment is everything outside his own body.* The scope immediately becomes overwhelming and almost self-defeating. For rational handling, environment must be broken down into some of its more important components.

2. *The world's environment is unique in the solar system.* This appears to be supported by recent Apollo trips to the moon and photos of Mars. The world's environment is characterized by its unusual combination of atmosphere, water in liquid form, and land. Together they first spawned life and then man.

3. *The growing danger is that man will destroy himself by degrading the environment to where it is no longer livable.* This degradation is caused basically by man's failure to dispose adequately of his waste products. It results mainly not from lack of knowledge, but from misuse of his technological know-how.

4. *Failure to use properly man's scientific knowledge is causing serious water, air, and land pollution, pesticide poisoning and improper disposal of solid waste.* The worst polluter of all is the automobile with its internal combustion engine. Usually the finger is pointed most accusingly at the mining, chemical, steel, auto, oil, and utility industries as the leading villains. But let us not forget the road builders, construction industry, real estate developers, and timber depleters. Let us not forget also that regulatory and other public agencies are major contributors to environmental deterioration.

On the other hand, let us remember that these industries and agencies not only are promoting, but also are responding to the demands of you the consumer. The price of big auto engines, fancy homes, weedless lawns, and countless other creature comforts that you want and enjoy is environmental depletion.

5. *The motivations that cause environmental decline are the desire for large families, status living, social conformity, material affluence, creature comforts, and so-called "progress."* The United States has 6 percent of the world's population and uses 40 percent of the resources. Generally the higher the living standard the greater the consumptive use of resources. The affluent suburbanite is the worst offender of all. The United States is choking on its own affluence.

6. *Man can learn about, but he cannot alter, the natural laws of this earth nor the solar system.* To survive, he must control the technological apparatus by which knowledge of these laws is applied to his own well-being. Man's confrontation with nature is a war he cannot win. He not only must atone for past abuse, but also must reverse the trend. The President indicated that the number one domestic priority is to make peace with nature, and reparations for past damage to air, water, and land.

7. *If there are certain industrial "princes of pollution," the kings and queens of environmental decline are the men and women of the world who enjoy a high standard of living—namely you and I.* We have it in our power in countless ways to halt the downward trend and maintain the biotic balance between nature and man that is essential to survival of the species.

8. *The price runs against our grain.* It runs against progress, development, and the biological urge. The price is twofold. It includes: (1) control of the world's population, and (2) a social ethic that make environment the number one National priority in terms of performance as well as words. To achieve such priority means willingness to forswear profits and dividends, pay greater taxes and higher prices for consumer goods and services, reduction in the material standard of

living, sacrifice of certain strongly-desired comforts, and educating ourselves and our children as to the environmental necessities. Major revision in national and social priorities means raising sufficient public opinion against principal offenders to compel change, challenging the politicians, and finally the ability by our leaders to recognize the point-of-no-return before it is too late.

In short, the people of this Nation must develop a consciousness and determination regardless of individual, corporate, or collective sacrifice.

We as a people must be willing to bite the "hot bullet." To illustrate and bring it close to home, we should look with disfavor on more than two children per family, on buying a new car every two years, on buying a V-8 instead of a Six, and on other conspicuous consumptions of contaminating consumer goods.

9. *The main deterrents to correction are neither scientific nor technological. They are political, social and economic.*

10. *At stake is man's survival.* The environmental threat is no less certain than that of unleashed nuclear weapons. But it is far less dramatic, less sudden, more insidious. Thus far more dangerous. Through simple disinterest, disbelief, or selfishness, man as a species may go down the drain—a victim of his own brain.

MAN AGAINST HIMSELF

Population

So much has been written and said about the world's population explosion that I can add nothing—only summarize. I do commend an article in the December Reader's Digest, "Our Spaceship Earth—Standing Room Only."

The United States took 180 years to go from 4 to 200 million Americans. By 2000 we will have over 300 million. There are one billion more people on this planet now than in 1950. In the last 5 years alone there have been added 250 million, or a greater increase than the total population at that time of either the Soviet Union or Continental Africa. The world's population is now 3.5 billion and due to double every 30 years.

What does this population increase mean in terms of environmental impact? Each new American adds 120 gallons of sewage, and 4 pounds of solid waste per day. In the course of a year each new American discards 250 cans and 135 bottles.

There long has been recognized the carrying capacity of a range for livestock or the sustained-yield capacity of a forest for timber. It is high time we recognized that the earth has a carrying capacity for humans.

Ecologists also long have recognized that an understocked range produces fatter and healthier cattle than a fully-grazed or overstocked range. In human terms this means there is an inverse relation between standard of living and numbers of people.

Population control is a touchy subject involving religion, race and invasion of privacy. But it is time to flush it out and do something. Voluntary control would be best. I doubt that it will work.

Deterrents to large families in terms of additional tax costs for more than two children, and property taxes graduated upward in relation to numbers of children have been discussed.

I have heard a Catholic attorney urge legalized abortion, and compulsory contraception by Congressional statute with sterilization as the penalty for violation. The same individual also urged a court test of the position of the Catholic Church.

True, there is growing awareness of population pressure. But how to reach that quarter of American families that produce two-thirds of America's children? Or the Puerto Rican fisherman with 16 children who is too poor even to feed his own children the fish he catches, and who obviously pays no taxes? How to change a culture which is ex-

tant in the United States and looks down on a bride who does not become pregnant shortly after marriage?

But even if the United States were to face up, what about the rest of the world? Frankly, I get a feeling of hopelessness when I think of the population problems of some continents other than North America. Nor do I believe the United States could become an island of isolation, nor survive in biotic balance if the rest of the world is out of tune and headed for disaster.

There are various voluntary action groups; there have been Congressional hearings; bills are pending; the President has established a Commission and sent a message to Congress. But the political clout to do something is missing. Reelection is more important.

The population issue is one example of what I mean by biting the "hot bullet." Solutions are definitely not for the chicken-hearted. Stabilizing U.S. population probably will prove the ultimate environmental test. The alternative might be catastrophe by numbers.

The abuse of nature

A stabilized population is certainly one part of the equation for environmental maintenance. The other is living in harmony with nature. If we fall on either count we are in trouble. So, turning now to the other part of the equation—what are we doing to America the Beautiful by our proud American way of life?

Generally speaking, there are three earth resources vulnerable to environmental pollution—air, water, and land. All of the air, nearly all of the water, and much of the land is in the public domain. The problem throughout is both a public and private responsibility. Do not comfort yourself that solutions lie only with a distant Congress, the President, the Governor, or the Judiciary. It is a personal problem for which you as an individual have a responsibility, as do your neighbors and children.

Air has its visible and invisible contaminants, with the latter the more serious. Principal sources of air pollution include the auto, trucks, busses, jet planes, factories, garbage and city dumps, pesticides, steel mills, heating and power plants. All of us recall big city smog, heat inversion, haze, belching smokestacks, burning dumps, dust bowls, and forest fires.

The air over most of the East Coast from Maine to Florida is visibly polluted up to 20 or 30 thousand feet and often a hundred miles or more out to sea. The smog of southern California is infamous, with wisps and fingers reaching across the state into Arizona. San Francisco and Sacramento are not immune. Just east of the Front Range in Colorado from Colorado Springs through Denver north to Fort Collins, air pollution has become a recognized problem. City after city could be named.

Of all causes the automobile is the worst offender. But despite great talk of auto safety, little beyond research has yet been done about that most dangerous source of all—the exhaust pipe. General Motors in its report to stockholders of the 3rd quarter of 1969 reported on reductions made in vehicle emissions and research under way, and recently has made more forcible public statements of intent. Ford Motor Company has announced an "intensified effort to minimize pollution in its products and plants in the shortest possible time." New York State is suing major auto manufacturers, charging conspiracy to eliminate competition in the development of anti-pollution devices. Standard Oil of California has reported the discovery of a fuel additive that reduces undesirable emissions by half. Steam, electric and gas engines are being investigated.

It is hard to know where the truth lies between announcements by manufacturers and such charges as made by New York State.

The airlines now have an emission-free jet

engine; but why do the airlines wish to install it only as part of an orderly rotation system, not on a crash basis? The answer is cost. Fortunately, the Administration has pushed up the target date from 1975 to 1972.

Direct action is available but the Nation is not ready. Smog in Los Angeles would be ended if gasoline sales were banned in southern California. A slower alternative would be to immediately ban the sale of new autos without the best corrective devices, and additionally require their installation and regular inspection on all existing vehicles, without waiting for gradual supersession.

Noise is another form of air pollution that is increasingly serious. It is traceable to big city din, trucks, railroads, jet planes, jetports, sonic booms, interstates, turnpikes, beltways, expressways, and the construction industry.

One scientist has suggested that within 10 years air pollution may become so serious, urban Americans will be forced to wear plastic head hoods to breathe an artificial atmosphere, and such masks will become more essential than clothing.

Water is polluted from soil erosion, sewage, industrial, agricultural and consumer waste of all kinds, and of course the ever-present pesticides. Most major rivers of the nation are polluted as are many minor streams. Lake Erie may be dying. So may Lake Tahoe whose color is changing from blue to green.

The coho salmon of Lake Michigan are contaminated. So were your Thanksgiving and Christmas turkeys. The pollution of Long Island sound has doubled in 10 years. Ore waste continues to go into Lake Superior and some beaches of Monterey are unsafe for swimming.

Estuaries and wetlands are disappearing to high rises and condominiums. Even the oceans are becoming garbage pits and the end of the line for trash, of all sorts, sewage, industrial waste, the persistent pesticides, and other chemicals.

Disasters such as the oil leaks off Santa Barbara are fresh in mind, and uncorrected. Why does not Union Oil abandon drilling in the public interest? The State Assembly of California has, by resolution, urged the Administration to abort the leases, but why have not the Interior and Justice Departments taken action on their own initiative? Why cannot a restraining injunction be initiated by the State or other aggrieved parties?

The beautiful harbor of Charlotte Amalie on St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands stinks from raw sewage and is beset by slums. The proposed St. Thomas jetport will be at the expense of wetlands, lagoons, and island beauty.

The sugar mills built on the cliffs of the various Hawaiian islands dump their effluent into the blue Pacific, thereby making it look like the Muddy Missouri. The petro-chemical and other waste discharges into the ocean on the north and south coasts of Puerto Rico are visible for miles as one approaches by plane. So is the smoke hanging over San Juan and coming mainly from rum distilleries and a cement plant.

Thermal pollution from nuclear power generators raises the temperature of rivers and lakes and possibly in due time even the oceans to the point of affecting marine life in unknown ways. Should the polar ice caps melt either from this cause, air pollution, or Arctic development, the oceans would rise over 200 feet. Visualize what this would do to the great central valleys of California and other lowlands throughout the world. The peaceful use of nuclear energy is challenged by this fear of thermal contamination.

