EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE ROLE OF RURAL TELEPHONE SERVICE IN RESTORING A POPULATION BALANCE

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, one of our distinguished colleagues, Congressman ED JONES of Tennessee, made some very excellent and incisive comments recently concerning the quality of life in rural America. Congressman JONES made these comments during a speech to the 16th annual meeting of the National Telephone Cooperative Association in New Orleans on February 4.

Several of his remarks were directed to one of the most pressing problems now facing both the people of rural America as well as those citizens who reside in our urban centers. This is the problem of out-migration of people from the farm to the city, from the rural towns and cities to the crowded and problem-plagued megalopolises.

This problem is creating major problems for both our rural areas which are losing population that they need, and it is creating problems for our cities which lack the facilities, the finances, and the opportunities to assimilate these new residents. This is a problem that deserves national attention, and Congressman JONES has helped us to bring this problem into a clearer focus.

Because Congressman JONES is an expert on this subject, and because his comments are worthy of consideration by every Member of this Congress, I request that they be printed in the RECORD at this point:

THE ROLE OF RURAL TELEPHONE SERVICE IN RESTORING A POPULATION BALANCE

(By Congressman ED JONES)

It is a genuine pleasure for me to be here with you ladies and gentlemen of the NTCA in this magnificent old Roosevelt Hotel. Many times I have listened to radio broadcasts from the famous Blue Room here. I suppose everyone in America is familiar with the clear channel voice of WWL, New Orleans.

Since I last saw many of you, I have had the good fortune of being elected to represent the Eighth District of Tennessee in Congress. This new responsibility has proved to be unusually hard work, but I believe I am in a better position now to serve the country, the people of my district, and those beliefs I hold concerning government.

Some of you will recall that I wrote an article for the August issue of "Phone Call." In that article I mentioned that I had been appointed to serve on the House Committee on Agriculture, the committee that I feel I am best qualified to serve on.

My service on this committee has enabled me to broaden my scope of understanding. I have had a fairly thorough grounding in the problems of agriculture, both in its specifics and in its general picture. What serving on the Agriculture Committee has done for me is to make me more aware of how agriculture fits into the overall picture of American life. And, frankly, I have become even more aware of the importance of rural America to the national scene.

Everyone is familiar with what has become known as the urban crisis or as the problem of the inner cities. But what is not clear to everyone is that the problems of the cities and the problems of rural America are bound together by a common cause.

Since World War II, there has been an unparalleled exodus of people from the countryside and small towns of this nation to the big cities. During this period of twenty-five years, more than twenty million Americans have left the rural areas for the urban centers. In 1940, our farm population was over thirty-and-a-half million, but at last count (1968) only slightly more than ten million remained on the farm. This tremendous decrease in the number of people living on farms has occurred in spite of a growth in our total population of fifty-five million persons in the same period of time.

Our population has shifted so drastically that more than seventy-two per cent of our people now live on just two per cent of our land. Our cities are literally bursting at the seams, while rural America is becoming deserted.

Many of our nation's problems can be traced to this shift in population patterns. For example, Former Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman feels that poverty and welfare, violence, unemployment, crime in the streets, housing and health problems "could be linked to a migration from rural America that resulted in too many people on too little space."

Psychologists tell us that when a human being becomes too crowded, he is likely to experience psychological turmoil, and his behavior is likely to become erratic. Is it any wonder, then, that our cities are having problems when nearly three-quarters of our people are packed into the urban centers?

On the other hand, small town merchants all across the country are finding fewer and fewer people to buy their wares. Small town industries in many areas are having trouble finding people to man their machines. The result of this, of course, is to encourage further migration to the cities and further drain on the resources of rural America. (I do not need to remind you that these ex-rural Americans no longer pay taxes where they formerly lived.)

The urban centers are crowded because most industries are located there, and that is where the industrial jobs are. Most government installations are also located in or near cities, and that is where the government jobs are. The simple fact is that people go where the jobs are.

Thus, we see that the problems of the cities and the problems of the rural areas can be traced back to the same cause: the migration of our people.

What we must do is to reverse the trend. We must induce people to move out of the cities and into the rural areas. We must seek to arrive at a population balance. We must do this not only to prevent the cities from exploding, but to prevent rural America from drying up.

Two weeks ago, those of us who are concerned with this problem received some encouragement. The president, in his State of the Union Message, publicly acknowledge the problem. In his speech, the president said:

"For the past thirty years our population has been growing and shifting. The result is exemplified in the vast areas of rural America emptying out of people and of promise—a third of our counties lost population in the 1960s.

"The violent and decayed central cities of our great metropolitan complexes are the most conspicuous areas of failure in American life.

"I propose that before these problems become insoluble, the nation develop a national growth policy. Our purpose will be to find those means by which Federal, state, and local government can influence the course of urban settlement and growth so as positively to affect the quality of American life.

"What rural America needs is a new kind of assistance. It needs to be dealt with not as a separate nation, but as a part of an overall growth policy for all America.

"We must create a new rural environment that will not only stem the migration to urban centers but reverse it."

I was especially happy to hear the president make this statement, since I obviously agree with him on this goal. Of course, Congress has not received his specific proposals as yet. It would be unreasonable for us to expect them so soon. But I do have some definite specifics in mind.

To reverse the population trend and to create this new rural environment the president speaks of, we must encourage rural industrialization, perhaps with tax incentives for industries which move out of the cities and into the rural areas. We can decentralize our government installations by moving some of them to the countryside. We can promote tourism; we can encourage agriculture; we can improve education and recreation in rural areas; and we can provide for the renewal and expansion of such services as central water, waste disposal, and telephone systems.

The means for many of these steps are already under our noses, especially the one concerning rural telephone service. I am referring to the program which has been the lifeblood of rural telephony in America, the REA two percent loan program.

Let us face the facts, gentlemen, this program is in danger. I know that our Executive Manager, Dave Fullerton, gave you a complete rundown on the current status of the supplemental financing bills at the general session this afternoon. He mentioned the danger that supplemental financing programs of any type have always presented to the two per cent loan program. I know for a fact that these dangers are very real. My support, and that of NTCA, for supplemental financing legislation has always been predicated on the assumption that the two per cent program would need to be continued as at present for at least another fifteen years. I know there are people in the Congress and within the Administration who view the supplemental bank as an opportunity to diminish or eliminate the traditional two per cent loan program. Until this time the Administration has offered no official recognition to this theory. In fact, the President's budget submitted to the Congress last Monday contains a fiscal year 1971 REA loan appropriations request for 125 million dollars.

This may be regarded as a minor victory because the program has not been drastically cut and it is widely known that the Bureau of the Budget has been looking with disfavor at all Federal direct loan programs.

However, everyone seriously interested in the rural telephone program—bringing modern, efficient service to rural America—realizes that this 125 million dollar annual appropriation is becoming increasingly inadequate.

I do not believe—based upon recent history—that this administration request will meet strong opposition in the Congress. Neither do I believe there will be any immediate groundswell of support for a major increase in the figure.

The rural telephone program is a part of the regular appropriations process. The approval of the loan program request, although far from sure is, to a certain extent, a part of the Congress's regular routine of business.

It will, of course, require considerable work on your part, and on mine and on that of our allies in Congress, to maintain the appropriation's present level, and will be even more difficult to convince members of the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate of the need to raise the amount.

I talked at length last weekend with my fellow members of the NTCA Board and I know that they—and you—realize the need for an annual appropriation of at least 140 million dollars for next year. So do I.

I do not think there is any question that telephone borrowers, commercial as well as cooperative, urgently require considerably more government capital than they are presently receiving. As an additional statistic which I know you will find of interest, the current amount of telephone loan requests outstanding with REA as of December 31, 1969, is more than 394 million dollars. This represents an increase of more than 91 million dollars in a single year.

Despite this apparently obvious need, how convincing NTCA and its allies can be in persuading Congress to increase this amount is another matter.

Quite frankly, at this stage of the game, I feel that it will be very difficult to get the annual two per cent appropriation raised much above 125 million dollars. We may find, as the session moves along, that this becomes increasingly true as a supplemental financing bill comes closer to reality. You may rest assured that I personally will do all that I can to see that if an increase is possible, it will be accomplished. However, as a freshman Democrat elected from a district which the President's party had high hopes of capturing for the first time in history, I find that I do not possess a tremendous amount of pull with the Administration or with the Bureau of the Budget. I also should caution you that along with our apprehensions about the Bureau's plans for our program, they have also in the past demonstrated a reluctance to spend amounts in excess of that requested by the Administration.

What this means in terms of concrete realities is that each loan request made at REA has a built-in delay factor of three years before approval and even longer before any funds are actually advanced.

This is the background for the hard decisions that you the membership must make here at the Roosevelt. The needs for additional capital are painfully obvious. 1971 will probably represent the best chance we shall have for achieving passage of a telephone supplemental bank bill. As you know the bill reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee is not nearly so satisfactory as the bill currently bottled up in the House Rules Committee. Supporting passage of the supplemental financing bills does represent, as I have said, a very real hazard to our current two per cent loan program, regardless of how often we say, "It ain't so."

I intend to work for passage of H.R. 7. by the House in its current form. Chairman Colmer of the Rules Committee has recently stated he will act more promptly in 1970 to bring legislation favored by the House majority to the floor for action. I have been working with my fellow Tennessee delegates, Reps. Anderson and Quillen, on the Rules Committee and will continue to press for passage of H.R. 7.

We need this additional source of funds badly enough that I feel we must make a full effort to gain passage of the legislation during this session of Congress. The association leadership, quite frankly, is looking to you, the membership, for a definition of just what we can accept. I find changes the Administration proposed unacceptable and though the most harmful of these changes were deleted by the Senate Committee, some very significant alterations remain. Facing reality, we may not have the black-white option of choosing a bill with or without them, but rather an actual "shades of gray" position of having to determine how many changes we can accept in the legislation before it is judged to be not sufficiently useful to us to be worth the risk it entails to the two per cent program. The choice is still ours, ladies and gentlemen, but the time to act is here at the 16th Annual Meeting. By the 17th Meeting next year in Houston, this question will be, I predict, for good or otherwise, a matter of history.

That part of the president's State of the Union Message I quoted earlier does give us some hope. At least it gives us a lever. We must keep him reminded of his promise "to create a new rural environment" and keep him reminded that NTCA is already here and waiting for him to fulfill his promise. If he truly wants to start a movement back to the country, adequate funding of rural telephone cooperatives is the best starting point he will find.

If we are to solve the problems of the cities and the problems of rural America, we must have a redistribution of our population. To entice the people to move back to the country will cost money. I can conceive of no more logical place to spend this money than with the two per cent loan program.

In conclusion, I would like to leave you with a few thoughts about the value of your national association. As our president indicated in his kind introduction, over the years I have been active in a number of groups and associations and have been privileged to serve as an officer or board member of several. In truth I can say, however, that I have always particularly appreciated NTCA. During my years as a board member and as president of the Yorkville Telephone Cooperative and during the past years which I served as national director for Region III, I have had the opportunity to become uniquely familiar with our association. As a member and as an officer, while self-esteem no doubt colors my opinion, I have felt that NTCA has always done an outstanding job of representing the membership and, through the leadership of its officers, taking the lead in educating the membership to realize the problems we face in the industry.

During the past year in which I have served in the Congress, I have gained a new insight and appreciation into the value of NTCA to the membership. Consider the strides we have made as an association. We have increased the annual two per cent loan appropriation to the 125 million dollar level and have moved the supplemental financing bill to the promising position in which it is today. If there were such a thing as a "Lobbyist of the Year" award for the group which has accomplished the most for its membership with the least financial muscle and staff, NTCA should certainly get it. There does not seem to be any other group attempting to effectively represent the interests of the small, independent rural telephone company.

Lobbying, in the sense of supplying information and assistance to members of Congress, is a valid and necessary function. The volume of business of the Congress is just too large for the members and their staffs to handle alone.

In my office we enjoy a special relationship with the staff of NTCA, but I also welcome the assistance of other groups. I want to know who they are, who they represent, and what they want. On an association's part, this requires personal contact, getting to know me and my key staff people, writing positions statements for our files, assisting my staff with testimony drafts and statements, keeping us informed of a bill's progress through committees, etc. All of this type of work takes up association staff time and budget and does not bring the association a dime. But it is probably the most valuable work you can do.

I have spoken briefly about the need for increasing our effort in the area of legislative work—because it is a subject in which I have recently been undergoing a "crash course"—we have similar needs for expansion in many other areas of our association's activity. On the whole I think we have succeeded in accomplishing an amazing amount given our limited means at NTCA. But we need to do more. For this reason your Board of Directors has developed "Project-75", our long-range growth plan. I strongly supported this effort and am most gratified by the fine reception it has received by the membership. If the by-laws changes necessary to fully implement "Project-75" are approved at tomorrow's business session, I personally will consider it the single most important step forward the NTCA membership has taken in the years I have been associated with them.

Facing realities, as small, independent telephone companies, we are fighting what many people consider the inevitable trend of the future in our industry. During the next decade the pressure will be on every one of our systems to provide service fully comparable to the best in the nation, especially if we succeed in beginning a migration back to the country. Improving our position in the industry will take a major commitment from all of us. Building a stronger, more effective national association is a logical first step in the process.

Thank you.

THE TRADITIONALLY BLACK COLLEGE

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, a great many people have over the last few years evinced great concern over the progress and problems within the black community. Of particular interest has been the network of traditionally black colleges which still enroll over one-half of the black youth in degree credit 4-year college courses. One hundred and sixty thousand were enrolled in the fall of 1968.

There are 111 of these colleges: 68 private and 43 public. Of these 89 4-year colleges and universities, 78 are accredited; a higher proportion than is true nationally. They are located mainly in the Southern and border States, but serve a national population. Sixty percent are from the South and 40 percent are from outside the South in the 4-year colleges and universities.

This paper sets forth the contributions of these institutions to the stability of the American social order. Without them, the black community would be akin to the underdeveloped communities of Asia and Africa in educational attainments. Out of families with an average income of $3,900, these colleges are producing over 20,000 graduates annually. I include the paper at this point in the RECORD:

THE FACE AMERICA PRESENTS TO THE WORLD

One-half of the fourteen black United Nations appointments graduated from black colleges.

Four of the eight most recent black Ambassadors graduated from black colleges, including Patricia Harris, Luxembourg, and Franklin Williams, Ghana. Three of the other four made their careers in black colleges as teachers and administrators.

Army Officers: At least 75% of the Black

Army officers commissioned each year come from Black Colleges. A poll of Black Military Instructors in ROTC programs estimated at least the same percentage of the 5,594 Black officers now on active duty graduated from Black Colleges.

BLACK COLLEGES AND AMERICA'S IMAGE OF ITSELF

Executive Branch of The National Government: 64% of 80 federal officials currently serving and over the last five years (GS 14 up to Cabinet level) graduated from Black Colleges including Robert J. Brown, Special Assistant to The President; James Farmer, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; and Elizabeth Koontz, Director of the Women's Bureau Department of Labor.

Congress of The United States: Four of the nine Black Representatives in The House attended or graduated from Black Colleges as well as Senator Edward Brooke of Massachusetts.

State Legislators: 64% of the Black State Representatives who went to college went to Black Colleges. These include states such as Connecticut, Wisconsin, New Jersey, Kansas, Illinois, Michigan and Kentucky. In the South, 100% of those who attended or graduated from college went to Black Colleges.

Professions: 74% of a sample of 1,000 Black Ph.D. holders took their baccalaureate degrees in Black Colleges. 83% of all the Black physicians in America graduated from two Black Colleges—Howard University and Meharry Medical School. They still enroll about 68% of all Black physicians in the country.

ENROLLMENT IN COLLEGE VERSUS PRODUCTION OF COLLEGE GRADUATES

John Edgerton, in a study of the 100 largest state universities (they award 61% of all college degrees), found that they enrolled in May 1969 about 2 percent Black students. This was reinforced by an American Council on Education study showing 61% of white colleges enrolling less than 2% and 72% enrolling 4% or less.

Various estimates place the proportion of Black students in Black Colleges as between 45 and 55% of the total.

Enrollment is not the goal, but graduation. In output, Black Colleges produced 79% of the baccalaureate degrees estimated to have been awarded to Black youth. (17,242 of 21,700 degrees). The Black Colleges awarded 73% of all levels including M.A.'s and first professional degrees in Medicine, Law, Pharmacy, Dentistry and Architecture. These figures are for 1968.

It is clear that if these institutions are not strengthened, enrollment and graduation figures for Black youth could level off and decline. Any sharp reversal in the fortunes and functioning of these institutions will be a disaster to equal opportunity in the higher education of Black youth.

In 1968 less than half as many Black freshmen as should have enrolled in college. (84,000 versus 180,000). In the complete college population there should have been 811,000 Black youth enrolled. Various estimates for actual 1968 enrollment in degree credit courses were from 300,000 to 352,000. This 500,000 deficit will never be recovered. These youths have entered the unequal income distributions between white and black. Equal income will never be achieved without equal proportions of Blacks in those occupations requiring college degrees.

By 1975 1.3 million Black youth ought to be enrolled nationally. All the places now available for them must be expanded in black and white colleges since 319,000 freshmen (more than some estimates of current total enrollment) should be entering college in 1975. Anything adversely affecting an increased enrollment and graduation will prolong inequities in the society for the next four decades beyond the 1970's.

TRADITIONALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND THE DISADVANTAGED

All Black College students are not disadvantaged, educationally or economically. Some are advantaged in all areas. The general picture of the enrollment in Black Colleges, however, is a portrait of what equal opportunity is supposed to mean.

Input: Average family income is $3,900 with 65% below $5,200 income. On the average 34% are below $3,000 income and are from homes where 31% of the Mothers are domestics and 31% of the Fathers laborers. Nationally 30% of the parents of college students are businessmen and 40% earn more than $11,580 with 68% of the families above the median for family income.

Output: 20,000 graduates in 1968 who with an average income of $7,000 would return about $140 million in their first year of work.

Nationally 25% of American families were at $5,000 and below in income. Very few of the youth in these families go to college; as low as 7 percent according to the Carnegie Commission estimates. These include the Mexican-Americans, Indians, Puerto-Ricans, and poor whites.

Someone must take educational leadership in this arena. As the traditionally Black Colleges are strengthened, some of them will undoubtedly make major national contributions to these problems. For a hundred years they have worked in this area of higher education.

There is a massive failure of all levels of American education—first grade through graduate schools to educate any groups of the poor, black or non-black. Institutions which despite handicaps created by neglect and malicious intent have enabled hundreds of thousands shackled by poverty and racism to break free have earned the right to be of continuing service to the Nation.

In looking at the contributions of these schools, it is clear that they have been and still will be in the foreseeable future, the major force for integration of Black people into *all* levels of American life. It should therefore be the policy of the United States to declare these schools a National Resource for Equal Educational Opportunity. Their development should be supported to a level of leadership for the Nation in achieving its goal of equal access to education that is productive of success despite economic and racial origins.

GENERAL PROPOSALS

1. Increase Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to $91 million authorized for FY 71 with earmarking of funds for developing institutions *now* producing significant numbers of graduates, not enrollees, from low-income minority groups and showing a pattern of production over time (say five years). Latter provision designed to discourage sudden interest in low-income youth stimulated by federal funds. Low-income defined as lowest quarter of national income distribution.

This program is the *only* program in the support programs in federal government that has been responsive to traditionally black colleges. Yet its resources have now been directed away from these schools. Though other schools may be entitled to relief, the proven and documented ability of these schools to *produce* success in a low-income minority population gives the black colleges top priority. (About 18 of the 30 million goes to non-black schools; 23% to Junior Colleges; and about half of the remaining 23 million to non-black schools.)

The redirecting of funds based on *performance now* not potential to the future in producing equal opportunity ought to be the criterion.

The cooperative requirements ought to be made optional. It has not been the experience of these schools that much of the expertise they need resides outside their own academic community. Educating the disadvantaged is not the forte of any major segment of higher education.

2. Improved student financial programs are needed to be responsive to low-income students. These, however, must be coupled with general institutional support programs to provide the superior educational services required to do better the job the black colleges have been doing. Institutional matching funds should be waived for schools graduating large numbers of low-income youth.

(a) *Student Financial Aid.* The E.O.G. program should be expanded and *matching provisions waived for low-income students* or matching with the NDSL allowed. It is crucial to have full support without working in the first two years.

Both the NDSL and work-study program should be expanded with the most ample funds available for the last two years of college.

Programs assuming parental contributions are ineffective. At Miles College in Birmingham (an urban area where incomes are slightly better) 62% of the students' families could contribute nothing to their children's expenses.

Entering Freshman Family Income in Black Colleges, 1968:

18% less than $2,000.
16% $2,000 to $2,999.
17% $3,000 to $3,999.
14% $4,000 to $5,199.
13% $5,200 to $6,199.
13% $6,200 to $9,999.
7% $10,000 plus.
34% below $3,000.
65% below $5,200.
91% below $10,000.
31% of the Mothers are in domestic service.
31% of the Fathers are laborers.

Student support to equalize educational opportunity should be separate from general aid to students in higher education, particularly guaranteed loan programs available to the general population.

(b) *Institutional Grants.* Graduating not just enrolling larger numbers of low-income minority group students requires *superior* educational services. Attrition can be reduced. Too many capable students drop-out from a combination of financial problems which complicate academic problems. The number of black graduates could almost be doubled if better educational services could be developed.

(1) General institutional support can be based on the number of students from the lowest-income quartile (25% are at $5,000 and below in 1968). A $500 per student subsidy would be adequate in schools with large numbers of these students and with four-year degree granting programs.

(2) Black colleges, public and private, average $423 per student less than the national average of per student educational and general expenditures which support basic instruction.

The coupling of these two programs leaves the student free to choose his school and the institutional support follows him there. Low-income minority youth will choose those schools with a continuing record of academic payoffs for them.

3. Higher Educational Facilities Act of 1963. If in any state a disproportionate number of low-income and minority group youth are enrolled *and graduating* from a college (compared to national norms) that college should be eligible for *direct federal funding* of facilities over and above state by state formula allotments. Institutions now doing an effective job in equalizing educational opportunity should be raised in priority and funds earmarked for that purpose. Over crowding is particularly detrimental to low-income students, given their need for sup-

portive educational programs. In these special cases, matching funds could be waived or the amounts required negotiated with the colleges involved.

4. Higher Education Equipment, Title VI of HEA of 1965. Similar provisions to those above for facilities.

5. National Defense Education Act, Title IV Fellowships. This program should be shifted in emphasis to encourage development of "Teaching Doctorates". Higher education personnel truly interested in teaching versus research are badly needed to do the job of graduating the disadvantaged from college. Special emphasis must be placed on enrolling minority group candidates.

6. A National Education Foundation modeled after The National Science Foundation should be established. A first priority should be program development in the area of equal opportunity in higher education. Early emphasis should be on large scale experimental programs. It might designate colleges or clusters of colleges as equal opportunity experimental colleges. Priority should be given to comprehensive proposals from those institutions now enrolling and graduating large numbers of low-income minority youth.

A choice in favor of immediate attention on the post-secondary years is based on the fact that 4.4 million minority group youth were between the ages of 10 and 17 years of age in 1968. This is the pipeline for high school graduation by 1975.

Following this group is another group of some 4.5 million between the ages of 3 and 9 years, most of whom have already missed early childhood compensatory programs and are already in a failing school system.

Starts have been made at the level of childhood. Unless a massive start is made at the other end of the educational ladder, these kinds of youth may be the most destructive element in the society. Thus doing something about opportunities for adolescents and young adults is of the highest priority.

SUMMARY

Running through these proposals is the simple idea that effective performance in an area of national need should be improved and built upon. Educational opportunity that produces success is needed by the nation. Our racial crisis demands the use of all the resources at our command.

The traditionally black colleges represent an existing mechanism that can be improved and used to intensify the positive efforts to equalize opportunity. Operational programs for the black college today are for all of higher education tomorrow. These proposals try to help these colleges, the major force for the integration of black youth into all levels of American society, maintain and improve their unparalleled record of achievement.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 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?

SACRED COWS OF EDUCATION

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the notion that spending more and more money on Federal programs will automatically make them better has been detrimental to the Federal budget, and to the effectiveness of the programs themselves. Nowhere is this more true than in the field of education, where a virtual "sacred cow" has developed, leading many people within the field to believe that their decisions are unchallengeable and beyond question.

Fortunately, President Nixon is refuting this idea, and has called for a reexamination of our educational system to see how it can be improved, which programs fall down in the "accountability" test, and how the funds spent on education can be put to best use.

A recent column by Nick Thimmesch discusses this "sacred cow of education," and the improvements offered by the President's proposals. I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

SACRED COW OF EDUCATION

(By Nick Thimmesch)

President Nixon's message on education will cause much bellering from the high priests of pedagoguery and school supply mercenaries who insist on blind worship of the Sacred Cow of Education.

The President is saying that the $65 billion public school industry (second only to the Pentagon in spending) must show some results before it will get increased federal funding.

This notion of "accountability" will make school administrators, the National Education Assn., the fat instructional equipment lobby and assorted liberals-by-rote huff and puff and try to blow the Nixon house down. But in calling for "productivity" in public education, the President joins some avant-garde thinking on the matter, including that of the late Sen. Robert F. Kennedy.

Liberals don't like to hear this, but Robert F. Kennedy was one of the severest critics of public education, particularly as it dealt with poor children. In his 1967 book of essays, "To Seek a Newer World," Kennedy told of his frustration in proposing an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 requiring that results of programs funded by the act be tested for pupil performance before and after the programs.

"School administrators around the country resisted the implementation of this amendment," Kennedy wrote. "Therefore . . . we do not yet know how much educational improvement our billions of dollars have bought, if any."

This is precisely why Mr. Nixon wants future federal funding for experimentation, research and testing of education. He is proposing a National Institute of Education to find out what's wrong, and will soon appoint Dr. Herman Goldberg, superintendent of the Rochester, N.Y., school system, to chair a National Advisory Council on Education of the disadvantaged.

Education just isn't the way it used to be. The high school graduate today has spent 11,000 hours in school but 15,000 hours watching television. He is getting much more education "outside" the classroom—from his buddies, the media, and the great assault on the senses by rock music and other lures.

Meanwhile, billions are poured into 40 federal categorical aid programs; an army of 9,000 Office of Education consultants draws big money writing reports and studies, many of which are useful only as dust catchers, and school administrators blithely maintain that if they only had more money, more audio-visual equipment and more, shinier buildings, why they could straighten out the whole education mess.

But conservatives, avant-garde educationalists and muckraking publications like "Hard Times" criticize the whole milieu of consultant and "educational hardware" firms, or what Democratic Congresswoman Edith Green calls the "educational-industrial" complex.

Their antieducational heresies are akin to those of Dr. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (Ph. D., education), a roundly cursed realist, who drafted much of the President's education message. The President wants education to go ahead, but in a new direction. He wants more money to be spent on education after education finds out what is wrong with itself, and moves toward reform. The President feels that if public school educators avoid "accountability," there will be a great push for imposition of "national standards."

The President and Dr. James E. Allen Jr., U.S. commissioner of education, also believe much more emphasis must be given to the first five years of a child's life, and that the needs of private and parochial schools must be explored extensively so that this resource of "diversity" is not lost.

Some of the "new" thinking is anathema to the aging liberals who are really our New Tories. NEA President George D. Fischer, whose cascade of highly rhetorical press releases makes it appear he is running for office, will righteously cry out about the needs of the nation's schoolchildren.

In some respects, the NEA is as out of touch with the realities of education as the American Medical Assn. was about its domain several years ago. Those who advocate more and more blind spending on the education which hasn't worked are about as backward as the Old-Guard Republicans who bitterly opposed Social Security a generation ago.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following:

ROBERT OLIVER & ASSOCIATES,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1970.

THE EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Apparently the person who wrote the headline on today's front-page story on United Mine Workers' Joseph Yablonski is not a member of the Newspaper Guild. If he were, he should have known that the president of a local union is by no stretch of the imagination a United Mine Workers' "AIDE." If he was president of Local 3228, as described in the body of the story, then he was a local union official, elected by the local union membership and not a "UMW AIDE."

There has been no evidence, at any time, that the national office of the United Mine Workers was in any way involved in the murder conspiracy and to suggest such an involvement by careless headline writing is an injustice to a great organization. The UMW has made a tremendous contribution toward improving working conditions not only for the mine workers but also in the leadership, financially and otherwise, in the successful move to bring the benefits of unionization to millions of industrial workers who are now infinitely better off because there was a United Mine Workers union.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT OLIVER.

HARMFUL ASPECTS OF DEMONSTRATIONS

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, rudeness or the threat of violence has never been an effective way of changing national policy in a democratic, free society. The recent attempts we have seen to use these tactics are both frightening and discouraging.

The futility of these methods was seen again in the treatment of French President and Mrs. Pompidou, in their recent U.S. visit.

Two editorials, from the Houston Chronicle and the Birmingham News, point out the harmful aspects of these demonstrations, and the negative effect they might be expected to have on French policy. I commend these following articles to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Birmingham News, Mar. 3, 1970]

COURTESY AND NATIONAL INTERESTS

One need not agree with French policy generally or with France's Middle East policy specifically to regret the discourteous treatment President Georges Pompidou got from some pro-Israeli demonstrators over the weekend.

President Nixon was right, in our opinion, to express the nation's apologies to M. Pompidou and to make an unscheduled flight to New York last night to attend a dinner in the French president's honor.

In the first place, there is the simple matter of courtesy and respect for the office M. Pompidou holds.

In the second place, President Nixon's efforts to improve relations between the two traditional allies are hardly assisted when the French president is jostled by an American crowd. Not only M. Pompidou but all Frenchmen—including Frenchmen who themselves are critical of French policy in the Middle East, and they are numerous—are certain to resent such treatment, just as Americans have resented discourteous treatment of their presidents in other lands.

In the third place, speaking from a purely pragmatic point of view, those people interested in influencing a change in French policy are not likely to do so through such tactics. If anything, human nature being what it is, M. Pompidou and the French government might become even less receptive to the idea of modifying their policy.

We well understand the feelings of Israel's friends in America and elsewhere that French policy under Charles de Gaulle and now under M. Pompidou has been harmful to Israel's interests. But we fail to see how rude treatment of the man in the best position to alter that policy, if anyone can, serves Israel's interests any more than it serves America's interests—which are, after all, the interests most directly the concern of this nation during the French president's visit here at our government's invitation.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 27, 1970]

POMPIDOU DESERVES COURTESY

The discourteous, sometimes abusive treatment some Americans have accorded French President Georges Pompidou is deplorable. This behavior is not consistent with Pompidou's respected position, nor is it consistent with the long record of friendship which exists between the United States and France. Indeed, were it not for France's assistance during the time of our Revolutionary War, there probably would not be a United States today.

Ironically, Pompidou's eight-day visit to this country was planned as a sort of healing mission—to heal the wounds in U.S.-French cordiality caused by Gen. Charles de Gaulle. During De Galle's long reginme, France and the United States developed several serious areas of disagreement—over Vietnam, over gold, over approaches to the Soviet Union, over NATO, and over Britain's entry into the Common Market. These disagreements are in the process of being resolved. Once again our two nation's are becoming allies.

Upon his arrival in Washington, Pompidou restated his people's desire for stronger ties with the United States despite recent disagreements. He said France wants to see the U.S. military and economic presence maintained in Western Europe. Under De Gaulle, it will be recalled, France forced NATO and the United States to move its troops and installations elsewhere.

The protests directed against Pompidou arise from France's sale of 108 Mirage jet planes to Libya. Libya has no trained pilots to fly them. Egypt hasn't enough, although it is feared the planes may eventually fall into the hands of the Egyptians to be used against Israel.

We don't agree with French action in this matter. And it strikes us that they bungled this jet sale pretty badly. Certainly the timing was bad, since the sale has injected an angry note to Pompidou's U.S. visit.

Yet worse things have happened between nations. This one incident should not be allowed to obstruct improved relations between our countries. We cannot expect every nation or every ally to agree with our own policies all the time—especially in a situation as confused and as paradoxical as the Middle East.

We might recall that many nations have strongly opposed our presence in Vietnam, yet the American people would not take kindly to having our President called a "murderer" or a "Hitler" were he the guest of a foreign country. President Pompidou should be accorded the same respect and courtesies as we would expect the French to accord President Nixon.

We find the boycott by some U.S. Congressmen of Pompidou's address to Congress inexcusable. This action was politically motivated, and it was petty. The net effect of it is merely to antagonize the French and to make harder the reconciliation which Mr. Nixon and M. Pompidou are attempting to achieve.

HORTON RECOMMENDS CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR ARTICLE ON OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY LEGAL SERVICE

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues an article that recently appeared in the Christian Science Monitor describing some of the activities of OEO's legal services attorneys as they aid the poor. The legal services activities of OEO are much misunderstood and very controversial in some parts of the country. This brief article, which follows should help the reader to understand a little bit of what the program is about:

N.Y. LAWYERS FIGHT FOR POOR—MORE PAY SHUNNED FOR "RELEVANCY"

(By David Holmstrom)

NEW YORK.—To Stephen Wizner the distance from Wall Street to Rutgers Street is a loss of about $5,000 a year and a humanitarian gain of something called "relevancy."

As a Legal Services lawyer operating on Rutgers Street on Manhattan's lower East Side, Mr. Wizner is part of a phenomenon in the country: young lawyers who are turning their backs on prestigious law offices, big salaries, and going to battle for the poor.

"After two years of working here, my going to a Wall Street firm would be irrelevant," said Mr. Wizner.

Last year Mr. Wizner and nearly 1,800 other lawyers across the country sought to make the ringing phrase "equality under the law" more than mere rhetoric.

This new sense of "advocacy" among lawyers grew out of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which stipulated the need "to represent indigent persons against unequal treatment under law." As a result a whole new area of "poverty law" has mushroomed within the last five years.

HELP FOR THE ASKING

"Anybody from the neighborhood who walks in this office will get free help," said Mr. Wizner from behind a cluttered desk. The Legal Services office here is an arm of Mobilization for Youth, Inc. During 1969 Mr. Wizner, attorneys Bill Volckhausen, Ping Lee, Bill Resnick, and social worker Marilyn Schafer joined forces at 24 Rutgers Street to handle 1,600 "legal problems," a rate far exceeding a comparable Wall Street firm.

"At our age, if we were working in a big office downtown, we would be writing memos," said Mr. Wizner, a graduate of the University of Chicago Law School and a former Justice Department lawyer now salaried at $15,000 a year.

"Here you are constantly under the gun and the problems are warm people. Poor people seldom come to a lawyer unless there is a crisis. We are practicing crisis intervention and lawyers have never done that before on a large scale."

Among other things, grappling with the problems of the poor means grappling with the city bureaucracy. "Our biggest problem is getting the city agencies to do the job they are supposed to do," said Miss Schafer. "The poor consider the Welfare Department the enemy."

LAWYERS ASSERT RIGHTS

"Welfare law was secret law," said Mr. Wizner, "until poverty lawyers began demanding that it be detailed and in the open. The poor have never had their welfare rights asserted before. Welfare is really their property because they don't have any other property."

Defending the poor has more often than not brought the young lawyers hostility from the courts. "The awareness that a case may be used to test a law has sent a lot of grumbling judges back to law books they haven't touched in years," said Mr. Wizner smiling.

A recent proposal in Congress, championed by Sen. George Murphy (R) of California, sought to weaken the impact of Legal Services by giving governors the power of veto over any part of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) program.

"The Murphy amendment reflects the success of Legal Services," said Mr. Wizner. "The paradox is that we do not go to the streets and demonstrate. We go to the courts and do everything the way legislators like it done—orderly." Senator Murphy's measure failed to emerge from a Senate-House conference committee after being passed by the Senate.

While some city and state agencies around the country dislike the persistence of Legal Services lawyers, it has been estimated that nearly 600,000 poor families have received free legal help over the last two years. "Sometimes we'll have a social worker and a lawyer just trying to get a toilet fixed," said Mr. Wizner.

DIGNITY EMPHASIZED

The problems of the poor range from heatless apartments to evictions, to consumer fraud, to divorce, to homicide. "What you win sometimes isn't too much," said Bill Volckhausen. "Maybe just the right for someone to stay in a cold, seedy apartment."

"A lot of the problems stem from family tensions brought on by the physical environment and the Welfare Department," said Mr. Wizner.

"It's like a watchdog," said Miss Schafer referring to the Welfare Department. "Poor people are really tremendously interested in doing what's right when they are treated with dignity.

"But the Welfare Department is under tremendous pressure. It just doesn't have any esprit de corps." On several occasions Miss Schafer has learned of a new change in welfare law and has been the first to tell the welfare caseworker.

Because Rutgers Street borders Chinatown the work of Ping Lee, a native of China who formerly practiced law in Taiwan, centers around immigration and the housing problems of Chinese.

TYPICAL CASE CITED

The clients at the Rutgers Street office continue to be divided about evenly between Chinese, Puerto Ricans, and Jews. "One of our Puerto Rican clients bought $1,000 worth of furniture," said Mr. Wizner, citing an example typical of dishonest merchants in poverty areas.

"He made a down payment of $400, and when they delivered the furniture it wasn't what he had bought and he wanted his money back. I made a few calls and the furniture company wasn't too cooperative. So we filed a complaint. The day it was served the manager at the furniture company called and said, 'Do you want the check made out to you or your client?' "

Another common practice is to pressure welfare mothers into buying expensive encyclopedia sets for their children. Two salesmen will gain entrance by telling the mother that the "school" sent them.

"In one instance," said Mr. Wizner, "the two salesmen stayed for four hours until the woman was so upset she signed the order." Legal Services stepped in and had the order voided.

SOME WORK RACKETS

"Some salesman will check the obituaries in the papers," said Mr. Wizner, "and then approach the widow with a new Bible and tell her her husband ordered it for her just before he died. But naturally he didn't pay for it."

Mr. Ping recently prevented a young Chinese student from being jailed by raising a $1,000 bond. "He had been accused of having drugs," said Mr. Ping, "but he had pills for a cold." Through Mr. Ping's efforts the Chinese Consul put up half the money, "the first time it had ever been done," said a grinning Mr. Ping.

Statistics released in 1968 indicated that Legal Services lawyers across the country won 79 percent of their cases involving federal, state, and local agencies, 72 percent of their consumer-complaint cases and 60 percent of their appeals.

A MORATORIUM ON COMPLAINING

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the right of dissent is basic to our American system but, like so many other things, there always is the chance that this right can be used to such an extreme that it has no constructive objective and, in effect, becomes little more than exercise in futility.

In brief, it might be well if we stopped a moment to examine what we are really complaining about. Perhaps a moratorium on dissent is in order. Maybe we should quiet ourselves sufficiently long to give our minds, rather than our muscles, a chance to function.

A timely article appeared in the March 9, 1970, issue of the National Observer with respect to this matter of dissent. Because of its unique nature, I submit it to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

A MORATORIUM ON COMPLAINING

What this country needs, along with a good five-cent dime, is a moratorium on complaining. It might last only for a day but it would be a blessing. Imagine one whole day throughout the nation when nobody would blame his woes on somebody else.

The din of protest has now reached such a pitch that it is a kind of pollution in itself. And with so many groups complaining about so much, it is becoming difficult to sort out the reasonable complaints from the other kind.

What could we do with a day completely free of complaining? There are a number of things.

Black leaders, for instance, could remind their followers that racial-cultural antagonisms are among the toughest human problems to solve, but that the progress made in recent years is substantial. Not enough, but measurable and encouraging.

Rebellious students might re-read their college catalogs. Those catalogs, which they supposedly looked over before applying to the schools of their choice, contain the rules by which the institutions are administered. The students might ask themselves why they chose the schools they did if they disapprove of their regulations and customs. And if they intended to be rebels from the outset, perhaps they should meditate upon their own personalities, backgrounds, and motives.

The antiwar people who show how sincere they are by wrecking draft offices and burning buildings might spend the day considering their strange predisposition to violence. Isn't there some danger that destructive protesters will be fallen upon by other citizens with other views? And when civil order is gone, what will have been accomplished? There may be a kind of nobility in a bloody head, but there is a far greater nobility in arguing for change with a persuasive tongue instead of with a howling mob.

Behind these thoughts is the recognition that American society has serious problems and that all men don't agree on how or even when they should be solved. But our political system was designed exactly to accommodate diverse opinions. Because of this there is small need to be too patient with those of our countrymen who are so impatient to have their own way that they choose to scream and destroy.

In America today we protest too much. We have among us a record number of crybabies. The din of complaining may even be affecting the stability of society, and when society is rocked out of joint, the first casualties are the protections afforded complainers.

A one-day moratorium on complaining, aside from giving editorial writers a day off, would allow us all to get our bearings. And we might find that while we have a long way to go, our position is far better than the distractions of the complainers have permitted us to realize.