Land pollution is multitudinous and diverse in character. Pesticides upset the biotic balance. Erosion and construction tear the land apart and deface it. Examples are endless and include overcutting the forest, suburban sprawl, urban slums, overgrazing,

misdesign of cities and structures, overcrowding the parks, highways splattering ribbons of concrete over the landscape, strip mines, utility lines, litter, advertising signs, trash, junkyards, industrial and urban decay, and so on.

Why is mining, for example, permitted to continue for 25 years after establishment of Forest Service wilderness areas? Why won't Congress intervene at Miner's Ridge to stop Kennecott Copper inside the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area? The answer in both cases is mining industry pressure on vote- and contribution-conscious members of Congress. The result is violation of wilderness of which there is so little left.

The construction of an expressway through Humboldt Redwood State Park caused such an outcry that hopefully the continuation of the expressway will by-pass two other redwood State parks further north, both of which are within the Redwood National Park.

People over-crowding of the National Parks is acute. The density will become greater as more and more people come to the parks on one hand, and as most acreage in the parks is classified as legal wilderness on the other. Here is real environmental conflict, the only solution appearing to be both restricting visitor numbers in the parks and accommodating over-night visitors on outside surrounding lands which often are national forests or other public land.

The Mineral King controversy between recreation for winter sports and keeping a wild valley wild as well as forestalling an access road through a National Park has caused the Sierra Club to go to court with initial success. Here is a conflict between a people's varying cultural desires, one group for wilderness, the other for winter sports.

Finally there is Alaska. Must the oil of the northern slopes ruin the priceless domain under the care of the Interior Department, including the forests, wetlands, and irreplaceable habitat for wildlife? The balance of nature is delicate at best in Alaska. Here perhaps is the ultimate testing ground in the United States as to whether the American people can and will harmonize technological progress with a delicately balanced environment.

Meet yourself

What is being done in view of all that is happening—not only by your government, but also by you?

There is a baffling maze of Federal and State legislation, public programs, trade associations and other private groups, universities, foundations and research organizations, all either pushing one aspect or another of environmental improvement or conversely protecting a special interest.

Presently 11 Federal Departments, 16 independent agencies, 13 Congressional committees, 90 Federal programs, 26 quasi-governmental bodies, and 14 interagency committees are engaged in environmental matters.

In 1972 the United Nations is convening a world conference on the environment. 1970 is European Conservation Year. NATO has adopted a goal of improved environment. UNESCO has held a conference. London and Paris have had smoke and noise clean-up campaigns.

DDT has been banned in Sweden, Denmark and Germany. About 11 states either have restricted its use or are considering such action. Michigan has impounded the salmon from Lake Michigan because of excessive DDT in its tissue.

There are other good signs. Maryland is the first state to require undergrounding of all utility lines in new construction.

The Federal government has cut back the use of persistent pesticides. But, in a vast disregard of the public interest, six of the major chemical producers and formulators of DDT have forced delay by appeal procedures. The food manufacturers responded to the

ban on cyclamates. Lack of similar response by the chemical industry to DDT proves that environmental concerns have not really gotten home.

Jet planes and autos are scheduled for partially effective emission control devices, but not until 1972. California has taken steps to try to save San Francisco Bay. Reynolds Aluminum is paying 200 dollars a ton for discarded cans.

The jets versus the Everglades is a celebrated cause, and the Congress, through the Department of Transportation appropriation act, nudged the Administration to decisive action.

Actions of industry and foundations have been limited mainly to research or public relations. As an exception, DuPont claims it has invested 130 million in anti-pollution facilities and all known noxious gases are now restrained at all plants.

One of the bright hopes is the growing student war on pollution. Senator Gaylord Nelson and Congressman McCloskey are sponsoring a National environmental teach-in on April 22 in colleges and high schools. Ralph Nader has adopted environmental improvement as a worthy goal. Students with no investments, payrolls, nor profits to bother them are adopting environment as a cause and an outlet for their ideals, energies, intelligence and enthusiasm. And well they might, for students will be around to suffer the consequences of failure.

Also, students can do something about birth control, whereas it is too late for the bald and gray heads of my generation.

When appearing before student groups, the first question is usually Viet Nam, the second is environment. Student groups are springing up at colleges and universities everywhere under a variety of names. Many are not allied to any central movement.

All power to them, but let students become so fully committed that it carries over to when their generation becomes the establishment. Let them mobilize their strength, toughen their spirits for a long, hard struggle, and be prepared for disillusionment when environment fully flowers into the full-blown political issues of cost and action.

New organizations are springing up, such as the Environmental Defense Fund, an action-oriented organization seeking redress in the courts, the Committee for Environmental Information which publishes a top-notch magazine, and the Environmental Clearing House, an ad hoc committee on the environment consisting only of members of Congress. An Environmental Institute is being sponsored by the Conservation Foundation to publish an Environmental Law Reporter. Regional groups such as the Rocky Mountain Center for Environmental Information and various State open space councils are under way.

Environmental law is emerging as a new field with several law and natural resource schools showing special interest and some sponsoring inter-disciplinary programs. Numerous court tests are under way. The active interest of the Environmental Defense Fund, the Conservation Foundation, and Resources for the Future has helped to push environmental law into prominence. Several young and aggressive lawyers are seeking and developing national reputations and careers in the field. Some established law firms are loaning an attorney to environmental clients as a gesture of pro bono publico, but only if no conflict is seen with the firm's established business or clientele.

There is little body of environmental law; precedents usually favor defendants. The environmental lawyer is often a young Turk with environmental dedication, impatient of administrative or legislative processes, and without professional natural-resource knowledge. The relatively few individuals of experience who are lawyers knowledgeable

in natural-resources are mostly with public environmental agencies. Unfortunately, the young environmental lawyers have little liaison with these experienced attorneys, with consequent mutual loss.

The National government, both legislative and executive, is stirring, but is fuddled, and the pace is too slow. In past years Congress has passed numerous major enactments such as the Air Quality, Clean Air, Water Pollution Control, Solid Waste Disposal, Water Resources, Land and Water Conservation Fund, Clean Waters Restoration, Federal Insecticide, Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic, Fish and Wildlife Pesticide, and Pesticide Research Acts. Conspicuously absent is legislation on population control.

These enactments, forward-looking though they are, are piecemeal. Furthermore, the underfinancing of existing authorizations is colossal, mainly because the Administration won't recommend full authorizations and sometimes won't spend what Congress does appropriate. For example, the authorization in fiscal 1970 for water pollution control is \$1 billion. The Nixon administration recommended about \$250 million. The Congress overrode the Administration and voted \$800 million.

With over 100 environmental-related bills before the Congress, Senators Jackson and Muskie and Congressman Dingell have led the way in developing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. This act, among other things, will establish a Council on Environmental Quality comparable to the Council of Economic Advisors. Senator Jackson predicts:

"The law will immediately hit the Atomic Energy Commission's nuclear power program by requiring the AEC to curb thermal pollution. It will have an immediate impact on all defense programs—everything from the siting of ABM missiles to chemical and biological warfare. It will affect federally financed highway programs and every Army Corps of Engineers project."

This bill, although initially opposed by the Administration, was signed by the President in his first official act of 1970. He declared the fight was a "now or never" task for the new decade.

In related action, bills by Senator Muskie and Mr. Fallon have passed both Houses and would establish an Office of Environmental Quality in the Executive Office of the President. The Senator has accused the Administration of being more interested in form than substance and said the new office would "reflect the national commitment we need if we are to avoid ecological disaster." The Senator also told a recent meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science that "man has so misused the fruits of scientific endeavor, he has threatened his own existence."

The President is reported as opposed to this additional environmental office. Regardless of the outcome, it is not unlikely the present session of the 91st Congress will create either a Joint Congressional or Senate Select Committee on the Environment.

Pending too are various reorganization bills, particularly those by Senators Case and Moss to reconstitute the Interior Department as a Department of Natural Resources and Environment. This would be a mistake, because environmental concerns are too widely dispersed throughout the Executive Branch to be concentrated in any one Department. Reshuffling of Bureaus is a cheap and easy way for the President to show the country he is doing something about the environment. But it is no substitute for money.

Last May the President by Executive Order created a coordinating Environmental Quality Council chaired by himself and with six cabinet officers and the Vice President as members. He also established a Citizens' Ad-

visory Committee chaired by Laurance Rockefeller. The Council is staffed by the Office of Science and Technology, which is the wrong place, because the problems of environment are not primarily scientific.

So far the Council and Advisory Committee have met infrequently, done little, and created little enthusiasm. Funds were cut for staff support. Congress did not accept executive action as adequate and the future of this Council is uncertain in view of the more recent Council on Environmental Quality created by the Congress.

The President in his State of the Union message joined Congressional leaders in emphasizing environmental quality as the challenge of the '70's. But the message was largely non-specific, and also ignored population control. The real test of the President's concern will become more clear when details of the Budget Message are available, and when the dozen or more major programs are forthcoming that he promised to offer in this session.

Over the past 5 years Executive agencies have done a great deal of work on environmental matters. Reports of the National Research Council-National Academy of Sciences, the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee, the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty, the Department of Agriculture, and the Office of Science and Technology are outstanding. The recommendations are there, but they are far from being implemented either legislatively or financially.

The HEW Commission on Pesticides and Their Relation to Environmental Health recently issued its report with 14 recommendations. These included the usual ones on cooperation, coordination, advisory committees, and standards. But the Commission also recommended that we "eliminate within two years all uses of DDT and DDD in the United States, excepting those uses essential to the preservation of human health or welfare . . ." It remains to be seen what actually happens.

And so the students, the conservationists, and your Congress and the Administration all are moving. What are you doing as an individual?

If you are a banker or businessman, take an environmental risk, absorb some costs, cut a dividend, reduce some profits. As a citizen, stop using persistent pesticides in your yard and garden, boycott no-return bottles, get along with one car to last 8 to 10 years, equip it with an emission-control device and avoid high-powered V-8's. Be willing to pay higher utility bills and taxes.

If you are young, limit the size of your family and educate yourselves and your children. Expect to pay more and get less as the price for pollution control is reflected in consumer goods.

Above all, educate your children to environmental dangers and values from the elementary level on up. Universities should respond to student demands for environmental study programs and should make an environmental course a prerequisite for every graduate.

Teach the young people to have a different sense of social and national values and priorities than the distorted ones of our generation. Teach them to look down on large families and those who pollute and befool. Then perhaps when they are running this country, they will make peace with nature and reparations for damage.

A Gallup Poll shows that half of us believe we are spending too little on environment and most would cut defense spending to find the cash. But if not wholly at the expense of defense, what then?

Only 22 percent are willing to increase family expenses by as much as \$200 per year to save the environment. Obviously, those questioned were not thinking in terms of survival. Only 14 percent are willing to pay

\$2 more per month on electric bills to reduce air and water pollution.

Too often, environmental impacts from apparently unrelated actions are not identified. New York City recently raised its bus and subway fares 50 percent. How many more commuter cars will this force into the already congested bumper-to-bumper traffic of smoggy Manhattan? One offset is to raise bridge and tunnel tolls and to charge for empty seats in cars entering Manhattan Island. A better solution might be free rapid transit at public expense in major metropolitan areas to reduce gasoline pollution. This makes as much sense as free public schools. Reforming attitudes and innovative approaches to the public business are absolutely essential.

POLITICS THE KEY

Statesmanship is a better word than politics. But it is clear that on national and overriding issues, such as the environment, leadership must come from the Congress, the Executives, and the State Houses. If one doesn't lead, the other must.

This is no partisan issue and the fact that different parties control the Executive and Legislative should be of no moment. Neither can duck their sobering responsibility for both sides of the equation—population stability and environmental management.

There is much we need to learn; but to say research and science hold the key to environmental quality is nonsense. Such a statement reflects either gross misunderstanding or deliberate intent to befog and confuse.

How much is enough is the real question, meaning how far do we dare push our environment downhill in order to enjoy the fruits of technological knowledge, and can we detect the point-of-no-return far enough ahead to not go over the brink of a snow-balling irreversibility? It all comes down finally to a judgment balance between what technology can supply and what biology can stand. As the President said, the wonders of science must be turned to the service of man. This is why politicians and other policy officials in all walks become the ultimate key rather than scientists and engineers.

Population and material affluence are overdrawing our natural resources and despoiling the environment. It may take a killing heat inversion along the eastern megalopolis, or some other catastrophe to shake up this Nation sufficiently to take action. Unfortunately, Americans usually react after crises rather than before.

Right now everyone is joining the environmental bandwagon. There is a plethora of pieties, messages, commissions, hearings, reports and recommendations. The issue lends itself to words, eyewash, government reshuffling, research and rhetoric.

Let us view these with skepticism. Let us watch for massive Federal and State expenditures to clean up the air and water, for corporations absorbing an important share of the social costs, for crack-downs on the major industrial polluters, for enforcement of existing laws and regulations, for real revision of National priorities, and for willingness to make personal sacrifice.

At this point, the people are ahead of the politicians who are being slowed up by private interests, jealous committees of the Congress, and the fiefdom bureaucracy of both Congress and the Executive.

The issue should be hotter on Capitol Hill and in the White House than civil rights, poverty, housing, hunger, inflation, or crime.

To paraphrase one commentator, when survival of the species is at stake, there can be no differentiation between Republican and Democrat, black and white, rich and poor, young and old.

Finally, as a reminder to yourself, may you bear forever in the recesses of your mind and

on your conscience the recent words of Charles Lindbergh:

"I had become alarmed about the effect our civilization was having on continents and islands my military missions took me over—the slashed forests, the eroded mountains, the disappearing wilderness and wildlife. I believed some of the policies we were following to insure our near-future strength and survival were likely to lead to our distant-future weakness and destruction. Also I was tired of windowless briefing rooms, Pentagon corridors and the drabness of standardized air bases. I wanted to regain contact with the mystery and beauty of nature.

"After millions of years of successful evolution, human life is now deteriorating genetically and environmentally at an alarming and exponential rate. Basically, we seem to be retrograding rather than evolving. We have only to look about us to verify this fact: to see megalopolizing cities, the breakdown of nature, the pollution of air, water and earth; to see crime, vice and dissatisfaction webbing like a cancer across the surface of our world.

"We know that tens of thousands of years ago, man departed from both the hazards and the security of instinct's natural selection, and that his intellectual reactions have become too powerful to permit him ever to return.

"That is why I have turned my attention from technological progress to life, from the civilized to the wild. *In wildness there is a lens to the past, to the present and to the future, offered to us for the looking—a direction, a successful selection, an awareness of values that confronts us with the need for and the means of our salvation. Let us never forget that wildness has developed life, including the human species. By comparison, our own accomplishments are trivial.*"

CRAMER ANTIRIOT ACT VIOLATED BY KUNSTLER?

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the most recent activities of attorney William Kunstler, the infamous counsel for the Chicago riot conspiracy defendants convicted under the Antiriot Act, appear to present a clear case of Kunstler's violation of the act himself. Although sentenced to 4 years in jail for contempt of court, Kunstler was given a stay of sentence for the express purpose of preparing his clients' appeals. Instead, however, he has used this free time to travel in interstate commerce to make inflammatory speeches around the country, urging his listeners to exercise their "right to revolution," and thus has crossed State lines, inciting violent civil disturbances, in what appears to be a direct violation of the Cramer Antiriot Act.

I recently called upon the Department of Justice to investigate Kunstler's possible violation of the Antiriot Act and I shall continue to press for such action. In the interim, the Chicago Tribune, on February 28, carried an excellent editorial presenting the facts surrounding Kunstler's riotous activities, and urging that the stay of sentence be revoked and that he be jailed for continuing the contempt for which he was sentenced. Such action by Judge Hoffman is not only jus-

tified, it obviously is the only method of preventing Kunstler from continuing, not only his contemptuous behavior, but also his public exhortations to the people to take to the streets. In conclusion, the Chicago Tribune editorial states:

If their counsel find renewed occasion to call for revolution and taking the law into the streets, these revolutionaries, if turned loose on bail, can be counted on to follow suit. Their only contribution would be more turmoil.

Mr. Speaker, as the author of the Antiriot Act, and as a deeply concerned American, I commend this excellent editorial to my colleagues for their reading and careful consideration. To those of us charged with the responsibility of legislating the laws of this great country, Kunstler's appeal for a peoples' revolution against the law must not go unnoticed. The full text of the editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 23, 1976]

BEAT OF THE DRUMMER

William Kunstler, lawyer for the Chicago riot conspiracy defendants, professes to be "disturbed" that riots of revolutionary youth invariably attend speaking appearances for which he was booked upon the conclusion of the trial. He does not see any relationship between cause and effect. Indeed, he says, he disavows violence.

But if there is a self-evident fact, it is that wherever Kunstler goes a riot follows. He spoke at Northwestern university and urged students and faculty sympathizers to take to the streets to correct "injustice" and socialize property. They did, and \$20,000 of window-breaking occurred in downtown Evanston. Nevertheless, his sponsors want him back and, as a substitute, have billed his colleague, Leonard Weinglass, for next Tuesday.

Kunstler went from Northwestern to the University of California at Santa Barbara. There he again called upon his student audience to "fill the streets," and he predicted that if resistance to the existing order, as exemplified by the convicted trial defendants, were not heeded, "then it can lead to revolution." Three nights of violence followed. A bank was burned, with \$400,000 property loss. A man was shot. The governor was obliged to call out the national guard. Nevertheless, Kunstler says he deplores violence.

It is true that he does not have to be around to stir up campus and town militancy. In the last two days there have been violent demonstrations, clashes with police, and seizure of buildings in half a dozen eastern colleges. But his presence is an infallible incitement to street action.

At the conclusion of the Chicago trial, in which five of the seven defendants were convicted of crossing state lines to incite riots, Atty. Kunstler was sentenced to more than four years in jail for contemptuous behavior in the courtroom. Weinglass was sentenced to one year and eight months for similar behavior.

Defendants and counsel during more than four months of the trial staged "guerrilla theater" in the courtroom in an attempt to degrade American justice and make it impossible for the court to function.

Kunstler and Weinglass were given a stay of sentence until May to draft appeals. Their peregrinations, incitements, and continuing attacks on the law and its administration indicate no interest in working on appeals but a determination to keep up a running war against our institutions. In the circumstances, Judge Hoffman would be justified in revoking the stay of sentence and putting them in jail, for their conduct is a continua-

tion of the contempt for which they were sentenced.

This is what Rep. William C. Cramer, author of the anti-riot law under which the Chicago convictions were returned, recommends. He has not only asked the justice department to investigate the lawyers' post-trial activities but has urged that Kunstler be held in contempt anew for his statements since the trial.

Such behavior also could readily influence the United States Court of Appeals to deny petitions for bail filed by the convicted defendants, whom Judge Hoffman ordered jailed as "dangerous." If their counsel find renewed occasion to call for revolution and taking the law into the streets, these revolutionaries, if turned loose on bail, can be counted on to follow suit. Their only contribution would be more turmoil.

RHODESIA—A CIVILIZED NATION EMERGES IN AFRICA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, for month after shameful month we have witnessed—and participated in—the perverted and foolish attempt to destroy civilization in the Republic of Rhodesia.

Rhodesia, called a threat to world peace by the new masters of the United Nations Organization, is considerably more peaceful than is the city of Washington, our Nation's Capital. Its Negroes enjoy a high standard of living compared to their brethren in the so-called emerging nations of Africa. It is a matter of great embarrassment to the Communist trained and armed guerrillas that the very blacks whom they professed to be willing to "liberate" were loyal to their government in Salisbury and bitterly fought the infiltrating terrorists.

To our shame, we bow meekly to the wrong perpetrated by the United Nations Organization. We endanger our own defense by placing strategic materials in the hands of our Soviet enemy. We seem to wait for someone in New York to demand that our own "unilateral Declaration of Independence" from the same British sovereignty be declared invalid, so that our own civilization can be ended.

I include in my remarks articles relating to Rhodesia, where there is no mass exodus, and the balance of eastern Africa, where the contrast is noteworthy, although seldom mentioned:

AFRICANS WANT FORCE USED ON RHODESIA

The Foreign ministers of Algeria, Zambia and Senegal were preparing to fly to United Nations headquarters in New York yesterday to demand that the U.N. Security Council order Britain to use force to bring the self-styled Rhodesian republic to heel.

The three ministers were armed with a resolution adopted by the ministerial council of the Organization of African Unity calling on Britain to take military action to "restore legality," in the breakaway British colony.

Even in the unlikely event that the resolution were adopted, Britain still retains the power of veto and has consistently refused to use force against Rhodesia.

Rhodesian Prime Minister Smith himself announced the detention without trial of a "couple of hundred" political opponents. He

said in a television interview that the reason for the detention of political opponents without trial was the difficulty of getting evidence in open court because of intimidation.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 9, 1970]
EAST AFRICA'S HARRIED ASIANS CLAMORING FOR
CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Jim Hoagland)

NAIROBI.—Independent black Africa's first significant civil rights movement appears to be taking shape here in Kenya and neighboring Uganda.

Frustration, impatience and dwindling funds are pushing many of East Africa's Asians into acts or threats of civil disobedience as they are squeezed out of jobs and homes.

The target of their bitterness is not the African governments cutting off their livelihoods, but Britain—which gave the Asians British citizenship six years ago and now discourages them from using it.

"The situation of some of our younger people is getting desperate," says a middle-aged physician who is a respected member of Nairobi's Indian community.

"They can't work, can't leave the country, and are running out of money. The number grows every day, and when it gets big enough, they will be in the streets."

The new militancy of East Africa's Asian minority is reflected in these recent events:

A sit-in and partial hunger strike at the British embassy by eight Asians is now in its sixth week in Uganda's capital, Kampala.