We value Pollyannas as little as we value violence, and we will blacken the eye of the man who disputes it. Of course dissent is part of our heritage, and so is dissent from dissent. But it would be a kindness to our country if all kinds of dissenters would rest their tonsils and unclench their fists, if only for a short time.

The complainers might be surprised. They might find that their return to civility will win them allies who appreciate their ideas but can't stand their noise.

After all, when one is subjected to a cat's concert, one doesn't throw a fish. One throws a shoe.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, today the Veterans of Foreign Wars, one of America's most respected veterans' organizations, is holding its annual congressional dinner here in Washington.

A remarkably intelligent and talented young lady from the Second Congressional District of Indiana, which I am proud to represent, is attending that dinner tonight as a guest of the VFW. Her name is Janet Conner of Otterbein, Ind., a student at Benton Central High School in Benton County.

Jan, as she is known to her friends, is in Washington tonight as the Indiana winner in the VFW's annual Voice of Democracy contest and is now a contestant in the national contest. I know I am joined by my colleagues from Indiana on both sides of the aisle in wishing Jan every success in the final judging.

We can often learn from our children and I believe that Jan's speech is an excellent example of this. There is food for thought for each of us in her speech, "Freedom's Challenge."

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of Miss Conner's prize-winning speech at this point in the RECORD:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Janet Conner)

These two words kept turning over in my mind as I lost myself in a mental review of our great past, our turbulent present, and the unknown future. Suddenly, a television commercial blared colorfully on the television screen that stated, "Camel's are not for everyone!" and I received my answer, "Freedom is not for everyone!"

First, Freedom is for thinkers. Do I think for myself, or do I let others think for me? Am I capable of a way of life that lets me judge each person for himself, for his personality, for his integrity? I am not forced upon anyone, nor is anyone forced upon me. I choose my friends, and I choose my mate. This kind of freedom carries with it a challenge and responsibility.

Second, Freedom is for workers. Am I content to sit back and take from my country? Is it in me to accept President John F.

Kennedy's eloquently stated inaugural challenge that asked his countrymen not to take from this country, but to give all that they have in honor of their country? In the United States, I could be a respected and honorable Ditch Digger or I can be the President. Both require work, neither requires a special birthright nor special name. Just especially hard work. What a challenge!

Third, Freedom is for lovers. My Grandfather used to recite a poem that went somethink like this, "Breathes there a man with soul so dead, who never to himself has said, 'this is my own, my native land'". Is my soul dead to the love of a country that led Washington's men across the Delaware, through a winter at Valley Forge, and on to Independence? Is my soul dead to the love of mankind that made Lincoln sign the Emancipation Proclamation? Is my soul dead to the thrill of the sight of Old Glory? And yet, can my love engulf any people anywhere in need?

Love of God brought the Pilgrims to America, Love of Freedom made the small band of colonists become the fathers of a great nation, Love of the land sent the farmers and trappers to settle the prairies to make an even greater nation. Do I have less love in my heart than they? Am I less dedicated to my country than were they?

Well, I am not paying any attention to the television now. I'm wide awake and very positive for my challenge. Freedom is not for everyone! Freedom is for the thinkers, the workers, and the lovers. God grant that I may be worthy enogh, that Freedom will be for me.

NUMBER OF FARMERS CONTINUES TO DROP

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, a matter of increasing concern to our people and the people of all of the world is the population growth.

Where will be put all of these people? How will we feed them?

At the same time as we express concern over our ability to feed this expanding population, we are losing farmers at a dangerous rate.

This should be of concern to all of us because we all know that without farmers we will be without food.

Mr. Speaker, a factual, well-written editorial by Gordon E. Duenow on this subject, recently appeared in the Little Falls Daily Transcript.

I hereby insert that editorial in the RECORD and commend its reading to my colleagues:

NUMBER OF FARMERS CONTINUES TO DROP

We sometimes wonder if we realize the seriousness of what is happening on our farms in Minnesota as well as in other states. The small towns have been losing good farmers at a tragic pace with the result that eventually we'll lose out all along the line. While industry is making some gains in the rural area, these industrial jobs fall far behind replacing the farmers who have been forced to move elsewhere—usually to the larger cities.

A recent news release from the Minnesota Department of Agriculture quotes an announcement from the State-Federal Crop and Livestock Reporting Service that the state has lost another 4,000 farming units—families—during 1969.

The result is that Minnesota begins 1970 with only 125,000 farming units, or 80,000 less than it had in 1935. Peak for farm population was 1935. The loss since that time is nearly 40 percent and represents a population shift of nearly 450,000 Minnesotans from the farms to the cities within the past 35 years.

This population shift has contributed to a situation where taxes are skyrocketing in the cities because there are too many people and in the rural community because there are too few people.

Loss of even one farm unit represents a serious economic setback to any rural community as farmers are required to spend a considerable amount to operate their business. Thus even though sometimes they cannot operate profitably, they are good customers just the same. It would require a number of industrial jobs just to replace the purchasing power generated by one farm.

While it is true that the smaller number of larger farms are producing an increasing abundance and quality of essential food and fiber necessary to sustain all of us, these larger farms do not make up for the loss of those forced off the farm. One big farmer is not as good a customer for the small towns as were the thousands who have left.

Maybe sme day we'll realize just what has happened but by that time it may be too late. Encouraging, however, is the fact that some of our governmental leaders are recognizing what is taking place. Eventually, and we hope not too late, something will be done.

WHAT THE CITIZEN CAN DO ABOUT ENVIRONMENTAL DETERIORATION

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to participate in a beautification award ceremony in College Park, Md., in my congressional district.

Certificates of appreciation were presented to individual citizens and to citizen groups who made outstanding contributions to beautification and improvement in the College Park area during the past year.

The citizens listed below have demonstrated that restoration of environmental quality can be, and must be, started on the local level involving groups of interested individuals. We have heard so much lately of the Federal Government's tremendous expenditures in fighting environmental pollution and the even greater amount which will be necessary in the future to eradicate the harm of the past. I think it is time we look at what can be done on a smaller and less expensive scale which nevertheless is equally effective.

Every day I receive inquiries from individuals who would like to know what they can do, in their own small way, to improve the quality of their surroundings.

The following list is, I believe, a good example of what can be done if the effort is put forth.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the names of the awardees from College Park and a listing of their contributions to beautification.

RECIPIENTS OF CERTIFICATES OF APPRECIATION

Alpha Gamma Rho Fraternity, 7511 Princeton Avenue, College Park, Maryland: Planting trees along City street during "Plant-In" week, May, 1969.

Mr. and Mrs. Merle E. Beall, 9024 49th Avenue, College Park, Maryland: Outstanding landscape architecture on their home grounds featuring fountains and Oriental decor.

College Park Boys Club, 8702 49th Avenue, College Park, Maryland: Cleaning up trash along Rhode Island Avenue.

College Park Lions Club: Organizing and subsidizing "Can-In" paying children for beverage cans picked up in a weekend campaign.

College Park Motel, 8419 Baltimore Avenue, College Park, Maryland: Attractive lighting and improvement of the front of their motel property.

Cub Scout Pack #408: Cleaning up area behind the Safeway Store.

Girl Scout Troop #1140: Planting area at Hollywood Elementary School and decorative painting of trash cans at the Rhode Island Recreation Field.

Mr. R. Doyle Grabarck, Graduate Student, 9010 Riggs Road, Adelphi, Maryland: Organizing the "Trash Bash" at the University of Maryland, May 3, 1969.

Hollywood Elementary School PTA: Brick wall and evergreen plantings to decorate flagpole area.

Mr. and Mrs. James V. Keister, 4804 Fox Street, College Park, Maryland: Utilizing skill in chrysanthemum culture in beautifying their home grounds.

S. Lachman & Son, 9517 Baltimore Avenue, College Park, Maryland: Attractive building, landscaping, and spot lighting of building at night.

Phi Delta Theta Fraternity, 4605 College Avenue, College Park, Maryland: Demolishing condemned buildings and cleaning up the debris.

Miss Penny Pometto, 5203 Paducah Road, College Park, Maryland: Entry in the Holy Redeemer School Progress Fair—a mobile on beautification.

Rollins Outdoor Advertising, Washington, D.C.: "Clean-Up, Paint-Up, Fix-Up" display on outdoor advertising billboard at Chaney's Esso Service Center.

Mrs. Barbara Schaffer, Beautification & Improvement Committee, College Park Citizens Advisory Planning Board: Outstanding leadership and dedication in her work on this committee particularly for editing the scrapbook, which won a Distinguished Achievement Award for College Park in the 1969 National Beautification Contest.

POLICE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1970

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, today I appeared before the National League of Cities Congressional City Conference at the Washington-Hilton Hotel and delivered the following remarks:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM O. COWGER

Ladies and Gentlemen: It is indeed a pleasure to once again be meeting with a group of municipal officials. It is like homecoming for me. I not only had the experience of serving for four years as Mayor of Louisville, Kentucky, but also the pleasure of having been elected to a two-year term on the Executive Committee of the National League. Additional association with municipal officials was gained during my three years as President of the Inter-American Municipal Organization and my year as President of the Kentucky Municipal League. It is good to see many of my old friends and I can assure you that I know from experience of the great problems of our urban areas.

I would like to briefly explain to you the legislation that I have introduced in Congress, known as the "Police Assistance Act of 1970" (H.R. 15706). As Chairman of the Republican Task Force on Urban Affairs, I have been working for more than six months with various groups in drawing up this legislation. Basically it provides for direct federal assistance to local law enforcement agencies in the amount of half a billion dollars a year for five years, with a total grant of $2.5 billion. The money would be available to cities and counties with a population of 50,000 or more.

For instance, a city the size of Jackson, Michigan, with 50,000 population, would receive approximately $400,000 annually. Cities in the 100,000 population bracket, such as Wichita Falls, Texas, would receive $780,000. Omaha, Nebraska, with a population of 300,000 would receive $2,360,000. My own city of Louisville, Kentucky, with a population of 400,000, would receive $3,150,000. St. Louis, Missouri would receive $5,500,000, as would other cities in the 700,000 population bracket. Baltimore, Maryland, with a population of one million, would receive funds totaling $7,880,000.

In drafting this bill, I wanted a greater level of discretion and flexibility for local authorities in formulating ways to combat crime, setting priorities and in carrying out individualized programs suited to meet local needs. As a former Mayor, I know from experience that every metropolitan police force in the country is below complement. The problems of recruitment are, in large measure, the result of low salaries and inadequate pensions. In Louisville, where our budgeted police complement is 650 officers, we are over thirty men short. This legislation would make money available directly to the municipalities, where about 85 percent of the law enforcement budget is comprised of salaries.

The Safe Streets Act of 1968 has not functioned as a weapon to directly fight crime in our cities. For instance, in Kentucky the State government has allocated 75% of the state's action funds to local government on a "balanced geographical basis". Now please tell me, what does geography have to do with population and crime? My city provides approximately 34% of the total revenue for the State of Kentucky and receives in return about 18%. Almost every state legislature in the country has shortchanged its cities and Kentucky is no exception.

We know, you and I, that the pure physical evidence of officers on the street is a strong deterrent to crime. I can remember that in order to spread out our force we went to one man patrol cars. This soon had to be abandoned because of the danger involved. We reduced traffic fatalities on our expressways by increasing our motorcycle patrols. There isn't a person in America who hasn't slowed down when he has spotted a cruiser in his rear view mirror. Mayor Washington, of our capital city, recently doubled the police overtime pay in order to put an additional 102 men on the streets. Every department across the country is attempting to recruit with newspaper, radio and television advertising. In most instances the metropolitan departments have had to reduce their rookie requirements to increase recruitment.

So far, ten of my colleagues in the Congress have endorsed this legislation and we have received letters of backing from the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors. Those who have to fight crime on a day-to-day basis know, from cruel experience, where help is needed. I have discussed this problem with law enforcement officials who are almost unanimous in their endorsement. From the chiefs to the recruit patrolmen, it is known that crime is expensive. The taxpayer now realizes that public protection is a good investment.

On the other hand, we must expect opposition from the Conference of Governors and from the rural-oriented legislators in the Congress. The governors will resist any plan to weaken their authority over "block grants" to urban programs. As a matter of fact, with thirty-two governors of my own party in office, I can probably expect little gratitude for trying to help solve America's most important domestic problem. It is a matter of fact that a large majority of those who are serving in Congress have had as their previous governmental experience, service in the state legislatures. Many of my colleagues hold more dearly to "states rights" rather than "majority rights." As state legislators they really did not understand the problems of the cities. Only through true reapportionment will this change. As city officials we have traditionally had our problems with the rural oriented state capitals, but improvement is in sight.

To my knowledge, I am the only Republican in Congress who represents a strictly hard core urban district. My party could establish an important breakthrough and an excellent record on urban legislation by supporting my bill. But I hasten to add that anti-crime legislation is not of a partisan nature. Former Mayor and now U.S. Senator, Vance Hartke, has introduced an amendment to the Safe Streets Act which has gained endorsement from Republicans and Democrats alike. Yesterday I submitted testimony before the House Judiciary Committee in support of his amendment. Those of us with previous municipal experience have a strong obligation to fight with all of our strength for meaningful urban legislation in the field of crime prevention. With 80% of our population now living in the metropolitan areas of America, this contest must, and will be won. You may be assured, that I have fought against and upset the odds before, and I intend to win this one. Perhaps not today or tomorrow, but majority rights and needs will be understood and heard.

THE LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION AMENDMENTS OF 1970

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to introduce today the Library Services and Construction Amendments of 1970. This bill represents another step forward in the administration's drive to cut away entangling redtape from Federal assistance programs. By amending the Library Services and Construction Act to consolidate its four titles into a single State administered program for library services, the bill will turn each State's job of overseeing five narrow categorical programs into a responsibility for shaping a coherent, statewide approach to strengthening library services.

The President struck a deep chord in the public when he called for a halt to continued concentration of power in Washington. The American people know that the Federal Government cannot singlehandedly solve the Nation's problems. They sense that the more power concentrates in the Federal Government, the less responsive it grows to local needs and desires. It is appropriate, then, for us to seek ways to return some responsibility to the States, where local voices are better heard, local needs more clearly seen.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does precisely that. If it is adopted, the Federal Government would no longer tell each State how much it must spend for what kind of library services. Instead, the States would tell us what their library needs are. The States would determine what part of their library assistance allocation should go for the different kinds of library aid within the State. This bill would leave the States free to undertake a coordinated attack on deficiencies in library services. To put the issue in another light, the bill would insist that States take on responsibilities for which their experience under the existing act has prepared them.

The existing Library Services and Construction Act contains four titles, authorizing the five separate programs. Title I, public library services, extends improved library services to areas inadequately served. It has provided library materials, additional staff, specialized staff training, and other needed services to communities without strong libraries, and sometimes to communities without libraries at all. Title II, public library construction, has—matched with State and local resources—assisted in the construction, remodeling, and expansion of inadequate facilities. Title III, interlibrary cooperative networks, encourages libraries of all kinds to share resources and to work together for better services to each of their different clienteles.

Title IV–A, State institutional library services, offers assistance in establishing and strengthening library services in State residential institutions of all kinds: Prisons, orphanages, mental hospitals, and the like. Finally, title IV–B, library services to the physically handicapped, helps States to extend library services to citizens who, because of certain physical handicaps, cannot use regular library materials.

Each of these programs has served well in strengthening some aspect of library services. Precisely because the Library Services and Construction Act has encouraged the States to improving these areas, through commitment of their own matching resources as well as through Federal funds, the States are now experienced enough to make more fundamental decisions about the allocation of resources than they are now permitted to do. It is highhanded and, in the end, unrealistic for us in Washington to force States to spend so much on construction as opposed to so much on cooperative networks; we cannot set a standard that is appropriate for all States. Now the State agencies have behind them the kind of experience the Library Services and Construction Act has given them, we need not hold to a single national standard; we can ask each State to use its own judgment concerning its own library needs. The Library Services and Construction Amendments of 1970 proposes to do so.

Under its provision, each State would receive a base allocation of $200,000. The rest of the money would be apportioned among States on the basis of its overall population, just as it is under existing law. At this point, Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing differs from the draft bill submitted by the administration. The draft bill would have departed from existing law and introduced into the distribution formula a poverty factor somewhat akin to that found in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I do not feel that this is wise or justified. This is not "poverty" legislation. Furthermore, it introduces a needlessly complicated factor based upon unsatisfactory data into a distribution pattern which has worked smoothly. While a program emphasis on library services to low-income families is desirable—and in large measure State and local library agencies have always served this purpose—it has little connection with the formula for distributing these funds between the States for carrying out statewide programs of services for all our citizens.

Funds would be used for the same kind of library assistance as those supported by the present law, except that each State would decide how much of its allocation would go for which purpose. Priority would be given to projects in areas with high concentrations of disadvantaged people, adding a new emphasis to services to the disadvantaged. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to set aside up to 1 percent of each year's appropriation for evaluation of the programs supported under the act.

The amendments contained in this bill would become effective in fiscal year 1972, immediately after the expiration of the present law. However, some funds could be appropriated in fiscal year 1971 under the bill I am introducing, to aid States in making the transition from their responsibilities under the existing provisions of their mandate under the new provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I would conclude by commending to the attention of my colleagues this bill, as another step toward making Federal aid more responsive to the needs of its recipients, States, and local communities:

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION AMENDMENTS OF 1970—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Citation: This section of the bill provides that the Act may be cited as the "Library Services and Construction Amendments of 1970."

Section 2. Statement of Purpose: This section describes the purpose of the Act, to improve the administration and implementation of programs under the Library Services and Construction Act, by easing the administrative burden upon the States through reduction in the number of State plans and by affording the States greater discretion in the allocation of funds through program consolidation. The section further indicates that the Act is intended to offer greater encouragement for the extension of library services to areas with high concentrations of low-income families.

Section 3. Consolidation of Titles I, II, III, and IV of Library Services and Construction Act: This section of the bill would strike out everything after section 2 of the Library Services and Construction Act[1] and would insert in lieu thereof two new titles as follows:

TITLE I—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION

Section 101. Appropriations Authorized.

Subsection (a) of section 101 directs the Commissioner of Education to make grants to the States for the purposes set forth in section 103.

Subsection (b) of such section authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972 and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

Section 102. Allotments to States: Subsection (a) of section 102 directs the Commissioner to reserve up to 1 percent of the sums appropriated in a fiscal year for carrying out Title I, and to allot this amount among Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, according to his determination of their needs. The remainder of such sums is to be allotted by the Commissioner by allotting $200,000 to each of the other States. The balance would be allotted among such States on the basis of relative proportion of the population.

Subsection (b) of such section provides for reallotment authority.

Subsection (c) of such section provides that funds appropriated in any fiscal year shall be available for payments with respect to construction projects for that year and the succeeding fiscal year.

Section 103. Uses of Federal Funds: This section provides that payments under the title may be used, for programs or projects for any of the following purposes: (1) extension of public library services to areas without such services or with inadequate services; (2) construction of new or improved public library facilities (with priority for projects in areas without library facilities); (3) establishment and maintenance of interlibrary cooperation programs; (4) establishment or improvement of State institutional library services; (5) establishment or improvement of library services to the physically handicapped; and (6) comprehensive planning for the above-mentioned programs.

Subsection (b) of such section would define "public library services" to mean library services furnished by a public library free of charge; "State institutional library services" to mean provision of library materials and services for inmates, patients, or residents of certain designated State supported or operated institutions, or students in residential schools for the physically handicapped operated or substantially supported by the State; and "library services to the physically handicapped" to include the provision of special services to physically handicapped persons certified as unable to read or to use conventional printed materials as a result of physical limitations.

Subsection (c) of such section would authorize use of funds appropriated for Title I for evaluation and dissemination activities. It would also allow use of funds for proper and efficient administration of a State plan, and for technical, professional, clerical, and other assistance for a State advisory council, if appointed by the Governor and broadly representative of professional library interests and library users in the State and if vested with appropriate advisory functions.

Section 104. State Plans and Programs: Subsection (a) of setion 104 provides that a State which desires to receive grants under the title for a fiscal year must submit, for approval of the Commissioner, a State plan for that year. Such plan would have to include satisfactory assurances with respect to the adoption of procedures for fiscal control and accounting, evaluation and dissemination, and coordination of programs. It would also include assurances with respect to reporting requirements, procedures upon approval or disapproval of applications, and opportunity to participate in programs. In addition, the State plan would have to provide, subject to section 204 of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, for the administration of the plan by the State library administrative agency. The plan would set forth criteria for determining the order of approval of applications in the State, including criteria designed to assure that in the approval of applications for the extension and improvement of public library services, priority will be given to program or projects which serve areas with high concentrations of low-income families.

Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of such section provides that the Commissioner shall not approve a plan unless such plan fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) and has, prior to its submission, been made public and subjected to comment by interested persons.

Paragraph (2) of such subsection provides that the plan shall be made public as finally approved.

Paragraph (3) of such subsection provides that the Commissioner shall not finally disapprove a plan without first affording the State reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing.

Subsection (c) of such section provides that, in order to be eligible for assistance under the title, a State must adopt, in consultation with the Office of Education, a long-range program for carrying out the title covering a period of from three to five years, to be annually updated. Prior to its final adoption, such program must be made public and a reasonable opportunity must be afforded for comments thereon by interested persons. The program must be made public as finally adopted.

Section 105. Withholding: This section provides that whenever the Commissioner, after notice and hearing, finds that a State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the title or that, in the administration of the plan, there is a failure to comply with any assurance or other provision of such plan, then the Commissioner shall make no further payments to the State or shall limit payments, as appropriate, until he is satisfied that there is no longer such failure to comply.

Section 106. Judicial Review: This section provides for judicial review of final action by the Commissioner with respect to a State plan.

Section 107. Payments to States: This section provides for payments to States of the Federal share of amounts expended by the States in accordance with the title.

Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 107 directs the Commissioner to pay to a State, which complies with the plan and program requirements of section 104, from its allotment, an amount equal to the Federal share of the amount expended by the State and its political subdivisions during the applicable fiscal year for the uses referred to in section 103. With respect to administrative expenses, however, only the Federal share of the amount expended by the State will be paid.

Paragraph (2) of such subsection provides that payments may not be made to a State unless the Commissioner finds—

(A) that there will be available for expenditure from State or local sources during the applicable fiscal year (i) an amount sufficient to enable the State to receive payments of at least $200,000, and (ii) at least the total amount expended, in the areas covered by the plan, for public library services during the second preceding fiscal year;

(B) that there will be available for expenditure for public library and State insti-

[1] Section 2 of the Library Services and Construction Act contains a declaration policy. Section 1 provides for citation of the Act.

tutional library services from State sources during the applicable fiscal year not less than the total expended for such services from such sources in the second preceding fiscal year; and

(C) that there will be available for expenditure for library services to the physically handicapped from non-Federal sources during the applicable fiscal year not less than the total actually expended for such services from such sources in the second preceding fiscal year.

Paragraph (3) of such subsection provides for methods of payment under the title.

Subsection (b) of such section provides that the "Federal share" for a State shall be 100 percent less the State percentage, and the State percentage shall be that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of all the States (excluding Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands), except that the Federal share shall not be more than 66 percent or less than 33 percent, and, for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa and the Virgin Islands, shall be 66 percent, and for the Trust Territory, 100 percent.

Subsection (c) of such section provides for promulgation of the Federal shares by the Commissioner.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 201. Evaluation: This section provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may use up to 1 percent of the total appropriations under the Act for evaluation of authorized programs.

Section 202. Recovery of Payments: This section provides that if, within 20 years after construction of a facility for which Federal funds have been expended under the Act, the facility ceases to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed or the owner of the facility ceases to be a State or local library service agency, the United States shall be entitled to recover a pro rata share of the value of the property from the applicant or other owner.

Section 203. Labor Standards: This section applies the usual labor standards provision to construction assisted under the Act. Provision is made for waiver of this requirement in certain cases where services are voluntarily donated.

Section 204. Definitions: This section defines for the purposes of this Act, the terms "State", "State library administrative agency," "public library," "construction" and "Secretary".

Section 4. Transitional Provisions: Subsection (a) of section 4 of the bill provides that amendments made by the Act shall be effective on July 1, 1971.

Subsection (b) of such section provides that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, funds allotted to a State under the Library Services and Construction Act for any of the programs referred to in section 103 of that Act (as amended by this Act) and available for expenses of administration may, with the approval of the Commissioner, be used by the State for preparation of a State plan, for the development of a long-range program, and State advisory committee expenses, for purposes of the consolidated act for Fiscal Year 1972.

DRUG ADDICTION

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, it is not exactly known how great is the toll drug addiction takes in lives each year. Nor is it known how extensive are the effects of drug addiction on our national crime rate. But, even as these figures elude us, however, there are others which are much more alarming.

Countless numbers of our teenagers and high school students have been tragically "hooked" on narcotics, whether they started "taking trips" for fun and excitement or sought this lethal menace as an escape mechanism. The illegal use of drugs by the younger generation has become so commonplace that teenage addicts recently testified that obtaining drugs from a classmate is a simple process—"more like borrowing a book." Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that when the traffic in drugs has reached such ominous proportions, it is long past the time for not only the Congress, but the Nation as a whole, to do something to stop this dangerous invasion of drug abuse into the youngest segments of our society.

Certainly having more stringent, more effective laws controlling drug traffic is one method of abating drug abuse, but I believe that perhaps the best device for combatting drug addiction in our young is through education. We should educate them against the use of narcotics not only because it is illegal, but also because it is a potentially dangerous, deadly health hazard. Most importantly, we should instruct our young against these activities before the temporary "highs" of smoking marihuana or "popping pills" generate the more permanent tragedies of freak accidents of overdosage or the fierce bonds of addiction.

Kiwanis International is sponsoring such an instructive campaign. "Operation Drug Alert" is a yearlong program of drug education designed to reach high school students. In Clermont County, Ohio, the Kiwanis Club of Union Township recently conducted an essay contest on the subject of drug abuse, after holding an educational assembly at each of the area high schools.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Kiwanis Club for providing our young with this invaluable information and for their initiative in sponsoring this civic-minded program. I would also like to congratulate the two winners of this essay contest for their fine efforts. They illustrate some of the problems our young people face who are tempted to "turn on" with drugs, and I am greatly encouraged by their remarks, for they voice the sentiments of another "turned on" generation—one "turned on" to the dangers of drug abuse.

I commend these essays written by Miss Terri Jones and Miss Joyce Rusk to my colleagues, and I am including them in my remarks today with the hope that they will read them:

WHY RUIN YOUR LIFE?

(By Joyce Rusk, Amelia High School, Amelia, Ohio)

Drugs are now one of the most talked about subjects in the world. It is almost like one of the *in* things to do, but when you come right down to it, it is really very out. The older generation says that it is just showing how immature and stupid the teenagers are nowadays. It shows their true feelings: mean, anger, and hatred. The teenagers say that it really isn't wrong to take drugs. It is their life and their own privilege to live the way they want. Maybe both of these answers are right. There are some teenagers that are immature but there are also many adults the same way. Yes, you do have the privilege to live your own life the way you want but there is a limit to everything. You just can't cut your life off from the things that really get you down. You have to face them sooner or later because they will always be there. That is the way of life, it will probably always be. Most of the teenagers that take dope and become addicts say that this is the life they like not the other life, the real one. Sometimes it is good to get away from your problems but not by taking dope. It doesn't solve anything. Besides it ruins your health, maybe not everyone that has taken dope but the majority of them it has. Some of the adults want to do away with the drugs because they want to help the teenagers and their problems. A part of the adults don't mean to be so strict. If we didn't have regulations, this world would be in a much worse place than it is. It just isn't right to take narcotics because there are so many factors against it like: It is illegal, it is damaging to your health and it is just a fake way of living. Today more than ever we need real things, real thinking and real living. Is this so hard to do, you, the teenagers of the world today? Try it for once, don't use drugs to find your answer.

To me I wouldn't think of taking narcotics. It is very wrong, I care about myself and what happens to me. I want to live in this real world. I want to be someone before it is too late. I don't want a dream world that drugs give you. I want what the world can give me, and what I can give the world.

WHAT ABOUT DRUGS?

(By Terri Jones, Glen Este High School, Cincinnati, Ohio)

Today in our nations, we are faced with many problems. Some are wars, racial conflicts, and Communism. But not so far down on the list is the use of drugs. Usually when someone thinks of drugs, their first association with the word is teen-agers or hippies. But what those people don't realize is that adults, including physicians, housewives, businessmen and other solid citizens are among the regular drug takers. It is time that the people of this country stop and think about the dangers of drugs, both physically and mentally. It is time that people take time to find out about drugs and the damage they can cause . . . and then do something about them.

There are many different drugs taken. Among them are marijuana, amphetamines, barbiturates, LSD, heroin, morphine, cocaine, and glue sniffing.

Amphetamines, sometimes known as pep pills, bennies, dexies, copilots, wake-ups, peaches, footballs, and hearts, are medically used as stimulants. They give a good feeling, and they postpone fatigue. There are two ways they are taken. One is pills or capsules for swallowing, and the other is a liquid which is injected into the body and known as "speed" or "water" to abusers. Its medical name is methamphetamine or methedrine. Amphetamines are used in moderate doses by people who want the stimulating, anti-fatigue effect: students cramming for an exam, athletes trying to improve their performance, truck drivers on an all-night run. Since amphetamines create tolerance, the "good-feeling" seeker must take more and more pills. A moderate increase over the normal dose results in staggering, bleary eyes, incoherent speech, and poor muscular coordination. The dangers of amphetamines as well as other drugs are great. Long and excessive use may damage the heart and blood pressure. In "speed" users, irritability, loss of weight, and hallucinations are common among the worst addicts. All of the amphetamines, used heavily, can in the end create insanity equivalent to schizophrenia. Used this way, "speed" may cause definite brain damage and death. Users may be spotted by unusual liveliness and cheerfulness, heavy perspiration, bad breath, talkative, restless and irritability.

Barbiturates known as goofballs, downs, red birds, yellow jackets, blue heaven, barbs, candy, nimbies, seccy, rainbows, double trouble, blue devils, and sleeping pills, are most popular in the medical field as a treatment of sleeplessness. They also aid in treatment of mental disorders, including epilepsy, and for ailments of breathing, blood flow and digestive systems. A user takes it in pills or capsules, or he may prefer to dissolve the powder in water and inject it. The main danger is that it is very easy to take a "death-dealing" overdose, for two reasons: Barbiturate and alcohol reinforce each other's effects. Secondly, the stupor caused by the drug affects the memory, so that it may not be recalled that a dose was taken. A person anxious for sleep may take a second and even third—and fatal—dose. Its legal standing is like the amphetamines. Only attained legally from a doctor.

Heroin, known as H, horse, snow, stuff and junk has no accepted medical use. It could be valuable as a painkiller, but it is completely illegal. It's a white or brownish powder taken by injection. The injection may be made into the skin or muscle. This is "skin-popping." But it may also be taken directly into the vein for quicker and stronger results. It is known that more people die from heroin than any other drug.

Marijuana, nicknamed as pot, grass, hay, tea, weed, loco-weed, giggle, smoke, griffo, maryjane, hemp, rope, green, joy smoke (the cigarette: reefer, stick, goof butt, and joint), has no accepted medical use. It is taken in liquid, solid, or powdered form. Transporting, possession, and selling the drug is against Federal law, and has severe penalties.

These are a few of the most common drugs, nicknames, dangers, legal standings, and uses. A lot of the people that start on drugs of any kind do it to be "part of the gang" or because they were dared to try it just once. But a lot of them get "hooked," and it's no longer a game. Drugs are not only harmful to the user, but to his family. To the family, it's not physical harm, but it can do a lot to you mentally to know your son or daughter is on drugs, and is slowly destroying himself.

Girls should especially be aware of the effects of drugs. A girl who has been on drugs of any kind risks birth defects in any children she may have.

It would take a lot more time, ink and paper to write about all of the harmful effects drugs have, and no time at all to write of the good that comes from drugs, since there is no real good.

UNFAIRNESS AND HOT DOGS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago I introduced an amendment to the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 which would make possible the continued operation of our small countryside combination locker meat processing and retail meat sales establishments.

As the law is now written, most of these economically vital rural community businesses would be forced to close, raising meat prices to those people they serve.

I recently read an editorial on this matter by Curtis Warnke of the Wood Lake News.

Mr. Speaker, Editor Warnke, a former State legislator, is a man of perception and good judgment.

I insert into the RECORD his editorial, "Unfairness and Hot Dogs"; and I urge my colleagues to read what he has to say:

UNFAIRNESS AND HOT DOGS!

Sometimes we wonder—the federal government does strange things. Recently they have been raising Cain with Minnesota locker plants; particularly our smaller ones. According to Robert W. Carlson, Minnesota Commissioner of Agriculture in a statement made January 24th, "Small locker plants which do custom meat slaughtering are threatened with extinction—because of federal refusal to compromise on a meat inspection law." The question is not proper or effective meat inspection—we have that here in Minnesota following the new 1969 law which passed the legislature—to the contrary, it involves a mere technicality. Our State law permits Custom slaughterers to sell *inspected meat* provided it is segregated from custom meat—that butchered and packaged for farmers and householders who bring in their own meat animals. Federal law prohibits custom slaughterers from selling inspected meats. This federal provision has no relationship to clean and wholesome meat, but is rather a regulation *directed to eliminating the custom slaughterers.*

Thus we can readily see that it's a matter of economics, pure and simple. The big boys want to do away with the custom slaughterers (all of our small locker plants) and the federal government very typically falls into the trap, and does the "dirty work" for the big boys. It happens time and again—over and over!

To add insult to injury, two days later, on January 26th, the federal government announced they were going to approve the sale of Cancerous chickens to the consuming public. In November, inspectors had condemned over 2 million frying chickens because they have leukosis which simply means they survived a bout with cancer but the virus developed lesions and tumors within the chicken. But now under the new announcement, the federal government would ban only chickens whose internal organs showed the disease, was active—a bird with tumors on one wing, for instance, is now considered unsafe. But the new recommendation says it would be safe to cut off the wing and use it in products like hot dogs, while selling the rest of the bird as cut-up chicken.

So they tighten up standards against the "little fellow" and loosen them for the "big fellow." (Most frying chickens are raised today in giant Corporative type operations.) Apparently somebody got stuck with a bunch of chickens and "got to" the right people within the federal government. How else can you explain such inconsistency? Think what they'd do to our small locker plant operators if they attempted to market similar trash! Hotdogs indeed!

COME ON OVER, SAM

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the majority of my constituents live quiet, peaceful lives. They abide by the law, they serve unprotestingly in the Armed Forces; their day-to-day activities rarely make the newspapers.

It was, therefore, of more than usual interest to me when a letter appeared in the Council Bluffs, Iowa, Nonpareil addressed to Sam Brown, Jr., by a former neighbor and classmate of his, Capt. Charles R. Hannan IV. The contrast between these two men is most revealing. Both are my constituents, yet one would have thought that they came from different countries, so separate and opposed are the worlds they now inhabit.

Sam Brown, Jr., is head of the moratorium committee, a national leader of youthful antiwar protesters, and a hunter of headlines. Captain Hannan, on the other hand, does not garner headlines. If he makes the news at all, it is as an anonymous member of the U.S. military forces serving in Vietnam. After reading an article about Brown in his hometown newspaper, however, Captain Hannan was moved to break his silence to step out of the shadows of anonymity. Acting as spokesman for all his companions who are dedicated to advancing the cause of freedom everywhere in the world, he framed this reply to Sam Brown's philosophy and to his protests, which I include here in its entirety. The chorus of protests we constantly hear should not deafen us to these quieter voices.

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE: OFFERS ASSISTANCE VIETNAM.

Sirs: Relative to the article (in The Nonpareil) on Sam Brown Jr. 23–24—Dec. '69.

Sam, after a number of years of education equal to your own, but in a different academic discipline, I do not feel competent to pass judgment on the complex issue now consuming both of us—Vietnam.

That discipline, I believe, taught me an appreciation of the facts, tempered by the concepts of a rule of just laws and an established, but not unquestioned moral code.

I am sorry that you encountered difficulty you could not surmount in attempting to come over here and gather the facts necessary for a moral judgment. Since I did not encounter the same problem about getting over there, I will be happy to act as your guide should you succeed in getting over here. I can guarantee it will be no more of a military tour than I am subject to at the present time.

I cannot guarantee that you'll be able to gather the facts you need to justify your moral judgment in the time you can spare from your busy schedule. But I have just about a year to devote to the project.

My only bias will be that created by my behalf that laws enacted by the properly constituted governing bodies of the United States should be followed. This includes those lawful orders given me by those the people elected have placed over me.

I will be glad to put up another bunk in our bunker at Fire Support Base Buell. I will be glad to hold your place in the chow line. I can show you the calm courage covering fear on the face of a 19-year-old kid who didn't have the education benefits we enjoyed. He does not have much of an insight into the morality of staying alive.

I can show you the strain of concern engraved on the faces of the officers responsible for implementing the policy set down by our elected representatives, and trying to get as many of those kids as possible to their rotation dates.

I can show you some of the strange country and people who seem to me like adolescents struggling with their own destiny against forces they can identify, but do not understand enough to control.

I can show you the heat, dust, mud and jungle. I can show you poverty, confusion, and waste. I can show you insects and rodents. I can show you hospitals stacked with broken bodies. I can show you young men who have seen many close brushes with death. I can show you evidence of the spirit these men draw on to keep going.

No, Sam, I can't show you sufficient facts to justify moral condemnation of the war. I can only show you what I can see. I hope you are able to come over. I'll do all I can to help at this end.

Capt. CHARLES R. HANNAN IV.

MRS. LUCY ALBRIGHT

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years Mrs. Lucy Albright has been a correspondent of the Glasgow Republican, a weekly newspaper in Glasgow, Ky.

Her writing reflects the feeling of the good people of Fountain Run, Ky., and its environs.

I am enclosing an editorial which expresses her inmost desires for the future of our country:

LUCY'S LETTER

(By Lucy Albright)

The 70's loom on the horizon, and what do they hold in their bag for the future? A century appears to be the greatest single period of time to tantalize man with its forecasts and predictions, but there are only a relative handful of people who live to see the beginning of years that end with double zeros. So the beginning of a decade with only one zero, provokes the greatest thoughts, and speculations with profound interest at each beginning; however even the best qualified historians are finding it difficult to formulate their prophecies for the incoming decade. There seem to be several schools of thought, and I am reminded of a man who could never be certain about anything, as he would say. "It mout and then agin, it mouten."

The 60s are too close at hand to correctly evaluate them, but they have been dubbed as frustrating, revolutionary, violent, criminal, shocking, intellectual, stupid, vexatious, among other adjectives. But still the past decade was a period of great acheivement with the heart transplant and the man on the moon probably the most outstanding. The pessimists contend that times will continue to grow more turbulent, more distressing, more complicated, more violent as the decade progresses, while the hopefuls on the other plane of prophecy foresee a transition into more normal, steadier, peaceful years. They even predict an upsurge in a Revival of Religion. They base their reckonings by mans innate nature, in that when he becomes thoroughly saturated with anything, it becomes so repulsive, that he wants to throw the whole caboodle over board. And the extremists will become so ill with vice they will vomit it up out of their system, and the other wing will be so full up to the hilt with lawlessness in our land, they will demand a solution to the problem, which may bring each camp a bit nearer center.

This old saying comes from the days of kings, "uneasy lies the head that wears the crown." This day of uncertainty is highly flavored with uneasiness for the individual as well as the leaders of our country. The high value of honesty, truth, integrity, decency, unselfishness, virtue (to name a few) never changes. It is only that man permits greed, selfishness, egotism, arrogance, and pride blind him to the real things of merit. And it is only when his thinking switches on to the right track, and he accepts the fact that God is still the Lord of the universe, and when man, individually and collectively moves in the realm of his will, then the web in which the world seems enmeshed will begin to untangle; right will become right; good will then be called good, and evil will be called evil.

CANADA-UNITED STATES RELATIONS

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to inform the Senate that the Canadian-United States Interparliamentary Group will open its 13th meeting tonight with an informal banquet at the National Portrait Gallery in honor of the Canadian delegation.

Representative CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER and I are the cochairmen of the U.S. delegation. The Canadian delegation will be headed by the Honorable Jean-Paul Deschatelets, Speaker of the Senate of Canada, and Mr. J. Hugh Faulkner, Deputy Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons.

Meetings will take place in Washington, D.C., on Wednesday, March 11, dealing with trade and economic matters, plus defense and security issues of common interest. On March 12, the delegations will fly to Cape Kennedy, where they will inspect launch facilities, and then proceed to Houston, where, on March 13, they will tour the Manned Spacecraft Center.

Mr. President, Canada is on the move. This giant among nations is advancing rapidly into the 1970's with an optimism as broad as its far ranging frontiers and a buoyant belief that its future is unlimited. As Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Canada's Prime Minister at the turn of the present century, rightly predicted, "the 20th century belongs to Canada."

To better our understanding of contemporary Canada, I have assembled the following articles: an excellent, six-part series on "Canada in Transition" by James Nelson Goodsell of the Christian Science Monitor, a stimulating New York Times Magazine piece on Prime Minister Trudeau by Gerald Clark, editor of The Montreal Star, as well as recent newspaper clippings concerned with Canada's political life, economic developments, and foreign affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that these several articles on modern-day Canada be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADA'S POLITICAL LIFE

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 5, 1969]

FROM SEA TO SEA—THE CHANGING FACE OF A NATION

(Canada, a land of distinct political, economic, and cultural differences, is undergoing a quiet revolution. It is waking to its own potential.)

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

Stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific with a mighty window on the harsh Arctic frontier, Canada today reminds one of the giant, who, upon waking, flexes his muscles and shows his strength.

In a real sense, Canada is a giant among nations and in the recent past has come alive with a host of political, economic, and social advances.

In this second half of the 20th century, Canada is emerging as an industrial power of consequence. Moreover, it possesses a tremendous economic potential which is the envy of many another nation. And it now appears to have the political and social strength to match.

Canadian development amounts to a veritable revolution, confirming the forecast of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Canada's prime minister at the turn of the century, who proclaimed that "the 24th century belongs to Canada."

DIMENSIONS ROUGHED IN

That bold and somewhat pretentious forecast may have seemed overoptimistic during the first half of the century. Many a Canadian wondered about its validity during those years. But Sir Wilfrid's forecast does not appear so odd and out of place today.

The visitor cannot fail to be impressed, as this writer is, with the vitality of the Canadian people and with the confidence they share in the future of their frontier nation, the largest in the Western Hemsiphere.

Here, in brief, are some of the dimensions of Canada's current development saga:

The nation's economy is growing at a healthy clip, somewhere in the neighborhood of 5.6 percent a year—and the economy is expected to register a 50 percent hike in the current eight-year period which began in 1967, Canada's centennial year, and ends in 1975. That would be a boost from $66 billion to $100 billion (Canadian dollars worth about 93 United States cents).

Mounting mineral production will show a doubling of the value of the ore taken from the soil in the 10-year period 1965–75. This should boost mineral-production totals from $12 billion in 1965 to $26.1 billion in 1975.

And perhaps most important, Canada possesses the world's largest known reserves of oil, gas, minerals, and water. And along with this, it has one of the half-dozen untapped land frontiers left in the world today. Only Russia's Siberia, Brazil's Amazon, Australia's interior, and core areas in Central Asia and Central Africa have frontiers comparable to the Canadian Arctic.

The view of geologists and others studying the difficulties of working and living in these harsh frontier lands is that Canada's Arctic may well prove the most hospitable and the easiest to develop.

"Canada's northern reaches are among the next to be opened up," a United Nations report said recently. "It will be necessary to overcome many hurdles, but the potential is there."

WHEAT AND NICKEL PROBLEMS

Canadians looking at the recent bidding on the Alaskan oil fields and on the voyage of the United States oil tanker Manhattan through the Northwest Passage are fast becoming aware of the potential wealth awaiting development in the north.

There are, of course, some storm clouds on the immediate horizon.

Wheat, for example, is being overproduced out on the prairies. The wheat-producing regions may even be headed for a depression. There are serious strikes at the moment, including that of the nickel workers, which is causing a worldwide pinch since Canada normally produces 80 percent of the Western world's nickel. But these are short-range problems.

Of more consequence is a list of other problems with a longer history and more meaning today as Canada faces up to its new role in the world as an important "middle power," a phrase being heard with increasing frequency in Ottawa, the Canadian capital.

At the top of the list of these problems are the harsh realities of Canada's geographical location. To the north lies that important Arctic frontier, an area that Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau recently called "the future of Canada."

And to the south lies the United States, a nation looked upon with mixed feelings by today's Canadian.

On the one hand, he values the generally friendly relations between the two countries. On the other hand, he worries about United States economic and political encroachment on Canada.

"In some ways, it is a love-hate relationship," a leading Canadian politician said recently. "Being so close, we are faced with the problem of 'keeping up with the Joneses,' who always seem to have a little more of everything—except land, and there comes the rub."

Many Canadians, however, probably feel much like the Winnipeg businessman who said: "If we have to live next to a great power, I'm glad it is the United States."

Still, the closeness of the United States and its preponderant influence in the world and particularly in the Western Hemisphere—politically, economically, and culturally—are an issue for Canadians. And the visitor hears it on all sides.

There are answers to the problem, of course. One of them lies in taking hold of the development of the Arctic frontier and in moving Canada's population and economic activity northward.

For 100 years, Canadian development has been largely confined to a 200-mile strip between the frontier and the United States—"hemmed in between two difficult realms," as a Calgary banker put it.

The vast bulk of Canada's 21.3 million people lives in this 200-mile-wide belt, leaving perhaps a million Canadians scattered elsewhere in the nearly 3.9 million square miles making up the nation. The transcontinental railways built in the last century stayed within the belt, as does the Trans-Canada highway.

All the principal cities are here also—from Ottawa and the big eastern industrial and population centers of Toronto and Montreal, to the prairie cities of Winnipeg, Regina, Saskatoon, Calgary, and Edmonton, and out west to mild Vancouver and its important Pacific port. Quebec and its French-speaking population, as well as the Maritime cities of Halifax and St. John's are in the belt, as are a host of other important towns with colorful names like Moose Jaw, Medicine Hat, and Red Deer.

EAST-WEST CLEAVAGE DESCRIBED

This narrow belt has its problems, too, "when you consider the east-west cleavage facing the nation," to use the words of a Toronto politician.

The people in the far west, in Vancouver and elsewhere in British Columbia, feel discriminated against in issues such as freight rates and representation in Ottawa. "In fact, there is budding separatism here," a Vancouver newspaperman said, adding quickly, however, that he doubts it will ever become "too serious.'

If the westerner feels isolated from the rest of Canada—partly owing to geography and distances over the prairies and through the mountains—the easterner often has the same feeling, particularly if he lives in parts of the Maritime Provinces which have become "Canada's Appalachia."

In the present boom era for the Canadian economy, the area to benefit the least is the Maritime region composed of the province of New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island (P.E.I.). Moreover, the region's traditional ties to the sea have weakened in recent decades, cutting off one of its sources of economic power.

Although the 200-mile-wide belt has provided one sense of unity to the Canadian nation, it may well have "given us a certain myopia about the total picture," an associate of Progressive Conservative Party leader Robert Staneld said here. "We put too much emphasis on parts of the whole and tended to forget even portions of the narrow corridor from ocean to ocean."

It may be that the new awareness of the northern Artic frontier will prove a boon to the more depressed areas of the Maritimes and to other parts of the corridor where there are economic and political problems.

But Canada's other big historical problem and perhaps the most pressing social and cultural dilemma today is the question of a French-speaking minority.

It is centered in Quebec and locked into a nation where the English language, ways, and customs predominate. The struggle between the two cultures dates back into the 1700's, when Britain and France warred over Canada. And it has never been fully or finally resolved.

Today, a serious separatist feeling exists among many French Canadians. The leaders of French-speaking Quebec, including Premier Jean-Jacques Bertrand, however, regard themselves as Canadian and have concentrated on efforts to heal the long cleavage between the "two Canadas."

But underneath, in the more impoverished and impassioned quarters of Quebec City and Montreal and some of the rural areas of the province, one hears the Quebecois speak with ardent feeling against Ottawa and all that it symbolizes.

All sorts of solutions have been advanced toward mending the breach. Some Canadians argue that Prime Minister Trudeau, himself from Quebec, may prove to be the Canadian leader who solves the separatist problem or at least goes a long way toward dampening it. Time will tell.

Meanwhile, the recent efforts of the federal government to make the nation more truly bilingual are stalled on many fronts. There are some doubts in Ottawa about the wisdom of imposing French on English-speaking people and English on French-speaking people.

One of the solutions which some observers think worthy of trying is a massive effort to get the Quebecois out of "the ghetto atmosphere" of Quebec, to use the words of a Toronto newspaper columnist. Dennis Braithwaite, in the Toronto Telegram, complained that "nothing is being done . . . to help rescue Quebec from its long night of ignorance." His solution: Get the Quebecois to travel about Canada, bring more industry and development to the province, and provide Quebec with better educational facilities.

TONE OF CONFIDENCE GROWS

Whatever the solution, Canadians know it must be found. And at this moment, despite pessimism in some quarters, there appears to be a degree of optimism in Ottawa and particularly in the Trudeau government about making progress in resolving the dispute.

And that optimism on the French-Canadian problem spills over into many other areas. The general malaise written about by many observers in Canada a few years ago has yielded to a growing tone of confidence in the future.

The centennial year, 1967, now appears to have marked a turning point. "We are more confident about tomorrow," an associate of Mr. Trudeau said, echoing almost the very words uttered by the opposition leader, Mr. Stanfield, during the course of a recent interview.

And this confidence seems to be shared and felt across Canada, even in Montreal, where serious riots erupted in mid-October, and the Maritimes, where there are signs that the economy may be coming out of the doldrums.

Yet as Canada moves into the 1970's, Canadians find themselves with the prospect of being on the doorstep of a future bright with promise, but still shackled by the legacy of the past which must be overcome if the future is to be fulfilled.

"We have to both utilize our heritage and overcome it," is how a Toronto banker put it.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 12, 1969]

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: RESHAPING A NATIONAL IMAGE

(To the Canadian public, Canada's prime ministers, beginning in 1867 with Sir John A. Macdonald, were often party leaders painted in traditional party colors. But Trudeau is shifting the emphasis, proving a colorful leader as well as an astute politician.)

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

Canadian politics is being significantly reshaped these days.

Here in Ottawa, the Canadian capital, Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau has taken firm control of government machinery and is slowly but clearly altering some of the traditional concepts of the Prime Minister's job.

"It would be fair to say," comments a newspaperman here who has watched governments come and go, "that Trudeau after a year and a half in office is more firmly in control of Canada and Canadian affairs than any leader since Mackenzie King."

Mr. Trudeau's emergence as a national leader came as a surprise to many Canadians who knew little of this politician-intellectual before he was tapped by the Liberal Party as successor to Lester B. Pearson in 1968.

Yet Mr. Trudeau is proving something of an enigma to Canadians—and to the Progressive Conservative Party, the main opposition force in Canadian politics which itself is headed by a new man, Robert L. Stanfield.

Mr. Stanfield took over as leader of the Progressive Conservatives shortly before Mr. Trudeau assumed leadership of the Liberals. He has not made the impact on Canada that Mr. Trudeau has but seems to be more and more taking an active and vigorous part in leadership of his own party and in challenging the Liberals and Prime Minister Trudeau.

Part of Mr. Stanfield's problem is that Mr. Trudeau continues to upstage the opposition leader. His upstaging comes in a variety of ways. Obviously the Prime Minister has a platform of importance denied the opposition. But, more importantly, Mr. Trudeau is proving a colorful leader.

"Trudeaujinks" was the coined word used by the Montreal Star last summer to describe the activities of the Prime Minister.

Pictures in Canadian newspapers, as well as throughout the world press, tell something of the man. He is shown in bathing trunks diving into a pool, throwing a football at a high school competition, riding horseback in the Canadian West, strapping himself into a two-seat jet aircraft, taking his tie and hanging it around his neck to suggest the strangling when he discussed a politically unpopular issue, and kissing pretty girls on the cheek.

A bachelor whose basic desire is to separate his public and private life—which he does with considerable success—Mr. Trudeau's less flamboyant self, that of a quiet, pensive intellectual, does not make the headlines. Yet it is there.

And it is this aspect of his makeup which is helping to reshape Canadian political life.

Under his aegis the Prime Minister's office is taking on an increasing amount of activity. He says he wants a staff around him that will be able to meet the challenges of the 1970's, a decade which he feels will require more specialization and more expert decision than any previous set of 10 years.

Mr. Trudeau, the enigma to Canadians, is proving the enigma to his fellow Liberal politicians.

NEW MARKET WANTED

His basic goal is one of altering Canada both at home and in the world. He envisages a Canada with quasi-neutralism as its international posture, an independent stand which will, or at least should help, keep Canada independent from the dominant United States neighbor next door.

But his neutralism is not a passive one. He wants to find new markets for Canada's products—items which the nation produces in large abundance, such as wheat, cod, forest products, and both light and heavy manufactured items. If this means selling to the Communist world and to areas not previously included in Canada's trade pattern, so much the better.

Part of the Trudeau effort is one of making Canada an important middle-power voice. This is seen in his downplaying of Canadian defense efforts overseas, cutbacks in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization commitment, and the restructuring of some of Canada's foreign service. While these steps were taken for economy reasons, they have another important aspect: They are designed to give Canada a greater sense of flexibility.

And this is the essence of the Trudeau approach to government. He wants Canada to have—both at home and abroad—a flexibility of approach for the 1970's which will allow Canada to roll with the punches and to be able to effectively adjust to changing conditions.

His own office style suggests this approach. He has a larger staff than any previous Canadian prime minister. He puts heavy importance on the staff system. And he tends to downplay the importance of parliamentary committees with their more formal procedures.

He is accused by his detractors of wanting to change the prime minister's office into a presidential office. And there does appear to be more of the executive system in operation under Mr. Trudeau than his predecessors. He argues that this is necessary in a time when decisions must be made quickly and with expertise.

As a middle power, not a major power, Canada in the Trudeau view can serve as a mediator between the major powers, an arbiter in East-West relations.

This role demands of Canada increasing domestic peace and solutions to a number of problems which have beset the nation for the 100 years since confederation back in 1867—a date Canadians regard as their year of independence.

Most prominent among these is the issue of French-Canadian separatism. Mr. Trudeau, a product of the French-Canadian system, sees the issue as dominant but perhaps not as impossible of solution as many Canadian officials and observers say.

Toward this end, he has followed a conciliatory course toward French-speaking Quebec and has gone out of his way to find ways to more effectively incorporate the Quebecois in national life. A language bill which hopefully will make Canada more truly bilingual has been passed. Members of the Trudeau government as well as civil servants in Ottawa are being called upon to learn both languages.

But this in only a beginning.

OPPOSITION FROM QUEBEC

Style and approach are important—and here Mr. Trudeau is carrying on the programs begun by his predecessor, Prime Minister Pearson, which aim at getting away from separatism in political treatment and in ministerial performance.

Some observers think that only a French-Canadian like Mr. Trudeau, although he is not a typical one, can effectively heal the separatist issue. Yet there is strong opposition to Mr. Trudeau—coming right from Quebec. Many of the Quebecois see him as more English than the English in Canada, something of an "Uncle Tom" among his fellow French Canadians.

Whatever the debate now under way, there seems little doubt that this basic issue of separatism is one that will continue to occupy Mr. Trudeau's thought and activity in the months ahead.

For his part, Mr. Stanfield has come to recognize the importance of greater attention to Quebec. A native Nova Scotian, he plugs away at learning French, but says it is difficult for a man in his 50's to do so (he is 55, Mr. Trudeau 50).

The Progessive Conservatives have not really had a strong foothold in Quebec and see little likelihood of gaining one in the immediate fture. But Mr. Stanfield and his fellow Conservatives hope that with time this can be broken down.

In the meantime, they see their role in this regard as one of "doing what is right on constitutional issues and on separatism and thinking and acting in bilingual ways," as a Stanfield associate put it.

Mr. Stanfield's party not only is an opposition force, but it is a minority party. In the 1968 general elections, Mr. Trudeau's Liberals won 151 seats to Mr. Stanfield's Progressive Conservatives who won only 72 seats.

The road to a return to power will be difficult, particularly if Mr. Trudeau succeeds in maintaining his control over his party and an effective hold on public opinion.

Yet Mr. Stanfield holds that the time will come again for Conservative leadership in the nation, reminiscent of the years of the last Conservative government, that of John G. Diefenbaker in the 1950's but much more "progressive" than that government.

Mr. Stanfield as a result emphasizes the "progressive" part of the Conservative name.

The term "conservative" is not entirely descriptive of the party as a result. Mr. Stanfield views the party as a political force which in many ways is to the left of Mr. Trudeau and his Liberal Party. He favors major social legislation, for example.

A recent party conference at Niagara Falls worked on new proposals—and before long Mr. Stanfield hopes to outline some basic changes in the federal tax law which he would like to see adopted. In addition he has ideas on social-welfare legislation. Without being entirely specific, he has talked of adopting a guaranteed annual income for all Canadians.

Some members of his staff, a young and aggressive group of men and women, many of whom are in their 20's, have given him concrete proposals on amounts and on sliding-scale increases to take into account inflationary pressures.

Mr. Stanfield is expected to incorporate some of these proposals into his public utterances in the months ahead as he campaigns against Mr. Trudeau and the Liberals.

Party designations are not entirely meaningful in Canadian politics. It more depends on base. And in this the Liberals have tended to be a broader-based party than the Conservatives, appealing throughout the country and in French-speaking Quebec.

At the same time, Canada has additional parties—particularly the socialist-oriented New Democratic Party (NDP), which has 23 seats in Parliament, and the French-oriented Le Railliement des Creditistes with 14 seats.

The NDP gained wide attention this past summer with a spectacular showing in Manitoba, where it won control of the provincial legislature and put a former Liberal in the provincial premier's post. The new Premier, Edward Schreyer, is a Roman Catholic, a political science professor, and a sharply individualistic and articulate speaker.

Yet the NDP in Manitoba, under Mr. Schreyer, is a far cry from the NDP nationally, under T. C. Douglas. The NDP with its socialist philosophy is anathema to many Canadians on a national level, but the NDP in Manitoba is attracting business support.

The reason is essentially Mr. Schreyer's moderate approach to the issues. He is not a doctrinaire socialist, but one interested in progressive government in Manitoba.

Moreover, it may be due in some measure to the political attitudes of the prairie provinces, which have always shown a degree of political independence. Saskatchewan had a socialist government from 1944 to 1964, and the socialists have made headway in a number of provincial elections.

In British Columbia, the NDP seemed to pose a serious threat this past August to the Social Credit Party of Premier W. A. Bennett, himself something of a maverick in Canadian politics. But Mr. Bennett withstood the NDP attack and came back stronger than ever, winning a total of 39 seats in the provincial Parliament—a gain of 7—in the 55-seat House. Most of his gain was at the expense of the NDP which had seemed to pose a serious threat.

But for all the variety in Canadian political life, the Liberal and Progressive Conservative Parties—with their leaders, Prime Minister Trudeau and Mr. Stanfield—are the major forces in the nation. They will probably remain that way, although the NDP stands to retain a significant minority position, one which could be particularly important when the parties are more evenly balanced than they are today.

POLITICAL HEADWAY

Mr. Stanfield looks toward 1973 and the next scheduled parliamentary election with considerable optimism. He can take some hope in the fact that Mr. Trudeau's star in popular opinion polls is not as great as it was a year ago. And he can be pleased that the Conservatives are once again making more political headway than seemed possible after their stunning 1968 defeat.

Yet Mr. Trudeau appears likely to continue to dominate Canadian political life in the months and years ahead.

He is a political leader of consequence with an independent style and approach, a somewhat elusive man who has already begun to make his mark on Canadian politics. He has long enjoyed the give and take of political argument, particularly in the grass roots with the voters. And he has something of a knack for winning public sentiment by informal sessions with the public.

Mr. Trudeau travels widely out of Ottawa and apparently likes to get away as often as he can from the official routine in the capital. In fact, those around him say he dislikes the routine of Ottawa life and prefers to be out in the hustings.

This attitude has served to show the difference between Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Stanfield. Yet the difference may not be as important as some observers think. Mr. Stanfield is a personable individual, even if he suffers sometimes in comparison with the more gregarious Prime Minister.

In the long run, Mr. Trudeau's personal assets will prove less important than his performance as a leader and his ability to heal the breaches in the nation. His top job is probably that of solving the dilemma over French Canada.

If he can satisfy both the French in their effort to retain an independent language and culture and the English in their desire to keep the nation together, his place in Canadian politics seems secure.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 11, 1969]

CANADA FACES THE FUTURE WITH "A RAGE TO LIVE"

(Not since confederation in 1867 have so many vital issues confronted Canadians. The answers could foreshadow a country much changed from the familiar Canada of the past.)

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

A recent issue of Maclean's magazine contained a feature on redrawing the map of Canada. The article asked Canadians if they had to roll up the present map, "Which Canada would you choose?"

Suggesting that Canada of the future may have "an image that is far from familiar," Maclean's editors gave readers three options:

[Maps not printed in RECORD.]

Map 1 consolidates Canada's present 10 provinces and two territories into eight subdivisions—including two "city provinces" embracing what are now Montreal and Toronto, although calling the latter "York."

This map, based on population grouping and economic efficiency, leaves Ontario, Quebec, and Newfoundland pretty much intact. But it merges the small Maritime Provinces into one grouping, to be known as Atlantica. The prairie provinces and the Northwest Territories become a single subdivision, Alsaskaman, taking the first letters of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. British Columbia and the Yukon Territory become North Columbia.

DEBATE UNDER WAY

Map 2 handles the situation which would develop if Quebec went its own way. In a Pakistan-like redrawing of the map, the rest of the nation becomes Canada West and Canada East with a Polish-corridor-type highway linking the two. The highway crosses not only Quebec but part of Maine in the United States. In return, Canada grants a similar corridor linking the continental United States with Alaska.

Map 3 merges Canada into the United States, giving Washington four new states with Quebec becoming "a French-speaking enclave surrounded by a continent-sized American melting pot."

Maclean's disclaims any advocacy of such wholesale revision. But the magazine feature points up the debate under way in Canada over the constitutional future of this northern land.

It could well be that the map of Canada will not change one iota in the years ahead—except perhaps for turning the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories into full-fledged provinces. Yet the possibility of change does exist in a nation with only 21.3 million people, with vast unpopulated reaches, and with so mighty a nation as the United States and its 200 million people next door. Taken together with the separatist sentiment in Quebec and other divisions, Canada today is at something of a crossroads.

NEW CONCEPTS BREWED

The new look in political leadership in Ottawa, reflected in both the majority Liberals headed by Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau and the minority Progressive Conservatives led by Robert L. Stanfield, suggests this is a time of possible change for Canada and its governmental patterns.

The possibility, however, is abhorrent to many Canadians who like the comfortable, somewhat time-honored patterns that have worked reasonably well over the past 100 years since confederation in 1867.

But new concepts are brewing. Many of Canada's younger people—not those in universities, but those who already have begun to take a place in government, business, or the professions—are openly talking about changes in government.

They question, for example, whether Canada ought not to go it alone more regarding Commonwealth affairs. Some wonder whether or not the monarchy's usefulness is over. Still others actively champion the concept of a presidential system of government with its various checks and balances. Prime Minister Trudeau's handling of government in Ottawa leaves many to suspect he is moving in the direction of the presidential system.

All of these notions and concepts are little more than talk at this stage. But they are growing factors in Canada's political and social evolution. And observers throughout Canada expect these factors to become even more important as time goes on.

"The decade of the 1970's," says a prominent prairie editor, "will probably determine our future course." He continues:

"We have not been called upon to make such important decisions since the time that our ancestors set up Canada, as we know it today over a hundred years ago. We now need the wisdom of Solomon and the ability to foretell the needs of the future. Will we be better off remaining fully independent or working out some sort of liaison with the United States.? What of the Queen? Will we continue to sing 'God Save the Queen'? Or will we opt out of this tie as seems to be the trend in other places?"

MAJORITY OPPOSE TIE

The overwhelming majority of Canadians are clearly opposed to any tie with the United States, more than now somewhat unhappily exists in economic encroachment. But there is an articulate minority supporting such a tie. Thus this prospect seems remote. But some of the other prospects now being aired seem less so.

Maclean's map feature, as farfetched as it seems to some Canadians and as strange as it looks to the eye, well may presage changes in Canada's look and its governmental instruments. Time will tell.

Meanwhile, most Canadians are thinking about issues of more immediate consequence, although they are issues which will have a considerable impact on Canada's destiny. These issues involve the cities, the development of the northern frontier, and Canada's role in the world.

What of the cities? As the first map in Maclean's proposal suggests, today there are two major metropolitan areas in Canada: Montreal and Toronto. Both have populations of more than 2 million people, and Toronto probably can claim an additional million in the surrounding area. This population dimension means one of every four Canadians is a resident of either Toronto or Montreal! This fact alone cannot help but have consequences for Canada's future development.

Out here in the prairie provinces, five important metropolitan centers exist—all with populations passing or approaching a quarter of a million persons each. Calgary and Edmonton, the key cities of Alberta, have half a million each. Regina and Saskatoon in Saskatchewan boast 200,000 each. Winnipeg in Manitoba boasts 600,000.

Farther west metropolitan Vancouver and its more than 800,000 inhabitants dominate the western province of British-Columbia. And then there are such cities as the Canadian capital of Ottawa and Quebec City, as well as those in the Maritimes and others elsewhere across this nation, which all are metropolises of consequence.

While some Canadians wish that the growth of the cities could be curbed, such a wish seems rather vain. The city core may slow down in growth, but the metropolises as a whole seem certain to grow spectacularly in the years ahead.

Some Canadian commentators now see Canada in terms of a number of large city-states, with a central core around which are clustered an increasingly industrial area. Such is certainly the case for Toronto and Montreal. And in Calgary, the Calgarians see themselves as dominating a vast region of this western prairie province. Certainly Calgary is the center of Alberta's oil industry even though most of the oil drilling is north and west of Edmonton, Calgary's rival for dominance in the province.

SOLUTIONS UNDERTAKEN

The development of this city-and-region situation has brought a call for governmental structure to cope with the new arrangement. Some of it exists already, but more is needed. Yet Canadians are considerably ahead of their neighbors in the United States in this regard.

What city planners are grappling with is a whole list of urban problems ranging from inadequate transportation to inefficient housing. These are not dissimilar from the problems faced by large U.S. cities. For Canada, however, as evidenced in city planning in Calgary and Edmonton, something is being done to solve these problems before they become almost too big to solve. Both cities have concentrated industry away from living areas, and Calgary has fully adequate waste-disposal arrangements.

Turning to another area, Canadians—as previous articles in this series have indicated—are beginning to focus attention on the vast, unharnessed frontier lying north of the narrow east-west population zone in which most Canadians live.

In this connection, a series of task-force studies are being made concerning resources and potential for industrial and urban development in the broad belt from Newfoundland to the Mackenzie River Valley near the Alaskan border.

This belt, named the Mid-Canada Corridor, may well become the next area for Canadian growth. It sweeps down below Hudson Bay in Ontario, but runs well north of cities like Winnipeg, Regina, and Edmonton.

The result of these studies should provide a jumping-off point for developing the north. Once the mid-Canada frontier is opened up, the possibility of opening the far-northern frontier become more likely.

Thus, the present effort undoubtedly will be focused on opening up more accessible regions first. Developing the $900 million (U.S.) Churchill Falls hydroelectric-power project in Labrador is a significant first step.

This project, the biggest civil-engineering effort in North America, also is one of the largest single-site hydropower plants in the world. It is scheduled for completion in November, 1971. Its planned capacity is large enough to provide power equivalent to that utilized by the cities of Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver. These cities have a combined population of about 6 million.

Canada is beginning to open up and use its wilderness and it also is opening up a new avenue of independence in the world.

Canada's voice long has been one of mediation in world councils. It now is becoming one of independence as well.

The Trudeau government may be cutting back on its overseas staffs as an economy measure, but the thrust of Canada is being felt in other parts of the world. Canada's independence on the issue of ties with Communist China nettles Washington.

More importantly there appears a trend toward Canada's alignment with such European nations as Germany and Italy and with Japan in resisting Washington's efforts on a number of issues. One of these areas is atomic testing.

Canada made a number of entreaties to Washington when the United States carried out its underground atomic test in the

Aleutians. Canada, moreover is providing a haven for many United States men who are resisting the draft and the war in Vietnam. Even if providing a haven is proving a touchy subject with many Canadians, it does suggest the trends now evident across this nation.

MUSCLES FLEXED

Numerous articles in Canadian journals of opinion recently have indicated something of the growing trend toward independence in thinking and in acting on foreign affairs. One commentator suggested that any government failing to give support to the "politics of independence" is not with the tide. He concluded, "This country has a rage to live."

One Canadian—Harold Horwood, the Newfoundland novelist—says that among Western nations, "Canada is the first truly 20th-century nation." That may stretch the point a little, but there is little doubt Canada is a vigorous and important 20th-century land.

And the next decade well could witness some major changes in Canada's role in the world and in the way it governs the vast reaches of its 3.9 million square miles.

[From the New York Times Magazine, Jan. 25, 1970]

TRUDEAU WITHOUT THE TRUDEAUMANIA—CANADA'S PRIME MINISTER IS NOT A SIMPLE SWINGER NOR A RADICAL REFORMER

(By Gerald Clark)

One evening last spring, Gordon Fairweather, a member of Parliament, left the House of Commons and strolled along Parliament Hill, enjoying the early flowers and the release from winter harshness. It was a quiet evening, and the collection of gray sandstone Gothic buildings looked unusually peaceful in the dusk. Fairweather, suddenly, was startled to see the Prime Minister, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, walking toward him. No one else was around, not even the Royal Canadian Mounted Police plainclothesman who normally accompanies the Prime Minister wherever he goes.

Trudeau was on his way from his office in the East Block to the other office in the Centre Block, which he uses when the Commons is in session. Fairweather, who had known Trudeau since his days as an ordinary M.P., had shared a bond as a fellow lawyer and upholder of civil liberties and, even though a member of a rival political party, had always admired and respected him. "Prime Minister," said Fairweather, "do they allow you out alone now?"

Fairweather does not remember the precise reply, but he says he will not forget the meaning of the gesture when Trudeau shrugged his shoulders. It was as if to say, "I wish it were so." Fairweather experienced a powerful sense of empathy, for here was Trudeau, an intensely individualistic person who in the past managed to escape periodically to a mountain retreat, Thoreau-style, to meditate alone, trying to cling to a moment of privacy. His brief flight in the spring was from a post that had made him a captive, but, typical of the enigma of Trudeau, no longer a reluctant one.

More recently, an interviewer found Trudeau in his Centre Block office—a formal, stiff setting—with the Prime Minister dressed appropriately in a dark suit. His collar was unbuttoned, his tie askew. This was not merely a concession to compromise. It was, instead, quite in keeping with Trudeau's innate conservatism yet demand for personal freedom. For the man who has on occasion worn as ascot and open sandals in the House of Commons, or—attired in white tie and tails—slid down the banister of Lancaster House, a British government mansion in London, there is no intrinsic contradiction between uninhibited behavior and a dedication to a solid, safe approach to government.

Besides, he slides down banisters to demonstrate he is physically fit. Trudeau is bewitched by a mark of vanity. But it is not necessarily about his formidable intellect, an I.Q. of 180 and an erudition piled up at l'Université de Montréal, Harvard, the London School of Economics and l'Ecole des Sciences Politiques, Paris. It is, rather, about his age—he is 50—and his determination to keep forever youthful and athletic.

If there is a contradiction it exists chiefly in the minds of those electors who chose Trudeau because they visualized him as a swinger, a wealthy bachelor who takes out dazzling actresses half his age, who arrived on the political front late but who would help Canada eliminate its image of stolidity. Things have not worked exactly that way, and the disenchanted include intellectuals who thought Trudeau would animate the country with radical social and economic reforms. Trudeau, as the 18 months since his election as Prime Minister have confirmed, is neither a simple swinger nor a radical reformer. Nor is it entirely right to dismiss the story ingenuously, as he himself attempted to do when he told his interviewer, "I am just trying to set myself up as some kind of modest efficiency expert in government."

Trudeau is a complex mixture, a man to himself and comparable to no other political figure. He has been called patrician, autocratic, cold, selfprotective and mysterious. He may be all of these, but he is also charming, warm, carefree, open, modest—and shy. Gordon Fairweather, who, as a Conservative spokesman, finds it difficult to criticize Trudeau, quotes a description once given by Lord Haldane, the British statesman, of Prime Minister Asquith—too much head, and not enough "fire in his belly." To a degree, it fits Trudeau. He has shown himself venturesome in foreign policy, but cautious in domestic affairs, prompting Fairweather and others to suggest that they would welcome more of a gambler and less of a precision-maker in Trudeau. He has given Canada its most efficient government in modern times. In the process, he has kept pace with the enormous growth of administrative needs by expanding the staff and apparatus of the Prime Minister's office, so that today it is twice as big as that of his predecessor, Lester Pearson.

Trudeau has been able to concentrate on the housekeeping and mechanics of management because he has been under no compulsion to deliver promptly on campaign promises—for the good reason that there were no specific campaign promises. Such was the enchantment of Trudeaumania in 1968 that he had no difficulty leading the Liberals into election victory as Canada's first majority government in six years. He did so on the strength of vaguely worded and philosophic approaches to national unity and regional disparity in the face of growing separatism in Quebec and a persistent gap between the affluent and poor provinces.

There has been some improvement in English-French relations, but less marked success in the fight against economic inequalities. This is not unintentional. In Trudeau's mind, national unity held priority, for without it there would be no country and consequently no other program could carry meaning. And in the deliberately calculated timetable of the technocrats with whom Trudeau has surrounded himself, the cutting of government expenses would have to precede the spending of more money. "The goodies"—as his principal aide, Marc Lalonde, puts it—will come later, by 1972.

Trudeau, whom France's Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, editor-publisher of L'Express, has called "the first really modern politician in the West," has no doubts about the validity of his approach. "We're setting up machinery which will permit us to deal with the important and not only the urgent," he says. He has set up a multitude of study groups and task forces to delve into almost every aspect of Canadian life, from agriculture to the welfare structure, from constitutional revision to public information. In the past session of Parliament, 10 white papers were introduced, compared with an average of two or three in previous governments. It suits a computerized age, and it suits Trudeau's own personality. The result is an effusion in efforts, though not always in warmth. One of the lieutenants in the Prime Minister's office, who worked previously for Pearson, confesses there was more excitement in the old days: "It was like being in an ancient DC-3 with Pearson the pilot, a grin on his face, flying by the seat of his pants—coming in for a landing with the wings, wobbling, clipping hedges, but always touching down safely. Now it's like being in a DC-8, landing on instruments, everything efficient and calm—and impersonal."

There is a feeling here that, Lord Acton notwithstanding, power instead of corrupting Trudeau has made him more tolerant and subdued, as though he is aware of the limitations of any individual in the face of economic and social and political realities. A man who has worked closely with him for many years—previously when Trudeau was teaching law at l'Université de Montréal, and more recently when he became Justice Minister and Prime Minister—says, "Ten years ago he was, intellectually, an arrogant bastard. Now he has learned some humility."

At Cabinet meetings decorum is stiffer than it was under Pearson, but Trudeau presides much as a professor at a seminar. He arrives with a message containing perhaps three main points—the maximum, as any good lecturer knows, that can be absorbed in a single sitting. Trudeau makes his points, then listens to the discussions that ensue, in a technique that may have its origin in his Jesuit classical college training in Montreal—of not imposing views on others but letting them find their way to your position. In response to items raised by ministers, Trudeau frequently and candidly confesses he is not sure what action should be taken. He heeds arguments, does not necessarily act by consensus but has a knack for selecting the best reasoning offered around the table.

In the easy-going Pearson-administration, Cabinet leaks were frequent. Trudeau has imposed a ruling that no disclosures may be made to the news media—largely on the ground that these are designed to build the reputation of one minister at the expense of another. The prohibition has worked to a remarkable degree, and there have been no revelations of a substantive nature.

Once, Bryce Mackasey, the capable and strong Minister of Labor, who had been out of town and missed a couple of meetings, was asked by Trudeau to relate to the Cabinet the latest developments in a strike by grain handlers in the port of Vancouver, B.C. Mackasey said that on the basis of a quick fill-in from his deputies, he could report that all was well and there was no need for concern. Jean-Luc Pepin, Minister of Trade and Commerce, broke in to say this was not so that according to his information there was grave dislocation. Mackasey conceded that Pepin was speaking accurately, but he had thought it prudent to make an optimistic statement before the Cabinet; his intention was to tell the Prime Minister the gloomier facts later in private. A tense silence descended, the other Ministers watching for reaction from Trudeau, whom they knew to like frank discussions. Then Trudeau said icily, "Mr. Mackasey, in your absence there have been no Cabinet leaks."

Trudeau, at Cabinet meetings, can exhibit a boyish sense of humor. At one session, he was scheduled to leave at 12:20 p.m., in order to attend a formal lunch at 12:30. As the deadline arrived after a lengthy debate, a Minister said, "If I had the time, I could present two other points to support my case." Trudeau, whose high cheeks seem to reflect a special glow when he feels impish, grinned and said, "But you haven't the time."

In the House of Commons he is less whimsical. Just as he is impatient or ill at ease with small talk, he appears awkward and bored with prepared statements. He delivers fewer of them than any of his recent predecessors, and when he does, it is in a dull, classroom style. He becomes alive during a question period, when his intellect is challenged. He can give a bright, satisfactory answer—or engage in debate in impressive style—and then alienate everyone by being contemptuously sarcastic. Last July, during a particularly bitter exchange, some M.P.'s shouted, *"Heil Hitler."* Trudeau retaliated with such vindictive personal assaults that several members walked out of the chamber in protest. Trudeau urged them on: "I think we should encourage members of the Opposition to leave. Every time they do, the I.Q. of this house rises considerably."

Such haughtiness distresses old hands, among them David Lewis, deputy leader of the socialist New Democratic party and probably the finest parliamentary performer of all. "When I look across the aisle from time to time," Lewis commented in the House, "and observe the disdain with which the Prime Minister treats Parliament, and the way he looks at us in the Opposition, I often say to myself: there, but for the grace of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, sits God."

The people around Trudeau defend him pointing to his high target of perfection and idealism. He respects the parliamentary process—they argue—but has no tolerance for members whom he considers to reduce its level. Parliament, according to his view, should imply a lofty discussion of principles, of white papers, of the philosophy of politics. But to men like Lewis there is a disturbing inability in Trudeau to understand that Parliament in a real sense represents the people, mediocrities as well as geniuses. Members, like their constituents, are average mortals with hang-ups and parochial interests.

Lewis, during the election campaign, described Trudeau as "a suspended brain." Now he adds, "Time has proved it a not invalid description." Lewis, whom some correspondents judge to hold the most sagacious insight into Trudeau, says: "On the whole, he has not been, so far, an innovative Prime Minister. He talks the language of change but doesn't show he feels it. He's a highly intelligent 19th century liberal with an obsession for civil liberties which is 25 years behind the times."

Trudeau's preoccupation with civil liberties does indeed go back a quarter of a century, to the regime of Maurice Duplessis, who as Premier of Quebec in the nineteen-forties and fifties ruled with semi-dictatorial and repressive laws which Trudeau fought as a lawyer and co-founder of an outspoken review of opinion, Cité Libre. The mark of those years lingers in his wariness of political figures in Quebec, a province that has long shown a proclivity to authoritarianism. Thus today he is deeply committed to the establishment of an effective bill of rights that would cut across the rigidly held prerogatives of the provinces and become entrenched in a federal constitution.

His achievements in office up to now reflect this key to his character, his concern for the legal rights of the individual. A bill reforming the criminal code, introduced when Trudeau was Justice Minister and enacted when he was Prime Minister, eases the abortion laws and legalizes homosexual acts in private between consenting adults. In one of his most celebrated statements, he said: "The state has no place in the bedrooms of the nation." In similar fashion, Canada under Trudeau appears to be moving toward liberalization of marijuana laws.

Trudeau's feeling for individual rights is also discerned in his stand on political or military refugees. Canada was always lenient in allowing entry to draft resisters. But for a period there was ambiguity regarding American military deserters. It was left to the discretion of Canadian immigration officials at border points whether or not to admit deserters. Frequently the deserters were not only turned back, but were greeted by U.S. authorities, ready to arrest them, on tip-offs from Canadian Immigration people. Under the Trudeau Administration, the policy was clarified last May. Immigration men at the border no longer possess the power to forbid entry to an American simply because he is a deserter. His military status is not taken into account when Canadian Immigration officers assess his admissibility. On the lower level, United States Immigration and military officials may be unhappy, but the State Department has made no representations to the Canadian Government—largely, it is assumed, because the United States remembers how it provided sanctuary to Canadian deserters after Canada went to war in 1939, before the U.S. involvement.