More than 65 Asians left East Africa last month, knowing they would never be readmitted, and tried to crash through Britain's immigration laws. Twenty-four are in prison in Britain, six have been admitted and the rest are floating around Europe stateless.

The worldwide publicity given to the odyssey of Miss Ranjan Vaid, 22, an Indian girl from Kenya who was bounced from airport to airport for two weeks before Britain admitted her, has convinced Asian leaders here that world opinion can be turned against Britain through peaceful protest.

COURT MOVE THREATENED

England's Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants threatened to take the case of the 24 jailed Asians to the European court in Strasbourg. Although there appears to be little chance the court will hear the case, because Britain has failed to ratify the section of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights that covers citizenship, the council's threat helped mobilize public opinion in England.

Britain's Labor government, faced with elections in which race and immigration will be major issues, has been pressuring Kenya and Uganda to let the Asians stay in Africa.

The pressure has worked so far because Kenya and Uganda depend heavily on British aid. But there are signs that both governments are losing patience.

The newspaper of Uganda's ruling party said recently that Britain was in effect "renting Uganda" to keep its Asians in. The same day, a junior member of Kenya's cabinet accused Britain of trying to blackmail Kenya over the Asians and said his government might soon deport 5,000 or 10,000 of them to show Britain how serious the problem is.

If Kenya or Uganda deport the Asians—Britain is honor bound to admit them.

Until then, they are stuck. An estimated 1,500 Asians in East Africa are living off relatives or charity while waiting for the British to accept them. The story of how the Asians, who are East Africa's middle men—racially and economically—have been trapped in this position is more than a compelling human tale.

It is a story of Africa coming of age economically and its growing pains; of inter-

national conflicts that haunt former colonial powers and the newly emerging nations; and of the uncertainties that surround the concept of citizenship on this still developing continent—and in Britain, when the citizens involved are nonwhite.

It is also an emotional tale, clouded by charges of racism and double-dealing being hurled at each other by the English, Africans and Asians.

The Asians are in fact almost all persons whose ancestors came here from India. Together with a smaller group of Pakistanis and others from the Asian subcontinent, they have always been referred to collectively as Asians.

Their contact with Africa stretches back to the time, centuries ago when Indian traders from the Cutch and Sind regions plied the Arabian Sea and sailed to Africa.

The British brought 30,000 indentured laborers from their Indian colony to build a railroad linking of Kenya and Uganda at the end of the 19th century.

Indian traders, soldiers and others eager to get away from their overcrowded homeland followed, pushing into the remote interior which they helped to open up.

Industrious, thrifty and better educated than the African tribesmen with whom they dealt, the Asians quickly gained control of the petty and medium-scale commerce of East Africa that they still retain.

Like the Jewish merchants of America's ghettos, to whom they are often compared, the Asian traders assert they have provided services that no one else would and as in America, many of their black customers say exploitation is rampant.

Placed above the African in the colonial order, the Asians were segregated into certain sections of towns and barred from settling on the rich farmlands that had been taken by the white colonialists.

Even now, they still live apart—from the whites and the Africans, and from each other.

The Asian community is divided along rigid social and religious lines that permit little mixing. This may have brought much of today's trouble on the community.

Perhaps 60 to 70 per cent of the estimated 350,000 Asians of East Africa are Hindus, who provide most of the area's shopkeepers and traders.

The smaller groups are mainly the bearded, turbaned sikhs, who are artisans; the Moslems (who form one of the richest segments of the Asian community) and a small number of Goans, whose ancestors were Christianized by the Portuguese when they came to Goa.

These groups are subdivided into castes and into groupings based on the town or area of origin in India, and keep very much to themselves. Outsiders are permitted only rare glimpses into their lives.

"These people are perpetuating the old rigid social order that we in India are now trying to change," says a young Indian diplomat posted in East Africa.

Each group maintains its own temples, schools, and living areas. Pretty young Indian women may replace their filmy saris with miniskirts when they go downtown, but they rarely if ever would date outside their own sub-grouping, much less outside the Asian community itself.

When I want to marry, I will have to go back to India to find a girl of my caste," says a young Indian.

RELIGIOUS BARRIER

Africans have also been suspicious of Asians because of the exclusive nature of their religion. The white man came to evangelize and spread Christianity. But Hinduism, an introspective religion, has not been shared with Africans. Many Asians admit that race relations here are bad.

"We have a conservative, stratified society," says a member of the Indian elite.

"It takes us much longer than the white man to change our attitudes. If an Indian shopkeeper has been kicking an African around, he cannot suddenly stop it and say what a great fellow the African is. The white man here have that talent, but we do not."

Estimates that Asian traders have controlled up to four-fifths of the retail and small wholesaling enterprises in this region are not scoffed at here, even though the Asian population is only a small percentage of the combined 32 million population of Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda.

Experts estimate that Kenya has about 150,000 Asians and Tanzania and Uganda have up to 100,000 each.

But the extent of the Asians' control of the economies of these countries has probably been exaggerated. The industries, major banks and big farms were, and in many cases still are, in the hands of white men.

WHITES' POSITION

The positions of the whites, whose capital is still needed by developing countries, seems secure for the time being. The Asians are much more vulnerable. They were not only the merchants but also the tailors, jewelers, repairmen and clerks of this society until independence.

It is their jobs and their shops that the Africans are demanding and getting as they become more educated and skillful. This, for the moment, is what Africanization is about.

Kenya and Uganda have begun to restrict trading licenses and jobs to their own citizens. This is the crux of the problem and the developing civil rights movement. Most of the Asians in these two countries are British citizens, not Kenyan or Ugandan.

When Britain gave Kenya independence in 1963, British citizenship was automatically granted to Asians who did not apply for Kenya citizenship.

Only about 20,000 Asians did, in fact, apply for Kenyan citizenship. This created new African resentment against the Asians.

"We were uncertain what would happen here under an African government," explained an Indian businessman. "This was just after the Congo and around the time that Asian traders were murdered and chased off Zanzibar during the revolution.

"It was much more of a gamble for us than for the whites. It became known fairly quickly that a white who took out Kenyan citizenship could always get his British passport back very easily. It also became known we would not."

BRITISH BLAMED

The most frequent criticism is short and bitter: "We thought we could believe the British."

Most of the estimated 120,000 Asians who had a right to British citizenship stayed in Kenya after independence, hoping for a few more years of making money and living in sunshine, with the British passport as an escape hatch if anything went wrong. But the hatch was slammed shut at about the time things began to go wrong.

In 1968, faced with what it perceived as growing racial tensions between colored immigrants and Britain's white population, parliament passed an immigration act that took away the Asians' absolute right to enter Britain.

Now they have to apply for permission, and entry permits are rationed at 1,500 a year for heads of families, meaning about 6,000 persons a year.

The British assert that this is not welshing on their offer of citizenship, but merely a fashion of making the Asians "form an orderly queue." Everyone in the line will get in, the British say—eventually.

LITTLE TIME LEFT

Time is in short supply to the Asians. They have been racing against Africanization of

their jobs and shops since independence, and this is the year when they clearly will have lost the race.

In January, Uganda ordered about 3,000 Asian traders to close their shops immediately, and warned them they could be expelled from the country.

Kenya ordered also 1,000 Asian traders to wind up their businesses. Unlike Uganda, Kenya is giving them up to six months to settle their affairs.

In Tanzania, where the role of Asians is much different because many did apply for and receive Tanzanian citizenship and they have taken a more active part in supporting the African government, no direct action has been taken against Asian traders. But the nationalization of the wholesaling industry puts a severe financial squeeze on Asians, who had monopolized it.

The situation in Kenya will get worse in a few months, when, according to B.B. Bangeau, Kenya's principal immigration officer, many of the work permits held by Asians here will expire.

"It is not intended to renew the permits," Bangeau says.

Kenya does not expel the Asians as their permits are cancelled. Knowing that Britain will eventually take them, Kenya issues renewable three-month permits to remain in Kenya.

But they cannot work. Many assert they have already been reduced to living on charity. As their funds recede, and they have nothing left but the price of an airline ticket to London, they have little to lose by flying there and trying to embarrass the British government.

Britain is pressing major airlines not to carry Asians unless they have valid entry permits. Thus far the airlines have gone along, but there is growing resentment of the British tactics. There are reports that some Asians are planning to charter airliners to carry the gate-crashers to London to force a confrontation.

125 A MONTH

There are now more than 10,000 entry permits, which are doled out at the rate of 125 a month. Most of these represent families who are living on savings or charity.

Officials estimate that of the approximately 70,000 Asians in Kenya who hold British citizenship, about 40,000 would go to Britain.

The other 30,000 are expected to go back to India. They are mostly older people with solid ties and in better financial shape than the British-leaning group.

The Indian ambassador here, Avtar Singh, has said that India would welcome these people back and give them citizenship.

WAR IN ENEMY TERRITORY

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the editorial from the Dallas Morning News that follows points out, "war is a dirty business." This is particularly true for foot soldiers under combat conditions in areas inhabited by enemy civilians.

They never know who is going to shoot them, who is going to boobytrap them, or who may be an accessory before the fact to their own murder.

Justice must be leavened with basic understanding of the horrors of war under these circumstances in assessing blameworthiness.

Whether a jury or court-martial, the trier of fact needs take a good hard look at the situation actually confronted by individuals in combat in such areas before finally exercising final judgment in each case.

The editorial follows:

WAR IS A DIRTY BUSINESS

(NOTE.—This editorial from the Dallas Morning News was written by Don Moore, Dallas Businessman and an infantryman in WWII.)

I saw my best friend, an Italian youngster from New Jersey, fatally shot in the back by a 12-year-old German girl. He was inspecting a cellar in Cologne, Germany, 1944, as our 102nd Infantry moved into that enemy city.

War is the dirtiest game in the world. Maybe I'm biased—but to court-martial American foot soldiers in Vietnam for killing civilians is ridiculous.

I saw an old German woman remain silent while an American GI inspected her house, the door of which had been booby-trapped. He is dead. Was she not just as much an enemy as a German in uniform—or just a kind old lady in a foreign country?

War is dirty—you're just as dead from the shot of a 12-year-old Germany girl as from a bomb dropped by a German plane.

I was yanked out of the University of Texas, trained and sent to Europe to defend the country I love. In no time I—and every other foot soldier—learned that you'd never get back unless you killed and got the thing over with.

If you turned your back a second, in an enemy city, your head would be blown off or your spine severed by a knife.

Yes—you killed. Your one objective was to get back to Austin, finish your education and resume a normal life. It's either you or the other fellow—and sometimes the "other fellow" is a helpless-looking old German you're trying to help. You turn your back and you're dead.

There is a difference between our experience 25 years ago and the current ordeal in Vietnam: At least we knew a German when we saw one. Those poor soldiers in Vietnam don't know a Communist Vietnamese from an American ally—they all look alike.

If righteous finger-pointers want to try you boys over there, the requirement is simple: Let the jury be composed of men who have had frontline infantry experience.

You can't judge the actions of a combat infantryman by standards of what is moral, kind and right today in Dallas, Texas.