The trend extends into the foreign field. Trudeau's steps toward recognition of Communist China came after a protracted analysis of whether Canada should have a two-China policy, a one-China-one-Formosa policy, or continue a line of ambiguity that would please Washington. Now negotiations with the Chinese are leading unequivocally to the recognition of Peking as the government of China. This is not inconsistent with Trudeau's attitudes about the world based on trips as a private citizen to China, before and after the Communist takeover, to Palestine during the 1948 war, to Indochina during the French war, to Cuba after Castro's entry into Havana, and to other areas in transition.

The decision to cut back on NATO—half of Canada's forces will be withdrawn starting next June—is part also of Trudeau's belief in facing reality and "the challenge of future world social and political events." He expressed his views a few months after taking office: "I am very concerned that the Canadian government, through its own policies and through influence on its friends and allies, should get people to understand that we are not so much threatened by fascists or Communist ideologies or even nuclear bombs as by the fact that two-thirds of the world goes to bed hungry every night."

In the 18 months of Trudeau's Premiership, Quebec representation has unquestionably shot up. In the Prime Minister's office (or P.M.O., as Canadians say), nearly half of the senior members are French-speaking, inspiring Western M.P.'s to refer, not always in good nature, to the "French Mafia" taking over.

However, the important point, in a country where the French number one in four, is not statistical. It is that all the personnel in the P.M.O., whether French-speaking or English-speaking in origin, are bilingual. Conversations begin in one language and end in the other. Equally important is the passage of a bill that makes French, as well as English, the official language of Canada, so that French Canadians, in communities outside Quebec, can have access to federal institutions, such as courts, in their mother tongue. The provinces, with education under their control, generally have indicated goodwill by expanding the teaching of French.

It is in Quebec itself that Trudeau has drawn the sharpest lines. For several years various gradations existed between "separatism" and "federalism," confusing many peopel into believing the province could achieve a highly privileged special status within confederation. But Trudeau, in a deliberately calculated push, has forced polarization. "The fuzziness has gone," he says. At least provincial Liberal leaders have been impelled to stand up and declare themselves "federalists," in other parties, the issue is less clear, and separatism itself has a vocal following. But in the overall, Trudeau's strategy is working. A Gallup poll of last November showed his popularity among French Canadians—always high—had risen compared with a year ago, even if, in the same period, it had dropped among English Canadians.

A principal reason for disenchantment is that Trudeau has not done much in the field of social welfare or in attacking the large patches of poverty that remain in an affluent society. Canada contains its Appalachias, particularly in parts of eastern Quebec and in the Atlantic provinces, where there are twice as many low-income families proportionately as in Ontario. Ottawa has established machinery for regional expansion and investment, but with negligible results.

As for the general weal—in a country that long has been mindful of welfarism, with children's allowances and old-age pensions for all, state-paid hospitalization for all, and spreading medicare regardless of age—Marc Lalonde has an answer. The 40-year-old Lalonde, who sometimes is identified as Trudeau's Ted Sorensen, speaks much as Trudeau: "Government by magic or magicians in the world is over. Look at France. After de Gaulle, the country settled down to steady government and to tackle practical economic problems. As soon as we've got the money, you'll see where the goodies go—to the underprivileged and homeless, and the start will be within the next two years. But we won't resort to gimmicks. We'd rather be thrown out of office."

A clue perhaps is contained in a white paper on taxation that envisages a better break for low-income groups. Trudeau people also promise that another white paper on social policy, scheduled for release early this year, will grab the imagination of youth and reformers and others who say that Trudeau—a millionaire's son who never experienced insecurity—lacks gut feeling for people's everyday needs. One of his aides admits that "it will be very hard for us to defuse this bit about Trudeau lacking humanity."

No one has proved that Trudeau is callous. Part of the trouble is his own impatience or flippancy in responding to serious questions. During the election campaign, the leader of the Conservative party, Robert Stanfield, called for a limited form of a guaranteed annual income; it was a vague promise but nonetheless indicated an effort to get at a growing issue. Trudeau shot back that Canada had "enough of this free stuff." Then, typically, when he became Prime Minister, he ordered a wide study on welfare which could result in a guaranteed annual income.

On another occasion, soon after the election, Ron Collister, a television reporter for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, awaited Trudeau when he emerged from the East Block. Also attending restlessly was a crowd of tourists, among them teen-age girls seeking his autograph or a buss on the cheek. Collister edged his way in to ask the Prime Minster about Canada's position on Biafra. Trudeau, trying to brush aside the reporter in the midst of an untidy melee, and obviously not realizing he was being recorded, said facetiously, "Biafra? Where's that?" It came out on television screens across Canada and looked terrible—Trudeau, so soon after confirmation in office, surrounded by giggling girls and appearing frivolous. Editorialists continue to fling the remark at him.

Trudeau long has harbored a disdain for most journalists, and his relations with the press have been spotty. He grants few interviews, but reporters know they can sometimes stop him for a minute or two of comment when he leaves the House of Commons or a conference room. He has no patience with trivial or personal questions. When a reporter asked him, "in the public interest," how large his fortune was, Trudeau just shrugged and said, "How rich is rich?"

But at other times he loses his temper. A notable example of this occurred in London in January, 1969, during a Commonwealth Prime Ministers' conference. Trudeau had made the rounds of some of London's fashionable spots in the company of an actress, Jennifer Hales, or of Mrs. Eva Rittinghausen, a blond who proclaimed her determination to marry the Prime Minister. Then, unexpectedly, Trudeau lit into correspondents, accusing them of invading his privacy and that of his companions by phoning them to ask questions. He said reporters were guilty of "pretty crummy behavior" and made a half-threat of instructing police to start files on them.

The press promptly fired back, pointing out that if Trudeau really wanted to keep his personal activities private he had no business selecting such places as Annabel's, London's most glittering discothèque, on the regular beat of gossip columnists, where people go to see and be seen. He could have chosen with more discretion. If he insisted on such exhibitionism—commentators said—why did he resent it when the news media catered to his ego?

The answer partly is that Trudeau is an odd blend. If not precisely an exhibitionist, he is unafraid of displaying his zest for airplanes, fast cars, leather coats, young women and breezy one-liners. (Was he, he was asked on becoming Prime Minister, going to give up his Mercedes? "Which one," he replied, "the car or the girl?") Then, just as quickly, he can demonstrate exquisite delicacy of timing and style. On a campaign trip out West, where he was busily assaulted by teenagers who wanted one of his famous pecks on the cheek, a photographer, spotting him chatting with a handsome woman in her 30's, shouted, "Kiss her." Trudeau obviously sensed her sophistication, held his hands together in veneration, Hindu-style, and bowed to her.

More recently, a Montreal woman who had done some committee work for him a couple of years before, walked up to him, at a reception and said, "Remember me?" She was an attractive, green-eyed brunette, and Trudeau said, "How could I ever forget you, my dear?" Plainly he did not remember her, and she said she felt silly on reflection but grateful he had not let her down.

Trudeau has lost much of the patrician manner which once branded him. At a Liberal fund-raising dinner recently he went from table to table shaking hands with strangers—an act he would have considered repulsive a few years ago. At the St Mary's ball in Montreal, he danced with each of the two dozen debutantes, and took his seat, when a young girl came over and said, Could she ask a favor? A dance—not with her but with her grandmother? Trudeau rose and said, "On one condition—that you'll dance with me, too."

The gracious touch, however, can swiftly turn the other way. Last October, when Montreal constitutents held a reception in honor of Trudeau's birthday, a radio reporter approached him and said, "Prime Minister, may I talk with you?" "Why not?" Trudeau said. "How does it feel to be 50?" the reporter asked. Trudeau, who was holding a drink, took a long sip, smiled benignly and said, "Will you—off!"

It is hard to know whether sensitivity about his age relates to his insatiable demand for privacy in personal matters or to touches of vanity. Certainly his physical daring has been highly publicized: he has swum the Bosporus, climbed mountains, undertaken canoe expenditions in the Arctic and earned a brown belt in judo. This month, escaping temporarily from public affairs, he spent a week skin-diving in the Gulf of Mexico on the British Honduras coast and from there flew off to a week's skiing in the French Alps.

He regards athletic challenges seriously. To get in shape for the official kickoff in the 1968 Grey Cup game—Canada's classic East-West football championship—Trudeau took coaching in punting from a member of his staff, Vic Chapman, formerly of the British Columbia Lions. But his big moment, in Toronto, was ruined when the ball popped into a crowd of photographers 10 yards away. Trudeau didn't take well to the jibes, and for last November's Grey Cup game, in Montreal, he spurned more lessons from Chapman, saying, "I'll do better without coaching." And he did. Dressed in a fur coat, and wearing white matching crocheted mitts, muffler and Dutch boy cap—with a red carnation tucked behind the brim—Trudeau marched onto the field and booted the ball 28 yards.

Three weeks earlier Trudeau had spent a quiet weekend in New York, in one engagement with U Thant—he had simply picked up the phone in Ottawa to call the U.N. Secretary-General directly, much to the horror of his protocol officers—and two dates with Barbra Streisand. The Prime Minister had met the singing star in London at a reception following the European film premiere of "Funny Girl." Now he dined and danced with her and escorted her to the theater. When a gossip columnist asked him whether it was serious, Trudeau grinned and said to an aide, "Arrest that man." It was a neat and relaxed play on his London effort to intimidate the press, and it designated a noticeable trend toward greater self-control in public.

Trudeau's frequent companion is a 25-year-old Montreal actress, Louise Marleau, who not long ago became the subject of a question in the House of Commons. Donald MacInnis, a Conservative, wanted to know if the Government intended, through a federal film-development agency, to finance a movie starring Miss Marleau. There was a hush in the chamber while members waited for Trudeau to explode. Instead, he placed one finger against his temple in the traditional sign indicating he thought MacInnis was crazy.

Even the image of a swinger has become somewhat subdued. Undoubtedly Trudeau likes the company of a woman young enough to be his daughter, and it may be that he enjoys the sensation this creates. But there is also more public awareness that Trudeau can be shy and distant. A disk jockey in Toronto quipped, "Say, did you hear the Prime Minister was out with Barbra Streisand? I'll bet he spent all evening saying, 'I run Canada.' "

Crowds no longer greet him as effusively as they once did. But this in itself may not be so surprising; an American resident in Ottawa points out that Adlai Stevenson lost some of his allure in the 1956 Presidential campaign compared with 1952, partly because of the inevitable repetition of many things said before. Trudeau today can sound stale when he talks of national unity or the need for a bill of rights. The Gallup poll reveals a slackening of attraction among the group aged 21 to 29, but the charisma is far from dead. Recently Trudeau, leaving his seat in the front bench of the House of Commons, glanced up and noticed a cluster of young people in the visitors' gallery. He waved. They let out a cheer and waved back.

But it can work in reverse. Two types of heckling sometimes confront Trudeau. In one—if it is verbal or impersonal—he responds easily and well and with quips. But in the other—if it involves either physical abuse or invasion of privacy—he reacts quite differently, and even violently.

Last August, on a visit to British Columbia, he did not like being jeered at by young demonstrators who held aloft placards, "Hustle grain, not women." But he retained control of himself until, in Vancouver, a group of Vietnam protesters jostled him and swore at him for not being critical enough of U.S. policy. The eyewitness accounts became confused, but it appeared that one demonstrator took a swing at Trudeau, who retaliated by seizing the youth's hat and squashing it down on his forehead.

Among teen-agers, however, Trudeau-mania is still endemic. Cartoonist Jim Reidford in Toronto's Globe and Mail depicted Trudeau's birthday in a sketch showing two teen-age girls discussing their idol. One says: "So he's not 48. So he's 50. But that doesn't mean he's 50 like your father."

Quite representative of his unorthodox ways of behaving and reacting was the meeting in Ottawa last month with Beatle John Lennon and his wife, Yoko. Trudeau had planned to allow them 10 minutes; he was interested in Lennon's idealistic approach to world peace, even while considering it impractical. The session stretched into 50 minutes when Trudeau found himself fascinated by Lennon's personality and effort to change an image from a pop ideal into a serious figure: there was something of a parallel with his own case.

One or two commentators condemned Trudeau for granting so much time when, for instance, the Mennonites had long been attempting unsuccessfully to make an appointment on a similar mission of peace. Some of the dinosaurs in the Civil Service even wondered if it was proper for a Prime Minister to associate with a Beatle. But, as Trudeau himself remarked, informally, he was worried whether it would be bad for Lennon's image to call on a Prime Minister. Lennon, incidentally, found Trudeau a "beautiful" person and told reporters. "You don't know how lucky you are in Canada."

The magnetism is not confined to youth. At a social gathering in Montreal a few weeks ago, attended by some of the most elegant and wealthy members of English and French society, word spread that Trudeau would be dropping by around midnight. Most of the guests anticipated his arrival with the tremor of youngsters, and greeted him with an awed silence. "Hey, it's quiet in here," he declared, and immediately was surrounded by adult men and women—and small talk. Trudeau does not really enjoy such gatherings. He much prefers the intimate intellectual discussions he participated in as a professor or Justice Minister. Now he manages occasionally to conduct such sessions at his Prime Minister's residence in Ottawa.

When Trudeau first contemplated the move to the mansion, with its 30-foot drawing room and assorted living rooms, he exclaimed, "A great place for parties." But in fact he has held no frivolous parties there. Instead, most of the men and women who arrive at 24 Sussex Drive are scientists, philosophers, historians, economists, academics. And they arrive in small groups, not to be seated at the 24-place formal dining-room table but at the table for six in the half-circular bay window. Trudeau questions his guests intensely and works them; his dinner parties waste little time with small talk.

Despite his striving for privacy, despite his open resentment that the press and public sometimes intrude on his personal life, Trudeau likes being Prime Minister of Canada. As one of his oldest confidantes expressed it, "Trudeau never thought he would enjoy making things run. Certainly, he was not the type of man who would chase after a political career. But once it was offered to him, one should not be surprised it turned out this way."

When he first took office, a prevalent question was whether he would allow himself to stay on, or whether, with his hauteur and penchant for independence, he would walk out on whim or in disgust. Now it is rather more the traditional question of whether the public will want him to continue as Prime Minister when a general election is called, within the next three years. Despite the drop in his following, he still holds an overwhelming lead in popularity over other contenders. In any event, the public's response to him appears to be contained in the kind of mash note from teen-agers received almost automatically in every newspaper office whenever Pierre Elliott Trudeau is enmeshed in controversy: "We still love our Prime Minister, P.E.T."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1970]

TRUDEAU CITES NEED FOR "REAL SACRIFICES"

(By Edward Cowan)

OTTAWA, February 9.—A two-day national conference to persuade Canadian business leaders to restrain price rises this year, even if it means lower profits, opened today wtih an appeal for sacrifice by Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau.

The Prime Minister, in a hortatory address, acknowledged that the Government was asking for "real sacrifice" in some cases. He appealed to labor, which refused to attend the conference, business, represented by about 275 invited executives, the provinces, most of which were represented, and the cities to "hold back price and income increases."

Mr. Trudeau, who read his address sitting down and with little vocal color, got 18 seconds of perfunctory applause at the end. John H. Young, the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission, who spoke second, got no applause.

The audience, mostly men in their 50's and 60's, came to life only when one executive, conscripted by Mr. Young during a dull period in the discussion to voice his views, wittily expressed skepticism about the Government's approach.

By tomorrow afternoon, Mr. Young hopes to have forged, before the national press and the television cameras, the first link in an economy-wide commitment to restraint. Despite the evident lack of enthusiasm in some corners this morning, he is thought to have a fair chance of success.

Canada experienced a 4.6 per cent rise in retail prices last year, about one point less than in the United States. Nevertheless, there is deep concern in Ottawa because Canada's economy has been less strained by excessive spending since 1967 than was the guns-and-butter United States economy. The fear is that inflation in Canada has put down such deep psychological roots that tight-credit and a Government budget surplus will not check the trend short of a painful recession.

Prices have been climbing fastest in the labor-intensive services sector. An Ottawa hair salon charges $4 for a shampoo and-set that cost $3 two years ago. The cost of dry-cleaning a suit in Toronto has just risen to $1.65 from $1.50. The Canadian dollar is worth 92.5 United States cents.

Food and merchandise prices are generally higher in Canada than in the United States, as are interest rates on mortgages, which now run between 9 and 10 per cent in Canada.

As Ottawa's monetary and fiscal stringency have made themselves felt, some critics have charged that the country was being made to suffer needlessly because inflation was imported from the United States. Trade accounts for almost one-quarter of Canada's economy, and roughly 70 per cent of her imports come from the United States.

TRUDEAU REPLIES TO CHARGE

Mr. Trudeau replied to this argument today with the assertion that "we also have an internal problem of inflation."

"For the first time in our history," he said "inflationary attitudes and expectations have become firmly embedded in the minds of Canadians." This "pervasive inflationary psychology," he continued, "will not automatically disappear when inflation abroad is brought under control. We must be prepared to deal firmly with our part of it."

Delegates to the conference, held in the refurbished railroad station opposite the Chateau Laurier Hotel, had mixed reactions to the opening session.

UNEMPLOYMENT GROWS

A Quebec official privately expressed the tentative thought that inflation might be already receding and that the Government was grappling with the wrong problem. Unemployment climbed sharply in Quebec last year and the French Canadian province feels, as do most other provinces, that it is being made to suffer for the inflation generated by booming Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia.

Mr. Trudeau said the Government was looking at other measures to check the boom in these three provinces in addition to the tax disincentives it had applied to construction in them last summer.

There were public and private expressions of dissatisfaction with Mr. Young's central proposal, that business should accept some profit shrinkage in 1970 rather than pass on all cost increases to customers. Perhaps the most enthusiastic supporters of that proposition were the food executives, who said that competition had been forcing them to swallow cost increases for years.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1970]

TRUDEAU NATIONALISM SEEN TURNING COUNTRY INWARD

Is Canada turning inward? Some people think so, and they date the phenomenon from the replacement of former Prime Minister Lester Pearson in 1968 by Pierre Elliott Trudeau, who is more of a political nationalist.

The surface evidence is persuasive. After World War II Canada cut a considerable swath as a middle power, and there was much talk of what it could contribute to world stability by such innovations as peace-keeping forces.

Under Trudeau such talk has diminished. Canadian forces in NATO are being reduced by half. The government has closed various diplomatic missions in Latin America and Asia, while opening one in the Vatican and making plans for another in Peking.

Morale in the much-respected Canadian foreign service has been severely shaken. Meanwhile, Trudeau has invited criticism of "government propaganda" by unveiling a new domestic agency to publicize federal activities—"Information Canada."

Some of the retrenchment is attributable to government efforts to combat inflation by holding spending to a minimum. A new prices and income commission is attempting to persuade business to absorb part of any cost increases and is asking similar restraint by unions.

But the new look also fits the philosophy of Trudeau, who concerns himself more with the quality of life at home than with overseas commitments. He seeks to reduce domestic economic disparities, and the government concentrates on pollution, the language issue and problems of the Canadian North.

At least in part, the trend coincides with a re-examination by the United States of its own world role. Middle powers also have had their frustrations with the Afro-Asian majority in the United Nations.

Nevertheless, the inward look bothers some astute analysts. Charles King writes in the Ottawa Citizen that Canadians will never convince others of the country's importance "until we begin to look outward again ourselves."

One piece of evidence cited to prove the preoccupation with parochial matters is the decision of the Times of London to close the Ottawa bureau it has operated for more than 40 years. Hilary Brigstocke, who has been its correspondent here more than 15 years after a period in Washington, is being reassigned to Europe.

Reportedly the Times was influenced in part by its own financial problems. But undoubtedly, the decision reflects less London interest in Canada, which in turn reflects less Canadian interest in the Comomnwealth and even in Britain.

Although many older citizens take pride in the fact that Canada remains technically a kingdom, younger Canadians find little excitement in the monarchy. Thus when Queen Elizabeth II visits Canada this summer in connection with the centennial of the Northwest Territories, the warmth of her reception is likely to be determined more by respect for her as a person than by the symbolism she connotes.

ROBERT H. ESTABROOK.

CANADA ECONOMY

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 30, 1970]

TRUDEAU STAKES POLITICAL FUTURE ON INFLATION STRUGGLE

(By Bruce Hutchison)

After many twists and turns, the Government of Canada has set a straight course and fixed a definite schedule in its fight against inflation.

Within the next six weeks the nation should begin to see whether this grand strategy will work. On it the government has staked not only its hopes but its credibility and political future.

As a first move it will meet about 250 business and professional leaders at Ottawa on Feb. 9 and ask them to restrain prices voluntarily.

On the following week a conference of the 10 provincial governments will be asked to restrain their expenditures and the wage increases of their employees.

If business and the provinces are willing to cooperate in restraint, the government will ask organized labor to do likewise.

UNKNOWN FACTOR

So far, the labor unions have flatly refused to consider any ceiling on their wage demands. But the government hopes they will change their minds if they are convinced that management is holding down profits and prices.

The continuing wage spiral is the big unknown factor in the government's equation. John Young, chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission, says that unless the unions will cooperate, the whole attack on inflation will be in trouble.

"A one-sided arrangement," he warns, "could not exist for long."

Probably it could not last far beyond March 1. Until then, but no longer, various business concerns have agreed to postpone some intended price increases. If, on the target date, there is no sign of wage restraint the agreement will lapse.

Apparently, however, the government has other weapons in its arsenal to be disclosed, for the first time, at its meeting with the provinces.

Meanwhile, Mr. Young alerted and puzzled both management and labor by saying that "sanctions" would be enforced if voluntary measures failed.

"It is our intention to press for something much beyond the use of public opinion," he said. "It will not be a meaningful step if there is a flagrant price increase and nothing happens."

Whether sanctions mean direct wage and

price controls, as sometimes threatened by Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau, remains an unanswered question.

PROVINCIAL JURISDICTION

The provinces expect to get an answer at their meeting with the government next month. They, and not the federal authorities, have jurisdiction over most wages and prices.

Apart from the possibility of direct controls by joint federal-provincial action the prices and incomes commission intends to impose some direct sanctions of its own.

It will soon review prices in major industries, publicly report its conclusions, and submit them "to the appropriate level of government where the price increase could not be shown to be justified."

Mr. Young added that price restraint cannot mean the end of price increases, "but we intend to see that these price increases will be less than cost increases."

A pinch on profits was thus clearly signaled by the government, and business got the message. Just as clearly, the government has committed itself to an early and dangerous test.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 2, 1970]

OTTAWA WILL PAY FARMERS TO KEEP WHEAT ACRES IDLE

(By Edward Cowan)

TORONTO, March 1.—To work off a choking surplus of wheat, the Canadian Government is borrowing an American-style "soil bank" device—cash payments to farmers who do not plant—with the hope that this avowedly temporary, one-year program will not stretch out and mire Canada in American-style permanent costly subsidies to agriculture.

How many of last year's 24.4 million wheat acres will be taken out of production in 1970 is uncertain. The prairie's initial reaction to the program announced Friday has been cautious but not hostile.

T. C. Douglas, the leader of the left-wing New Democrats, smallest of the three national parties, commented that reducing wheat production while millions of people in the world "go to bed hungry" illustrated the "insanity of our political and economic system."

One result of the payments undoubtedly will be to help farmers diversify into livestock, a desire that has been frustrated by the cash shortage resulting from slow wheat exports and the high cost of credit, roughly 9 per cent.

Payments for not planting will give a lift to the sagging prairie economy this summer and perhaps remove some of the political tarnish that has dimmed Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau's luster in the wheat-growing region.

The payments also may moderate the switching of land from wheat to barley, oats and rapeseed. Such switching occurred last spring. With wheat barely trickling from farm to market this winter, much more could be expected, with perhaps much downward pressure on prices.

MINISTER COMMENTS

Otto E. Lang, the minister without portfolio responsible for grains, argued that the acreage cutback "will greatly enhance the continuing effort to strengthen international wheat prices. Foreign buyers are not willing to pay top prices when they know we are sitting on a mountain of grains."

Some quarters regarded Mr. Lang's optimism as premature in light of the International Grains Council's January estimate that by July 31 the carry over of the seven major exporting countries would rise above last summer's 2.4 billion bushels.

The principal aim of Operation LIFT (from Lower Inventory For Tomorrow) is not to prop up world prices but to reduce Canadian inventories that have been jamming prairie bins and elevators. Because of the resulting decline in the prairie economy, the few Liberals in Parliament, such as Mr. Lang, are worried for their political lives.

Some farmers, not necessarily big ones, are storing without compensation $15,000 or $25,000 worth of grains and cutting their family budgets to the bone. Wheat keeps well for several years, but to store a 1970 crop would require buying new bins.

HOW PLAN WILL WORK

Farmers will be paid $6 an acre for fallow land and $10 an acre for land devoted to forage, or grasses, for two years—1970 and 1971. The official estimate Friday was that farmers would qualify for $100-million of a maximum $140-million, thereby reducing the wheat harvest by 400 million bushels from last year's crop of 685 million. Premier Ed Schreyer of Manitoba said participation would be much less.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1970]

CANADA TO BAN ALL PHOSPHATES IN DETERGENTS OVER 2-YEAR SPAN

(By Jay Walz)

OTTAWA, February 19.—The government, confident that it has the full backing of the 10 provinces, plans to ban phosphates in detergents in two years.

J. J. Geene, Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, said today that phosphate pollution of water would be made a criminal offense under the Canada water control legislation now before Parliament.

Mr. Greene announced a few days ago that the Canadian Government would join the United States in a cooperative drive against phosphates as a factor in contaminating boundary waters such as the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes. This week Mr. Greene discussed the problem with provincial premiers here for a conference with Federal authorities.

"There was a clear agreement—everyone said they would go for it," Mr. Greene said afterward.

Pollution control in Canada is mostly within the jurisdiction of the provinces, because they own most of the waters. Mr. Greene's pending bill would implement a Federal clean-up policy in waters that are outside provincial boundaries or are regarded as national waterways.

WOULD OFFER INCENTIVES

Under the bill, the Federal Government would offer aid and incentives to provinces undertaking antipollution projects in their own waters. It would also seek agreements with the provinces to establish specific areas of joint control where penalties under the Canada Criminal Code would be applied to violators of pollution controls.

Phosphates, used to give detergents their whitening powers, speed the growth of algae when washed into lakes or rivers. The increased algae upset the ecology and other marine life dies.

Mr. Greene said he would propose amending the pending bill to have phosphate eliminated progressively from detergents until they are completely outlawed by the end of 1972. The minister said he would notify the detergent-manufacturers that he expected the first cutbacks to begin Aug. 1.

A new concern among Canadians over the widespread use of laundry detergents resulted from a recent survey by Pollution Probe, a study group at the University of Toronto. It showed some leading brands of detergents containing more than 40 per cent phosphate. The laboratory analysis of 24 brands indicated also that some products had four times as much phosphate as others.

In Toronto, Brian Kelly, spokesman for the study, said the survey was aimed at informing consumers of the different phosphate levels in various products and to persuade them to switch to soap or low-phosphate detergents.

PRODUCTS ARE ANALYZED

The analysis showed that Whisk, a Lever Brothers product, had a phosphate content of only 10.5 per cent, compared with 41.5 per cent for the same company's Drive. Colgate-Palmolive's Bio-Ad was 49 percent phosphate compared with the same company's Ajax 2, which had 36 per cent phosphate. Procter & Gamble's Cheer showed 44.5 per cent phosphate in the analysis, while the same company's Bold had only 32.5 per cent.

Spokesmen for Procter & Gamble and Colgate-Palmolive have declined comment on the findings. However, Alan Rae, president of Lever Detergents, Ltd., (Toronto) said the company had introduced Whisk, the low-phosphate detergent, about 15 years ago without great success.

Housewives, he said, had not been attracted to it "although it is quite usable" in washing machines and "is effective as a pre-soaker." As a result, he said, the company has spent little money promoting Whisk. It might now consider spending more, he indicated.

Pollution Probe said in a brief release that copies of the analysis results might be obtained by sending stamped, self-addressed envelopes to Pollution Probe, University of Toronto, Toronto 181, Ontario. The news release urged citizens to write Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau and members of Parliament demanding early action to ban phosphate detergents.

The release also said that major amounts of pollutant phosphates were contained not only in detergents, but also in human waste, industrial effluents and agricultural runoff.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 22, 1970]

LESSONS FOR UNITED STATES IN CANADA'S INFLATION

TORONTO.—The Canadian Government is trying a psychological approach to what many experts now regard as a largely psychological problem in this country—inflation. If in the coming months the mild recession the United States seems to be experiencing does not slow the rate of price advance, Canada's effort to forge a national anti-inflation coalition of business, government and labor could look increasingly interesting to Washington.

At meetings in Ottawa in the past fortnight, the Government has elicited from business leaders and Premiers of the 10 provinces agreement to some general, unenforceable propositions about the desirability of restraint in prices, rents, professional fees, government spending and wages. Labor has refused to concur.

To set a good example, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau announced that Ottawa was deferring national park fees and the introduction of an airport tax.

Mr. Trudeau had less difficulty getting the provincial Premiers to subscribe informally to his code of noninflationary conduct than John H. Young, chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission, had with 235 business, farm and professional leaders.

The businessmen have a natural aversion to the proposition pressed on them—that they absorb part of 1970 cost increases out of profits rather than make fully offsetting price mark-ups.

LABOR MUST AGREE

To round out its exercise in economic-climate making, Ottawa must now get labor to agree that it, too, should practice restraint. The unions, having spurned Dr. Young once, show no inclination to sign up. The Canadian Labor Congress said last week that it would make no recommendations to affiliated unions because, like the exhortations of the Canadian Manufacturers

Association and the Chamber of Commerce to member companies, its advice would "have no binding effect on the individual unions and locals."

Inasmuch as the whole "restraint" exercise is vague and its efficacy in doubt, why did Ottawa bother to set up a Prices and Incomes Commission last year? The answer is that the Government became convinced that the principal tools for fighting inflation, tight credit and a budget surplus, were failing to do the job within politically tolerable limits.

WORSE THAN UNITED STATES

In a sense, inflation, having persisted despite some slack in the Canadian economy, has been a meaner headache than in the United States. Retail prices in Canada climbed 8.8 per cent in 1968–69 and unemployment averaged 4.75 per cent. That was a poorer "trade-off" than in the United States, where a two-year spurt of 9.8 per cent in consumer prices was accompanied by a 3.5 per cent jobless rate.

Canada could lick inflation by leaning even harder on the credit and fiscal brakes—but at what cost in unemployment and in further weakening of already strained bonds of national unity?

But it is doubtful that Canada can stop inflation so long as it persists in the United States. American prices influence, through imports, Canadian costs. More important, Canadian exports to the United States zoomed in 1968 and 1969, thanks to the American boom, thereby pouring fuel into an economy Ottawa wanted to keep in check.

Trends in the United States will determine one of the big 1970 labor settlements in Canada—autos, where the principle of Canada-United States wage parity is established—and will influence another, forest products. Canadian interest rate changes are even more closely linked to the American market.

LIMITATIONS

In the face of such limitations on Canada's ability to manage her own economy, will Ottawa's experiment in creating a counter-inflationary psychology have any actual effect on price trends?

It can't hurt. It might help. The effort coincides with the onset of recession in the American industrial sector and some slowdown of growth in Canadian industry, much of which consists of subsidiaries of American firms. On these grounds alone, some abatement in the rate of inflation can be expected.

Perhaps the psychological approach will extinguish inflationary expectations sooner, making possible an earlier switch to expansionary policies. Mr. Trudeau presumably would like to be able to switch before unemployment climbs to the politically sensitive 6 per cent level which he has pledged to tolerate if that's what combatting inflation requires.

EDWARD COWAN.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 19, 1969]

CANADIAN DILEMMA: A BREADBASKET IN NEED OF LEAVEN

(Canada's living standard is high and its Arctic regions beckon with promises of great wealth. But all is not rosy. There is the gnawing problem of the grain glut.)

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

Harry Gray is a farmer with a problem.

This 45-year-old wheat farmer, who runs a 1,000-acre spread of rich Saskatchewan soil, is up against one more of those perennial dilemmas facing farmers in Canada's prairie breadbasket.

His problem is threefold: He produced too much wheat in this bumper year; he has been able to sell only a portion of it; and for what he sold, he had to take a low price.

This is the pattern one hears all over the prairie provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, where agriculture remains a major factor in provincial livelihood, despite the growth of mineral and petroleum industries and related activities.

For this area is still Canada's breadbasket and one of the half-dozen major granaries in the world. It rivals that of the United States Midwest, the Soviet Ukraine, and the Argentine pampa.

POSSIBILITY OF DEPRESSION

Very few farmers this year or in recent years have sold all their crop—and most of what has been sold has been at a loss. The prairie provinces face serious depression possibilities. Were it not for the new industries and activities based on minerals and petroleum, there would be very little economic hope here.

Even at that, legislators and politicians and others in the prairie capitals of Winnipeg, Regina, and Edmonton are clamoring for some federal action to help the prairie farmers out of their dilemma.

But the government of Pierre Elliott Trudeau in Ottawa does not find the grain surplus an easy problem to solve. There simply is too much grain being produced, and there has been some rough sledding on international grain sales.

For example, the Soviet Union this fall defaulted on a major three-year wheat agreement with Canada, with the result that Canadians stand to lose somewhere close to $300 million.

Taken against a wheat surplus of more than 900 million bushels, a loss of this sort is serious—and it has only partially been offset this year with new sales to Japan and Communist China and such onetime-only sales as a recent shipment of 10 million bushels to Peru.

The basic problem facing the Canadian wheat and grain farmer is that farmers in the other major grain-producing areas of the world have been just as successful as they in bringing in large harvests.

Surplus wheat stocks for the three biggest wheat exporters—Canada, the United States, and Australia—have grown to 2.4 billion bushels.

Even the Soviet bloc countries, which for the past several years have been wheat importers, now are recording good harvests, and in the case of the Soviet Union, there is wheat to spare in the Ukraine prairies. Hence the Soviet default on the Canadian wheat agreement.

Putting it quite simply: The world has too much wheat. And here in Canada, the result is a much lower income for the farmer and a taste of lean years for the agricultural side of the prairie provinces.

NO PRICE SUPPORTS PROVIDED

The problem is compounded for Canada's farmers because they are more dependent on export sales than, say, farmers in the United States, who sell so much of their crop on the domestic market. Domestic users in the U.S. use up more than half the total production. In Canada domestic consumption is only about one-quarter of the total crop.

Even more important for the U.S. farmer are price supports, which keep their income up. But Canadian farmers have no such support. They simply receive the going price, and at present the price is about $1.80 a bushel for their top grade, down from almost $2 a couple of years ago. And from this Canadian price is deducted about 20 cents in freight handling charges.

Under law, the Canadian Wheat Board handles all wheat sales. This government agency takes only the amount of wheat it thinks it can sell—and this year it has agreed to take a flat 400 bushels per farmer, plus an additional five bushels per tillable acre.

That means the average farmer out here in the prairie provinces can get rid of only about half his crop.

In Mr. Gray's case, the facts are even worse. His excellent yield this year has left him with more than two-thirds of his crop and nowhere to go with it. Even some of the wheat he should have been able to dispose of remains: The local grain elevators used by the government to store the wheat it markets are full.

"The situation is getting worse year by year," Mr. Gray says. And the official explanations of improving crops in the Soviet Union and elsewhere mean little out here. "We're waiting for Ottawa to do something," Mr. Gray adds.

Looked at from the government point of view, there is little that "Ottawa" can do. Many Asian lands, once prime markets for surplus Canadian wheat, are becoming major wheat producers themselves and could within a year or so become wheat exporters, even if only on a moderate scale.

On a world market already glutted, "this spells trouble for our grain farmers," a provincial agricultural official here said this fall. In fact, we're facing the prospect of phasing out more and more of our farms. The big problem now is how to accomplish this.

Complicating the picture for Canadians is the fact that this nation has a high standard of living, partly the result of keeping up with the Joneses—the United States—next door, and yet it has a relatively limited population to carry out the vast task of moving away from agricultural efforts into other fields.

This overall economic dilemma is one of the key factors at present in an economic situation which on the surface looks like a boom.

The Economic Council of Canada foresees a boom situation through 1975 at least, with an average annual growth of 5.5 percent in the next five years, almost comparable to the 6 percent a year in the past five years.

The council, a 27-member nonpartisan group which has been a significant force in shaping policy and public attitudes in Canada, warns against inflationary pressures, unemployment, and the threat of a housing crisis.

The council says there are two factors which will ultimately determine the growth rate: economic conditions abroad, especially in the United States, to which Canada is clearly tied and government spending at home.

SPENDING CURB ASKED

In this regard, the council wants a curb placed on government spending—something which Prime Minister Trudeau has already started. In his speech to the nation last August, he announced some civil service cutbacks, and the fall has already brought a number of announcements from Ottawa indicating, among other things, that Canada is:

Cutting back on its military commitments, halving its forces with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Europe and closing half a dozen military installations at home.

Closing down some of its overseas embassies, including several in South America, and cutting back on the size of the embassy staffs in other locations.

Holding the line on government spending on many home-front programs, exempting, however, such key areas as Indian affairs, development programs in the north, and similar items.

In many ways, the Trudeau program appears an effort to spearhead Canadian development in the 1970's, a decade which almost certainly will see Canada's expansion into the harsh, somewhat forbidding north. This vast region, with its untapped mineral and petroleum riches, limitless expanse of waters, and other unknown potential, is seen by visionaries as holding the future for Canada.

"Canada's future lies in the north," a recent government report on mineral production stated. Much of the development already under way is in the hands of United States business—a fact which both galls and worries many Canadians.

But U.S. investors have not only the capital to invest but also the willingness to put their money into ventures which are not always certain of success. The Canadian investor tends to be more cautious and this very caution has played a role in opening the door more and more to the foreign investor.

Today, however, there appears to be a great willingness on the part of Canadian investors to pay attention to home-front "venture" investment. And while the limited resources in the hands of Canadians may not alter the pattern of heavy U.S. investment, there does appear to be more Canadian money and effort and thought going into development ventures at home.

But meanwhile, problems of a possible grain-glut depression in the prairie provinces are proving more important and more troublesome out here than any other issue.

OTTAWA ACTION TAKES TIME

"Who cares about development," complains one of Mr. Gray's fellow farmers, "when we can't sell our wheat. I say it is up to Ottawa to find new markets and to pay attention to our problems."

In fact, there is concern in Ottawa about the wheat surplus, but it takes time for this concern to be translated into any sort of action. "It will be a year or so before anything Ottawa does can reach us," Mr. Gray says. "And who knows what the next harvest will bring. If it's a bumper year, we're in trouble. If it's a lean year, we're in trouble. Anyway you slice it, the hard realities of farming keep coming back.

"There's one slight hope for some relief. The university [of Saskatchewan] where my daughter Susan will go next year will take barley in payment for tuition. The campus in Saskatoon uses 25,000 bushels a year for its feeding station, and some of my neighbors have paid their children's tuition this way. Susan's going to be a barley student."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 7, 1970]

CANADIAN GRAIN-SURPLUS SOLUTION: OTTAWA PLANS TO PAY FARMERS NOT TO GROW WHEAT

(By James Post)

The administration of Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau has produced a radical solution for Canada's chronic wheat surplus. One result would be the strengthening of the already formidable links between the Canadian farmer and his government.

If the solution is radical, it is also startling in its simplicity: To halve the country's burdensome wheat stockpile, pay wheat growers in the prairie grain belt not to grow a 1970 crop.

Under the program growers in the four western provinces—Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and small areas of British Columbia—would get payments for wheat acreage taken out of production.

PAYMENTS TO GROWERS VARY

The price would be $6 an acre for farmers who decide to let wheatland lie fallow at spring-planting time. The outlay from the federal treasury would be $10 an acre for farmers who switch wheatland to a forage crop such as hay.

Cost to the taxpayer would be $100 million or more. The exact figure is uncertain because federal officials are unsure how many of the 188,000 western farmers would go along with the drastic plan and to what extent.

But officials forecast at least a 70 percent reduction in last year's wheat acreage of 24.5 million acres.

TRUDEAU SHIFTS STAND

Farmers would not get rich on government transfer payments because there would be a $10,000 maximum for an individual farmer no matter how much land he switches from wheat.

Prime Minister Trudeau to date has shown a reluctance to assume more responsibility for the Canadian farmer, who has suffered from tight international wheat markets and prices that have hung consistently below the International Grain Arrangement minimums.

Whatever reluctance he had to shift more of the farmer's burden onto the backs of the taxpayer has apparently been dispelled by the seriousness of the situation.

At the end of the current crop year July 31, the wheat stockpile is expected to be 950 million bushels—a two-year supply. The wheat mountain has become a political millstone around the neck of the ruling Liberal Party. Unsold wheat on the prairies has always been bad political news for Ottawa, the usual whipping boy for anything that goes wrong in rural Canada.