It isn't easy to see your best buddies taken prisoner, then view their bodies later—all shot through the head.

No foot soldier, who had been through it can reconcile the difference in killing civilians—who'll kill you in a second—and killing the enemy in uniform. Also, why pick out the infantryman, when our bomber pilots would kill 5,000 German civilians in a single raid?

At a recent gathering of our infantry veterans, all were burned up over this—and particularly over this country tolerating those who spit on the flag, burn their draft cards and escape service through a loophole. Meanwhile, infantrymen get malaria, the mange, jungle rot or a free burial in Arlington Cemetery.

It is strange that the bleeding-heart, pro-Communist liberals didn't say a word in World War II when the Reds were our allies; but now that Americans are killing Vietnamese Reds, they think they should be court-martialed. Their pink slips are showing.

These bleeding hearts, now screaming over alleged massacres, don't know the score. They haven't seen their buddies killed by a hand grenade thrown by a "harmless" civilian.

War is dirty. You kill or get killed. That's the sum or substance of it, and a civilian can put you in a coffin as quickly as an enemy in uniform.

CHICAGO'S PROPOSED LAKE AIRPORT—V

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have made remarks concerning the broad ecological, cost, and safety problems presented by the proposal to build an airport in Lake Michigan, off the shores of Chicago's southside.

A lake airport, if constructed, will influence the lives of millions of Chicagoans. The Chicago chapter of the American Institute of Architects has pointed out that:

Experience has shown that airports are extremely powerful environmental factors that influence the lives of millions of people not directly associated with the airport.

Airports, by their very presence, produced economic and social change. They relocate people and change the nature of communities. They produce air and water pollution and create a great problem of noise pollution. All of these factors affect people to a very real and extensive way.

One such effect of a lake airport which I have not previously mentioned is the traffic congestion it will generate. Frederick Blum, urban planner and coordinator of the Campaign to Stop the Airport in the Lake of the Businessmen for the Public Interest, a Chicago organization, has studied this traffic problem. His conclusions are ominous. I would like at this time to include his report in the RECORD.

The report follows:

TRAFFIC CONGESTION GENERATED BY AIRPORT IN LAKE

(By Frederick Blum)

The proposed airport in the lake will produce traffic tie-ups of monumental dimensions. In order to accommodate anticipated peak-hour traffic loads, over 24 multi-level expressway lanes would have to be constructed on the causeway between the airport and the shore. The extraordinary number of traffic lanes would be in addition to a rapid transit line linking the airport to the subway system.

The huge volumes of traffic generated by the airport would have to be absorbed by an already saturated expressway system which would cause auto and truck traffic to be at a virtual standstill during the morning and evening rush hours.

Rapid transit, which is capable of carrying a greater volume of passengers than by an expressway system, could not be expanded at the airport site beyond a two-lane system due to limits imposed by the number of lines in existing and proposed subway systems.

Traffic interchanges to be constructed at points linking existing and proposed expressways with airport traffic would require a complex of multi-level structures whose dimensions would overwhelm the urban landscape and the lake view.

Attempts to accommodate anticipated traffic loads would lead to absorption of large

amounts of south-side residential land for expressway expansion and truck terminal facilities. Relocation loads will be large. Displaced populations will press south and south westward. A portion of displaced persons will be forced to move great distances to the northern part of the city and suburbs.

Added to the costs of constructing the airport will be the estimated \$400 million needed to construct the 24 lane causeway including a surface rapid transit line.

With all the anticipated rhetoric about the existence of technical solutions to the traffic problem, it is inconceivable, in the light of traffic to be generated by McCormick Place and the commercial developments on I.C. air rights, that even vast expenditures on transportation could do anything but cripple the inner-city transportation system. The Loop would be strangled by traffic overloads.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION ESTIMATES

Anticipated passenger traffic for 3rd airport by 1990: 75 million passengers per year; 200,000 passengers per day.

Total daily passengers who travel from airport: 45.

Percent of transfers who would travel from airport to city: 10.

Total daily passengers who travel from airport for city: 130,000.

For every originating or terminating passenger, 2 persons are at airport to send off or greet passengers: 260,000 persons times 130,000 passengers equals 390,000 persons.

Estimated number of persons who will be employed at airport: 50,000.

Number of persons traveling between airport and city: 440,000 persons per 24 hours.

Peak hour traffic loads—25 percent of 24 hour loads: 110,000 persons per peak hour.

Maximum expected CTA two-line rapid transit—peak hour: 40,000 persons.

Persons using cars and buses—peak hour: 70,000 persons.

Persons per car: 1.5.

Number of buses—peak hour: 100.

Capacity per expressway lane: 1,800 automobiles per hour.

Number of expressway lanes on causeway: 24.

Cost per mile four-lane causeway: \$10 million.

Number of miles of causeway: 5 miles.

Total cost of causeway traffic lanes: \$10 million per mile times 6 (4-lane causeway) times 5 miles equals \$300 million.

Cost of rapid transit line: \$100 million.

(No estimates were made of the large number of trucks which would carry air cargo and service materials between the airport and expressways.)

TELLING THE FARMER'S SIDE

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the committees of Congress are deeply involved in drafting new farm legislation, it is important to take note of what a strong agricultural economy means to the Nation. Station KCMO, Kansas City, Mo., in a recent on-the-air editorial, has pointed out some of the facts we should keep in mind in assessing the role of agriculture and in fashioning a new farm program to bolster this economy. I wish to call attention to the following editorial, "Telling the Farmer's Side":

TELLING THE FARMER'S SIDE

(By George Stephens, KCMO farm director)

Urban citizens in Mid-America should be grateful for the good job their country cousins are doing. City folks are often tempted to leave town and start farming in order to get away from it all. Well, if you start farming now, you'd better take along your check book because a farm that will support a family today will cost you anywhere from \$100,000 to a quarter of a million dollars. That's how much the nation's one million commercial farmers who produce over eighty percent of our Nation's food have invested, and it's a high risk, low-return business.

Farmers spend over \$33,000,000,000 a year for goods and services to produce crops and livestock and another \$12,000,000,000 for things we all use such as furniture, clothes, appliances etc. Three out of every ten jobs in the U.S. are related to agriculture in the so-called agri-business field. Farmers are important taxpayers with total farm real estate taxes over 1.7 billion dollars a year, to say nothing about all the other taxes farmers pay.

Agriculture is the Nation's biggest industry with assets of better than \$273,000,000,000. U.S. agriculture is efficient enough that we pay only seventeen percent of our disposable income for food in this country, compared with thirty-five percent in Japan, twenty-five percent in England, etc. Your grocery bill may seem high, but when you compare it with those in other parts of the world, you can see that U.S. farmers are the most efficient anywhere. Unfortunately, farmers have not benefited much from food price increases that have occurred in the spiral of inflation the past few years.

This has been a KCMO editorial. Copies are available on written request. If you have a different opinion, we invite your comments. Send them to SPEAK UP, KCMO Broadcasting, Kansas City, Missouri.

VETERANS' PAL

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, there is a gentleman on Long Island who has been giving a tremendous amount of help to our veterans of our armed services despite the unfortunate fact that the present Nixon administration has permitted the Veterans' Administration to overlook many of their needs. This gentleman is Jack Kluger, the director of the Veterans Service Agency, a Nassau County department which is liaison for the Veterans' Administration.

Since he continually provides a tremendous service to our veterans I would like to extend my remarks to include a recent article from the fine newspaper Newsday which exemplifies what a gift it is to have Jack Kluger helping our boys:

VETERAN'S PAL IN MINEOLA

(By Jack Altschul)

"Back our boys in Vietnam is the word you get from Washington. But when the boys come home, Washington turns it back on them."

The speaker was Jack Kluger, a natty mustached man who smokes a cigar and spends all his working days helping veterans and their families. He is director of the Veterans Service Agency, a Nassau County depart-

ment that acts as a liaison for the Veterans Administration.

Kluger is perturbed at the present trend of the Nixon administration in its dealings with servicemen returning from Vietnam. "The word we hear is economy," he says. "And the one who suffers the most is the boy being discharged from service."

A case in point is the present level of aid for a discharged serviceman who wants to go to college under the GI Bill of Rights. The government will give him about \$1,300 a year towards his college education and Kluger insists it isn't enough.

"Take a Long Island boy who wants to go to Hofstra," he says. "Even if he lives at home, tuition and books cost more than \$1,800 a year. And if he wants to go away to college, the costs run anywhere from \$2,000 to \$4,500 a year. When I got out of the service after World War 2, we only got \$65 a month, half of the present allotment, but tuition was one-third of what it is today."

There is a move in Congress, Kluger notes, to raise the allotment, but he said that President Nixon has indicated he will not sign the bills passed by the Senate and House. The Senate's bill calls for a 40 per cent increase in the educational allotment; the House has passed a 27 per cent increase; President Nixon has indicated he will veto any figure above 13 per cent.

Kluger is equally critical about the government's economy move that has cut down on graveside maintenance and honor guard ceremonies at national cemeteries. "I think it's a disgrace," he says, "to visit Pincelawn National Cemetery these days and find that it is cluttered with beer cans and refuse. I understand Washington has simply cut down on expenses necessary to keep the grounds tidy. There ought to be some dignity attached to a man who has died for his country or fought for it."

But it is the living veteran who occupies most of the attention of Kluger and his 17-man staff in offices at 320 Old Country Road, Mineola. In the six years that Kluger has been on the job, cases handled by his agency have doubled to the point that last year more than 40,000 "contacts" were processed. These would include any problem affecting a veteran or his family: pension and disability requests, aid in seeking employment and young men seeking an education.

About a third of the increase Kluger attributes to the Vietnam war. The rest reflects the county's increase in population and the problems brought on by old age and death for veterans of World War I.

Many of the younger veterans have little idea of how the Veterans Service Agency can help them. Kluger tells of a 22-year-old discharged Marine who came into the office recently and made it clear he didn't want any handouts. What, then, did he want? The boy said he was broke and thought maybe he could get a loan. He couldn't, but before he left, Kluger had put the wheels in motion to get him a \$44 a month disability pension for life.

"He didn't even know his two Purple Hearts rated that," Kluger said.

Sometimes the director's work takes on investigative chores worthy of a detective. "We had a young veteran's widow in here, who was really hurting to make ends meet. She had three children. Her 40-year-old husband had died of a heart attack. If I could prove it was in any way service-connected, I could get her a sizable pension. Sure enough we found out by looking through his records, he had had a mild attack in the service when he was 19. We were able to get her a 30 per cent disability pension for life and the children will get educational benefits."

The phone rang. Kluger answered it, listened and said, "We'll get it." The request had been for six blood donors for a veteran's wife. At 320 Old Country Road, they care about veterans.

PREVENTIVE DETENTION

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, in recent years at least three crime commissions have recommended the enactment of legislation for pretrial detention in the District of Columbia. A provision to implement these recommendations is included in the omnibus crime bill reported by the District Committee on Monday. The need for this provision is urgent, and I join with many others in the House in supporting its passage.