As a powerful additional incentive for the western farmer to take wheatland out of production, the government plans to juggle the delivery quota system for the 1970–71 crop year that begins Aug. 1.

Although the two-sided incentive program is a one-shot affair, it will make it extremely difficult for the government to retreat from the greater responsibility it has assumed for the economic health of the western farm community.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 3, 1969]

AIR, WATER, NO LONGER SO CLEAN: POLLUTION MUDDIES THE CANADIAN IMAGE

(Until recently pollution caused little concern in Canada. Canadians, shattered by the extent of the problem, may be one of the first peoples to legally guarantee all citizens the right to a decent environment.)

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

Visitors to Canada, particularly from the large metropolitan areas of the United States, are usually impressed with the tidiness of Canadian cities, the relatively low level of pollution, and the general air of cleanliness.

Yet increasing numbers of Canadians are expressing concern about pollution—and about the threat it poses to Canada's future development.

For Ontario residents, the pollution threat came home with full force this past summer as polluted streams and lakes were discovered in Algonquin Provincial Park, a wilderness area some 200 miles northwest of here.

And then beaches on the Rideau River, which runs through this capital city, were closed because of pollution at the height of the summer swimming season.

In fact, the summer brought the pollution problem right to the doorsteps of millions of Canadians who previously looked with a degree of smugness about the problem faced by their neighbors in the United States and elsewhere in the industrialized world.

Now the problem "has come home to roost," the Ottawa Citizen commented.

And there is a growing clamor for action—and for such action immediately. Provincial as well as federal study groups now are looking into the problem.

PROBLEMS RANGE WIDELY

What they have come up with so far is a list of pollution problems without quick and ready answers. These problems include:

Water pollution—"a significant and rapidly increasing threat to the health and prosperity of our people," according to Otto E. Lang, federal Minister of Energy and Water Resources. This pollution affects every province of the nation and is growing at rapid rates. It is not confined to the populated regions but spills over into the low-density population centers in the west as well.

Air pollution—mounting steadily, particularly in the large metropolitan areas like Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg, and even Vancouver on the Pacific Coast. Airplane jet engines are a factor, as are smoky exhausts from some trucks and buses. But the threat comes also from factory fumes which, according to an initial survey by the Toronto metropolitan government, suggests a 150 percent increase in pollution levels in Toronto in the past five years.

Chemical pollution—a new complaint in such areas as DDT usage and food preservatives—as well as the use of other pesticides and fumigants. British Columbia's Agricultural Minister Cyril Shelford put it this way: "Everyday we get letters to my office from people concerned with food pollution." He says it is up to the Food and Drug Administration in Ottawa to handle the matter.

Highway litter, a growing problem particularly in the large metropolitan areas where wastepaper, soft-drink and beer cans, and cigarette butts are dumped from cars without any real concern by motorists. This problem is even found in western park areas where the cost of cleaning up litter "doubled last year," according to a park official in Banff.

There is hardly a day that some aspect of the pollution problem is not brought to the attention of newspaper readers, radio listeners, and television viewers. And it seems apparent to most observers that Canadians are being made quite aware of the pollution problem in all its aspects.

These same observers, both Canadians and foreigners, expect the government of Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau to move soon to solve some of the pollution problems. Already, it has taken action against DDT usage.

In this connection, Mr. Trudeau told the House of Commons that beginning Jan. 1 the use of DDT will be cut by 90 percent and that its use in various foodstuffs will be substantially reduced. The federal action follows similar steps taken by several provincial governments, and Mr. Trudeau encouraged other provincial governments to follow suit.

Earlier Mr. Trudeau issued what amounted to a discreet warning to provincial governments to clean up on pollution or face the threat of federal action.

Ottawa, he said, is prepared to make pollution a crime—and thus subject to federal law and action—if the provinces do not act.

The provinces, however, with only one or two exceptions have started action. The most noteworthy efforts are in Ontario and parts of Quebec, but there are evidences of pollution-control efforts elsewhere as well. Ontario, for example, has taken a number of steps. One of them involves putting labels on detergents marking them as a health hazard. Another step is the proposed 700-foot smokestack on Ontario Hydro's generating station in east Toronto which should "difuse and lower the concentration of pollution by the time it reaches the ground," according to Ontario Energy and Resources Minister George Kerr.

THREE CITIES CRITICIZED

But these are only limited efforts. Much more will be needed if pollution is to be brought under control, say observers, and in this regard it will take major government intervention to do something "about this growing hazard to our lives," as the Calgary Herald recently called pollution.

One dimension of the problem is contained in a report on city sewage conditions. Only 8 of the 18 largest metropolitan areas in Canada are said to have 100 percent treatment of their sewage and other waste water.

Three of the cities—Halifax, Nova Scotia; St. John's Newfoundland, and Quebec City—

do not treat their waste at all before it is discharged into nearby waters.

Partial treatment is carried on by Saint John, N.B.; Montreal; Windsor, Ont.; Saskatoon, Sask.; Edmonton, Alta.; and Vancouver and Victoria, B.C.

Only Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton, Sudbury, and London in Ontario; Winnipeg, Man.; Regina, Sask.; and Calgary, Alta. treat their waste to a full 100 percent.

The survey singled out Montreal as a key offender, although other areas did less treatment than Montreal. This largest of Canadian cities gives only 8.4 percent of its 2,436,800 people full sewage treatment, the survey said.

But it is not only the cities that face pollution problems. The countryside also is being polluted. Take the case of the Spanish River in western Ontario. Flowing west through the towns of Massey and Espanola, it reaches the little town of Spanish and then empties into Lake Huron.

Back in the 1930's, it was a popular river for anglers and tourists who camped along its banks. The river provided a variety of fish, including walleye and pike, sold in Toronto and elsewhere.

Then in 1946, a paper mill was opened upstream at Espanola by the Kalamazoo Vegetable Parchment, Ltd., and things changed rapidly.

TOURIST BUSINESS DISAPPEARS

The river below Espanola became, as a local resident termed it, "a stinking mess." Untreated industrial waste poured from the paper mill with estimates as high as 16 million gallons daily.

The tourist business at Massey disappeared, as did the fish and the small commercial-fishing industry of the area. For 35 miles from the paper mill, now owned by Eddy Forest Products, Ltd., the river is a polluted stream.

Efforts to clean up the river have so far been of little avail. And even if efforts were begun at this writing, Ontario resources people say it would be 20 years before the river could, at best, be returned to its pre-1946 state—even if such a cleanup ran into no snags along the way. "We frankly don't know whether it is possible to clean up a river entirely once it is polluted," one Ontario official said.

Or take the case of Buttle Lake out on Vancouver Island in British Columbia. This lovely lake, which supplies water to the Campbell River community, now is so polluted that its lead contamination is only one point short of the level at which human consumption becomes dangerous. This lead contamination is caused by mine tailings which make their way into the water of Buttle Lake.

Yet when mining operations were begun by Western Mines, the public was assured that there would be hardly any contamination of Buttle Lake waters from wastes deposited in it by the mine, and that in any case, the toxic material would be placed on the lake bottom never to rise.

"How long does the contamination process have to proceed before wildlife and human beings are sufficiently endangered to bring an anxious government hurrying to their defense?" asked the Victoria Daily Times.

Not too long, if the ideas of many people in federal and provincial governments are put into action. Dr. D. R. Idler of the Fisheries Research Board said recently: "I feel when a new project is planned that is sufficiently large or unknown to merit attention, scientists in the federal government should sit down with the scientists in the industry to talk about what is known about toxicity (of the process) and other matters."

Against this growing clamor for government intervention is concern that some businesses might be forced to close down as a result of the drives to clean up pollution. And pollution control could in some instances increase prices. Resources Minister J. J. Greene says that the public is going to have to be prepared to accept these additional costs and perhaps higher prices "as what we must pay for an environment in which we can live normally healthy lives."

Whatever the cost, it now seems likely that Canada will move ahead smartly in the months and years to come to put effective curbs on pollution. The Trudeau government is committed to it as are Canadians in general.

In fact, Canada could well make major headway in pollution curbs, outdistancing many of its industrialized neighbors including the United States. The provincial premiers at their annual meeting in Quebec recently agreed to unite with the federal government in the battle against pollution.

The federal government has taken some early steps as well. It is announcing a water-quality program, the cost of which will run into millions of dollars. No one has any idea how much. But the hard facts of pollution are such that most Trudeau supporters and a good many people in the Progressive Conservative opposition see pollution control as not only a need, but a necessity.

SAFETY DEVICES ON OIL SHIPS?

Another step to be taken is legislation for the arctic areas which so far are virtually unspoiled by pollution. One aspect of this will be legislation to require safety devices on oil ships transiting the Northwest Passage so that Torrey Canyon-type disasters will be minimized. Sweeping land-use regulations are part of the package, according to Northern Development Minister Jean Chrétien.

Joint action by Canada and the United States, particularly in the Great Lakes area, now is being studied. Mr. Lang, for example, recently went to Washington to confer with his counterpart in the Nixon administration, Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel.

Although there are as yet no constitutional safeguards on pollution matters, there is a feeling that this may well come about in the future. Gavin Henderson, executive director of the National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada, recently said: "It seems only a matter of time until we shall see such protection, provided of course we survive that long."

In a column in the Toronto Globe and Mail he asked:

"With the new-look conservation about to take hold in Canada, could it be that we shall write history by being the first country to guarantee under law to all citizens the right to a decent environment?"

Canada does indeed have that opportunity.

CANADA'S FOREIGN POLICY

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 26, 1970]

DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH: CANADA TAKES NEW APPROACH

(By James Post)

Despite its current anti-inflation austerity drive, Canada has decided to invest a considerable sum of money into a new foreign aid approach.

The Liberal administration has committed itself to a minimum expenditure of $30,000,000 in the next five years on an agency to do scientific and technological research to benefit underdeveloped countries.

Beyond this minimum, External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp says he foresees eventually the allocation of up to 5 percent of Canada's foreign aid budget for the Ottawa-based International Development Research Center.

If the government holds firm to the 5 percent formula, some day the center could be getting $25,000,000 a year to find ways to close the gap between the wealthy, industrialized countries and underdeveloped nations.

The $25,000,000 figure would be 5 percent of a half-billion foreign-aid budget, a level which Canada could reach within a few years. The total Canadian foreign aid budget in 1969 was $338,000,000.

GAP HARD TO CLOSE

The new center is in effect an acknowledgement that mere transfer of capital and knowledge to underdeveloped countries just is not going to close the standard-of-living gap.

Mr. Sharp has called it "a scientific and technological gap." Almost all scientific and technological research is done by the wealthy countries, helping them outpace the poor ones more quickly year by year.

What is needed, in the Canadian view, is research that is applicable to the backward economies. Technological breakthroughs for the benefit of advanced economies do not help economies at a far more primitive stage.

"The relative position of the less-developed nations can only worsen if the balance in the deployment of the world's scientific and technological resources remains so heavily biased against them," Mr. Sharp says.

RESEARCH BOOST GIVEN

In addition to having the express purpose of helping underdeveloped nations, the center should provide a considerable boost to Canadian scientific research.

The center will soon start distributing research projects approved by the headquarters staff largely to Canadian institutions and individuals in areas of expertise where Canada is strong. Scientists from underdeveloped countries and indeed abroad generally will be called on to help out.

The international flavor of the center will be enhanced by the appointment of foreigners both to the governing board and to the staff. Despite the use of foreigners, most of the governing board and staff will be Canadian.

Also the Canadian hope is that Canadian scientists who left the country in search of greater opportunity might be lured back by the increased scientific activity as the years go by.

PRIORITIES STIPULATED

The center, in its choice of research programs, is supposed to give high priority to those that will assist poor nations to build their own scientific and technological capabilities so they can contribute to their own economic advancement as well as to the solution of their own problems.

At the outset, the center may start with five or six research programs. About two-thirds of the committed $30,000,000 from the Canadian Government will go into these and other later projects. The remaining third will pay for the operation of the center's headquarters.

The specific projects of the center are not known at this time. But possible areas of interest include development of techniques for identifying and evaluating mineral resources, development of genetically improved plants of high-protein value, population control, and so on.

Even though the center is not yet operating, officials are already talking about changing roles in the long-term future. Some see it as becoming even more international in scope than currently foreseen, possibly evolving into a United Nations agency.

Others see the center as evolving into a world clearinghouse for scientific information related to international development. But for the present the center is an attempt to break down some of the obstacles to change in less-developed societies.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 10, 1970]

CANADA AND PEKING RESUME DIALOGUE

(By Roland Huntford)

STOCKHOLM, February 9.—Canada and Communist China have resumed talks here on the establishment of diplomatic relations. This is understood to mean that the Chinese are prepared for a certain flexibility in dealing with the question of Taiwan.

The Stockholm talks started a year ago but were halted in December by Chinese intransigence over the issue. Canada was asked both to break off all relations with the exiled Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek and to recognize Peking's claim to sovereignty over Taiwan and the offshore islands—the socalled "one-China policy."

While the Canadians apparently were willing to discuss the issue of relations with Chiang they refused to accept the one-China policy. Since China had made this a condition of establishment diplomatic relations, there seemed no point in continuing the talks.

If the Chinese have shifted their position, it may be because they have changed their estimate of the position and motives of Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau. They are supposed to have assumed that he wanted to demonstrate independence of the United States and that he could be pressed to accept the one-China policy as a means of making his point.

But apparently the Chinese have decided that Trudeau is not prepared to go that far; that he may want to demonstrate his independence of the United States but would prefer not to alienate Washington by rejecting the independence of Taiwan.

Moreover, the Chinese probably realize that any willingness shown by them to compromise in the Stockholm talks might be taken as a sign that Peking is interested in improving communications with the West. Some diplomats point out that Ottawa would be a good base for contacts with the United States. It has been suggested that these need not be confined to the diplomatic sphere, but could be extended to such activities as political agitation and spying.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 15, 1970]

CANADA AND RED CHINA START SECOND YEAR OF TALKS ON RELATIONS

(By Jay Walz)

OTTAWA, February 14.—Canada and Communist China have begun the second year of their talks to establish diplomatic relations with no sign of an end to the deadlock over the paramount issue of Taiwan.

It was a year ago last Tuesday that Mitchell Sharp, Secretary of State for External Affairs, announced that the Peking Government had accepted Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau's proposal that contacts begin between ambassadors in Stockholm.

This week Mr. Sharp said that, with "great patience" being exercised on both sides, the ambassadorial meetings were continuing at monthly intervals.

"The major problem," he said in a statement, "is the problem of Formosa. We cannot get to the housekeeping details because this question of principle is still unsettled."

Peking is demanding that Canada recognize that Communist China includes the island of Taiwan, or Formosa, now held by the Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek. Canada takes the position that recognition of Communist China does not oblige Canada to accept all of Peking's territorial claims, including Taiwan.

CANADIAN VIEW STATED

"The Canadian Government in general," Mr. Sharp said, "has taken the view that the question of the limits of sovereignty of any particular government is not at issue in the exchange of diplomats. And that is the problem around which we are having discussions."

Canada, during the last year, has made known to the Chinese Communists her readiness to break existing diplomatic relations with the Chinese Nationalists, who maintain an embassy in Ottawa. This would occur regardless of any accord on Taiwan because the Nationalists—who maintain they are the rightful government of China—have indicated they would not be willing to keep an embassy in Ottawa representing Taiwan only.

Mr. Sharp, commenting on the length of time the talks are taking, said that the Chinese were traditionally a people of "great patience." Now Canada, he said, "wants to match the patience of the Chinese."

In a talk with reporters he said it was impossible to predict how long both sides might be willing to exercise patience. It was not clear, he said, whether the Chinese negotiators would insist on their demand about Taiwan to the end, or draw the talks out to find out whether the Canadians would make further concessions.

TRUDEAU'S CAMPAIGN PLEDGE

At a recent news conference, Mr. Trudeau, who made diplomatic overtures to Communist China a campaign promise in 1968, said talks would continue until an accord was reached, or there was evidence that the negotiations were irretrievably stalemated.

The Stockholm talks are being carried on by Miss Margaret Meagher and Wang Tung, the Canadian and Chinese ambassadors to Sweden. It is assumed that if progress materialized each side would send in higher-ranking negotiators.

The return to Ottawa recently of Pu Chao-min, a correspondent of Peking's Hsinhua press agency, appears to have no immediate bearing on the progress, or lack of progress, of the Stockholm proceedings.

Mr. Pu and an assistant report from Canada under an arrangement of the middle nineteen-sixties for an exchange of correspondents—one Chinese reporter in Canada in exchange for one Canadian in Peking. The Canadian correspondent in Peking is Norman Webster of The Globe and Mail, Toronto.

Mr. Pu left Ottawa for home in late 1966, and his post was vacant until a few weeks ago, when the correspondent and a new assistant came back.

[Chicago Daily News Service, Feb. 3, 1970]

TRUDEAU IRKED BY U.S. PLAN FOR ABM SITES NEAR BORDER

OTTAWA, ONTARIO.—Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau has told the House of Commons he is unhappy about U.S. plans to install the Safeguard antiballistic missile on bases close to the Canadian-American border.

At the same time, however, he argued yesterday that there is no evidence the ABM project will contribute to an escalation of the arms race.

Trudeau was answering questions from Thomas C. Douglas, leader of the New Democratic (Socialist) party, who says Canada should protest against the installation of American defenses that might shoot down intercontinental missiles approaching the United States over Canadian territory. The first ABM sites will be in North Dakota and Montana.

Trudeau said the Canadian government is "unhappy that a friend and ally sees the way to peace in this direction" and added that "there has been some element of protest in my words."

"But," Trudeau said, "it might be felt that the Safeguard was necessary to protect the American nuclear deterrent from attack from an oriental direction."

[From "Common Debates" House of Commons of Canada, Feb. 2, 1970]

U.S. ABM SYSTEM—INQUIRY AS TO CANADIAN DECISION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. It arises out of a statement by President Nixon that his administration now proposes to proceed with the second stage of the Safeguard ABM system. In view of the Prime Minister's statement of March 19 last that the Canadian government was reviewing the matter and would decide very soon whether they would condemn this ABM program or cooperate with it. I ask the Prime Minister whether the government has now reached a decision, whether it has conveyed any protest to the United States, against the ABM system or whether it has indicated its intention of cooperating with them in the construction of the Safeguard system?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that on that occasion we were concerned that the announcement by the United States of America would create an escalation of the arms race. I must say that to date our evidence has not shown that this has resulted. Therefore our main concern at that time does not appear to have been well founded thus far.

This does not mean that on over-all grounds we are happy to see the project proceed. As far as we are concerned, we have no deterrent to protect on our soil. However, insofar, as it is important to protect not the deterrent but the civilian population, we feel—and I understand the fear felt by the United States is mostly coming from an Oriental direction—that our own approach to the People's Republic of China the negotiations going on in Stockholm are certainly a better way in the long run to protect the world from war than is a continuance of the arms race.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the fact that, as majority leader Mike Mansfield has said, this program will cost over $50 billion, which in itself is an escalation of the arms race, may I ask the Prime Minister whether we are to take his response as meaning that the Canadian government has now decided that this does not constitute any peril to the future peace of the world, and that the Canadian government does not propose to make any protest whatsoever with respect to the second phase of the Safeguard system being proceeded with?

Mr. Trudeau: I am afraid the hon. member has unintentionally misinterpreted my statement. It seems to me, on the contrary, that there was some form of protest in what I said; if the hon. member prefers to look at it otherwise, that is up to him. So far as the figure produced by Senator Mansfield is concerned, we only heard it this morning on the news and we have not had an opportunity to look into it. I also take issue with the hon. member's logic. When we talk of escalation we talk of escalation between countries rather than in terms of dollars and cents spent in one country. When we were answering this question last spring, it had to do with the danger of a decision by the United States resulting in a decision by the Soviet Union which would lead to a series of escalation. We have not seen this follow from the original United States decision. The Canadian government remains rather unhappy, however, that a friend and ally of such importance should be seeing its way to peace in this direction rather than in the direction I have just mentioned.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask the Prime Minister whether any member of the cabinet is at the present time carrying on any negotiations or discussions with the United States authorities with respect to the extension of the Safeguard system? If so, which ministers are concerned and what is the purpose of those discussions?

Mr. Trudeau: There has been no consultation on this item of news, which we learned about only this morning. To answer the hon. gentleman, there has been no consultation and there is no minister engaged in consultation. We have not, since this morning, made any decision.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): May I direct this supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs? Are we to infer from the reply just given that the presidential announcement in the United States does not involve any cooperation on the part of Canada whatsoever?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I can certainly give that assurance. This decision by the United States was made quite independently of any consultation with us.

PROPOSED U.S. NUCLEAR TESTS

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): My supplementary question is also directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the announcement by the United States that further atomic explosions are to be set off in the Aleutians, reportedly three times as powerful as the one last October, does the Canadian government plan to make any formal protest regarding the continuation of these tests so close to Canada?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): With regard to this item also may I say I have just read the bulletin in which the announcement appeared. Again, this announcement by the United States was not made after any consultation with us. In the course of the announcement the United States authorities said they had no reason to fear, on the basis of the tests made on Amchitka Island earlier, that there would be any untoward effects—for example, the creation of an earthquake or a tidal wave. They are satisfied in this regard on the basis of previous tests. We have not had the opportunity of seeing the results of those tests yet and therefore we have had no opportunity to decide whether to make a formal protest this time as we did before.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 23, 1970]

OIL-FOR-WATER PROPOSAL: HOW MUCH SHOULD CANADA AND UNITED STATES INTEGRATE ECONOMIES?

(By Bruce Hutchison)

After long slumber the oldest economic issue in Canadian life has awakened and reentered practical politics. It is whether Canada and the United States should further and perhaps totally integrate their already interdependent business.

Two recent developments have pushed this question to the forefront of the great debate now under way at Ottawa and throughout the nation.

When Washington dispatches indicated that the Nixon administration would soon offer Canada a large new oil market in return for Canadian water, Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau rejected this proposal in advance.

The Canadian Government does not intend to sell any water from the rivers flowing to its three seacoasts—not at least until it knows for sure how much water it will need for its own use centuries ahead.

Pending a long, detailed study of these needs, the government will not consider trading water for either an oil or any other American market.

UNANIMOUS SUPPORT

In this policy the government seems to have the almost unanimous support of all parties in Parliament and of the nation as a whole.

But excluding the alienation of primary resources, the government apparently is ready to discuss with the United States some form of continental energy program. It would cover the export of Canadian hydroelectric power and the movement of Alaskan oil by pipeline through Canada to the American market.

As these prospects were under investigation by a parliamentary committee, George W. Ball, former U.S. Under Secretary of State, carried the argument into a wider dimension.

Testifying at Ottawa, he recommended a free-trade area and later a full customs union between the two neighboring nations because, he said, the completely sovereign state already is economically obsolete in the modern world.

REMARK RECALLED

But he argued that Canada could still retain its own way of life in a continental economy freed of all trading barriers. He also modified his previous "speculative" opinion in a controversial book that Canada would ultimately seek political union with the United States to secure its superior living standard.

The angry reaction from Canada, he said, had purged his mind "of any lingering doubts as to the vitality and assertiveness of Canadian nationalism."

WESTERN RUMBLINGS

He urged Canada, however, to maintain its place in NATO and in continental defense and proposed some international instead of exclusively Canadian control over the Northwest Passage.

As Mr. Ball was arousing sensitivities at Ottawa, the government heard somewhat similar rumblings in the Canadian west.

There Mr. Trudeau's Liberal Party is mounting a strong campaign for a general tariff reduction. It has the support of four western provincial governments and is endorsed publicly by Jack Davis, the Prime Minister's leading colleague in British Columbia.

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

CANADA AND U.S. PRESS OIL TALKS—OTTAWA HINTS IT MAY SLOW DELIVERIES TO MIDWEST

(By Edward Cowan)

OTTAWA, February 15.—Canada and the United States are deeply immersed in negotiations over oil and natural gas and Canada hopes to announce results within weeks, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has disclosed.

The Minister, J. J. Greene, in a speech last week to oil men in Calgary, Alberta, also hinted that the Canadian Government may make a new effort to curtail sharply rising deliveries of Canadian crude oil to United States Midwestern refiners.

Reporting "an abnormal surge in our oil exports" because "the demands of certain Chicago refiners have recently been added to those of established customers for Canadian oil," Mr. Greene said not only Washington but "the Canadian Government is also concerned."

Ottawa, he said, has always recognized that the exemption Canada enjoys from United States crude oil import quotas "carries with it the responsibility of avoiding disruption of United States markets."

CLEAR STRATEGY

The Minister left no doubt that his strategy is to help Washington avoid intense short-run pressure from the Texas-Louisiana oil producers in hopes of securing in the long run a larger American market for Canadian oil.

More directly than he has done in his speeches, Mr. Greene made plain in an interview in Ottawa this week that he regards access to Canadian natural gas, a fuel in short supply now in the United States, as a bargaining lever with which to pry open the American market for Canadian oil.

Mr. Greene said that depending on what Washington offers, Canada might revise her criteria of gas needs so that a larger "surplus" would be eligible for export.

He said he has had numerous talks recently with Walter J. Hickel, the Secretary of the Interior, in Washington, and by telephone. Out of these negotiations, in which the Canadian press has taken an intense interest, have come the phrases "common energy market" and "continental energy pool."

Mr. Greene and his staff, he said, have given no thought to establishing a joint energy board.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 6, 1970]

CANADA PUSHES FOR SOVEREIGNTY—WHO OWNS NORTHWEST PASSAGE?

(By Bruce Hutchison)

Canada will soon assert its sovereignty over the islands and waters north of its Arctic coast. But how this claim will be made and enforced is not yet known.

Some Members of Parliament, including government supporters fear that Canadian action may be too timid and too late.

After a sudden, unscheduled debate, Mitchell Sharp, Minister of External Affairs, told the House of Commons only that forthcoming legislation would affirm control over "our natural heritage."

The government, he added, did not disagree with the bipartisan report of a parliamentary committee which urges immediate steps to clarify Canada's position in the far north. It is not "ready, however, to disclose its strategy in seeking the agreement of foreign nations, especially the United States."

OPPOSITION SKEPTICAL

Awaiting this strategy, Parliament is worried and the opposition skeptical. Robert Stanfield, the Conservative Party leader, said that each day of government silence "increases the conviction of other countries that Canada has doubts about her sovereignty in the north."

Doubts about the government's policy, if not its objectives, were raised last fall when Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau suggested an international agreement, with Canada as its trustee, to protect the Northwest Passage from pollution by oil tankers.

Members of the parliamentary committee refuse to concede that the passage is an international waterway as the United States Government apparently believes. Ian Watson, committee chairman and government supporter, said Canada itself must regulate shipping in this channel.

The present international authority that sets oil-spillage levels on the high seas is dominated by countries with a strong shipping lobby subservient to oil interests, Mr. Watson said.

CHALLENGE SEEN

In his view the U.S. tanker Manhattan had issued a challenge to Canadian sovereignty last summer by entering the passage without asking Ottawa's permission.

The government reserved its answer to these general complaints pending the declaration of a specific policy.

Meanwhile, outside Parliament, a vigorous debate on the future of the north is under way. Many newspapers have emphasized with or without approval, George Ball's recent warning that exclusive Canadian control of the passage would be "abrasive" to Americans.

Mr. Ball, former Undersecretary of State, told the parliamentary committee that the American Government definitely regards this water as international. How the Canadian Government will regard it in the promised legislation remains to be seen.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 17, 1970]

ARCTIC WATERS LOBBY PRESSES OTTAWA

(By Gerald Waring)

OTTAWA.—A program for a fleet of new icebreakers for the U.S. Coast Guard and a serious oil spill from a wrecked tanker on the coast of Nova Scotia have provided new ammunition for the Canadian Arctic territorial waters lobby.

The pressure for a government assertion of Canadian sovereignty over waters between Canada's Arctic islands comes from opposition groups in Parliament, some Liberal members, the press, university activists and private citizens.

Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau has resisted the pressure on the grounds that other countries, notably the U.S., might reject a Canadian claim and insist that the inter-insular seas are international waters. In a recent forum confrontation with university students Trudeau was angered by charges that his Arctic sovereignty position was "anemic."

Canada, he retorted, has two choices. It can "go to the International Court at The Hague and maybe lose for all time its right to Arctic waters, or grab them and face the possibility of war. Do you want us to go to war over the matter?" he asked the suddenly sobered students. "Time and finesse," he explained, are needed to make Canada's case for Arctic waters control.

How far the government will go towards meeting the demands for sovereignty probably will not be known until the government introduces legislation, promised soon, dealing with protection of the Arctic environment from pollution, particularly by oil spills.

The recent wreck of the Liberian tanker Arrow in Chedabucto Bay, Nova Scotia, and the spill of a large part of her 3.8 million million gallons of bunker oil has given the sovereignty lobby a new case in point.

So has congressional criticism of the U.S. Coast Guard for not proceeding as quickly as possible to build a new fleet of Arctic icebreakers, a construction program that has raised questions in Parliament about whether the icebreakers are destined for use in what many Canadians consider are Canadian territorial waters.

Recently the government's position was outlined in a Commons debate by Foreign Minister Mitchell Sharp. He said there was "no fundamental difference" between the government and Members of Parliament who want the government to assert sovereignty over the sounds, straits and channels of the Northwest Passage.

However, he explained, the government is inhibited by uncertainty about whether such a claim would be internationally accepted.

The question of whether the inter-island waters are land locked territorial seas or international waters became important in light of the possibility that Alaskan North slope oil may be shipped by super-tanker through the passage to eastern U.S. markets.

This possibility gave rise to concern by the government, Parliament and the public that a Torry Canyon-type oil spill in the Arctic would have a calamitous effect on sea life, bird life and native food resources.

Trudeau promised "a policy for use of the Arctic waters which will be designed for environmental preservation" but which would "not be a restriction upon progress."

Sharp announced that legislation will soon be introduced in Parliament which "will vest in Canada the maritime jurisdiction which is essential for this purpose."

Canada's own oil interests, as well as those of the U.S. are involved in the question.

Panarctic Oils Ltd., a consortium in which the Canadian government has a 45 per cent interest, began a three-year drilling program in the high Arctic last spring, and already has found much gas and some oil on Melville Island.

Should Panarctic find oil in commercial quantities, it could be brought out only by tanker—either surface or submarine.

Equally significant, in a negative way, to the Northwest Passage question is the discovery of oil near the mouth of the Mackenzie River announced Jan. 15 by Imperial Oil Ltd.

The size of this oil pool on the Arctic coast has not yet been determined, but geological formations suggest it could be of major importance.

In that event, added impetus would be given to the proposal to build a pipeline from the North Slope to the Mackenzie River, and then south 1,300 miles to Edmonton, Alberta, to carry both Alaskan and Canadian Arctic oil to continental markets.

If North Slope oil went out by tanker, it might not be economically feasible for Canadian companies alone to build the pipeline.

—

[From the New York Times, Feb. 22, 1970]

CANADIANS STRESS CLAIMS ON ARCTIC—ISSUE LINKED TO FAILURE OF NIXON TO MENTION NATION

(By Jay Walz)

OTTAWA, Feb. 21—There is a certain amount of dissatisfaction in Canadian circles over the failure of President Nixon to mention Canada in his review of foreign affairs on Wednesday.

As a result of his silence officials here have issued stronger statements affirming Canadian sovereignty over the Arctic. At the same time, uneasiness about United States intentions in the Canadian far north, particularly the waters there, has been intensified.

The fresh concern expressed by both Government and Opposition officials grew out of Mr. Nixon's warning of the great need to "head off the threat of escalating national claims over the ocean." Did he, or didn't he, include Canada in that admonition?

When the Washington correspondent of The Globe and Mail, of Toronto, asked the State Department about the lack of any mention of Canada in Mr. Nixon's message, he said a spokesman had told him that the President's statement on the ocean applied to the Northwest Passage in the Arctic among areas regarded as "high seas."

CANADIAN OFFICIAL DIFFERS

However, in Canada, Mitchell Sharp, Secretary of State for External Affairs, told reporters that Mr. Nixon could not have been referring to Canada in this connection, because Canada had "never made any territorial claims over water regarded as part of the high seas."

"It would be difficult to argue that the Arctic waters between Canadian territory have been regarded as part of the high seas," Mr. Sharp said. He argued that the trip of the Manhattan, a United States supertanker, through "Canadian waters" last summer with Canadian acquiescence and the assistance of Canadian icebreakers "was evidence of that position."

Both Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau and Mr. Sharp have been pressed in the House of Commons for "assurances" that the Arctic land and waters both belong to Canada, and are not accepted in Ottawa as part of the "ocean."

"We have regarded the Arctic waters as our waters," Mr. Sharp said in one reply. Neither he nor Mr. Trudeau had ever made that flat a statement on this issue before.

GUARANTEE ON SPILLAGE

Answering another question, Mr. Trudeau indicated that if the Manhattan makes a second voyage through the Northwest Passage this spring. Canada would require a guarantee against the dangers of oil spillage.

This is regarded here as tantamount to saying that the Northwest Passage through the Canadian Arctic islands belongs to Canada. But Mr. Trudeau has never said so directly, and Mr. Sharp's statement about the passage being "our waters" is not backed by a proclamation of any kind. Nevertheless, when asked by reporters about his declaration before the House, he answered: "Well, I said it."

The United States takes the position that the Northwest Passage is an international sea lane.

The status of the Northwest Passage has been a delicate issue here since the discovery of vast oil deposits in Prudhoe Bay, Alaska. This has spurred American efforts to develop the sea lane as a short cut to markets on the Atlantic Coast. Supertankers, such as the icebreaking Manhattan, have been designed to cut their way through the ice.

Canadian Arctic specialists fear that heavy traffic by supertankers would result in large oil spills, which would contaminate vast areas for decades. And Mr. Trudeau has claimed for Canada the responsibility for protecting the Arctic against pollution.

—

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 24, 1970]

SECOND MANHATTAN ARCTIC TRIP STUDIED

HOUSTON.—The S.S. Manhattan, which proved in September the feasibility of a shipping lane via the Northwest Passage, was in Baton Rouge, La., last weekend to take on a load of crude for Humble Oil & Refining's Bayway, N.J., refinery.

Meanwhile, officials at Humble's Houston headquarters inched closer to a decision on the 1,005-foot tanker making a second fact-finding voyage across the top of North America.

"The decision must be made soon," Stanley B. Haas, project manager of Humble's Arctic task force, explained.

"The object is to get the ship into the ice before the start of the melt season so tests could be conducted in ice of uniform thickness", Haas said.

"We tested last fall in multi-year ice—ice that has survived more than one or two seasons," he said. "We want to test ice that has been formed this season that will be of fairly uniform thickness.

The variable ice thickness makes it difficult to get engineering data that could be treated with confidence," Haas said.

The 115,000 ton tanker (loaded) summoned up 43,000 horsepower to crunch its way through ice packs 30 feet thick.

The same route, north off the coast of Greenland to Davis Strait, Baffin Bay and Lancaster Sound to Viscount Melville Sound would be taken, eliminating the Prudhoe Bay leg.

"Ice thicknesses of six feet could be expected," Haas said.

The supertanker would sail about April 10 and get into the ice a week later if the decision is made to go, Haas said. The 5,000-mile roundtrip would take about six weeks and cost "only about 1-30th of the $43 million expended last time, mainly for converting the ship for ice-breaking duties.

"Atlantic-Richfield and British-petroleum would be entitled to have representatives aboard under the arrangements we made with them last year," Haas said.

"About 80 percent of the crew has volunteered to go again," Haas said.

A second voyage could act as a catalyst on the Canadian government, now debating a declaration of Canadian sovereignty over Asiatic waters and evaluating the oil disaster off Nova Scotia shore recently.

Supporters of the Asiatic shipping route say it can be an economic gain for Canada, and haggling over sovereignty of the iceberg choked waters is small-minded.

External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp said last week Canada would welcome and co-operate with any more Arctic voyages by the Manhattan, and he stressed Canada's permission was not required for any additional expeditions.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 2, 1970]

SOME CANADIANS FAVOR TAX EXEMPTIONS FOR U.S. MAGAZINES

(By James Post)

The special committee of the Canadian Senate investigating the mass media has discovered that Time magazine's Canadian edition has at least some friends among Canadian magazine publishers.

At one time, Time Canada was almost universally feared in the magazine industry as a tough and unbeatable competitor for the advertiser's dollar. Testimony to the Senate committee has shown some softening in the opposition, although it is still well entrenched.

For example, the popular Canadian-owned monthly, Maclean's feels that Time Canada's privileged tax position should not be changed.

TAX-DEDUCTIBLE EXPENSE

Both Time and Reader's Digest are exempt from a five-year-old Canadian tax law that puts foreign periodicals sold in Canada at an economic disadvantage to Canadian periodicals.

Advertisers can treat advertising placed in Canadian periodicals and the exempt foreign publications as tax-deductible expense, but not in other imported magazines. The rule was applied to protect the financial health of Canadian media.

Time and Reader's Digest won exemptions after a considerable controversy in the early '60's. Now Time has piled success on success and has emerged as the dominant market for magazine advertising in Canada.

Ad revenue hit $9,545,752 for Time Canada last year, almost double that of 1960. Circulation now is 460,000. Time also puts out 12 regional editions in Canada to capture advertisers who want to hit a specific region or regions.

The arguments favoring continuation of Time's privileged position among foreign periodicals include the point that Time gives the whole Canadian magazine industry an appeal for advertisers as opposed to television, radio, and newspapers.

COOPERATIVE PROJECT

Time also has linked up with 11 other popular magazines sold in Canada in an organization to promote magazine advertising. It pays heavily into the project. Canadian magazines are said to benefit.

There also is the question of United States owned subsidiary businesses advertising in Canadian publications. The U.S. parents could regard any action against Time as anti-American and the resulting theory is that advertising budgets in Canadian magazines could suffer.

The telling argument against Time Canada's privileged position put forth by critics—and there are many of them—is that Time Canada has big cost advantage over Canadian periodicals on editorial content.

The bulk of the magazine distributed in Canada is the same as the U.S. edition with the addition of a Canadian section. So Time Canada gets much of its content for a song, the critics say, in that it is produced for non-Canadian editions of the magazine. Canadian magazines, on the other hand, have to pay the full cost of developing their own editorial material.

REMOVAL SUGGESTED

As a result, such organizations as the Toronto Star—Canada's biggest daily—have suggested the removal of the Reader's Digest and Time exemptions. So has Southam Business Publications, a prominent chain of trade magazines.

The Senate committee will have to weigh both sides of the question. After hearing so much evidence on the subject the committee can hardly avoid saying something about it in its report expected later this year.

Public hearings of the 15-member committee, which began in December, will continue until spring. After that, it is report-writing time, a job that will be done with a considerable amount of other research by committee investigators.

OTHER ISSUES STUDIED

So far the committee's other big concerns appear to be the dangers of a further concentration of ownership in the media, particularly newspaper chains. The committee also has heard sharply divided opinions from newpaper publishers on whether some form of press council is needed to police the industry.

But lately, the question of Time's powerful and growing presence has taken the committee's attention.

Time Canada's special status may or may not be on the line, but it is certainly getting a thorough airing in a country where there is considerable discontent about cultural and economic domination by the United States.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 15, 1970]

CANADA PLANNING LIMITS ON U.S. TV—CURBS LINKED TO CAMPAIGN TO SAVE NATION'S CULTURE

OTTAWA, February 14.—The Canadian Radio Television Commission served notice this week that broadcasters must give viewers more and better Canadian programs and rely less on productions from the United States.

Proposed regulations announced by the body, which oversees all broadcasting, may not deprive Canadians of some of their most popular programs such as "The Ed Sullivan Show," "I Love Lucy" and "Bonanza." However, the commission wants fewer such programs in the prime time between 6:30 P.M. and 11:30 P.M.

The five-member commission, which was established two years ago, has recently concentrated on "saving Canadian broadcasting from extinction." Under its chairman, Pierre Juneau, a former executive of the National Film Board, the commission has taken up the cause of many Canadian sociologists, who are alarmed over the great impact of United States television on what they call "Canada's distinctive culture."

A few weeks ago the commission set restrictions on operators wanting to send United States programs into the Canadian North by relays and cable television.

BIG CITIES GET U.S. TV

Viewers in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver, Canada's three largest cities, pick up United States network programs easily. Recently, cable TV has brought United States programs to a growing number of subscribers in Ottawa.

This week the commission proposed to limit the amount of United State programing on Canadian stations. Subject to a final order after public hearings are completed, stations must gradually increase their "Canadian content" to 55 or 60 per cent of their service. They must, above all, hold the foreign content of their evening programs to 40 per cent. At present the situation is reversed, with stations required to maintain a 60–40 ratio in favor of non-Canadian shows.

Furthermore, Mr. Juneau wants programs "produced in any one country outside Canada" held within 30 per cent of total service. The United States is the "one country" exceeding that limit now. Britain, whose British Broadcasting Corporation is a large contributor to radio and television programing in Canada, has been under the commission's definition a "Canadian" source because of Commonwealth ties. But this will change under the new rules.

RADIO TO BE AFFECTED

Radio stations will be affected similarly. While they will be required to raise their Canadian content only to 30 per cent over a period of months, they may be harder hit because so much of their entertainment consists of recordings. Most of the records played by disc jockeys are from the United States.

Mr. Juneau said a Canadian content record might be one for which the music or lyrics had been written or performed by a Canadian, or which had been recorded in a Canadian studio.

Reaction is mixed. Officials of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation said it would have little difficulty meeting the new requirements if given a little time.

However, Murray Chercouver, president of the privately owned C.T.V. network had reservations. To meet the standards, his network, he said, would have to create about four hours a week of new evening-hour entertainment, and this would be expensive. If weaker Canadian shows were programed, he said, audiences might change to other channels.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 22, 1970]

U.S. POLICY CRITICIZED IN CANADA

OTTAWA.—Canadian opposition to American policies appears to be growing more outspoken on such issues as Cuba, the draft and Arctic sovereignty as direct criticism of Vietnam policy recedes.

A case in point concerns the group of 500 young Americans who went to Cuba to help the Castro regime with its sugar cane harvest. They left by boat from Saint John, New Brunswick, after arriving by chartered buses.

This expedition which followed other trips to Cuba by American students, were treated as important news in major Canadian papers.

The Montreal Star, usually friendly to the U.S., blamed Washington editorially for continuing the "quarantine" of Cuba and charged that State Department "perversity" rather than Castro's deeds led to the break in relations a decade ago.

"Castro has not only survived," the editorial said. "He has continued to hold the imagination and support of young people in his own country and other parts of Latin America. He offers relative altruism and involvement in challenging projects while other political figures in the West speak in redundant cliches."

Canada continued cordial relations with Cuba throughout the period in which the U.S. was imploring other countries in the hemisphere to join in the quarantine of Castro.

Some Americans who visited the Cuban Pavilion at Expo '67 in Montreal found that it was illegal to bring Cuban cigars back to the U.S.

Similarly, several Canadian papers recently mustered editorial indignation at reports that Canadian immigration authorities may have informed U.S. law enforcement agencies about American deserters and draft-dodgers entering Canada.

No one knows exactly how many such persons are now in Canada, because no tally is kept under Canadian immigration regulations, but the total is thought to be in the thousands. Recently these regulations were changed to make entry easier.

Canadian legislators as well as newspapers also have been making a substantial issue of the need to assert sovereignty over waters in the Arctic against possible U.S. encroachment, in light of the new interest in navigation that has attended oil discoveries.

The U.S. has made no claim but has not recognized some Canadian claims that certain straits constitute national waters.

Plucking the eagle's feathers is an old winter sport among some Canadian publications, and there is nothing about the present spate of criticism to suggest that it is very serious.

Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that one purpose of the visit by Queen Elizabeth to Canada's far Arctic in July will be to show the flag and thus, some persons hope, establish Canada's claim to the waters beyond dispute.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 22, 1970]

UNITED STATES ASKS CANADA FOR ASSISTANCE IN PROBING OF UMW ELECTION

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

The Labor Department has asked the Canadian government for help in investigating fresh charges of vote-padding and forgery in the controversial election of United Mine Workers President W. A. (Tony) Boyle.

UMW pensioners, especially in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, were said to have voted illegally and UMW local officials there were allegedly offered $50 each to tabulate the "unlawful" ballots, according to complaints submited to federal officials.

"I guess they (UMW leaders) figured no one would ever look up there," said Joseph A. (Chip) Yablonski, son of the slain labor leader who was defeated by Boyle in a bitter contest Dec. 9.

By the UMW's tally, Boyle won the election over union dissident Joseph (Jock) Yablonski with a vote of 80,577 to 46,073.

Disclosure of the apparently unprecedented step to investigate alleged union irregularities in another country followed a sharply worded salvo from the Yablonski camp's lawyer, Washington attorney Joseph L. Rauh Jr.

In an impassioned 9-page letter to Shultz, Rauh accused the Labor Department of conducting "a woefully inadequate . . . wholly pusillanimous investigation." He said its investigators have completely ignored charges of most pre-election irregularities and not a few election-day improprieties.

"The Yablonski supporters will never let you sweep this under the rug," Rauh warned. He asserted that Boyle's election should be set aside "on the full record" rather than "the narrowest possible ground."

Pointing to Canada, Rauh declared that an accompanying affidavit, "now handed to you on a silver platter . . . shows that tally sheets were altered and another forged."

But so far, he protested to Shultz, no investigation has been undertaken there.

The deadline for a Labor Department decision on the election is less than three weeks away. The government's request for an investigation of the Canadian balloting, it was reliably reported, was sent through diplomatic channels to the Ministry of Labor in Ottawa Friday.

Protocol-conscious officials here, however, want Ottawa to make the announcement.

Yablonski charged before his death that Boyle "stole the election through massive violations" of the UMW constitution and federal labor laws, including intimidation, vote-padding and misuse of union funds.

Boyle has dismissed the allegations as "largely technicalities and trivialities" and called the election "entirely democratic."

Labor Secretary Shultz ordered an investigation of the balloting after Yablonski was found murdered with his wife and daughter Jan. 5.

The charges of election fraud in the UMW's two Canadian jurisdictions, Districts 18 and 26, were first mentioned briefly by Yablonski's son last Dec. 18. They were subsequently set out in detail by a Canadian newsman, Strang (Jock) Ferguson.

In a Feb. 19 affidavit that he said was based on interviews with hundreds of miners in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick (District 26), Ferguson charged that the irregularities he found were "due to the efforts of District President Bill Marsh . . ."

Ferguson accused Marsh of voting the pensioners on Boyle's orders although "they neither pay dues nor remain eligible to vote under the District's constitution." The newsman said he talked to "several hundred pensioners" and found only 11 who said they actually had cast ballots.

The official tally in the Feb. 15 UMW Journal lists that local simply as having "over voted." The Journal also showed a vote of 1,768 for Boyle to 350 for Yablonski in District 26—compared to an original tally in the Dec. 15 UMW Journal of 2,677 votes for Boyle to 470 for Yablonski.

"Chip" Yablonski maintained to a reporter yesterday that the District 26 vote for Boyle, as finally listed, was still improbably high.

Marsh could not be reached for comment.

Meanwhile, from Pittsburgh, UMW President Boyle was reported to have sent a telegram to the FBI there, asking them to be on hand when Yablonski's sons open safety deposit boxes that belonged to the union leader.

Boyle asserted in his telegram that the deposit boxes "may contain incriminating evidence . . . (such as) the names of those notorious persons with whom Jock Yablonski had financial dealings and obligations."

A federal grand jury in Cleveland investigating the murders is presently concentrating on a list of witnesses drawn exclusively from the ranks of the UMW.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 2, 1970]

CANADA RAPS WATER DEAL

(By Bruce Hutchison)

The Canadian Government has assured its people that none of their fresh water will be sold to the United States in the foreseeable future.

It has told the United States that the salt waters north of Canada's Arctic coast "are our waters" and that American ships entering them must obey Canadian safety regulations.

These two official statements followed President Nixon's proposal that Canada and the United States negotiate a common energy policy "looking toward a freer exchange of petroleum, natural gas, and other energy resources between the two countries."

Some Canadians immediately suspected that the United States was willing to import Canadian energy without restriction provided that it also could divert Canadian rivers into dry American territory.

T. C. Douglas, leader of the left-wing New Democratic Party, even warned Parliament that the United States was conducting "a very refined form of blackmail."

To dispel these fears J. J. Greene, Minister of Resources, told the House of Commons that Canada is not considering any export of water.

APPROVAL HELD NECESSARY

"I reaffirm in the strongest possible terms," he said, "that no water could be sold to the United States without the approval of the Government of Canada. No contemplation of such approval is under consideration by the government."

He also said that an ice survey conducted by U.S. Army engineers on the Great Lakes last November "is in no way connected with any plan to divert waters."

None of the statements is intended to mean that Canada will not discuss a common energy policy with the United States; they mean only that water is excluded.

Nor is there any suggestion that American ships cannot enter Canadian waters in the Arctic, only that they must not pollute them by spilling oil.

Under parliamentary questioning, Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau made it clear that the United States tanker *Manhattan* will not be permitted to undertake a second voyage through the Northwest Passage unless her owners satisfy the government that she poses no risk of oil pollution.

GUARANTEE PROPOSED

The government will soon introduce a new antipollution law. If it has not been passed by Parliament before the *Manhattan* enters the Canadian Arctic her owners must guarantee that the ship will meet all the safety standards proposed in the legislation.

Robert Stanfield, leader of the Opposition, asked Mr. Trudeau how he regarded the claim of some American officials that Canada's sovereignty ends three miles from its mainland and island shores.

The Canadian position, Mr. Trudeau replied, would be "set out clearly" when the antipollution bill was introduced.

Meanwhile the government has ordered a feasibility study of an oil-transfer terminal on Herschel Island close to the Yukon-Alaska boundary. It could be used to gather American and Canadian oil for movement by ship or by pipeline through Canada to the American market.

Arthur Laing, Minister of Public Works, says he doubts that tankers will prove feasible in the Arctic and believes that the northern oil fields probably will be served by a Canadian pipeline up the Mackenzie River Valley.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 26, 1969]

WHAT PRICE AFFLUENCE? CANADIANS ASK

(Canada's high living standard is supported by foreign investment—mostly from the U.S. In fact, says any Ottawa study, "no advanced economy has as high a degree of foreign control of its industry." And this is causing growing concern to Canadians.)

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

Some weeks ago an official of the Royal Bank of Canada was talking to a visitor about his concern over foreign control of Canada's economy.

"Recent acquisitions by United States interests," he said, "pose a challenge to us, and I for one hope that we can meet it by holding the line against increasing United States investment here."

Yet just a week later the advertising department of the same bank inserted a substantial-size ad in a United States newspaper telling U.S. investors that the Royal Bank "can help you cash in where the action is."

The advertisement said, in part: "Whether you plan a survey, a reconnaissance in force, or a full-scale product invasion, . . . we can tell you where the prime opportunities lie and how to grasp them."

These two incidents help to explain the dilemma facing Canadians who want both to share in the material prosperity evident in the United States but to keep Canada for Canadians. It is a real problem for the government in Ottawa and a serious concern for most Canadians, who probably feel somewhat akin to the banker.

PRODUCTS PENETRATE FAR

Canadians today are alarmed at what they regard as growing foreign control of their economy.

The major threat, it is felt, comes from the United States, where investors are more willing to take risks than many Canadians. All that the 21.3 million Canadians need do is look around them to realize how extensive the U.S. product invasion is. And what is more, how much of Canada's development potential—in oil, gas, minerals, and water—appears to be slipping into foreign hands.

The problem is multifaceted. Many large Canadian firms are closely linked with United States firms either through direct ownership or interlocking arrangements which leave little room for Canadians to exert their own options on policy and product decisions.

The problem turns up in many subtle ways for Canadians. A local firm here, owned by United States interests but managed by Canadians, recently planned a sizable sale to Cuba of light industrial machinery made in Toronto. But when the deal became known to the U.S. owners, the international policies of the United States stopped the deal.

Under United States Government orders, businessmen and industrialists are not permitted to sell their goods to Cuba—a nation with which the United States does not have relations.

CAPITAL INFLOW DEFENDED

"But these are Canadian goods," a company spokesman here complained. "All the product and all the labor and all the management are Canadian. But 51 percent of the company is in United States hands and that's enough to cut out a good sale. I'm speaking out of turn, but I don't like it."

Neither does the Canadian Government—nor do most Canadians who resent not only the foreign control, but the implications involved.

Still, few Canadians with whom this reporter spoke in the course of two months in Canada would do away with foreign investment. "It's been important to our development. There's more money across the border, more capital for speculative ventures, than we have here," one noted Canadian writer said.

Yet, "No advanced economy [in the world] has as high a degree of foreign control of its industry as has Canada," a study published by the Economic Council of Canada said earlier this year.

The most recent figures suggest that outsiders, mainly from the United States, control something in the neighborhood of 60 percent of Canada's manufacturing industry. There is growing, but as yet unrecorded, foreign control of large segments of land in Canada.

Accumulated direct foreign investment is estimated at $25 billion, with fully $20 billion from the United States. Those new figures, released within the past two months, compare with the 1965 tally, which showed foreign investment at $17 billion and United States investment as $14 billion of that total.

TWO-YEAR TAKE-OVER TALLY

According to estimates by bankers and others here, about 500 Canadian firms have slipped into foreign control in the past two years. It was just under two years ago that a report on foreign ownership of Canadian industry stirred a massive ruckus in Parliament, in the press, and in public opinion.

The report, prepared by Melville Watkins, a University of Toronto economist, contained findings of an 18-month ownership survey he made for former Minister of Finance Walter Gordon.

The Watkins report urged Ottawa to do something quickly to halt the trend because of its disturbing implications for Canada's independence.

Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau recently appointed Herbert Gray, a Windsor, Ont., lawyer, to the Cabinet and charged him with the task of seeking ways to lessen United States economic domination.

The problem for Canadians is not academic, however; and most Ottawa observers say that the Trudeau government, or any government that follows in the next decade, is going to have to scramble fast if it is to hold the line against the mounting onslaught of foreign capital.

DIMENSIONS TRACED

Here are some of the immediate dimensions of the problem:

The effort of the United States-based Philip Morris tobacco firm to take over 50 percent control of Canadian Breweries, Ltd., Canada's largest beermaker. The price offered by Philip Morris is $120 million. And while the deal is not consummated, the effort of South Africa's Rothman tobacco empire to win such control has apparently failed, leaving the way open for the American firm.

The sale of one of Canada's largest investment firms, Royal Securities, Ltd., to the world's largest stockbroker, the New York-based Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith. Though the sale touched off a furor, the deal went through with only minor concessions by the firm to Canadian interests.

The joint purchase of British Columbia Forest Products, Inc., by the Mead Corporation of the United States and Noranda Mines, Ltd., of Canada, a firm doing $100 million worth of business yearly. The firm is also partly owned by the Brunswick Pulp & Paper Company, which in turn is jointly owned by Scott Paper Company of Philadelphia and the Mead Corporation, headquartered in Dayton, Ohio.

MANY SHIFTS ELUDE HEADLINES

Many of the firms which have recently passed into U.S. or other foreign hands are not well known. They are small and relatively insignificant in terms of the overall Canadian market. Their sale to a foreign purchaser does not make the headlines, but observers here say such sales are steadily going on.

It is the big take overs, the big foreign investments, and the like that make the headlines. One way of looking at this is to realize that, according to recent figures released by the government, foreigners control more than half the total assets of Canada's 400 largest corporations.

Or that 97 percent of Canada's automobile industry is controlled by nonresidents, 97 percent of the rubber industry, 78 percent of the chemical industry, 77 percent of electrical-apparatus industry, 59 percent of the mining and smelting industry, and 74 percent of the petroleum and natural-gas industry.

NOT A ONE-WAY STREET

Part of the problem is quite simply geography. The undefended border between the United States and Canada, combined with over 100 years of relatively good relations between the two neighbors, has meant considerable interrelationship of politics, society, and the economies of the two nations.

And the trend for investment is not one-way. There are sizable Canadian investments in the United States. For example, the Massey-Ferguson complex, which manufactures farm machinery, is a Canadian-dominated organization. Several large whiskey makers, including Seagram, are Canadian in ownership. The Loblaw grocery stores of New York and other states are part of an organization based in Toronto Moreover, many small investors in Canada have holdings in U.S. firms and in mutual funds and the like.

But these investments, while large in their totals, are small in comparison with U.S. investments going the other way.

PRESSURE ON OTTAWA GROWS

Yet Canada needs this foreign investment to pace its development.

The Trudeau government does not worry much about foreign investment nor about United States investment itself. But it is under mounting pressure to do something about the situation, which some forces on the left charge with compromising Canadian sovereignty.

In Manitoba, where a New Democratic Party government is in the provincial saddle, there are growing calls for curbs on U.S. investment. In fact, there are some pretty strident voices being heard in Winnipeg, Manitoba's capital, where nationalist fervor is growing among leftists, among social democrats of the center, right-wing trade unions, and other conservative elements.

Such political protest may force the hand of the Trudeau government. The government could, for example, set up the proposed Canadian Development Corporation, which would provide a pool of government money to keep Canadian companies from falling into foreign hands. But it would not have the funds to fend off the vast take-over efforts of firms like Philip Morris and Merrill Lynch.

Another proposal to at least make the foreign investor think twice before investing would force the full disclosure of earnings and sales by privately owned companies. Thus, subsidiaries of Ford, General Motors, Procter & Gamble, General Foods, and others would have to divulge figures on their Canadian operations for the first time.

United States influence and the effect of a large superpower next door are felt in many other ways.

The recent voyage of the Standard Oil of New Jersey oil tanker Manhattan through Canadian Arctic waters stirred new Canadian protest and concern. The Toronto Globe and Mail, for example, has repeatedly called on the Trudeau government to act swiftly to assert Canada's sovereignty over the northern waterways.

Mitchell Sharp, Canada's Minister of External Affairs, suggests, however, that "this is not a time for wide-ranging assertions of Canadian sovereignty in the Arctic made without regard to the international political and legal considerations" which he regards as quite significant.

ATTENTION ON ARCTIC DEVELOPMENT

Rather, Mr. Sharp calls on Canadians to focus attention on "the opening up of the Canadian Arctic region for development," which will, he holds, do more for Canada than trying to test the sovereignty issue through unilateral declarations."

But not all Canadians are sure about these priorities. Many would agree with the influential Globe and Mail viewpoint.

Another worry for Canadians is a brain drain of top Canadian talent—a drain that funnels much of this talent to the United States. A government study recently said the problem is increasingly serious and suggested that Canada should woo back professionals who emigrate to the United States by paying their travel costs, waiving customs duties, and helping them find housing.

This concern about a brain drain, however, may be a little late. The biggest portion of the drain took place in the early 1960's; it has since slowed, owing to new American immigration quotas and growing Canadian disgust with the Vietnam war and what Canadians say it is doing to American life. The better-paying jobs in the United States are offset by this uneasiness about U.S. attitudes and values.

TRENDS IN WASHINGTON QUESTIONED

But if the talent drain has slowed, the uneasiness about the United States that has apparently helped slow it is reflected in Canada's attitudes on its big and powerful neighbor.

"There's a new concern about the United States felt here," said a Canadian politician in Ottawa. "We do not like the trends showing up in Washington, trends not confined to one party or another, which have their effect up here.

"Your young people may not know what is wrong, but they are sensitive to the failures of your society. It's not the foreign investment from the United States that I worry about, for heaven knows we need it and cannot develop alone without it, but it is the attitudes and the values which go along with it."

The problem of a superpower next door, one that offers a material prosperity and way of life which Canada has adopted and which Canadians enjoy even if not always agreeing with its full implications, is not an easy one to live with. And yet, live with it Canadians must.

ONTARIO DANGLES INCENTIVES

Toward this end, despite the growing crescendo of protest against foreign investment, Ontario's provincial government is offering all sorts of incentives to U.S. firms to come to Ontario. Last March, Union Carbide of Canada, Ltd., a subsidiary of the United States firm, was given $394,000 (Canadian dollars) by the Ontario government to help purchase equipment to produce dry batteries at its Walkerton plant in southwestern Ontario.

The Union Carbide "forgivable loan" was part of the government's "Equalization of Industrial Opportunity" program, which has granted $16.3 million to 77 foreign-owned firms, most of them American, to set up new facilities in Ontario.

The only condition on the company is that it must build or expand facilities in slow-growth areas designated by the government and that it not move for six years.

In a debate over this program, Ontario Trade and Development Minister Stanley Randall admitted that he "would like to find a solution where we did not need foreign capital.

"But at the moment nobody has any definite guidelines for us to follow, and until that happens I think we would be committing economic suicide to disturb the investment of foreign capital, whether it is from the United States, Great Britain, or any where else."

THE DISABLED VETERAN AS A MANPOWER RESOURCE IN MY COMMUNITY

HON. JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and honor for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues the presentation of an award to Miss Patricia Popham of Ponca City, Okla. Miss Popham was the top winner in the 1970 "Ability Counts" contest, for her essay entitled "The Disabled Veterans as a Manpower Resource in My Community," sponsored by the Oklahoma Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

I would also like to congratulate Mr. Randell Gregory of Enid and Jim Schoeppel of Fairview, Okla., for their outstanding ability set forth in their essays and receiving honorable mention.

Miss Popham's essay is as follows:

THE DISABLED VETERAN AS A MANPOWER RESOURCE IN MY COMMUNITY

His name was John Michael Roark. He was twenty-four years old and a lieutenant in the United States Army. Lieutenant Roark was engaged in a war in the small Asian country of Vietnam. His job was to fight the enemy, and this he did, steadily and unquestioningly.

He had earned his rank and the respect of the men in his outfit. He had plans for his future and one of these was a blonde named Elizabeth.

When the lieutenant's tour of duty was over, he was going to exchange "Lieutenant" for "Mr." and his steaming rice paddy for a classroom.

He had his plans made. He would receive his honorable discharge and lease an apartment in the middle-rent district. He would marry Elizabeth and, starting in September, grade homework papers in high school calculus.

The tall lieutenant was struggling up a hill, leading his men through the rain and muck. They were after the Viet Cong but could not bring them into sight in the swampy terrain. Perhaps because he was tall, perhaps because he was in front, perhaps—the reason doesn't matter; as he neared the summit of the hill, John Roark caught pieces of flying shrapnel in both his legs. The invisible enemy had appeared and was gone again, leaving behind three of the lieutenant's men and his own legs, lifeless.

He was carried from the site of his nightmare of realities and flown to the United States. He awoke in a hospital room. He knew it was a hospital from the medicinal sterility of the white walls, the white sheets, and the white face of Elizabeth. As the fog in his brain cleared, Elizabeth smiled unsteadily. His unconscious grip on her hand tightened when the nurse came in, rolling the wheel chair and smiling too brightly.

John Michael Roark was no longer in the army, but he was still fighting. He battled with an engulfing mental depression and overwhelming self-pity. He struggled to bury his self-doubts and his feelings for Elizabeth. He succeeded steadily in the first and failed miserably in the second.

Four months later, he sat in the doctor's consultation room staring at his wedding ring. The doctor was saying all manner of encouraging things. Roark's thigh muscles, he said, were not so mutiliated as originally thought. It was his knees and lower leg muscles that presented the real problem. It might be possible to replace them with artificial limbs. Roark nodded dumbly and held Elizabeth's hand. There was no reason, said the doctor, why Roark should not go ahead and get his teaching job. The replacement, he said, could be done. It was only a matter of time.

Time, thought Roark savagely. Since they had been married, Elizabeth had supported them. They lived in the middle-rent district, and he mentally cringed at just who paid their rent.

"Well, Mr. Roark," said the members of the first school board, "you certainly have the qualifications. We wish we could hire you. But in view of your, ah, infirmity, we think things would be too difficult for you. The students, well, you know the students."

No, thought Roark, he didn't know the students and he wasn't going to get the chance to know them. He gritted his teeth at the waste.

The Roarks went to different towns with different school boards. The result was always the same. A kind dismissal, murmurs of sympathy as he maneuvered his wheel chair. He did not want sympathy. He wanted a job.

At length, more perfunctorily than hopefully, Roark and his wife traveled to another town, another middle-rent district. He presented himself to another school board, prepared for another failure.

"Yes, Mr. Roark," said the members of this school board, "your qualifications are admirable." Roark sighed at the familiar beginning and waited for the familiar exit.

"We are aware of your handicap," they said, "but if you can handle a class of seniors and manage to drill any calculus into them, then you're hired."

"You're hired," they said.

Roark shook their hands and went home to his wife.

His name is John Michael Roark. He is twenty-five years old. He has a blonde wife named Elizabeth and he pays the rent on their apartment in the middle-rent district. Because a group of people in my community gave him a chance, he is also a teacher of high school calculus. He is a singular example of the countless physically disabled veterans of the Vietnam war; through the efforts of the state employment agency and perceptive employers this man can be counted as a manpower resource in my community.

"Mr. Roark, sir," comes a voice among several in the room, "could you help me on that third problem? I mean, you can explain it so I get it."

There are twenty-eight senior boys in that class who with minimal duress are learning some higher mathematics.

Roark does his job well.

THE GATES COMMISSION REPORT ON ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMED FORCES—PART II, CHAPTER 6

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, chapter 6 of the Gates Commission report deals with officer procurement and retention. The text of chapter 6 follows:

CHAPTER 6: OFFICER PROCUREMENT AND RETENTION

Regardless of the type of procurement system used, the officer corps is a crucial element in the effectiveness of any military establishment. An all-volunteer armed force must attract an adequate supply of officers from the limited number of individuals in the population who possess the necessary leadership qualities and motivation.

In recent years the major portion of the officer corps has been recruited from the ranks of college graduates. While it is important to continue to attract college-graduate officers, the decision to staff the officer corps almost entirely with college graduates was somewhat arbitrary and came about in part because of the favorable recruiting climate provided by the draft. Without the draft, a college-graduate officer corps will be more difficult to recruit and will require higher pay levels than one which includes some non-college graduates. To balance the need for high-quality officers with the extra cost that a voluntary all college-graduate force will entail, we assume in our estimates that about 90 percent of the officers entering the service each year will be college graduates. It is expected that most non-college graduates will either have graduated from two-year college programs or have at least two years of college.

Staffing the non-specialist portion of the officer corps in an all-volunteer armed force will be somewhat easier than recruiting the enlisted force. Two main reasons underlie our optimism. First, except during the Vietnam escalation of recent years, little difficulty has been encountered in recruiting new officers from among college graduates. While the draft has been an important positive factor in this recruiting, the flow of volunteers has been impressive in view of the relative ease with which college graduates could avoid military service through the middle 1960's.[1] Also to be taken into account is the relatively large proportion of first-term officers who remain in the military beyond their obligated period of service. Over 70 percent of officer personnel are currently beyond their obligated period of service and, therefore, can be considered career officers.

The second reason for optimism stems from the large and growing pool of educationally

[1] Of those males reaching 26 years of age in 1964, 40 percent of the college graduates served in some capacity in the armed forces; many in the 4 to 6 month reserve program. In comparison, over 55 percent of those who did not continue their education past high school, and 60 percent of those with some college served. For those with less than a high school diploma the rate was 50 percent.

qualified young men who will be available in the 1970's for military service as officers. Since 1960, the number of male college graduates has grown from 230,000 per year to 390,000 per year—an increase of 70 percent. By 1980, this number will increase 25 percent more to 490,000 annually.[2] With an armed force of 2.5 million, the annual requirement for new officers is not likely to exceed 30,000. This number can be met by recruiting about 7 percent of the yearly graduating classes of U.S. colleges and universities in the mid-1970's.

PROCUREMENT

Most commissioned officer procurement programs are designed chiefly to attract college gradautes. These sources of officers can be divided into four major groups: Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) and other in-college programs, Officer Candidate programs, service academies, and direct appointments. In addition, there are a number of programs which provide Warrant Officers, Limited Duty Officers, and Temporary Officers. By and large this range of programs has met the needs of the services even when these have changed rather drastically. The same major programs, perhaps modified in form, can be expected to supply the bulk of new officers in an all-volunteer armed force.

RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC) AND OTHER COLLEGE PROGRAMS

By far the largest single source of newly commissioned officers is the Reserve Officer Training Corps. Designed primarily for four-year colleges, it accounted for 26 percent of all new officers in the period just preceding the Vietnam war. (See table 6–I.) An additional 15 percent of officers commissioned in FY 1965 were obtained from a variety of in-college programs. Chief among these are the Reserve Officer Corps (ROC) in the Navy and the Platoon Leader Corps (PLC) in the Marine Corps. The major distinction between these programs and the ROTC program is that military training is provided entirely during the summer at special training centers run by the military, whereas the ROTC cadet receives a major portion of his training at his university during the school year. Because of the long lead time—two to four years—required for increasing the supply of officers from these sources, their relative importance declined during the rapid troop build-up in the early stages of the Vietnam War.

The importance of ROTC officers varies considerably from service to service. In FY 1965, they accounted for about 60 percent of newly commissioned Army officers, slightly less than 35 percent of new Air Force officers, and less than 15 percent of new Navy officers. In the Marine Corps only about 7 percent of the new officers were commissioned through the Navy-run ROTC program. The great majority of Marine officers were recruited from the PLC program.

TABLE 6-1.—OFFICER ACCESSIONS BY SERVICE AND SOURCE OF COMMISSION: SELECTED YEARS, 1960, 1965, 1968

	Fiscal year 1960		Fiscal year 1965		Fiscal year 1968	
	Number	Percent [1]	Number	Percent [1]	Number	Percent [1]
Total all services:						
Academies	1,546	5.0	1,896	4.7	2,131	3.0
ROTC and other college programs [1]	13,267	43.1	16,697	41.4	18,305	26.1
OCS	3,615	11.7	9,499	23.6	18,753	[3] 26.7
Noncollege graduate programs	3,464	11.2	1,454	3.6	13,874	[4] 19.8
Ad. from reserves	743	2.4	1,169	2.9	4,527	6.5
Direct appointment (medical) [5]	4,605	15.0	5,178	12.9	7,602	10.8
All others [6]	3,526	11.5	4,430	10.9	4,936	7.0
Total	30,766	100.0	40,322	100.0	70,128	100.0
Army:						
Academy	503	4.9	524	3.2	677	1.9
ROTC	6,252	60.8	9,886	60.5	10,176	28.1
OCS			1,527	9.3	4,398	12.1
Noncollege graduate programs	729	7.1	750	4.6	13,733	[3] 37.9
Ad. from reserves	525	5.1	595	3.6	1,517	4.2
Direct appointment (medical) [5]	1,418	13.8	1,664	10.2	3,123	8.6
All others [6]	850	8.2	1,392	8.6	2,590	7.1
Total	10,277	100.0	16,338	100.0	36,214	100.0
Air Force:						
Academy	325	3.5	579	5.3	624	3.5
ROTC	3,978	42.6	3,836	34.7	4,992	28.3
OCS (OTS)	322	3.4	3,656	33.1	6,283	35.6
Noncollegiate graduate programs	2,030	21.7	159	1.4		
Ad. from reserves					2,072	11.7
Air Force (cont.)						
Direct appointment (medical) [5]	2,149	23.0	2,548	23.1	2,466	14.0
All others [6]	529	5.7	262	2.4	1,221	6.9
Total	9,333	100.0	11,040	100.0	17,658	100.0
Navy:						
Academy	648	6.9	714	6.5	744	6.0
ROTC and other college programs	2,149	23.0	1,859	16.9	1,916	15.3
OCS	2,852	30.5	3,877	35.3	6,128	48.8
Noncollege graduate programs	522	5.6	361	3.3	58	.5
Ad. from reserves	110	1.2	515	4.7	811	6.5
Direct appointment (medical) [5]	1,038	11.1	966	8.8	2,013	16.0
All others [6]	2,041	21.8	2,678	24.2	882	7.0
Total	9,360	100.0	10,970	100.0	12,552	100.0
Marine Corps:						
Academy	70	.4	78	4.0	86	2.3
ROTC and other college programs [2]	888	49.4	1,116	56.5	1,221	33.0
OCS (OCC)	441	24.6	439	22.2	1,944	[4] 52.5
Noncollege graduate programs	183	10.2	184	9.3	83	2.2
Ad. from reserves	108	.6	59	3.0	127	3.4
Direct appointment						
All others	106	.6	98	4.9	243	6.6
Total	1,796	100.0	1,974	100.0	3,074	100.0

[1] Detail is not due to rounding.
[2] Includes Reserve Officer Corps graduates in the Navy and platoon leader graduates in Marine Corps.
[3] Includes many college graduates who entered OCS after enlisting or being drafted.
[4] Includes 2-year college graduates as well as some with no college degree.
[5] Includes physicians, dentists, and veterinarians.
[6] Comprises primarily professional appointment, including lawyers and other medical specialists. Also includes women officers and nurses. For the Navy and Marine Corps a variety of commissioning programs from the enlisted ranks is included.

At the completion of an ROTC student's college education he is required to serve a minimum term of obligated service. This minimum currently varies from service to service and according to the type of program. All scholarship recipients, regardless of service, must serve four years of active duty. For non-scholarship holders, the minimum is two years in the Army, three in the Navy and Marine Corps, and four in the Air Force. The two-year Army obligation was in part designed to be consistent with the active duty obligation of a draftee. We have assumed in our projections that in a voluntary force the minimum Army ROTC obligation will be three years.

During the last few years, a number of schools either ended their ROTC programs, or indicated they planned to do so in the near future. While it is not clear whether these are isolated events or the beginning of a trend, there is little doubt that some type of college recruiting program will continue in the future. For planning purposes, we assumed that ROTC will continue to be the major source of new officers for the Army and Air Force. The problem of declining ROTC enrollment is discussed later in the chapter.

A number of Department of Defense studies have recently been undertaken concerning the future of ROTC. While differing somewhat in goals and procedures, all recommend an increase in the number of ROTC college scholarships. We endorse this recommendation and encourage the use of such scholarships as a way of attracting applicants not likely to enter the program without them—especially those whose skills or aptitudes are in short supply in the military. In our projections of potential officer supply without a draft, we assumed an increase of 4,500 scholarships a year for each service (Marine Corps included in Navy total) producing 1,000 additional ROTC officers a year per service (See table 6–II). The total cost of such a program will be between $25 and $30 million per year and is included in our estimates of the increased budgetary expenditures associated with the creation of an all-volunteer officers corps.

With an all-volunteer armed force, one must expect that fewer students will volunteer for ROTC training, particularly in the first two years. Hence many schools may find that they can no longer operate viable programs. To insure that ROTC instruction remains available to interested students, it may be advisable in the future to establish area training centers. Thus students from a number of schools in one geographic region could participate in the same training program.

Serious consideration should also be given to the increased use of scholarship and non-scholarship Reserve Officer Corps and Platoon Leader Corps-type programs. Unlike the present ROTC, such programs do not require the stationing of permanent units on a great

[2] Derived from U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education *Earned Degrees Conferred by Institutions of Higher Education*.

many campuses. With the introduction of an all-volunteer force and the reduction in the size of each ROTC unit, the per-graduate expenses is likely to rise. If much of the military training can be provided during the summer in training stations which receive applicants from many schools, there is a good possibility that substantial savings can be realized.

TABLE 6-II.—ARMY COMMISSIONED OFFICER REQUIREMENTS AND POTENTIAL SUPPLY IN AN ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

[2.5 million man force level]

Fiscal year	Potential supply								
		ROTC		OCS					
	Academy [1]	Scholarship [2]	Nonscholarship [3]	College graduates [4]	Noncollege graduates [5]	Others [6]	Total	Required accessions	Estimated surplus or shortage
1971	900	1,400	11,200	200	1,000	1,400	16,100	16,800	−700
1972	900	1,500	8,000	300	1,000	500	12,200	5,300	+6,900
1973	1,000	2,000	5,700	300	1,000	600	10,600	7,100	+3,500
1974	1,000	2,500	3,200	400	1,000	1,000	9,100	11,400	−2,300
1975	1,000	2,500	3,100	500	1,000	700	8,800	8,700	+100
1976	1,000	2,500	4,100	500	1,000	700	9,800	8,500	+1,300
1977	1,000	2,500	5,100	500	1,000	800	10,900	9,900	+1,000
1978	1,000	2,500	6,000	600	1,000	800	11,900	9,500	+2,400
1979	1,000	2,500	6,800	600	1,000	800	12,700	9,000	+3,700
1980	1,000	2,500	7,300	600	1,000	800	13,200	9,400	+3,800

Note: Numbers rounded to nearest hundred.

[1] Based on current Army plans.

[2] Assumes an increase in current Army plans of 500 in 1973 and 1,000 thereafter.

[3] Assumes the additional 1,000 ROTC scholarships are given to new applicants and are not included in ROTC projections (original 1,500 were assumed to be included).

[4] Assumes growth in 1964 proportion of college graduates entering OCS in line with estimated growth in male college population adjusted for the war-induced decline in the rate estimated from ROTC. Estimated proportion of draft-induced volunteers among 1964 entrants equals 60 percent.

[5] Assumes approximately 10 percent of officer entrants will be noncollege graduates.

[6] Includes mostly direct appointments and entrants from special commissioning programs. Ratio of such officer to total requirements instituted at prewar level.

OFFICER CANDIDATE PROGRAMS

While officer candidate programs were originally established to train officers recruited from the enlisted ranks, they have increasingly been used in recent years to supplement the flow of new college graduates into the officer corps. The large demand for new officers created by the Vietnam buildup, however, required the Army, in particular, to allow significant numbers of non-college graduates to enter its OCS program. OCS programs are more responsive than ROTC to changes in military requirements, requiring a lead time of three to nine months as opposed to two to four years for the ROTC. With an all-volunteer force, each service will require more flexibility in the recruiting of officers. In addition to new college graduates, the services will doubtless seek to attract somewhat older civilians who desire to enter one of the more specialized and less physically demanding branches of the military. Such volunteers will require some military training, which is likely to be most efficiently provided through OCS-type programs.

ACADEMIES

A small but highly important number of new officers are commissioned annually by the service academies. Ranging in size from about 3 percent of the annual number of entering officers in the Army to more than 6 percent in the Navy, academy graduates form an important component of each service's officer corps. Their high career motivation is clearly shown by the fact that upon completion of their obligated tour of active duty (now 5 years), between 80 and 90 percent can be expected to remain in the service, as opposed to less than 50 percent for ROTC scholarship graduates and under 25 percent for OCS graduates.

With the planned expansion of the U.S. Military Academy and the Air Force Academy, academy graduates in 1973 will number about 2,840. For the foreseeable future, even with an all volunteer force, we do not anticipate a need to increase further the size of the academies. Such expansion would be very costly and it is also highly desirable that military officers continue to be recruited from a wide range of civilian colleges and universities.

DIRECT COMMISSIONING PROGRAMS

Each service requires many individuals possessing non-combat-type skills available in the civilian population. These include chaplains, lawyers, physicians, dentists, and specially trained technicians. Because of the importance and special problems connected with the recruitment of physicians, a separate study was undertaken by the Commission. The highlights of this study are reported in chapter 8. By and large, because appointment officers perform the same tasks in the military as in the civilian sector, they usually receive no extra military training. Such direct appointments have accounted for about 20 percent of new officers each year.

Since a major portion of these officers would not have entered military service without the draft, an all-volunteer force will necessitate more in-service training and further increases in the substitution of civilians for military personnel. In addition, we would suggest that procedures be established to attract civilians who already possess the necessary training, by offering advanced officer grades. Such lateral hiring generally should be limited to those specialties which require an individual to possess technical skills learned in the civilian sector and to those tasks and functions which must be performed by a military officer.

WARRANT, LIMITED DUTY AND TEMPORARY OFFICERS

Each service includes men who hold the rank of officer but who are not considered part of the regular commissioned officer corps. Included in this group are Warrant Officers, Limited Duty Officers and Temporary Officers. Such ranks are designed for non-college graduates who occupy positions which require greater technical skills and carry larger responsibilities than the enlisted grades. In most instances, such officer ranks are awarded to superior enlisted personnel. The Army, however, actively recruits civilian two-year college graduates and men with some college for their helicopter pilot warrant officer program.

The increased availability of four-year college graduates during the 1960's resulted in a decline in the use of these programs. Expanded officer requirements during the Vietnam buildup have reversed this trend. To facilitate the transition to, and the maintenance of, an all-volunteer armed force, we assumed in our analysis that greater use will be made of these sources of officer manpower.

PROJECTED SUPPLY OF ARMY OFFICERS IN AN ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

The problem of maintaining a voluntary Officer Corps is more difficult in the Army than it is in the other services. If the level of officer compensation is high enough to meet Army accession requirements, it will also be adequate for the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps. For that reason the analysis of officer supply focuses on the Army.

The most important source of supply of Army officers is ROTC. We have derived estimates of the number of Army officers which ROTC will produce in an all-volunteer environment for the period 1971 to 1980, from an analysis of ROTC enrollments at schools where participation is voluntary. These projections are calculated on the assumption that: (1) the draft is ended in 1971; (2) the level of war intensity declines by 1972 to the pre-buildup level of 1964; and (3) military pay relative to civilian earnings is increased to comparability, as described in chapter 5, table 5–III.