The policy questions raised by this legislation are of special importance to residents of the District. The crime bill authorizes courts in the District to consider a defendant's potential danger to the community in setting conditions of pretrial release. Further, if the court determines in an adversary hearing not only that there is a "substantial probability" that the defendant has committed a violent crime but also that "there is no condition or combination of conditions of release that will reasonably assure the safety of the community," the defendant may be detained. The time limit on this pretrial custody is 60 days.

This legislation is needed because the Bail Reform Act, which applies to every criminal offense in the District of Columbia, presently forbids courts to consider danger to the community in setting conditions for noncapital offenders. If there was ever any doubt about this, it was laid to rest last April in the case of *United States v. Leathers*, 412 F. 2d 169 (D.C. Cir. 1969). In *Leathers*, the Court of Appeals said:

The Bail Reform Act specifies mandatorily that conditions of pretrial release be set for defendants accused of noncapital offenses. When imposing these conditions, the sole concern of the judicial officer charged with this duty is in establishing the minimal conditions which will "reasonably assure the appearance of the person for trial. . . ." The structure of the Act and its legislative history make it clear that in noncapital cases pretrial detention cannot be premised upon an assessment of danger to the public could the accused be released.

Pretrial release is highly desirable in most cases not only because it secures the liberty of a defendant before trial—a defendant who may not be convicted—but also because it eliminates the expense of unnecessary custody. There is no question but that Congress should continue to support pretrial release as the general rule.

There are, however, some cases in which mandatory pretrial release amounts to a reckless disregard of the public safety. This is why the law must be changed.

Noncapital offenses in the District of Columbia include such serious crimes as forcible rape, arson, kidnaping, armed robbery, burglary, bank robbery, mayhem, assault with intent to kill, manslaughter, and second-degree murder. It does not take much imagination to see that some of the men who perpetrate these crimes pose a clear and present

danger to the public during the period of their pretrial release. Unfortunately, some of these people have nothing to do but make trouble.

Today, a defendant charged with any one of these serious offenses is entitled to pretrial release as a matter of law. The only possible exception is a defendant who is virtually certain to attempt escape. According to the language of the act, a defendant could be charged with any or all of these noncapital offenses—with second-degree murder, kidnaping, rape, armed robbery—and still be entitled to pretrial release. Under the Bail Reform Act, no significance whatever is attached to a defendant's propensities or viciousness. Courts are required to ignore the probability of future crimes.

A law so callously indifferent to the welfare of the public demands the urgent attention of Congress.

Let me illustrate the absurdity of this law.

Several years ago, police in New York City arrested a man who was strongly suspected of committing more than 750 burglaries over a period of 2 years. At the time of his arrest, the man was carrying burglary tools and a stolen coat. In addition, the man fit perfectly the description of a person who had pawned thousands of dollars of stolen property in the city. If this same defendant were arrested in the District of Columbia, he would be entitled to pretrial release as a matter of law simply by saying to the court, "I am not guilty."

A professional burglar regardless of his criminal credentials, regardless of his past record, is entitled to release as a matter of statutory law. All he has to do is to refuse to admit guilt.

More incredible is the fact that if a man like this, suspected of 750 burglaries, is released prior to trial, commits a new crime, and is caught in the act—he is still entitled to pretrial release, under the statute. He can be caught redhanded and he still goes free.

Prof. Herman Goldstein, of the University of Wisconsin Law School, cites a series of incidents involving a gentleman named Anthony Massari in Chicago:

Massari was released from the Illinois State Penitentiary upon completion of a three-year term for burglary and armed robbery in 1961. On July 8, 1963, Massari was apprehended in the act of committing a burglary. He was indicted and released on bail totaling \$7,500. On August 24, 1963, while free on bail, the subject was apprehended in the commission of a second burglary and was found to have in his possession the proceeds of still another burglary committed earlier in the day. He was indicted on two counts of burglary and released on \$4,500 bail. The subject was again arrested on November 18, 1963, when he was found to be in possession of a loaded firearm and burglary tools. On January 16, 1964, he was arrested in the act of committing a burglary and found to have the proceeds of two other burglaries in his possession. He was indicted the following day and released on \$15,000 bail, only to be again arrested on the same afternoon while committing still another burglary for which he was indicted and bail set at \$5,000. Subsequently, he was arrested on February 8, 1964, with release on bail set at \$10,000; again on February 21, 1964, with release on bail of \$5,000; and again on March 5, 1964, when bail was set at \$5,000.

On April 24, 1964, when Massari went to trial, he had been arrested nine times in the

period from July 8, 1963, to March 5, 1964, indicted on ten counts and was free on \$48,500 in bail. He entered a guilty plea to the 10 indictments and was sentenced to from five to 15 years in the penitentiary on each count—the sentences to run concurrently.

Not only would Massari have been released again and again in Washington, he would theoretically have been released without bond unless there was evidence that money bond was essential to secure his presence at trial.

The incidence of burglary is far too great in the District of Columbia for Congress to sit back and allow—even command—that people like Massari be released again and again and again.

But there is an even more serious deficiency in the law. The Bail Reform Act permits not only recidivism but violent recidivism. When we talk about armed robbery and rape, we are talking about violent crime. We are talking about criminals who pose a serious threat to the public.

Take the case of a defendant who is apprehended in the midst of an armed robbery—at a supermarket or a dairy store or a bank. Before he is arrested, he may trade shots with police. After he is arrested, he may prove to be a narcotics addict who is hooked on heroin. This man must steal to support his habit. He must commit crime to survive. And he may be reckless, dangerous, and violent. But all this is irrelevant under the present law, which mandates such a defendant's pretrial release.

Judge Tim Murphy of the court of general sessions was talking about this very problem last year when he told a Senate committee that:

Many cases come before the court in which from the outset there is not a shadow of a doubt about the defendant's guilt. Many of these cases involve dangerous persons whom the judge knows to a moral certainty will repeat their criminal activity if released. Yet under the Bail Reform Act he must release these people to prey on the community. My immediate examples are the holdup man who is in on one, two, three or four gun point holdup charges, and, of course, your narcotic addicts, who because of their illness must commit a crime to support a habit.

These repeated crimes can lead to great tragedy. In Baltimore a few years back, a man named James Larry Bandy was charged with burglary, possession of a deadly weapon, and possession of narcotics. He was released on \$5,000 bond. Shortly thereafter, he attempted to rob a Hot Shoppe Cafeteria. When Patrolman Charles W. Zeller intervened, Bandy shot him in the head, a bullet lodging in the officer's brain. Although the officer lived, surgeons were unable to remove the bullet. I insert two articles related to the case of James Larry Bandy:

[From the Baltimore News-American, Mar. 17, 1964]

ZELLER CASE SUSPECT PRESENTED

The Grand Jury today accused James Larry Bandy, 28, of the 1900 block N. Charles St. of assault with intent to murder a Baltimore policeman and attempted robbery with a deadly weapon.

Presentments alleged Bandy shot Patrolman Charles W. Zeller, a 38-year-old homicide detective, who attempted to break up

an attempted holdup of a cafeteria in the 4500 block Edmondson Ave. last Jan. 8.

Bandy was returned from Long Beach, Calif., last week on charges of burglary, possession of a deadly weapon, and possession of narcotics, separate cases still pending in Baltimore County and Baltimore city courts.

State's Attorney William J. O'Donnell said the fare of one Baltimore detective to California was paid by his office because of the deadly weapon charge against Bandy in the city. The bail bondsman, H. Andy Oberfeld, paid the fare of the other detective from the Fugitive Squad.

Deputy State's Attorney, Charles E. Moylan, Jr., said that he would recommend that a total of \$80,000 bail be set for Bandy, \$50,000 on the charge of shooting Patrolman Zeller, and \$30,000 on the attempted robbery accusation.

Mr. Moylan took Mrs. Nadine Engler, a cashier at the Hot Shoppe before the jurors. She was on duty when a holdup man attempted to rob her and then fled with Patrolman Zeller in pursuit. The fleeing bandit shot the officer in the head in front of the Upland Apartments in the 4500 block Manor-dene Rd., ending the chase.

Patrolman Zeller, still on sick leave, has made remarkable recovery despite the fact that he still carries the bullet in his brain, embedded in a "silent" area so near to vital centers that surgeons decided not to operate.

Lt. Anton Glover said that Bandy was wanted by Baltimore for ball jumping. He said that when officers reached the California city, they received information which led to Bandy's being placed in two police lineups in Baltimore over last weekend. After Bandy was identified in the lineups, one of which was viewed by Mrs. Zeller who was dining with her policeman husband when the holdup occurred, the Grand Jury presentment was arranged.

[From the Baltimore Sun, March 18, 1964]

BAIL JUMPER INDICTED IN ZELLER CASE

James Larry Bandy, 28-year-old ball jumper, was indicted by the grand jury yesterday on charges of attempted murder of Patrolman Charles W. Zeller and an attempt to rob a cafeteria last January 8.

Charles E. Moylan, Jr., deputy State's Attorney, said Bandy will be arraigned this morning before Judge Charles D. Harris in Criminal Court.

Bandy was taken into custody last week in Long Beach, Cal., during a traffic check, and it was learned then that he was wanted as a fugitive here for skipping \$5,000 bail in connection with deadly weapon and barbiturate charges.

BAIL SET AT \$80,000

New bail for the accused, who gave a local address in the 1900 block North Charles Street, was set at a total of \$80,000 by William J. O'Donnell, State's Attorney.

Bandy is charged with attempting to murder Patrolman Zeller by shooting him in the head.

The police victim was shot while chasing a holdup man after the armed robbery try at the Hot Shoppe Cafeteria in the 4500 block Edmondson Avenue.

Patrolman Zeller, 38, was in critical condition for weeks. Doctors never removed the bullet and it remains lodged in his head.

A second indictment accuses Bandy of attempting to rob with a deadly weapon Mrs. Mildred N. Engler, cashier of the Edmondson Village eating place.

The indictments were returned by the grand jury after testimony was taken from Detective Lt. Anton Glover, Detective Sgt. Donald Sutton, and Sgt. Louis Brandt.

Mr. Speaker, what is truly shocking is that if someone like James Larry Bandy attempts to rob a cafeteria in the Dis-

trict of Columbia, and if he shoots a police officer in the head while trying to escape, the Bail Reform Act would require that he be given pretrial release. The Bail Reform Act would see to it that he was back on the streets, free to pursue his criminal activities.

The Congress of the United States cannot tolerate this irrational law any longer. The Bail Reform Act must be amended to take account of the dangerous defendant.

Washington, D.C., has become the Capital of fear, the Capital of terror, for thousands and thousands of our citizens. The Bail Reform Act is partly responsible.

This law must be changed to permit courts to consider a defendant's danger to the community. This is a duty we owe to the country.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a contest for students throughout the United States and U.S. territories. The winning speech for this year on "Freedom's Challenge" was written by Miss Jennie M. Veno, who resides in the Canal Zone. Her mother, a widow, is a legal resident of my congressional district.