The ROTC supply figures are shown in table 6–II along with estimates of supply from the other officer procurement programs. Because of the special benefits inherent in receiving an ROTC scholarship or enrolling in the U.S. Military Academy, we anticipate that both programs will continue to be fully subscribed in an all-volunteer armed force, and will produce the expected number of annual accessions. The technique for estimating output from the other procurement sources is summarized in the footnotes to table 6–I.

The total potential flow of men into the Army officer corps will continue at a high level through FY 1972 because of draft-induced volunteers remaining in the pipeline. The lowest level of Army ROTC entrants, we estimate, will be in FY 1975. Most officers commissioned in that year would have entered the ROTC program in 1971—a time when the negative impact of the war on enrollments will probably be at its height. After FY 1975, as the war's impact on past enrollments diminishes and more men enter as a result of the pay raise, potential supply will increase. Except for FY 1974, the estimated supply will be more than adequate to meet anticipated accession requirements to maintain the Army Officer Corps in a 2.5 million man force without the draft. This one year shortfall can easily be offset by permitting more accessions in the previous two years. Hence, we feel justified in concluding that the recommended all-volunteer pay profile plus anticipated increases in the ROTC scholarship program will be sufficient to maintain the officer corps for each service at required levels for an all-volunteer armed force of 2.5 million or less. In the late 1970's the supply estimates shown in table 6–II are sufficient to staff the officer corps in a 3.0 million volunteer armed force. To insure that the required number of accessions for such a larger force would be forthcoming, however, we have included in our cost estimates for the 3.0 million man force a further increase in officer pay.

RETENTION

In an all-volunteer force, more officers will stay beyond their initial obligated period of service than with a draft. Those who today constitute true volunteers—individuals who would have entered military service without the draft—will make up a larger proportion of first-term officers, and their demonstrated higher retention experience will increase overall first-term retention.

First-term retention in the current force varies considerably from one procurement source to another and from one service to another. For those procurement programs including a large concentration of draft-motivated volunteers, which will not be as important in an all-volunteer force, the proportion remaining beyond the obligated period of service is relatively low. In this category, in particular, are college-graduate OCS officers in the Army and Navy where first-term retention rates are less than 30 percent. At the other end of the spectrum, at least 80 out of every 100 academy graduates can be expected to remain beyond their obligated period of service. Overall, the Air Force has the highest first-term retention rate and the Army, the lowest.

The impact on turnover of eliminating the draft can be appreciated by analyzing the results of a Department of Defense survey of active duty personnel. As shown in table 6–III, among officers serving their original obligated tour of duty, 46 percent of those who indicated they would have entered the military without the draft said they planned to remain on active duty until retirement. Of those who were considered draft-motivated volunteers, only 16 percent said they expected to remain in the service.

The survey results generally confirm expected differences in retention between services and sources of commission. From all sources of commission, the Army is revealed to have the smallest proportion of career-motivated first-term officers, while the Air Force has the largest. For each service, even among those who were considered to be draft-motivated volunteers, academy graduates consistently record the highest overall expected retention rate. High retention rates are also shown for ROTC and OCS entrants into the Air Force and OCS graduates in the Army. During the period prior to the survey, both the Air Force and Army OCS programs included mostly non-college graduates. These results reveal the high career motivation of such officers and suggest that, if difficulty is experienced with recruiting new college graduate officers in an all-volunteer environment, serious consideration should be given to expanding the non-college officer commissioning programs.

Another interesting aspect of these results is that among the "true volunteers" recruited through the more draft-motivated procurement programs, such as college-graduate OCS, the proportion expecting to make a career in the military was relatively small. This suggests that even with an all-volunteer force and more career-oriented accessions, turnover still will be substantial and a continuous flow of civilian-educated college graduates will enter the force each year.

Although these derived career rates are lower than actual first-term rates, the relative differences between the true volunteer rate and the draft-motivated volunteer rate were used to estimate the increase in officer retention that will accompany a shift to an all-volunteer force.

TABLE 6-III.—EXPECTED CAREER RETENTION RATE OF FIRST-TERM OFFICERS BY SERVICE AND SOURCE OF COMMISSION,[1] 1964

Service	Source of Commission					
	All sources	Academy	ROTC[2]	OCS (college graduate)	OCS (noncollege graduate)[3]	Direct appointment
Total all services	0.31	0.60	0.26	0.18	0.44	0.16
True volunteers[4]	.46	.65	.42	.24	.62	.31
Draft motivated[5]	.16	.27	.10	.14	.27	.06
Army	.20	.64	.17	----------	.48	.12
True volunteer	.38	.68	.31	----------	.63	.31
Draft motivated	.13	.41	.06	----------	.27	.04
Navy	.25	.59	.18	.15	----------	.24
True volunteer	.37	.63	.28	.25	----------	.36
Draft motivated	.13	.16	.09	.14	----------	.13
Marine Corps	.27	.53	.36	.19	----------	.67
True volunteer	.33	.53	.43	.24	----------	.67
Draft motivated	.15	----------	.21	.13	----------	----------
Air Force	.40	.60	.43	----------	.44	.15
True volunteer	.56	.67	.55	----------	.62	.27
Draft motivated	.21	.26	.19	----------	.27	.05

[1] Proportion of officers serving their original obligation who answered "yes" to the question, "Do you intend to remain in service until you are eligible to retire with pay?"

[2] Includes Navy scholarship holders.

[3] Includes some college gradutes in Air Force OCS.

[4] Answered "yes definitely" "or yes probably" to the question of whether they would have entered military service without the draft.

[5] Answered "no definitely" or "no probably" to the question of whether they would have entered military service without the draft.

Source: Department of Defense Survey of Active Duty Officers, November 1964.

MORE SUPPORT FOR A PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON MARIHUANA

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today the bill to establish a Presidential Commission on Marihuana is gaining 11 new House sponsors. This brings the total sponsorship of the bill to 97.

I know that many of our colleagues are hearing from constituents on the subject of marihuana and in my judgment, the establishment of a Presidential commission to consider the medical, social, and legal factors related to the use of marihuana, is the most rational approach to the problem. The commission would report in a year to the President and public with recommendations for legislative action at all levels of Government.

Hearings were held on this proposal by the House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 3, chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER), in October of last year. And, I am pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that today the bill was ordered reported to the full committee.

The bill's new sponsors include Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COWGER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. ESCH, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WIDNALL.

Recently, Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., wrote another column supporting the commission proposal. I insert in the RECORD, his piece entitled "Back to the Marihuana Wars":

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 25, 1970]

BACK TO THE MARIHUANA WARS

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

The public anxiety over marihuana mounts at a rate for which I can think of no precedent in recent U.S. history. I have a letter from Rep. Edward Koch, of Manhattan, who has been trying to get a presidential commission into motion.

"What is so bizarre is that early last year, when I introduced the bill, which I considered a very reasoned and rational approach to a very controversial subject, I was considered by a number of my colleagues as a wild-eyed libertine. Only nine members would join me in co-sponsoring it at that time. Since the original introduction and the dialogue which ensued, there are now 85 co-sponsors. And most important, the House Judiciary Committee appears on the verge of reporting it out," Koch wrote.

One hopes that the half million dollars—that is the sum requested by Koch—will be forthcoming, so as to launch an authorative inquiry.

Meanwhile, there is big news in Canada. I was not aware until now that a commission of inquiry had been empanelled there to inquire into the non-medical use of drugs.

In charge of writing the report for that panel is Dr. Keith Yonge, president of the Canadian Psychiatric Association and head of the department of psychiatry at the University of Alberta. Yonge wrote last November a memorandum which puts together the substance of what will be said in the report when it is issued.

Someone got hold of that memo and published the entire thing in the Toronto Globe and Mail. It is as impressive—and as disturbing—a document as I have seen on the subject, and I hereby volunteer to send a copy of it to anyone who desires one and will enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope. Write to Mr. Buckley, NR, 150 East 35th St., New York 10016.

Meanwhile, here are just a very few passages from Yonge's preliminary report.

". . . The use of these drugs does indeed induce lasting changes in personality functioning, changes which are pathological in so much as they impair the mental and social well-being. . . .

"The harmful effects are of the same order as the pathology of serious mental illness (psychosis), namely in distorting the perceptual and thinking processes and in diverting awareness from reality, impairing the individual's capacity to deal with the realities of life.

"The argument that marihuana is no more harmful than alcohol is specious. Although alcohol does constitute a serious health hazard in our society because of its readiness to intoxication, its action on the mental processes cannot be simply equated with that of marihuana. The primary action of alcohol is that of a relaxant. Impairment of mental functioning occurs when intoxicating quantities are taken. Marihuana, as with all the psychotropic drugs, on the other hand, acts solely as an intoxicant, its effects being primarily the distortion of perception and reasoning.

"In psycho-social development man grows from the prevalence of self gratification and dependency, with little regard for reality, to the prevalence of self-determination and self-abnegatory involvement in his society. Against this progression, the trend toward 'instant' self-gratification and artifical self-exploration (by the use of psychotropic drugs) is distinctly regressive—a reversion to the immature, the primitive. The regression is further evidenced in the other trends in group behavior with which the non-medical use of drugs tends to be associated—reversion to the crude or primitive in speech, in sexual expression, and in taste for music forms—however much these may be rationalized as emancipation from socio-cultural oppression."

I do not know where Koch's commission will begin, but neither it, nor anyone who wishes to understand the implications of marihuana smoking, should ignore the extraordinary findings of Yonge's commission.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, the Estonians constitute the smallest of three stouthearted peoples of the Baltic countries numbering barely more than a million. After living under the czarist Russian regime for more than a century, they were among the first in Europe to regain their freedom and independence at the end of the First World War. Unfortunately, they were also among the first to be robbed of their freedom very early in the last war. But the intervening two decades were a rather short, but happy, interlude in their national history of mostly misfortune.

In the newly established democratic republic, patriotic and thrifty Estonians did wonders in the course of their free existence. Besides rebuilding their devastated and war-ravaged country, they advanced in every phase of their national activity. And they were quite content with their lot.

But this happy interlude was abruptly and cruelly broken by forces of destruction and oppression let loose by the last war. In mid-1940 the country was attacked and occupied by the Red army, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Since then, for 30 years, these gallant and gifted people have been living under totalitarian tyrants. Today, they are still hoping to regain their much-deserved freedom, and we all ardently pray for the realization of their goal, their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

On February 24, Americans of Estonian descent celebrated the 52d anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Estonia. The United States has never recognized the Soviet annexation of Estonia. The people of Estonia have never lost hope that they will one day regain their precious freedom.

After extensive hearings, the 89th Congress unanimously adopted House Concurrent Resolution 416, which states that the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of the right to self-determination by the Government of the Soviet Union, and urged the President of the United States: First, to direct the attention of world opinion at the Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and second, to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

At this time Mr. Speaker, I wish to lend my support to these principles. The Baltic peoples have suffered for too long behind the Iron Curtain of the Soviet Union. It is time for them to breathe the fresh air of freedom.

VEEP AND HIS FRIENDS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most penetrating observers of the Washington scene is Dumitru Danielopol, the distinguished international correspondent of the Copley News Service. In his February 19 column in the Elgin, Ill., Daily Courier-News, he discusses the constructive criticism that Vice President AGNEW has applied to the TV networks:

[From the Elgin (Ill.) Daily Courier-News, Feb. 19, 1970]

VEEP AND HIS FRIENDS

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—Vice President Spiro Agnew called off his "war" on the TV networks. His criticism, he says, has had some success.

Other critics might postpone judgment, but the vice president put the spotlight on a sore which was festering for a long time. The plaudits come not only from the U.S. where the polls were heavily in his favor, but also from overseas.

Agnew's attack was legitimate, says the Manchester Guardian Weekly, and "contain more than a small grain of truth."

In Britain for instance there is no equivalent to American newscasters who "help put the news bulletins together and actually deliver them direct to the camera."

Thus, on American TV, it is often difficult to distinguish between news and commentary, the Guardian said.

"No superhuman attempt at impartiality can hide the fact that many American newscasters are opposed to the Vietnam war," it said.

It cited CBS Eric Sevareid who, it said, would not be allowed to "deliver his little homilies on British television—excellent though they are."

Neither would Tom Braden and Frank Mankiewicz get away with many of their value judgments in the context of a news program.

The Guardian also objects to allowing a former ambassador and politician W. Averell Harriman appearing after President Nixon's Nov. 3 Vietnam speech.

In Britain, it said, the interview with Harriman (or his equivalent) would at the very least have to be balanced by "an interview with a comparable figure on the other side: Someone acceptable to the Nixon administration."

The opinion is shared by other Britishers.

What would have happened, one Washington diplomat asked, if this had been allowed in Britain during the war.

He recalled Prime Minister Winston Churchill's fiery address of June 4, 1940:

"We shall fight on the seas and oceans . . . we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing-grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets . . ."

What would have happened, he asked, if a commentator came on the air immediately and said:

"The Prime Minister is talking through his hat, we have nothing to fight with."

The British approach to television news may be duller, the Guardian said, it may be less stimulating and entertaining but the "virtues of the British system should not be lightly dismissed."

In its quest for "theater" British critics fear American TV often goes beyond what is equitable and fair. They are particularly disturbed about the "ethics" of the CBS interview with Paul Meadlo concerning the alleged Pinkville massacre.

"What impact are programs like that going to have on the judicial process and how do they affect the individual's right to a fair trial?" asks one editorialist.

Agnew, says the Guardian, has raised important and legitimate problems . . . "He is expressing popular grievances and has focused on some vulnerable, unpopular targets."

Jenkin Lloyd Jones, the biting Oklahoma editor and president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce finds TV by its nature uniquely qualified to get away with fraud.

"By cutting out the footage showing demonstrators hurling rocks . . . at the police and picking up only where the cop dashes forward and belts an apparently defensive bystander, you publish the truth, the half-truth and something but the truth," he complains.

He recalled David Brinkley's copy was straight, Jones says, "but the faint smirk, the barely lifted eyebrow, the momentary hesitation were devastating."

For his own good reasons, Vice President Agnew is withdrawing from the controversy, but the issue has not been resolved.

OIL POLLUTION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the March 1970 issue of the National Parks magazine carried a most timely article on the dangers posed by oil pollution by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson. Dr. Gabrielson, a well known biologist, is chairman of the board of the Wildlife Management Institute, and former Director of the U.S. Fish and

Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. Those of us who have long been associated with the conservation movement know Dr. Gabrielson to be one of the truly outstanding protectors of our natural heritage. So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to be aware of Dr. Gabrielson's views, I include the text of his article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OIL POLLUTION

(By Ira Gabrielson)

WE CAN'T SAIL ANYWHERE IN THE ATLANTIC WITHOUT FINDING OIL

The environment always has been trampled under in the rush for mineral resources as valuable as oil. In the past, damage from oil exploration, though often extensive, has tended to be confined to the locality of the industry. Modern oil industry practices, however, are changing the picture drastically. Oil is produced more and more from the ocean floor, it is carried by giant tankers, and its refined products fuel nearly all the ships afloat—a combination that now is polluting the seas.

For many years during residence on the Pacific Coast, another ornithologist and I took advantage of every opportunity to walk the beaches of Oregon, mostly in Lincoln and Tillamook Counties and less frequently in the more southern counties. We were studying birds and bird movements and made notes on all the birds we saw, including the dead ones found along the beaches.

There were few occasions over the 17 years that we lived there when we did not find oil-soaked and dead or dying birds. This amounted to only a few birds in some instances and to many thousands in others. Obviously even in those days oil was taking a steady toll of bird life. From what we know now, it also was killing or harming other animal and plant life of the ocean environment. We had no information as to where and how this oil originated, but we assumed from information given us by Navy friends that it came from the bilges of ships plying the Oregon coast.

It is obvious from this experience and those of many other ornithologists of my acquaintance that spilled oil, no matter its source, is taking a constant toll of bird life, particularly among the oceanic birds. We saw more of it along the Pacific Coast because we spent more time on the beaches there. During our studies we also found dead fur seals and fish. Some were covered with oil, but we had no way of proving what killed them.

There is no doubt in my mind that the problem is more acute today—all the legislation, safeguards, and agreements notwithstanding—simply because there are more ships plying the oceans; more underwater oil exploration and recovery; more refineries and terminals; and more of everything that accidentally or deliberately introduces oil into the aquatic environment.

Not long ago, a senior biologist at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution reported that: "Just in the past few years we are finding we can't sail anywhere in the Atlantic—even a thousand miles from land—without finding oil."

SPILLED OIL IS TAKING A CONSTANT TOLL OF BIRD LIFE

During the course of our early studies of Oregon bird life, we found specimens of practically every sea bird that is even occasionally found along that beautiful coast. If my memory serves me correctly, for example, the first records of a red-legged kittiwake south of the Aleutian Islands was an oil-soaked bird picked up on the Oregon coast. It now is a specimen at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center of the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

Not only did we find birds such as murres, puffins, auklets, gulls, cormorants, shearwaters, and others that had become victims of oil spills, but we found numerous ducks, mostly of the diving species, although I also recall picking up a few mallards and pintails. I have seen few birds affected by oil spills on land, but I have seen some, particularly in Texas.

None of the kills of birds I experienced along the Oregon coast occurred as a result of any spectacular disasters such as have filled the headlines in recent years. As damaging and as unfortunate as the major accidents are, I believe the industry will agree that oil slicks arising from the bilges and the ballasted fuel tanks of ocean vessels are the most serious offenders today. Oil comes, too, from wrecks and accidents, mechanical failures, and from careless handling at manufacturing plants, refineries, and terminals. All in all, a Woods Hole scientist has estimated that oil spills total at least 1,000,000 metric tons a year and perhaps much more.

The Torrey Canyon affair and the Santa Barbara oil spill greatly heightened public concern about the handling of oil. Those two incidents gave massive and visual proof of the direct impact of oil on the environment. I believe the public will remain sensitive to the problem and that the oil industry will be operating in more of a fishbowl than ever before. The industry is aware, I believe, that various aspects of the problem are attracting the attention of more and more well-qualified specialists in the environmental disciplines. We are only at the entering stages of understanding this whole problem.

Right now, there is national concern about the possible adverse effects of the development of oil on Alaska's Arctic coast. The Department of the Interior has issued stringent stipulations regarding the construction of the proposed 800-mile pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez, but it is not asking Congress for enough money to adequately police and inspect the project to see that the stipulations are obeyed. Apparently, the State of Alaska is even less concerned about what happens on its lands that are involved in the oil activity. Many conservationists have visited the area, and every one of them with whom I have talked has been very critical of the way in which the tundra is being manhandled.

I know that the oil companies fly newsmen and other writers up there to give them a firsthand look. The hope, of course, is that the industry's side of the story will get into the news. My staff has been contacted by some of these newsmen, and we find that they use a key phrase voiced so much by our friends in the oil industry. "The tundra is a wasteland," they argue, "so why does it matter what happens there?" That one point, I submit, is symptomatic of the larger environmental issue in which the oil industry finds itself involved.

ENGINEERS ARE NOT QUALIFIED TO PASS JUDGMENT ON WHETHER AN AREA IS A WASTELAND

That point is that engineers and bulldozer operators are not qualified to pass judgment on whether an area is a "wasteland" or of little or no moment in the overall scheme of things. They are not the ones to pass final judgment on the relationship of their activities to the environment. They may understand the physical relationships, but they do not know the ecological ones. They can converse knowingly about cubic yards and pumping capacities, but they know little or nothing about hydrocarbon concentration in aquatic organisms, the insulation shield of tundra vegetation, or any other of the complex environmental relationships.

The tundra lichen is one of the staple foods of the caribou, and the various species of berries that grow and ripen on the tundra provide much food for great populations of birds that nest there. This vegetation is slow growing, and many studies have indicated that lichens, for example, take 40 years or more for rehabilitation once destroyed. Destruction of this fragile vegetation is equivalent to destroying a forest area farther south on the continent.

Now, the oil industry can do a good job and has done a good job in a number of places that I have been shown. It can develop wells without defacing the countryside and without destroying the vegetation. It undoubtedly costs more to operate this way, but industry will be paying more and more to conduct its operations within the limitations of environment. Business leaders now state publicly that *effective* environmental protection—and I emphasize effective, long-term protection as opposed to public relations demonstrations—will be a paramount factor in deciding public acceptability in the future. It is my experience that the oil industry needs to be more uniformly responsive to this point of view.

In Alaska, I hope that the federal and state governments and the industry will achieve new breakthroughs in positive actions to protect the environment. It no longer is adequate to say only that the state needs the revenues that will be generated or that the country will benefit generally from the discovery and extraction of Arctic oil, if the whole activity is undertaken in such a way as to seriously impair the environment of that largely unspoiled land. Industry still has to prove that it can explore for and remove the oil in such a way as to make the least inroads on the environmental factors involved.

In fact, this is the challenge facing the industry everywhere—not just in Alaska, but everywhere it now operates and where it may be operating in the future. Americans, as well as the residents of some other of the world's developed nations, are environment-conscious. Today, more than ever before, people are acutely aware of the massive threat to the environment from the expansion of population and all that it entails. They are calling on their governments for the kinds of laws and regulations that will safeguard the environment from further deterioration. There is not the least question in my mind that we are only at the early stages of this awareness in the United States. Environmental matters will be receiving more and more consideration. These new considerations are going to require new investments and the discovery and use of new techniques. The oil industry prides itself on innovation and technological advancement. It knows that something is not necessarily right because of its practice or utility in the past. It is time that the industry embraces these environmental considerations in a more meaningful way.

Because of the extent and nature of its activities, the oil industry will feel this pressure for environmental awareness more sharply than others. More and more, as accessible oil reserves are charted and exploited, the industry is moving into the fragile and sensitive areas of the environment—on the continental shelves and in deep water—where conditions test man's technical knowledge and equipment to the fullest. There is movement, too, into remote areas, like the Arctic, where the forces of nature pose severe tests of man and their equipment. From what we know and have experienced, I believe it is safe to say that the constant threat of accident alone is adequate to keep the industry in a state of ready alert. But the things we do not understand fully or only now are beginning to grasp add greatly to this uncertainty.

In the coastal zone, where tides can move pollutants many miles from their point of introduction, and where the vagaries of nature constantly threaten the permanence of industry's operations, there are many more questions than answers. Operating risks are easily charted, and equipment and procedures are designed to lessen or minimize them. These are the physical sorts of things that are within the realm of the engineers and geologists. But let us consider the biological or environmental problems that are not susceptible to physical approach.

As the Torrey Canyon and the Santa Barbara incidents illustrated—and keep in mind that those two unfortunate incidents are only symbolic of the vastly greater problem of the constant pollution of the sea by oil—man lacks positive methods of dealing with oil once an accident has occurred. The usual approach is to try to contain or isolate the floating oil—an attack that works rarely, if at all—or to remove it from the public eye by sweeping it under the ocean's surface by means of detergents or dispersants. More animal life was killed by chemicals used in the Torrey Canyon accident than by the oil itself. Containment failed as an attack at Santa Barbara, and everyone knows the loss that followed when the oil floated ashore.

But let us give some thought to the total aquatic environment, that vast volume under the surface of the sea, where only patient prodding will reveal what may be going on and where currently we have only the sketchiest outline of what happens when hydrocarbon molecules enter the mainstream of the sensitive aquatic community. In the first place, detergents and dispersants are pollutants in themselves. In the volumes in which they may be used, they add much of an alien chemical nature to the aquatic environment. And as in the case of Torrey Canyon where the detergents were dissolved in low-boiling aromatic hydrocarbons—which are poisonous to man and all other organisms—the results can be immediate and catastrophic.

Crude oil and its finished products consist of various hydrocarbon fractions—low-boiling, high-boiling, olefinic—the implications of the introduction of which into the aquatic environment are not fully understood. In weak concentrations, the low-boiling hydrocarbons have been demonstrated to produce anesthesia and narcosis. At higher concentrations, they produce cell damage and death in many lower forms of marine animals. They also seem to be injurious to the larval and young forms of other marine life. Many of these organisms are at the thresholds of complex marine food chains, whereby larger and more advanced forms feed on and are dependent on the lower forms. Man, of course, is the ultimate beneficiary of marine productivity because he uses sea life for food and other purposes.

The higher boiling hydrocarbons apparently occur naturally in marine life. Although perhaps not directly toxic to exposed animals, they may interfere with nutrition and reception of the chemical clues that are necessary for communication between many marine animals. More research is needed to understand fully these interactions.

Suffice it to say that even if the detergents or dispersants are not toxic in themselves, their use apparently accelerates the exposure of marine life to the toxic hydrocarbons. Some of the hydrocarbon fractions are suspected of having carcinogenic activity. These hydrocarbons are stable and can be retained and concentrated in the marine food cycle as the lesser animals are consumed by those higher up the animal ladder. Some ultimately may end up in man.

These relationships are not known firmly. Only now are they beginning to be suspected. Unknown, too, is the long-term impact of dispersed oil on the marine environment itself. Limited research points to abrupt and substantial changes in animal populations. Virtually nothing is known about the effect of the oil on ocean bottoms, whether it remains in partial suspension, or where it moves.

Sweeping the oil under the ocean's surface is reminiscent of the old proverb, "out of sight, out of mind." It resolves nothing as far as environmental contamination is concerned.

The problem is more profound than just removing the stain from the ocean's surface. We need less enthusiastic claims by industry of miracle chemicals that neutralize or disperse oil slicks, supposedly making them harmless and noninjurious to man's interests. We need less of a defensive and apologetic posture on the part of both government and industry. We need recognition of the fact that the direct and allied activities of the oil industry represent a substantial threat to the environment and that precautions are needed at every stage of the exploration, extraction, and handling of oil. We need less reaction and more cooperation in pushing for research to get the answers that are required. The industry must insist on better cooperation from its own people and from allied operators who have and use petroleum products. The industry had better realize that an indifferent tanker captain, a rednecked bulldozer operator, or a glib public relations specialist can be among its greatest liabilities.

Concerned people—conservationists and industry personnel alike—acting in a spirit of cooperation can stimulate the action needed to overcome a serious problem. Let us work together to find a solution!

THE 77 YEARS OF DELAY

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the postmaster of Wyoming, R.I., Mr. Henry A. Boucher, recently sent me a letter which I believe makes the case for postal reform very eloquently. Mr. Boucher is a veteran in our postal service, now serving his 21st year as a postmaster, and until recently he did not favor the idea of a postal corporation.

Mr. Boucher changed his mind when he read a book published in 1893, which dramatically reminded him of how little progress has been made in meeting the many problems that beset the Post Office Department. Vast changes have swept this country in the past 77 years, but the postal service has remained virtually untouched by these advances—and its problems have been greatly exacerbated by a rapidly expanding population.

The letter from Mr. Boucher is succinct and pertinent. I am inserting it in the RECORD so that my colleagues may share the irony it presents:

WYOMING, R.I.,
February 3, 1970.

Congressman MORRIS K. UDALL,
*Post Office and Civil Service Commission,
345 Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: Having started my 21st year as a postmaster, I am aware of some of the problems that beset the Post Office Department today, and I had been definitely opposed to the corporation concept until very recently when I was given a copy of Cushing's *History of The Post Office* printed in 1893. After reading portions of this book several times, I have changed my objections to a corporation because the problems that confront the Post Office Department today are the same as they were 77 years ago, multiplied by the increased population and the growth of business.

The restrictions placed by Congress which prevented drastic improvements 77 years ago are still the same restrictions that prevent drastic improvements today, and it is extremely doubtful, if under the present system, if drastic improvements or changes would be possible. Pages 18 and 19 of Cushing's *History Of The Post Office* states, "The Post Office Department never has enough money to work with, also, the fact is that the American Postal Service, the greatest business in the world, is today, 1893, the worst conducted—the best conducted under the circumstances, but the worst conducted under the lack of means to work with." This was in 1893 and the same quotation could be made today, 77 years later. It would be presumptuous for me to comment that if conditions or restrictions cannot be improved or removed in 77 years, then something is radically wrong, and being only an unimportant person in the government, I would not presume to state where the fault lies.

Another area of which I am personally familiar with and know of causing delay in the delivery of mails is the subletting of Star Routes, and on page 37 of Cushing's *History Of The Post Office* there are considerable reasons why this should have been changed, but again, in 77 years, no alleviation of the situation has taken place. On page 395 there is a very interesting statement whereby the postal deficit could be removed and possibly a profit result, but again, this has not been tried or enacted. On page 20 of Cushing's *History Of The Post Office* is an interesting statement made by the then Postmaster General Wanamaker, "If the money really required to run the postal service could really be granted, we would guarantee to make 10 million dollars annually with it." Nobody familiar with the system doubted that this real businessman would do that, and besides, with a difference on the credit side would come increased and improved facilities, cheaper postage rates, and improved service again and again and again. (This is also an abstract from page 20.)

Any resulting changes will have little bearing on me as a postmaster, as I intend to put in for disability retirement in two years, but after 21 years in the postal service and realizing that only by very drastic changes, can the postal service be improved. I am concerned both as a postmaster and as a citizen for better service.

Respectfully,

HENRY A. BOUCHER.

CHICAGO'S PROPOSED LAKE AIRPORT—VII

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 1970, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by Donald Polston, a member of the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization—PATCO—on the air traffic problems which would be created by the construction of a major Chicago airport in Lake Michigan.

Mr. Fredrick Blum, an urban planner for the Businessmen for the Public Interest, has studied information provided by PATCO and by the Federal Aviation Administration report of August 1968, "Graphic Simulation Study of Sites for a Third Chicago Metropolitan Airport." He concludes from these two reports that a lake airport would reduce the air traffic capacity of both O'Hare Airport and a lake airport, saturate the airspace over Chicago, and cause increased noise levels over the entire Chicago metropolitan area.

At this time, I would like to place Mr. Blum's conclusions in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues who are concerned about the environmental effects of airport development.

The statement follows:

AIR TRAFFIC AND AIR SAFETY PROBLEMS PRODUCED BY THE PROPOSED LAKE AIRPORT

(By Fredrick Blum)

A primary objective in selecting a location for a third airport for the metropolitan area of Chicago is to maximize the amount of traffic which could be effectively handled by airport facilities without sacrificing air safety. Yet the proposed location for a third airport in Lake Michigan, 8 miles off 55th Street will saturate airspace over Chicago and considerably reduce air traffic capacities over both O'Hare and the lake airports according to reports by the Federal Aviation Administration and the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization (PATCO).

The FAA report of August 1968, *Graphic Simulation Study of Sites for a Third Chicago Metropolitan Airport*, which compared alternative land sites and an airport site then proposed by the Chicago municipality located in the lake off 31st Street, unequivocally concluded that the lake site represented the worst selection because it would generate undesirable conflicts with O'Hare flight patterns and airspace.

Furthermore, the FAA study states that the close interaction of the lake airport and O'Hare flights during the extensive periods of adverse wind conditions over the lake (7 months of the year), would prohibit simultaneous approaches and thereby reduce arrivals during periods of peak demand by 50 percent. According to PATCO, changing the location of the lake airport to 55th street at a point 8 miles from the shore will not alter the conflict with O'Hare air traffic and air space.

According to PATCO, an airport located at the lake site would give Chicago a worse airspace problem than exists in New York where three major airports handle less traffic than O'Hare alone. The face that O'Hare is the major airport for transfers unlike the heavier terminating flights of New York, the lake airport would produce an even greater crisscrossing of arrival and departing flight patterns in the Chicago area airspace. PATCO considered the southwest land site a superior location than the lake location while recommending a site 40 miles south of O'Hare as ideal.

PATCO states that "turns and altitude restrictions already exist on aircraft operating in and out of O'Hare and Midway airports due to the close proximity of the airports. This causes aircraft operating into and out of Midway to be restricted to low altitude (1500 feet above ground level) for long periods of time, and traffic departing O'Hare to complete turns within 4 miles of O'Hare."

An increase in air traffic produced by the lake airport and its close location to O'Hare and Midway flight patterns would further reduce altitude levels of departing and arrival flights for all three airports according to PATCO and considerably increase noise levels over the entire Chicago metropolitan area.

The Air Line Pilots Association report that weather conditions at a lake airport would increase the danger of landings. Fog and iceing of runways is more pronounced and would significantly reduce arrival and departure capacities when compared with a similar size land based airport.

The evidence indicates that the considerable disadvantage related to air congestion and flight safety of the lake airport imposes limits on techniques which might be proposed to overcome the obvious air flight hazards.

OUR DRUG CRISIS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, there is no more pressing problem than that of drug abuse in our cities today. The drug addict in his search for a supply of narcotics is turning our streets into a jungle. Our newspapers are filled with reports of deaths from overdoses of heroin and other dangerous drugs. Our high schools and even our grade schools are involved in the drug culture. There is a pressing need for remedial action both at the Federal and at the local level. My colleague, Congressman RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, in a statement this week at the New York State capitol in Albany has made a number of recommendations that can do much to remedy our drug crisis. The gentleman from New York (Mr. MCCARTHY) has performed a useful service in suggesting concrete steps that can be taken now. His statement follows:

THE NATIONAL DRUG DISASTER

(Statement of Representative RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, at State Capitol, Albany, N.Y., March 9, 1970)

In an age when continuing crisis numbs us to the tragedies of life, the testimony of a 12-year old drug addict in New York City still shocks us. The boy, a heroin addict, told how he had first used drugs in order to be like his friends. He described how he placed the heroin under his skin with a needle, using the addict's slang to "skin-pop". It will only be with luck that this young boy can be rescued from the hell in which he is involved.

If this were an isolated case, we would know what should be done to restore this boy to health. But his addiction is but one part of a plague of drug abuse sweeping our country. The newspapers are filled with reports of deaths from overdoses of drugs. A 12-year old boy was found dead from drugs in a room in Harlem. A Barnard College student died last month from an overdose of drugs. In New York City alone, over 900 people died from overdoses of drugs last year. And our hospitals are treating thousands who suffer from diseases, such as serus hepatitis, connected with drug addiction.

The National Institute of Mental Health estimates that there are half a million drug addicts in the United States today. Of these, 125,000 are addicted to hard drugs such as heroin and opium. These estimates are understated because of a lack of information. Various polls show, for example, that as many as 30% of our youth have tried marijuana, hashish, or inject drugs into their veins. What we do know is that we are facing a deadly peril on a scale not witnessed before.

The widespread social problem of drug abuse in the U.S. is no longer restricted to any one part of our society. It is found at all social and economic levels; in wealthy suburbs and rural areas as well as in the inner city. Drug abuse touches all age groups and generations. It involves not only college students but junior high and high school students as well; not only the underprivileged residents of the ghetto, but also middle-aged truck drivers and suburban housewives. There is no longer any doubt that addiction and drug abuse have penetrated all segments of our society.

The human toll of drug abuse cannot be accurately measured, for it affects not only the abuser but his family and the community around him. Drug abuse is closely bound up with both juvenile delinquency and the rising crime rate. A Federal judge tells us that 77% of the crimes committed in the District of Columbia are by addicts. Somewhere between 50 to 70% of the crime in New York City is committed by addicts. Misuse of drugs also contributes to the growing number of accidents on our nation's highways.

This problem is especially critical in New York City. In 1968 the President's Crime Commission reported that more than half the nation's known heroin addicts were in the New York metropolitan area. And the problem is expanding at an unbelievable rate. Arrests for narcotic drug law violations were over four times as great in 1969 as in 1960—an increase of 329%.

Arrests for the use of heroin in suburban neighborhoods—virtually unheard of only a few years ago—increased by approximately 90% in 1968 and continues to increase today. Arrests for drug offenses in rural areas are increasing at an even greater rate. Perhaps the significance of these increases is best reflected in a recent F.B.I. report which indicates that *in the past decade drug arrests for persons under 18 have risen by the shocking figure of 1860%*.

Even more shocking and more tragic is the growing number of deaths caused by drug overdose. Such deaths now occur daily throughout the country. Of the 900 people in New York City alone who died from an overdose of drugs last year, 224 were teenagers. This year the City is averaging nearly three deaths a day due to heroin overdoses.

Drug abuse is a broad term. It now appears that there are approximately 1000 different types of drugs which find their way into the hands of the American people. However, drugs liable to abuse are generally put into two classifications—narcotics and "dangerous drugs." A third category—marijuana—is still considered as a narcotic in many States. It is in New York but marijuana users are normally given lighter sentences than users of hard narcotics. The growing trend, however, is to treat marijuana separately from narcotics.

Narcotics generally refers to the "hard" drugs—opium, morphine and heroin—all of which are addictive. Foreign countries are the main sources of these hard drugs.

Dangerous drugs are those, which for the most part, have been developed during the past three decades. These include stimulants (amphetamines), more popularly known as pep pills, bennies, and diet pills and the depressants (barbiturates) such as tranquilizers and "golf-balls". The most recent development in this field is the hallucinogenic or psychedelic drugs, used mainly by younger people. Most well-known in this class of dangerous drugs is LSD. Most of these drugs are produced in this country.

Beginning with the first Food and Drug Act of 1906 the Federal Government has attempted to protect its citizens against dangerous drugs and narcotics. Present laws prohibit unlawful importation, manufacture and distribution or use of narcotics, dangerous drugs and marijuana. Both federal and State laws make mere unauthorized possession of most of these substances illegal. Yet, as we are all aware, the problem continues to grow at an alarming rate.

Federal laws presently in effect were, for the most part enacted as a result of widespread national dissatisfaction with the growth of narcotic addiction during the 1950s. The Narcotic Control Act passed in 1956 and still in effect today has three basic provisions. First, it provided for mandatory minimum sentences of five years for a first narcotic offense, and in doing so, removed from the hands of the judges all discretion in convicting offenders. Second, it barred any possibility of eventual parole for narcotics offenders, and third, it provided for sentencing ranging up to life imprisonment and death for adults convicted of selling narcotics to juveniles.

Until five years ago the federal government exercised almost no meaningful control over manufacture and distribution of dangerous drugs in the country. Adoption of the Drug Amendments to the Food and Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1965 finally enabled the federal government to require manufacturers and others engaged in receiving or disposing of these drugs to keep records of the quantities they handled and make these records available to federal inspectors. It also required manufacturers and handlers of dangerous drugs to register with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This Law made it illegal to distribute any of the enumerated drugs to anyone other than specifically named parties such as warehousemen, wholesalers, specified researchers, and persons having a prescription for them. Penalties for violations range from one year and/or $1,000 to 3 years and/or $10,000.

These narcotics and the dangerous drug laws have certain shortcomings which prevent effective law enforcement and rehabilitation of offenders. Furthermore they have proved to be completely inadequate in controlling the illegal flow of dangerous drugs produced in this country.

The principal defect in the narcotics law is that it fails to make any distinction between the "professional criminal", narcotics dealers and the narcotics addicts themselves who, in order to pay for their own drugs, become small-time peddlers. The problem of the small-time addict is essentially a medical and psychological one and differs greatly from the problem of the large-scale nationwide criminal networks of professional narcotics dealers. However, the present laws allow the courts almost no discretion whatsoever in dealing with these two different types of offenders. Presently our federal courts are not allowed to distinguish between the young addict who may with proper treatment be cured from a life of despair and be converted into a normal law-abiding citizen, and the hardened professonal criminal, who may be responsible for the addiction of literally thousands of young Americans. One survey has indicated that over 90% of the federal prison wardens were opposed to these present laws which prohibit parole and probation and force the prisons to keep young offenders locked up with hardened criminals for a mandatory minimum of five years. The same survey indicated that approximately three out of every four federal district court judges are likewise opposed to the present laws.

The Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, Dr. Stanley Yolles, testified before Congress that "the effects of mandatory penalties defeats the whole purpose of treatment and rehabilitation of drug users it unnecessarily limits the courts and negates the traditional American expectancy that each individual will be heard by a court of law in terms of his intent, the circumstances of his alleged offense, and his potential ability to be rehabilitated."

For these reasons I shall continue to work for the adoption of revised narcotic laws which will eliminate all mandatory minimum sentences for narcotic violations except for a special class of professional criminals.

This will return the sentencing discretion to the judge and prevent any further hampering of the rehabilitation of drug addicts. New laws must also have distinct and separate provisions for narcotics offenses and marijuana offenses which will more accurately reflect the greater danger and threat of addiction imposed by the "hard drug" narcotics. These efforts if adopted will help mainly in the area of rehabilitation and more equitable law enforcement.

However, we must make a much more vigorous effort to cut off the sources of narcotics and dangerous drugs. This is a very crucial area in the current war on drug abuse, for if these drugs and narcotics were not so readily available, it would be quite reasonable to assume that the problem would not be so widespread.

Our government is currently making greater efforts to cut down on the influx of narcotics and marijuana smuggled into this country from abroad, and we must certainly continue our efforts in this area.