Over 400,000 young students participated in this contest, competing for five scholarships, which are awarded to the top prizewinners.

I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to Miss Veno's well-written and very perceptive essay. Miss Veno has as one of her major themes in this essay the idea that each man, every individual in this Nation, has a responsibility for seeing that democracy continues. This is something that should be stressed, and I commend her for discussing it. It is good to attempt to change things that are wrong, but at the same time, each American must practice democracy and just not talk about it.

Again, I commend this essay to my colleagues as an indication of the serious thought in which American students are engaged. It follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Jennie M. Veno, Curundu, C.Z.)

A Government by the people that strives for happiness, equality of rights, privileges and freedom, for the individual. This is Democracy and we are the people who are challenged to produce and maintain these ideals.

Some people seem to think that Democracy is faltering, maybe they just think it's old-fashioned and slow, but dreams don't come true over night. They also don't come true by sleeping. People who believe that Democracy is falling desire freedom, but what is Democracy if it does not mean freedom? They protest with riots, demonstrations, fighting and marching. People who do this can be compared to a spoiled child throwing a tan-

trum to get what he wants. These acts only help to destroy what we already have. Protesters say that they are attempting to secure freedom, yet they sometimes infringe upon the freedom of others. Instead of acting this way they should try to work out a set of standards, rules, or whatever it is they would like and to present them as civilized adults. They could propose reasonable possibilities of advancement that can be tossed around by all. That is the Democratic way.

There are certain ideals which our Democracy must preserve. Education is one of these. It determines the types of things a person can comprehend and enjoy. Every person has an equal opportunity to obtain the best form of education. We should take advantage of this convenience and we must maintain this opportunity for our children.

Our ideals of happiness and equality must also be saved. To do this we cannot allow people to become divided under any type of classification. When this happens one group is bound to feel deprived or superior, then conflicts arise. The freedom, well being and happiness of all concerned is then in danger. As we are all aware the racial problem is a split and must be sealed because it is threatening the ideals for which we are fighting.

It is up to us students, the future leaders, to continue this fight for freedom and not let its progress be hindered by nationalism, imperialism, Communism or Fascism. We cannot let their voices become louder than our cry for a sound democracy that produces freedom.

In order to defend our freedom we must be willing to fight for it. We have to understand and believe in what we fight for. We must be patriotic and strong. We will have to uphold our self-esteem and America's great image in this modern world. It will be impossible to do so by turning our backs when some one threatens our way of life. We must be ready to defend any of our policies.

All through the ages mighty empires were created by people who were proud and had the desire to advance, to progress and they fought gratefully to obtain these.

Those of us who cannot have the privilege of fighting should do our part by keeping well informed in current events, by voting and writing to our Congressman or the President when we feel we should. We must keep our patriotic spirit alive by passing it on to our children and others, (by living every day as a model citizen, obeying laws, and having a genuine interest in the welfare of our Country). It is our duty to help obtain a secure freedom for ourselves and our children.

If we follow these steps, we will be meeting the challenge that our Democratic ideals present and we will also be setting an example for future generations to follow.

MILITARY CODE WILL NOT RECOGNIZE ITS OWN MISTAKES AND INJUSTICES

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1970

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, one of America's true war heroes is now languishing in a naval stockade—the victim of our military system which is failing dismally to support fully our fighting men in Vietnam.

I refer, of course, to the celebrated and tragic case of Marine Lance Cpl. Denzil Allen, of Lebanon, Ind.

Denzil is a 22-year-old veteran of the Vietnam War where he was wounded and decorated.

Allen is receiving unjust treatment at the hands of the Nation which he so bravely and courageously represented on the battlefield.

While the shaggy draft dodgers cover in the traitors' dens of Canada and Sweden, men like Corporal Allen have fought and died against the Communist enemy in Southeast Asia.

Unless the American people are aroused, no doubt Corporal Allen will be in prison after the conflict has ended while the traitors in Canada and Sweden slink back to their affluent homeland for a chunk of the good life, unprosecuted and unmaligned.

I believe in all sincerity that Corporal Allen is the victim of a military code that will not recognize its own mistakes and injustices.

More than 70,000 residents of Indiana have petitioned President Nixon for the release of Corporal Allen. Countless resolutions have been passed, numerous meetings held, and the prayers of thousands of Americans have been offered for Allen.

Yet, he still is imprisoned.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD a series of articles written by managing editor Owen P. Hansen, of the Lebanon, Ind., Reporter, who visited Corporal Allen in his prison cell and has prepared a fine resumé of the case.

I ask that every Member of Congress examine the circumstances of this case and join with me in insisting that Corporal Allen be free to enjoy the fruits and happiness of a land that he so ably and honorably represented.

The articles follow:

WHO CAN HELP DENZIL?

We are often asked here at The Reporter: "Who can do something for Denzil Allen?"

We believe most people are concerned with justice in the case but feel frustrated in any individual attempts to get anything done.

There was a time when it appeared politically popular to defend the young Lebanon Marine. At one juncture, at least two Indiana Congressmen, two Hoosier senators and three or four out-of-state solons were making noise in Allen's behalf.

At the present time, we know of only U.S. Congressman Richard L. Roudebush who seems genuinely sincere about following through in Allen's effort.

And, as much as we hate to think it may be the case, we fear that only our representatives and senators can eventually get the proper review of Allen's case that it deserves.

Elected officials from the President on down, we believe, have a false idea of the sentiment concerning Denzil Allen and those charged at My Lai. Too many of them, it seems, have the feeling that the American public is angered by what these men have done in combat situations. We feel differently. We believe the American public supports the Denzil Allens of the country and in fact those who were at My Lai.

For in both instances, conditions there were different than at the present. The Tet Offensive was underway and American troops were trained to trust no one. Hundreds of Americans were being killed weekly and the enemy Cong and the Vietnamese friend looked identical.

We sent American boys to Vietnam to defend this country and we taught them to kill. We believe the American public recognizes

this and will bear the responsibility for their actions.

The concept to win has been built into all American men from the time they began playing marbles to the day they take the battlefield. The concept of war follows this same innate desire for it is there to kill or be killed, to win or lose, to defend a country or surrender it.

We believe the American public should make itself truly known regarding those we would punish. Only then will concerned Congressmen and Senators hear us.

Give us an Army of Denzil Allens as opposed to a league of bewiskered peace protesters when defending America and the war would have long ago ended.

Our country is treating Denzil Allen unjustly. And it is high time someone came to his aid.

DENZIL ALLEN SO ALONE IN CONFINEMENT

(By Owen P. Hansen)

(EDITOR'S NOTE—Reporter managing Editor Owen Hansen this week visited Denzil Allen, Lebanon Marine convicted of murder and sentenced to 20 years at the Naval Stockade in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. Here are his reactions:)

Yesterday's hero . . . and the war he braved, Seems forgotten today . . . by those he saved.

U.S. NAVAL STOCKADE, PORTSMOUTH, N.H.

A remorseful yet reflective and learned yet lonely Denzil Allen met newsmen here Monday at an exclusive conference to discuss the Lebanon Marine's treatment and thoughts concerning alleged Vietnam atrocities.

"What happened with our platoon and what happened at My Lai are common practices . . . some of us just happen to get caught," Allen commented.

"When you are preparing for combat you are taught that the Vietnamese are gooks, and slant-eyes, and grunts, and goats . . . they are not human beings. And when you are conditioned to taking these lives, how are you going to know when to turn it off."

Allen has become quite philosophical during his 18 months confinement. He has requested to be housed in the block section which houses the cells for more privacy. "It's too noisy and there's too much yelling and fighting going on in the bays," he said.

Described as a model prisoner, Allen reads everything he can get his hands on while not working as a linotype operator in the prison print shop. "Descarte, Plato, Berkeley, Kant, I've gotten quite interested in philosophy," the good-looking, two-tour combat veteran recalled. "I know I can never get rich studying philosophy . . . if I could get out I'd just want to be left alone . . . I'm not interested in getting rich, I just want to learn, to absorb an education."

And Allen is getting an early start on the education. In addition to obtaining his high school diploma by correspondence, the 22-year-old confinee is taking an I.U. English course. He received his first paper back from IU last week having written on "Eating a Meal While Being Harassed In Boot Camp." His next paper will be on "Serving In a Combat Zone And The Absurdity Of War."

Allen is the last of the four convicted of killing five Vietnamese May 5-6 near Hue to be retained in prison. John B. Belknap was discharged two weeks ago and James Maushart and Anthony Liccardo went free last week.

Allen's attorney, George Martz, of Indianapolis, also present for the conference, contends that the other three were equally as guilty as Allen for the Hue slaying.

Allen pleaded guilty to premeditated murder and got a life sentence which was reduced to 20 years by agreement. Martz contends Allen had been ill-advised by his Marine attorney at the time. "Premeditation is built into war . . . it is built in during boot

training to kill the enemy . . . that's the nature of war," Martz said. Martz has an appeal pending before the First U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals as well as pleas before the Marine Clemency Board and the Appeals Board.

So far, it has appeared to be a "pass the buck" type of legal lethargy which finds each court or board requiring one of the other two to take action before it will concern itself with the Allen case.

"The biggest mistake I've ever done is trying to do something for my country . . . the country doesn't appreciate it," Allen said when asked if he had regrets over what he had done.

The slim, 5'11" 175 pound Boone native has always contended that he believed the Vietnamese he and his men slew and were convicted of were Viet Cong. He can recall explicit times and instances surrounding the killings.

Allen had put in 10 months of combat duty from 1956-66 and was once wounded. He was home until 1968 and was then told his company was ordered merely on a cruise to Hawaii. Once there, the group was off to its second term in Vietnam. The second tour came during the latter part of the Tet offensive when casualties were heavy. The day before Easter 13 of his platoon were killed and 17 injured when they walked into an ambush. Death was a frequent visitor to friends of Allen and by early May, only three men in Allen's original 5 man platoon were still fighting.

The night before the slayings, Allen found himself in charge of his platoon when his Sgt. for some reason didn't awake during a heavy assault by North Vietnamese troops. He called in an air assault immediately over his own men run back the NVA and save a vital crossing point which the enemy had hoped could be used for troop infiltration during a second Tet.

It was this setting that led up to what ultimately happened.

"I had no right to take another man's life . . . but I can't bring them back. Knowing what I know now, if I had my life to live over, I wouldn't go over there."

"When I was over there on my first tour, I had feelings for the Vietnamese people. I tried to bury one VC I found dead and got reprimanded for it . . . Little by little I changed and the second tour I hated them all."

Allen said he signed the guilty plea because he was scared. The defense counsel claimed that Allen asked to sign the pleading. Martz showed a letter Allen had written his mother the same night as he signed the document saying he was "not sure" he was doing the right thing and asking for advice here.

"Abolish the military all over the world. If I was advising a young man now who was about to go over there, I'd tell him to go to Canada before I'd advise him to fight."

Allen, it is evident, is becoming bitter. "I can take six more years in here mentally but physically, I'm not sure," he said appearing to be drained of desire.

Allen said he used to get letters. Only a few nowadays.

Allen said he had planned to marry a girl from South Bend while nearing his duty's end. She left him when he was confined.

A lonely ex-soldier walked back to his cell in the dismal and damp New Hampshire afternoon. He has no business there.

NEW MAN HAS BEEN MOLDED FROM RIGORS OF WAR, PALL OF PRISON

The Portsmouth Naval Stockade which Denzil Allen calls home, is located in the midst of a sprawling shipyard situated near the Maine-New Hampshire state boundaries.

No cameras are allowed at the fringe areas or on the grounds of the base because of the submarines which are serviced there.

And at the north end of the base is the three story white, cellblock section which identifies the prison compound. It is here Allen prefers to live rather than with others because of quietness.

Allen's schedule is simple. He works at the base print shop from 9 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. and from 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. Monday through Friday. "We used to have enough to keep us busy all of the time but now we only have about a half day's work," Allen said. He learned to be a linotype operator while in confinement.

Allen looks physically fit and says he can't complain about the treatment. He seems liked by those around him. "We get enough to eat . . . beef three times a week . . . I can't complain."

Complaining is one thing Allen is not experienced in. In recalling incidents of his combat and of the death of the victims in his group's massacre, Allen is careful not to place blame on anyone other than himself nor will he mention names of others.

Prison routine: Sunday afternoon, Monday and Tuesday evenings there are movies . . . Wednesday and Saturday evenings are gym call for the 670 inmates and on Thursday and Friday evenings, good behavior permits watching television.

Little really interests Allen except reading. He says he reads newspapers sparingly because so much of them are localized. His favorite reading material next to his philosophy books are the weekly Time magazines he gets. "They do a good job of interpreting the events of the world and nation," Allen said.

But despite the fact that guards at the stockade seem friendly and conditions are tolerable, freedom is lost.

Each article sent to the Lebanon Marine must conform to authorized items or they won't be delivered to him. Last week, his mother, Mrs. Earl Allen, of Lebanon, sent a cartridge for his pen. They sent back the entire package and gave no reason. She returned it and they again would not make delivery. She is still perplexed as to what she might have done wrong.

His visitors have been few in the 18 months he has been at Portsmouth. His sister and brother and attorney have visited him there and his mother and father have been with him during a court hearing. Jack Shepherd, writer for Look Magazine, was also a special guest of Denzil's in May of 1969.

Allen's attitudes have changed drastically, spawned to a degree by loneliness and confinement. He says he has no desire to get married and wants no part of having any children. "The world has too many people in it without me adding to the problem," he commented.

So, while Allen in his 22 years of life has had little real time of his own, prison has provided him with more of an understanding of himself than he had as a youngster.

Leaving home after quitting junior high school, Allen has known only the regimentation of boot training, months of combat, and now confinement for what he felt was a career he wanted—to be a U.S. Marine.

YOU JUST CAN'T SEEM TO TRUST ANYONE— EVIDENCE STRONG WAR WARPS MINDS

"Every individual has his own threshold at which point he loses control . . . hunger, lack of sleep, or a number of days of continual combat may lower the threshold."—Dr. Joyce Brothers.

There is strong evidence that Denzil Allen, a 20-year-old Lebanon Marine did not know right from wrong on May 5-6, 1968 when five Vietnamese were slain near Hue.

And this is the point which appeared to be overlooked when the good-looking Marine was encouraged to plead guilty to a count of premeditated murder in connection with their deaths.

Allen entered the plea upon advice from

Capt. Sandy McMath, a court-appointed Marine Captain who had never before tried a murder case as either a Marine or civilian. Allen's civilian attorney, George Martz, of Indianapolis, has termed McMath's defense of Allen a fraud on the court and inexcusable.

Because of Allen's plea, he is destined to spend the next six years at confinement in the Portsmouth, NH stockade. Allen would then be 28 years old—he went into service as a volunteer at 17.

Since it was a week after the Vietnamese were slain that Allen was charged, no immediate psychiatric examination was conducted. And then Martz charged that Capt. McMath failed to have anyone at all examine the accused for possible mental disorders before pleading him guilty.

Although in retrospect, Martz twice has had Allen examined.

Dr. Robert Steavenson, of Columbus, Ohio, a 21 year veteran in the field concluded that Allen was "suffering a major mental illness at the time and was unable to distinguish right from wrong."

Dr. Louis Nie, of Indianapolis, 26 years in psychiatry and 21 years board certified, concluded that he could not definitely find a major mental illness but it seems probable that "hunger, anxiety, fear, and anger, had robbed him of his ability to distinguish between right and wrong and unable to adhere to what is considered right."

Allen's apparent break-down is not isolated from the incidents at My Lai now under investigation. The condition of the war at that time must first be brought into focus. Fighting was heavy. Casualties in 1968 had been high to the Americans. Every stranger was under suspect.

Dr. Robert J. Lifton, psychiatrist and professor of the Yale School of Medicine puts it this way: ". . . you must realize that many of these men had witnessed the death of buddies. That is a profound experience for any fighting man and something they feel directly. It automatically renders each of these men a kind of survivor. And the survivor has a special kind of psychology in which he finds some meaning in the death he has witnessed especially the death of a buddy. He seems guilty having survived while the other man died," he said when writing on the My Lai incident.

Is this type of behavior limited only to a few such as the Denzil Allens or the men who allegedly took part in the My Lai massacre?

"I think everything we know of human behavior shows that under extreme situations a large number of people are capable of this same behavior. So it doesn't reflect a lack of moral fiber or a moral inferiority of any kind but rather an impossible situation. And with the enormous stresses, anyone would be capable of this behavior, Dr. Lifton said.

Allen recalls that there was a great deal of difference between his first and second tour of duty in Vietnam. During the first the enemy was easily turned back and there was mostly light contact. "The second time was a lot different. They would stay and fight you just as long as you would . . . even longer."

Allen believes many of his enemy were high on dope or narcotics. He recalled some running at him with no apparent fear of death . . . "they would just keep coming no matter how many times you would hit them."

"One of the most frustrating things about the war is that you never know who the enemy is," a reflecting Allen commented. "You just can't seem to trust anyone."

What of Allen now? Could he adjust to normal civilian life if dismissed?

"Naturally," his attorney responded. He is much more stable than most of us. Who could have lived what he has gone through without breaking sooner than he did.

But, how long can this confinement and

resentment build up in a young man who is wasting away the best years of his life? Is the question asked by those who know him.

How much must one individual endure?

THREE IRONS IN LEGAL FIRES—BUT FREEDOM FOR DENZIL ALLEN SLOW

What's ahead for Denzil Allen?

Facing a 20 year sentence imposed for the slaying of five Vietnamese, which Allen still regards as Viet Cong, the young Lebanon Marine can look forward only to a release after a minimum of eight years behind bars.

The only hope he and his family have is the efforts of his attorney and public sentiment.

Allen's attorney, George Martz, Indianapolis, is hopeful that either the civilian courts or the military review tribunal will give careful thought to his clients actions leading up to the incident May 5-6 at Hue or the allegedly faulty defense which followed in the case.

"Some type of organized effort with responsible leadership could help us immensely," Martz said. "We need a pressure group which can keep the issue alive."

Martz, who has made 11 trips to Portsmouth in the past eighteen months, has

at least three irons in the fire. Martz hopes first rests with the Court of Military Appeals which could grant a review of the case. There is a petition on file with this court claiming Allen's defense was faulty and that a fraud was committed in not allowing the young Marine a psychiatric examination before he was counseled to plead guilty to the charge.

Second, the First Circuit Court of Appeals has before it a petition for a writ of Habeas Corpus which asks that a civilian body look into the sentence. This court has refused to act earlier until the military remedies have been exhausted.

And thirdly, the Clemency Board of the U.S. Navy has been asked to review the case which could act if the Board of Clemency refuses.

Should the U.S. Court of Appeals refuse to consider the case, Martz says the door then would be open to see whether the U.S. Supreme Court will grant a hearing.

"It's a slow process and sometimes we get the feeling that there must be a quicker way," Martz said.

The secretary of the Navy won't intercede until others have reviewed the case and President Nixon, who was shown petitions bearing the names of 50,000 Hoosiers has de-

clined to get into the matter until other avenues have been exhausted.

But, despite the delays, there seems evidence that the American public is aware of the imprisonment of the 22-year old combat veteran. "There isn't a day goes by that someone—a cab driver or a man on the street—doesn't ask me what's being done for Denzil," Martz says. The Indianapolis attorney believes the majority of the people—those called the silent majority—support American forces and what they do in a war called the most bizarre in the country's history.

Faith in the courts has not waned for the parents of Allen, Mr. and Mrs. Earl Allen, of Lebanon, who write to their son regularly. They are the only ones who can receive mail from Denzil although anyone may write to him by addressing their correspondence to Denzil Allen, 7462, Building 93, Naval Activities, Portsmouth, N.H. 03801. "We believe it would do much to cheer him up . . . to let him know that someone is thinking of him," Mrs. Allen said.

Allen himself has his doubts.

When his attorney left him this week saying, "I'll see you again as soon as I can get back," Allen responded: "Don't worry . . . I'll be here."

SENATE—Tuesday, March 10, 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 God, our Father, without whose help we can do nothing great or good, help us so to live that we may bring help to others, credit to ourselves and to the Nation we serve.

Help us to be patient with those who are slow to learn and slow to understand. Give us a good disposition Lord, that in all our difficulties we may be part of the solution and not part of the problem. As we strive to follow Thee, wilt Thou follow us with Thy goodness and mercy that we may abide in Thy love eternally. For Thy name's sake. 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 10, 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 Monday, March 9, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK TOMORROW MORNING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (Subsequently, this order was modified to provide for an adjournment until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.)

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 OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask

unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS AND LOCKHEED AIRCRAFT CORP.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, by letter of March 2, 1970, Lockheed Aircraft Corp. informed Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard that unless there was a quick resolution between Lockheed and the Department on a variety of differences between them amounting to \$600 million, it would be "financially impossible for Lockheed to complete performance of these programs."

The company stated that for it to complete the delivery of 81 C-5A aircraft during 1971 and 1972, "an additional \$435 to \$500 million will be required to cover production expenditures."

This is a shocking and scandalous situation. But it is not the final event in a series of shocking and scandalous events which have shattered public confidence in defense contracting and in the military procurement system.

I rise to warn the Congress and the public that the Air Force and Department of Defense may once again take action which is not in the public interest. That they have done so in the past is attested to by a myriad of actions. Their unwise and improper actions include signing a bad contract, withholding information, providing misleading and erroneous data, and firing A. E. Fitzgerald, to name only a few.

The possible alternative answers to the Lockheed plea for a bailout proposed by Secretary Packard on behalf of the Pentagon, gives very little confidence that either the taxpayers' interest or the security of the country will be served.