According to U.S. narcotics officials, most of the hard narcotics available in the United States comes from Europe. In New York, 80% of the hard drugs used came from or are processed in Turkey, Switzerland and France. Our government has taken some steps to stop the flow of drugs from these countries. We recently loaned $3 million to Turkey to compensate farmers for the destruction of poppy fields. Those familiar with Turkey point out that this money will have little effect for the Turkish farmer will continue to sell opium in the black market. Our recent efforts to cooperate with French narcotics agents in Marseilles merely highlights the fact that the French still permit the illegal transfer of drugs from Switzerland through their country and also allow clandestine laboratories to operate in France itself.

What we need is a crackdown on the production of heroin itself. This will require an agreement by the French and the Swiss to regulate the importation of morphine from Turkey and action by the Swiss Government to prohibit the manufacture of heroin except under strict licensing and supervision. The French Government can also enforce their own laws which prohibit the shipment of heroin capsules from Switzerland to the Riviera. And finally we can mobilize our Customs agents at John F. Kennedy International Airport to stop up this major source of smuggled drugs.

We can certainly expect these three nations, as well as our friends around the world, to take prompt steps to help us solve this drug problem. I have written to Secretary of State William Rogers urging him to exert the full influence to gain the cooperation of the French, Swiss and Turkish Governments in stopping the flow of hard narcotics either from or through their countries to the United States.

But perhaps the least publicized deficiencies in the current drug laws are those which cover the manufacturing, processing and distribution of the dangerous drugs—the stimulants and depressants or, in more familiar language, the pills.

Despite Amendments to the 1965 Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, enormous quantities of drugs legitimately manufactured right in this country continue to find their way into illicit drug channels. For example, according to estimates of the National Institute of Mental Health, 50% of the over eight billion amphetamine (pep) pills produced each year find their way into nonmedical channels. While we hear much about illegally produced and manufactured drugs, the truth is that of all amphetamines and barbiturates seized from illicit drug channels only 8% are actually produced illegally. This means that in spite of present efforts to control dangerous drugs, 92% of the amphetamines and barbiturates found in the illicit drug market today are manufactured legally right here in this country and somehow diverted along the chain of distribution. However, because the present laws do not compel drug manufacturers to keep the necessary records, we are unable to trace these illicit drugs back to their source.

The drug industry is a highly profitable business, currently grossing an estimated $5 billion annually. Understandably, any industry doing this volume of business is reluctant to submit itself to government controls and the drug industry is no exception. It has consistently and vigorously opposed any new dangerous drug laws. I, for one, believe that the industry has contributed to our drug crisis through lack of cooperation.

However, the extent of this problem has now become so severe that only severe measures can be used to combat it if a reversal of current trends is to be expected.

For these reasons I believe that the Federal government must face up to its responsibility to the people and crack down on illegal and careless distribution of domestically produced drugs.

We must begin by:

Imposing tighter government restrictions and supervision on all drug manufacturers and distributors;

Requiring all handlers of dangerous drugs at every level to keep separate, accurate and comprehensive records;

Require and carry out Federal inspection of these records.

Another measure which must be taken is to broaden the coverage of our dangerous drug laws. These laws must be comprehensive enough to include many of the newer drugs which are presently being misused but which are subject to almost no federal regulation whatsoever. For example, present dangerous drug laws do not include two of the newer tranquilizers—librium and valium, sales of which totalled approximately $100 million in a recent year. In light of the drug industry's claim that these two drugs were not of the type which are subject to abuse, the Justice Department's Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs conducted a limited study on the use of librium and valium which revealed evidence very much to the contrary. During a period of 2½ years in the 14 regions covered in the study, the Bureau found that 1353 people using one or the other of these two drugs attempted suicide and 97 succeeded. New York City alone had 173 cases of overdoses of librium in one year (1967) and 205 the next (1968).

The Federal government must also establish tighter export controls on dangerous drugs manufactured in this country. It is now common knowledge that many of the drugs legitimately manufactured here are exported to points outside the U.S., such as small towns in Mexico and later smuggled back in. Tighter export controls which would limit subsequent exports only to legitimate firms and prohibit shipments to "fly-by-night companies" would make significant strides in alleviating this part of the drug abuse problem.

Another area which must at least be considered is the possibility of production quotas on dangerous drugs. While the prospect of the federal government imposing a limit on the amount a private industry is allowed to produce may at first seem a drastic measure, I believe this should be balanced against the harm caused to society at large by the production and careless handling of drugs which are clearly not necessary for any legitimate use. And when at least 50% of the current production of certain dangerous drugs finds its way into illicit channels then the time is drawing near when the government may very well have to consider the measure.

A possible alternative might be strict federal licensing of all domestic drug manufacturers. Under this plan, strict requirements to control production and distribution would be set forth by the federal government and all producers and distributors would have to comply with them before they could legally operate their businesses.

Proper and vigorously enforced licensing procedures along with cooperation from all the responsible companies in the drug industry could very well help rid the industry of any of its members who are currently contributing either purposely or carelessly, to the drug abuse problem.

We must also recognize that the national drug crisis is a disaster just as destructive as a hurricane that sweeps across Louisiana and Mississippi or a flood that rages along the Missouri River Valley. Drug addiction threatens to blight an entire generation of youth that have suddenly been exposed to a danger that they are not prepared to handle. Many Americans that we would expect to avoid drugs do not do so because of a lack of knowledge. Others who have become addicted can only retake their place in society if they are given necessary medical and rehabilitative treatment. What is needed now are massive efforts in the areas of education, prevention, care and rehabilitation. This cannot be done on a business as usual basis. The same emergency or crash techniques that we would use to handle a natural disaster are called for at this time.

Federal funds are needed for the following purposes:

Massive public education campaigns to inform Americans about the dangers of drug abuse conducted by the schools, colleges, the media and governmental agencies.

Extensive Federal grants to states and cities with critical drug problems for the operations and in some cases the establishment of public and private medical and rehabilitation facilities for the care of addicts.

Added staff and overtime pay for Customs personnel involved in stopping the flow of illegal drugs into the United States.

Additional Department of Justice staff to stop the criminal element selling and distributing drugs.

Staff for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to monitor drug production, distribution and bulk sales to prevent misuse of drugs.

Our already overburdened states and cities cannot meet the needs for additional money for this effort. Only the Federal Government has the resources to act immediately on the scale required. I have therefore proposed in a letter to President Nixon that he use the authority available to him under the Federal Disaster Act, P.L. 875, the Emergency Funds available to the President, and the discretionary funds available to him in the recently passed Health, Education and Welfare Appropriation Act to provide money during the rest of this fiscal year for this program. I have also proposed that he submit a supplemental budget request for next fiscal year so that there will be no delay in undertaking this effort.

I emphasize that these are steps that President Nixon can take now. We cannot wait for another budget year to pass to meet this problem. We must use the powers available to us to act, and to act now.

In making these proposals I do not mean to convey the idea that legislation, law enforcement or emergency action alone can provide a panacea for the terrible problem of drug abuse. Every American must take an honest look at the drug problem and do what he can to bring it under control. This means taking the time to educate ourselves about the dangers involved in drug abuse, learning to recognize the signs of narcotics addiction, cooperating with local law officials to put a halt to the sale of illegal drugs, showing by example that any drug should only be used with proper medical advice. Youth in particular, exposed as they are to the drug peddlers are called on to exercise their judgment and avoid becoming ensnarled in the tragedy of drug addiction.

With the cooperation of all and effective Federal, state and local action, I believe that we can meet and reverse the plague that is sweeping our nation. The future of our society depends on our success in this effort.

RHODESIAN SELLOUT—WHO PROFITS?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I am astounded at the obvious and unnecessary blunder by our State Department in the handling of the Rhodesian independence issue. I am appalled at what seems to be an unbelievable breach of faith on the part of our Government—and I speak of understandings arising out of equally unbelievable diplomatic breaches in our consulate in Salisbury.

It is quite clear to me that the same crowd which has made political hay back home by selling out the South to bargain for bloc votes in the cities of the North has now inveigled the administration into playing the same perfidious game on an international scale—to the detriment of all Americans.

Within the past month we have seen the shameful attempts of insubordinate minor bureaucrats in the Department of Justice and in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to usurp the policymaking prerogatives of their superiors. I find it difficult to believe that the Secretary of State and the President, acting with full information, are responsible for so gross an error. I have, accordingly, addressed appropriate telegrams to each of them, which I include in my remarks for the information of our colleagues:

MARCH 10, 1970.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Your action last June in refusing to assent to precipitate withdrawal of consul from Salisbury was both correct and proper. Withdrawal now is dangerous error. As civilized Nation attributing our own independence to severance of ties to same distant and unresponsive sovereign, our moral obligation is to recognize and support civilized men who peacefully accomplish same independence for same reason. Prestigious long poll shows eighty percent of American leaders support recognition. True interests of world peace demand that we exert our influence to raise rather than lower standards of international conduct and not lend the name of the United States to such a patent fallacy as that peaceful Rhodesia is a threat to world peace. The interests of this Nation including our defense needs are served by recognition of the Republic of Rhodesia damaged both in the long and short term by submission to either London or UNO dictates. Urgently request you personally give consideration to acting promptly in the best interests of the United States and the civilized world by granting full and prompt recognition to the Republic of Rhodesia.

JOHN R. RARICK,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 10, 1970.

Hon. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
State Department,
Washington, D.C.:

Local press this afternoon indicated decision to withdraw consul from Salisbury as indication of displeasure with so-called apartheid. Assuming consideration of Rhodesia internal racial practices is controlling, advise when withdrawal of recognition contemplated in cases of Liberia which refused citizenship to whites, Australia which refuses admission to non-whites, Soviet Union and satellites behind Iron Curtain which deny both majority rule and protection of minority rights.

JOHN R. RARICK,
Member of Congress.

ANN A. TROY HONORED BY NUTLEY, N.J.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, few individuals have devoted their talents toward serving a community consistently for almost half a century. One such rare individual is Ann A. Troy in whom Nutley, N.J., rightfully feels a special pride. And, I am proud to join in honoring her on her 80th birthday. A recent editorial in the Nutley Sun pays a deserved tribute to this remarkable lady:

ANN A. TROY: "ELDER STATESWOMAN"

Thursday, March 12, will mark a special day for Nutley people. That is the day when Ann Troy will celebrate her 80th birthday. Ann Troy is no stranger to those of us who have spent a lifetime in Nutley, the community which has been home for us for all the years of our lives.

Ann Troy has been counselor, mentor, confidential adviser, teacher, principal, and friend to thousands of citizens who have contributed much to make Nutley the good town that it is.

A few of Ann's friends have decided to share next Thursday evening with her to join in a toast for more happy and healthy years.

Forty-two years of Ann Troy's life have been spent in the Nutley school system. She joined the system in 1910 as a teacher in the Park School, our present high school. In 1919 she was appointed Principal of the Park School, and in 1934 she was appointed Principal of Washington School where she served out her years as an educator, retiring in 1952.

During her years as an educator, Ann Troy introduced many innovations in teaching approaches, student discipline and parent-teacher relationships.

In 1931 Ann Troy introduced a course in "Social Studies" which for the first time in the history of the New Jersey educational system combined the history and geography courses into one. The idea took hold in Nutley and was adopted as a progressive measure in education by the New Jersey State Educational System.

Ann Troy is the first woman President of the New Jersey State Principals' Association.

She served in that capacity for the years 1931–32.

Ann Troy was a co-founder of The Nutley Historical Society.

Perhaps her most important contribution as a Nutley resident was authorship of the book "History of Nutley." This historical masterpiece serves as an authoritative reference text for libraries across the country.

We know Ann Troy as a Washington School friend and neighbor. When she assumed the awesome responsibility of running that school, it was at the height of the greatest depression the world has ever known, and if ever there was a depressed area in this country, the Washington School area was it.

In common with Lincoln School, Washington School was a melting pot of the most varied ethnic groups. There were children of Jewish families, boys and girls of Italian families; there were children from Negro families, there were the freckle-faced Irish kids from the neighborhood, and there were a small number of Anglo-Saxons among the school population.

Ann Troy was the catalyst for this diverse group of kids who studied together, played together, lunched together, cried together, and smiled together.

In the memory of the undersigned there was never a single argument among the school children at Washington School that related to race, color or creed—quite a tribute to our leader of that day—Ann A. Troy.

Ann Troy has made Nutley her home for 59 years. This community is richer for her presence.

Nutley has been fortunate in many ways—and one of its good fortunes is to have Ann A. Troy as one of its leading citizens.

Ann—May God bless you with continued good health and happiness.

SECRETARY HICKLE SPEAKS IN TEXAS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, Secretary of Interior Walter J. Hickle delivered an outstanding speech to the Chamber of Commerce in Midland, Tex.

In his remarks, the Secretary focused on what I think are two vital issues of the day; the importance of maintaining a healthy domestic oil and gas industry, and the threat to mankind posed by environmental pollution. Because of the perspective which the Secretary has on these two areas, and because his thoughts were so noteworthy, I commend his remarks to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, of particular interest was the well-deserved recognition Secretary Hickle gave to the activities of my good friend and distinguished colleague, GEORGE BUSH.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR WALTER J. HICKEL BEFORE THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MIDLAND, TEX., MARCH 3, 1970

Typical of Texas hospitality, you've been nice enough to spare me too many jokes about your great State.

In return, let me start off by saying that I'm not going to shoot first . . . I'll keep quiet about the size of Alaska.

The fact of the matter is, Alaska has a lot in common with Texas and the Permian Basin:

Oil . . . lots of it.

Secretary Seward almost lost his job when he bought my State from the Russians for seven million dollars.

And I'm told that for years, textbooks said there was no oil in the Permian Basin.

Then some people who didn't know any better—or with more vision—went out and proved the experts wrong . . . in both Texas and Alaska.

They looked at the problems and saw them as challenges.

Today, as a result, two great states are even greater.

Today we face different problems . . . even bigger challanges.

And those who face them will set the tone for a new decade . . . a decade of decision . . . a decade of destiny.

For example, in the petroleum business, our supply of natural gas cannot keep up with the demand.

And our production capacity for oil—in what Alaskans call the Lower 48 States—is falling.

We are rapidly losing the vital reserve capacity of these resources we need for emergencies.

Oil producers are caught between costs that have risen 60 percent since 1959 and a price of crude that has risen only 10 percent.

So we must find ways to make the petroleum industry more productive, and—hopefully—less costly.

But this effort *must* recognize—and fit within—the framework of a new American attitude.

Today, Americans by the millions are determined to stop the abuse of their air—water—forests—land . . .

No matter what the cost—no matter how difficult it may be.

And *they are completely serious about it.*

We are beginning a new decade.

When it ends, we expect to have 25 million **more Americans . . . people who will be just** as concerned as we are about the quality of the environment.

To supply the energy needs of all these people, over the next 10 years, we will need 60 *billion* barrels of oil and 240 *trillion* cubic feet of gas.

There will be 14 million more households to be served . . . 25 million more drivers using our streets and roads.

Texas is already historically and deeply involved in meeting these basic resource needs.

And, from all indications, Alaska will move up sharply on the scale of major petroleum producing states in this decade.

The challenges of the 70's for the petroleum industry are to supply more oil and gas, to more people, than it ever has done in its history . . .

To do this in the context of protecting the environment . . .

And, at the same time, to earn a fair return on its investment.

These challenges include a major one for the federal government:

To develop ground rules that will protect the environment . . . and the public interest . . . while allowing the petroleum industry to do its job efficiently.

To assure an adequate energy base, we will need new sources of fuels.

Our best thinking is that synthetic fuels, such as shale oil, can help strengthen that base.

I have under consideration a planning program for oil shale development in Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah.

Most of the oil shale, around 80 percent, in these states is on federal lands.

Its oil content is estimated in the *hundreds* of billions of barrels. . . .

By any measure, this is far greater than our proven reserves of petroleum.

Frankly, I can't reveal many details of the oil shale planning program now on my desk.

But I will say this:

If we go ahead, the program will have to include very stringent safeguards—not merely to protect the environment of that area—but actually to enhance it.

Second . . . the public, state governments, and industry will be asked to take part in this planning.

Third . . . we believe we can find workable ways to avoid road blocks that have delayed oil shale development for so many years.

Finally, this would be a relatively small-scale project, at first, in terms of acreage and total production.

But a substantial investment would be required.

And we realize that incentives are needed . . . *along with a fair return to both federal and state treasuries.*

The theme of working together is everywhere in the present administration.

Having built houses—alone—I appreciate how much easier it is to build when you have help.

I am proud to be a member of an administration that is capable of focusing on many difficult problems at the same time—and doing something about them.

President Nixon is not an "ivory tower" chief executive. He has applied himself to the problems of the petroleum industry.

And he has brought to government the expertise needed to solve them fairly—*for all Americans.*

In a special message to the House and Senate last month, the President announced:

"I have sent to the Congress *a sweeping set of proposals*—to clean up our nation's air and water, and to make our land more livable.

"This," he said, "is the most far-reaching and comprehensive message on conservation and restoration of our natural resources ever submitted to the Congress by a President of the United States.

"We are taking these actions—not in some distant future—but *now . . . because we know it is now or never."*

The strength of our country . . . or any country . . . is in the earth.

We have all the real estate we need.

Yet in developing the earth's resources we must make sure that we do not damage the environment or interfere with the rights of others.

But the right to use, does not carry with it the right to abuse.

And that's what we've been doing down through the years.

We now must see that users pay their fair share of using our resources—and using them in a truly civilized manner.

Up to this time we have not been charging the full costs of a resource.

We have overdue bills for dirty air . . . filthy streams and lakes . . . eroded hillsides.

There will be costs—heavy costs—in restoring the quality of the environment.

Good things are not cheap.

The federal government is getting the ball rolling, but the momentum will have to be maintained by those who are the greatest prime consumers.

First we must reach the break-even point in restoring our waters, land, and air to proper standards.

Then we must see that the full costs of keeping them acceptable are charged against the proper accounts.

This means standards, set by government, to make sure that everybody plays by the same rules.

In our competitive economy, we reward the producer who gets to market with the best item at the lowest price.

But if we allow him to do so while carelessly using and polluting our air, water, and land, then we penalize his competitior. . .

The competitor who leaves the water clean and unheated. . .

The competitor who installs anti-pollution equipment so the air will not be contaminated, and who carefully restores the land.

The "cut-and-get-out days" are long gone.

We will refuse to subsidize the producer . . . or the consumer . . . who degrades our environment.

We will not tolerate him.

We are now witnessing a great public awakening of the overriding urgency of achieving a new quality of life in America.

That is visible everywhere.

Ten days ago, my office was swarming with college and graduate students from all over the country. . . . part of our program for "Student Councils On Pollution and Environment."

They flew to Washington to see what part they and the students at their colleges could play in the fight to save the environment.

I really enjoyed working with them.

When they came into my office, some of them said they were "up tight."

They made it clear they were going to participate on their own terms.

One of them, with hair to his shoulders, commented, "It is an act of political courage for us to come here. We are milktoast compared to some of the militants we represent. We don't trust the 'Feds'."

They spoke about the depth of concern among students for the future of the environment and our natural resources.

A biology major from Portland challenged me to set a personal example for the country by having all the trash from my house recycled. . . . so that the aluminum cans would get back to the manufacturer, the newspapers get turned back into pulp and so on.

I told them if they came up with a plan for doing it economically, so that others could follow my example, I would be delighted. They said they would work on it and get back to me.

I believe these young people were somewhat surprised to find a member of the Cabinet who could identify with their concerns, and who was committed to bringing change at the highest levels of government.

They didn't buy all of my ideas, and I didn't buy all of theirs.

But what excited me was that men were meeting with a common commitment.

How great it will be when an issue such as the environment can unite all the idealistic and even militant youth, with the sincere men of action in the government.

It is appropriate, at this time, to mention that Congressman George Bush was chosen as one of the 22 members of Congress to visit college campuses throughout the country.

This select group then reported personally to President Nixon on the problems of campus unrest.

The Congressman and his colleagues saw that everyone breathes the same questionable air, sees the same polluted rivers, and watches as our open space vanishes.

George knows that there is no generation gap when you're facing a now-or-never situation.

Congressman Bush recognizes this, because he is one of the prime movers in our efforts to stop pollution.

And he does not believe in the saying: "Let Washington do it all."

Awareness of our basic natural resource problems is not new.

In 1907, Theodore Roosevelt said that conservation of our resources . . . and their proper use . . . constitute the fundamental problem underlying all other problems of our national life.

I want to make it very clear that we're out to win the fight for a better, cleaner America.

The cost will be one of the challenges.

For example: A four-year federal program—costing billions—for cleaning up our lakes and rivers.

. . . And a multi-million dollar program for urban parks and larger national parks and creation areas.

It costs money to do these things. But it will cost a lot more if we don't.

This Administration has agreed to accept the challenge, in costs and sacrifices, to reclaim a living environment.

The conservation crusade will not move forward under a barrage of words, but with all the equipment we can muster among people who are tired of ugliness.

If you were to visit the mail room serving my office in Washington you'll see the story unfolding.

In January of this year alone . . . in that one month . . . the volume of incoming mail was larger than for all of 1968.

People want to be heard . . . they will be heard.

Regardless of your basic business interests, the best advice I can give you is to listen to these voices.

You will find it will help your business and your fellow man.

And, best of all, it will make *you* a better American.

JOAN HAYES' INVOLVEMENT RESULTS IN REPEAL OF HAWAII ABORTION LAW

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, over 100 years ago, one of the most perceptive observers of the American scene, De Tocqueville, said:

> If I were asked . . . to what the singular prosperity and growing strength of the United States ought mainly to be attributed, I should have to reply, "To the superiority of its women."

This great tribute could very well be paid today to a remarkable woman in Hawaii, Mrs. Joan Hayes, chairman of the legislative committee of the Honolulu branch, American Association of University Women, who led the way this year to legislative repeal of Hawaii's archaic 1869 abortion law.

Doug Boswell, staff writer for the Honolulu Advertiser, dubbed Mrs. Hayes a "political miracle worker" in an excellent feature article which appeared in the March 2, 1970, issue of the paper. He credited her leadership in inspiring a concerted grassroots community movement as the key factor in bringing about the political climate which made possible the passage of the abortion reform bill in the current session of the Hawaii State Legislature.

I am amazed at what Mrs. Hayes accomplished in her crusade to have the issues involved in abortion law repeal better understood by the citizens of the Island State. She was able to enlist the community support which was needed to obtain enactment of this enlightened measure to strip from abortion its sordid clandestine character and make it a personal medical matter to be resolved between patient and physician.

In his article, Mr. Boswell comments that Hawaii legislators regard the recently enacted abortion repeal measure as a remarkable political development which could have occurred only with demonstrable public support. And, further:

> They view Mrs. Hayes' efforts as a classic example of what many legislators have been preaching for years when they urge private groups and organizations to "become involved."

This shows what can be achieved by individuals, both men and women, who commit themselves to work in the public interest by effecting needed changes in our society and its laws.

The article about Mrs. Hayes from the Honolulu Advertiser will, I am certain, be of considerable interest to every Member of the House. I therefore take pleasure in submitting it for inclusion at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

JOAN HAYES LED WAY TO ABORTION LAW REPEAL

(By Doug Boswell)

Key legislators have indicated they regard the passage of an abortion repeal law in Hawaii as an act approaching an authentic political miracle.

Miracle or not, many legislators attribute the success of the abortion bill to a woman who, little more than a year ago, was relatively unacquainted with the power structures of the State.

She is Joan Hayes, chairman of the legislative committee of the American Association of University Women, Honolulu Branch.

Most legislators who have followed the progress of the abortion bill for the past year credit Mrs. Hayes with a superb performance in creating a political climate in which the legislature could act.

Democratic Senators Nadao Yoshinaga and Vincent H. Yano and Republican Senator Percy Mirikitani have acknowledged that outright repeal of the abortion law would have been impossible a year ago.

Many legislators also believe that repeal of the law would be virtually impossible in 1971, or perhaps for many years in the future.

They reason that opponents of repeal were caught off-guard this year by the rapidly mushrooming support from more than two dozen different community organizations, and that given another year to marshal their forces the anti-repeal bloc could mount a formidable opposition.

Looking back over a year of intensive effort, Mrs. Hayes acknowledged a crucial decision made nearly 10 months ago.

"I was a lobbyist in Washington, D.C., for nearly six years, but in this move toward repeal of abortion laws I came to the conclusion that it was not lobbying that was needed, but community support," she said.

The hint, she said, came from Sen. Mirikitani, Manoa Valley Republican who at one time was president of the Association for Retarded Children.

"He warned us that we needed grass roots support, that his own mail was running five to one against any change," Mrs. Hayes said.

"He was right. Grass roots support was essential. We were unrealistic to expect that in an emotional issue like abortion reform any legislator would want to be out leading a parade unless he was pretty certain the parade was, in fact, there to be led."

Mrs. Hayes went to work on the problem during the 1969 legislative session.

She called on church groups, legislators and labor unions and made speaking engagements.

Her first audience, she said, was We, the Women of Hawaii, an organization which she said "might have been expected to be against any change.

"But they listened attentively and then voted to send letters to every Senator urging support of the House bill."

(The House bill at that time called for enactment of a model law liberalizing but not repealing the abortion laws.)

She said her initial approaches to the AFL-CIO unions and the ILWU produced a sympathetic but lukewarm response.

"One told us they preferred to emphasize legislative issues that seemed feasible.

"The other said there were many more other equally pressing areas of study. A reading list would be welcomed, but not much could be expected."

Mrs. Hayes said that after the close of the 1969 session, she asked Sen. Yano what could be done to help during the interim before the 1970 session.

Advised to conduct a survey among Island doctors, Mrs. Hayes worked out a questionnaire. A subsequent survey was conducted by the School of Public Health at the University of Hawaii.

Before turning the survey over to the University, Mrs. Hayes had covered 69 physicians in her own survey and learned that more doctors favored total repeal than a reform bill.

"The one shocker was that the only doctor in my list of 69 who wanted to keep the law intact was one of those whose names had been given as willing to perform an illegal abortion," Mrs. Hayes said.

In planning her drive to produce community acceptance of abortion law repeal, Mrs. Hayes set out to generate a seminar on the subject. She worked nearly three months to bring together as many elements of the community as possible.

In September, when the seminar was held, more than 200 persons representing a wide variety of local organizations appeared to take part. Most of those organizations later fell into line to support repeal.

It was at the seminar that Sen. Yano, a Catholic who had been skeptical of the abortion reform bill, announced his decision to go for total repeal.

The movement advanced and gained momentum a short time later when Gov. John A. Burns let it be known that he favored repeal of the present abortion law.

In a new approach to the labor unions, Mrs. Hayes pitched her appeal for support to economics.

"The logical point to emphasize for them was that this was a 'rich woman's law' now and that the model law was no improvement in that regard.

"For business leaders, I felt that the most telling point might be the unnecessary complications that accompany one illegal abortion in three, and the prolonged sick leave and lost time this could entail," she said.

To lend drama to her seminar, Mrs. Hayes located two young women who could tell of a first-hand abortion experience, one at the hands of a quack and the other of a do-it-yourself abortion.

"People still remember the story of Diane, the 18-year-old girl who nearly lost her life at the hands of a local illegal abortionist," she said.

"The first direct result of the seminar was a resolution in favor for repeal at the AFL-CIO annual meeting about 10 days afterward.

"Next was the decision of the Council of Churches and the Episcopal Church to consider, and take positions in favor of, abortion law repeal."

Meanwhile the survey of doctors by the School of Public Health was completed, showing that 94 per cent of the doctors replying favored a change in the law. A few more favored the model law over outright repeal.

"Obstetricians, however, voted unanimously in favor of total repeal," Mr. Hayes said.

She said the poll also revealed, for the first time some hard facts:

"Over 1,500 Island women had sought abortions from 425 different physicians who responded to the survey, all during the past year."

She said the doctors reported that nearly 700 of these women were referred to Japan.

"It was the first tangible clue to the size of the problem here," Mrs. Hayes said.

When she started out a year ago, Mrs. Hayes said, she regarded abortion repeal as a "hopeless cause" and that her efforts were pointed toward only a "political possibility."

"I can't claim to have been a long-time crusader for abortion law changes," she said.

"Until 10 months ago I really hadn't given it much thought.

"But perhaps because my conversion from apathy to crusading was so recent and so rapid, I may have been in a better position than most to understand what it would take to arouse others."

Legislators regard the repeal bill as a remarkable political development which could have occurred only with demonstrable public support, especially in an election year.

They view Mrs. Hayes' efforts as a classic example of what many legislators have been preaching for years when they urge private groups and organizations to "become involved."

THE KARAMANLIS STATEMENT ON GREECE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the former Prime Minister of Greece, Constantine Karamanlis, issued a statement on September 30, 1969, on Greece and its Government. The Karamanlis statement has received support from a broad spectrum of political personalities and parties, and deserves careful consideration by all of us who are concerned with the situation in Greece. I am submitting an English translation of Karamanlis' statement, and an interview in Athens on October 5, 1969, with Prof. George Anastaplo of the University of Chicago. This interview was not in Greek newspapers. I urge my colleagues to read these comments:

INTERVIEW IN ATHENS: ON THE KARAMANLIS STATEMENT*

(By George Anastaplo)

Ecclesiastes 3: 1, 7–8: To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven: . . . A time to rend, and a time to sew; a time to keep silence, and a time to speak; a time to love, and a time to hate; a time of war, and a time of peace.

ROBERT McDONALD. Constantine Karamanlis, ex-prime minister of Greece, issued in Paris on September 30 a statement calling for the present Greek regime to withdraw from power. Dr. Anastaplo, you have published several articles, ever since the present government took over in April 1967, supporting the proposition that Mr. Karamanlis should be returned to power in Greece. I gather that you have met Mr. Karamanlis, that you have corresponded with him at various times and that you have some appreciation of the man. Why have you written as you have about him?

GEORGE ANASTAPLO. What I have written about Mr. Karamanlis has reflected my recognition of the attitude of many people here in Greece toward him as the only genuine Pan-Hellenic leader of Greece at this time. That is to say, he is the one man who, for a variety of reasons (some of them accidental), has remained in the position to speak for the country at large. He is the one man who, I believe, could lead the country through a peaceful period of transition back to constitutional government. In other words, my call has not been for something that's unusual or unappreciated by others but has been rather for a recognition of what is generally appreciated by many people in this country. It has been an effort on my part to express the sentiment of many, many silenced people here and abroad about how things stand in Greece today.

Mr. Karamanlis seems to be a man who can not only lead many people here but who can also be reassuring to those foreign governments who have or believe they have considerable interest in the way Greek affairs are conducted. Since Mr. Karamanlis served for eight years as prime minister of this country, the most successful administration of any Greek prime minister in the last thirty years (and some would even say, perhaps in the twentieth century), he is a man others besides Greeks can have confidence in. This means that foreign support should be available for the transition from the present government back to constitutional government, support which is necessary if this transition is to be effected peacefully. These are among the reasons why I have been speaking as I have about Mr. Karamanlis's unique place in Greek political life.

His standing in Greece is unique partly because he happened to be out of the country during the political crisis which created the conditions which permitted the present military regime to seize power. He has not been tainted by the repudiation of politicians which took place because of the 1965–1967 political crisis. It's a happy accident, in a way, that he was not here, that he was able to seem to be above the bitter strife which disfigured Greek political life during that period and which led to the repudiation of politics and politicians in the minds of many Greeks, a popular repudiation which the present government not only exploited in coming to power but continues to encourage.

McDONALD. Dr. Anastaplo, why do you think Mr. Karamanlis should return to Greece?

---

*This article is based on the transcript of an unrehearsed interview recorded in Athens, Greece on October 5, 1969. Editorial changes (including the elaboration or addition of some sentences and the elimination of repetitions) have been made by George Anastaplo to adapt the transcript of this interview for an audience other than the radio audience (outside of Greece) for which it was originally intended.

Robert McDonald is a Canadian press representative and free lance writer who has been living in Athens several years. His publications on contemporary Greek affairs include his eyewitness account of the seizure of power by the present government, "Greece: April 21, 1967," *Massachusetts Review*, vol. 9, p. 59 (Winter 1968).

George Anastaplo, who was born in St. Louis and who now lives in Chicago, is currently Lecturer in the Liberal Arts, The University of Chicago, Professor of Philosophy and of Political Science (and chairman of the Political Science Department), Rosary College and Professor of Politics and Literature, The University of Dallas. He has been awarded the A.B., J.D. and Ph.D. degrees by the University of Chicago. His articles on Greek affairs have been reprinted in Volume 116 of the *Congressional Record* at pages 6023 (March 11, 1969), 8460 (April 2, 1969), 8461 (April 2, 1969), 16878 (June 23, 1969), 19732 (July 15, 1969), 21018 (July 28, 1969), and 40495 (December 20, 1969).

The September 30, 1969 statement by Constantine Karamanlis discussed in this interview is appended to this article in its entirety.

ANASTAPLO. Perhaps one could say he should return to Greece because he *can* return to power in Greece.

The principal means by which the removal of this present government can safely take place is with the aid—with the substantial aid, the deliberate and determined aid—of Greece's American ally. Only if the United States is willing to use its immense influence in Greece, to help the Greek people regain control of their destiny, is the present Greek government likely to be removed from power without recourse to civil war, without recourse to a long period of resistance, without recourse to all the uncertainties that such activities can mean.

Under what circumstances would the United States shift from its tacit support of the present Greek government and begin to help the Greek people rid themselves of their tyrants? The United States would help if it should be compelled to recognize that the present situation here might so deteriorate that the consequences would become disastrous or at least dangerously unpredictable. Even so, the United States would disavow the Greek government and help the Greek people only if the likely alternative to the present government is something the United States knows or can rely upon. This likely alternative today is clearly a government under the presidency of Mr. Karamanlis. The United States knows Mr. Karamanlis from long experience. The United States helped train him, in the sense that he was one of the men who got their political start at the time when the American economic and military missions were the most influential in the rehabilitation of this country after the Second World War. He's a man with whom, because of his long time in power, the United States is quite familiar. And he's a man who, as the United States has finally begun to appreciate, can count on support from people of the center and of the left in Greece as well as, of course, from people of the right (the people from which he himself originally came). In other words, I think Mr. Karamanlis is someone who is eminently available, eminently useful, and consequently someone the United States can safely rely upon, if it should become interested in preventing the general situation here and its own standing with the Greek people from deteriorating even further than they have already.

MCDONALD. Following Mr. Karamanlis's statement, there have been a number of statements made here in Greece approving his initiative. What do you think has been the overall effect of his call for the government to withdraw from power?

ANASTAPLO. The responses there have been to the Karamanlis statement are themselves significant indications that he is precisely the man who is needed if there is to be a successful effort to liberate Greece from the control of its present government. The overall effect of the statement has been that of a general raising of morale here in Greece among those in opposition to the government.

This general raising of morale need not be at the expense of the morale of sincere supporters of the present government.—That is to say, sincere supporters of the present government—those members of the Greek public who are conscientious in believing that the present government is doing something good for Greece or that it has saved Greece from something bad—cannot help but feel that Mr. Karamanlis would not undo the good the present government might have done or might be thought to have done. Consequently, these supporters of the present government would not be unhappy if he should be returned to power.

The Greeks who are in opposition to the present government are certainly heartened by Mr. Karamanlis's intervention. The remarkable hold which he has upon the country is, as I have noted, partly accidental—but accidents play a very important part in political matters and should be taken advantage of by prudent men. This hold is reflected in the fact that there has been here in the week since his statement was issued in Paris a wide endorsement of it by various political personalities and by representatives of all the leading parties in Greece.

The responses we have heard to his statement and the mood which now prevails here in Athens because of his statement are, as I have said, in themselves arguments for "the Karamanlis solution." The problem is, of course, what can be done to keep going the momentum of peaceful opposition which has now been built up but which cannot be counted on to be built up again if it should now be allowed to run down. What can be done to permit the present government to leave or what can be done to force the present government to leave? I put it both ways because there are obviously some supporters of the present government—perhaps some people who are even members of it—who would like, now that Mr. Karamanlis has intervened, to give power over to him. There are others in the present government—and this I'm afraid includes its leading figures—who do not intend to *give* power over to anyone but would be least reluctant to surrender it to him. What can be done to push them into surrendering? This is where the United States, I think, can play a critical part. The Greek politicians can do certain things. The Greek civil service can do certain things. But ultimately (if there is to be a peaceful transition) it will come down to what the United States does, because what will happen in the immediate future will depend in part on what the Greek Army does. What the Army of Greece will do, in circumstances which find that army under quite strict control by a conspiracy of usurpers, will depend in large part on what conscientious Army officers think the United States wants and will permit to happen. And, so, the American role in Greece, which has had to be very important for a generation, may well be decisive in the next few months, decisive as to the kind of life the Greek people will have for the next generation.

MCDONALD. Since you seem to think that more is needed, can you explain why the Karamanlis solution has not had such an immediate impact as to bring down the present government?

ANASTAPLO. The immediate impact *has* been considerable. One can detect it in people's mood: one can detect it in the switch from the helplessness of the days immediately before the statement was issued to the hopefulness that one now encounters among people who have been in opposition to the regime. In fact, one finds this hopefulness even among people who had previously been rather apathetic about this regime, perhaps because they had reconciled themselves to it and felt they might as well make the best of it, so much so that they had not dared (for their peace of mind) to recognize their own antipathy toward it.

Mr. Karamanlis's statement certainly has not been able to bring down the government. Such a statement as his could bring down a government only in a situation where there were some remnants of parliamentary government or where there were certain other institutions upon which the government relied for its perpetuation. Since the present government is a dictatorship which rests almost entirely upon the use of force, the Karamanlis statement cannot be enough in itself to compel this government to fall. But it may be enough to get forces moving which could lead immediately to the organization of significant activities in and out of the Army and which could lead ultimately to the replacement of this government by one which has some respect for constitutional processes.

MCDONALD. What political effect has the Karamanlis statement already had and what political effect could it have?

ANASTAPLO. It has had several political effects. It has moved various political personalities, as the Greeks call them, to declare themselves (in one form or another) in favor of Mr. Karamanlis. People who have never been with him—even people who have been bitter critics of his throughout their careers—have been obliged to acknowledge publicly, one way or another, the essential role Mr. Karamanlis has to play in Greece today. Another political effect is that he has created a crisis just by issuing his statement. He has created a crisis in the sense that the government of Greece has had to recognize and to face us to his intervention. It has had to recognize it by permitting this past week, at the press conferences prompted by the Karamanlis statement, questions relating to Mr. Karamanlis's criticisms of this regime.

Mr. Karamanlis has had to be spoken to. He cannot be ignored the way others of the Greek political world have been ignored during the past two and a half years. He is someone this government cannot lightly dismiss, partly because (as its Prime minister admitted during his press conference) many of those who support the present government were once supporters of Mr. Karamanlis. I think it's only a very small minority of Greeks who do support this government. But of that minority almost all of them could have been expected, ten years ago, to have been in the Karamanlis camp. He must still have among them great prestige because of qualities which they cannot help but recognize, no matter what the government now says against him. The leading members of the present government know that their own sincere supporters, except those who are directly benefiting by jobs or lucrative contracts or graft, must now be subject to a serious diversion of their loyalty away from the present government back to the old dispensation.

MCDONALD. If Mr. Karamanlis is this much of the right, how would his return be regarded by people of the liberal and left-wing camps of this country?

ANASTAPLO. The Karamanlis that the people of the right, particularly those who support this government, are moved by is the Karamanlis of the old days, someone whom they trust, someone whom they believe to be sober, prudent and so forth. This sobriety and prudence are reflected, by the way, in his statement, since care is taken therein not to depreciate too much the present regime, not to let his criticisms become too polemical, but rather to respect in effect some of the sentiments that move misguided supporters of the present regime.

On the other hand, people who are not supporters of the present regime remember Mr. Karamanlis as a man who, whatever differences they may have had with him, presided over a government which did have some respect for constitutional processes and which did permit itself to be defeated in a more or less free election. (I say "more or less" because Greek elections have always had serious problems about fairness.) They can remember him as someone who knows what it means to conduct an election in such a way that it is possible to lose it. These people know that Mr. Karamanlis would permit a decent government to be restored, a government which would move Greece away from the anomalies and the dangerous uncertainties and the sheer incompetence, to say nothing of the occasional brutality and the widespread suppression, of the present regime. They can reasonably anticipate his return to power as a distinct improvement, with the prospect through him of a long-run rejuvenation of constitutional government in Greece.

MCDONALD. Who has spoken out in favor of the Karamanlis initiative and what do their statements mean?

ANASTAPLO. Among those in Greece who have spoken out have been the leader of the party of the right, Mr. Kanellopoulos; the spokesman of the party of the center, Mr. Mavros; a leading personality of the center party, Mr. Zigdis; the leader of that faction of the Center Union which broke away from it in 1965, Mr. Stefanopoulos. In varying degrees, they and others (here and abroad) have endorsed the Karamanlis intervention. They can be understood to have said, one way or another, that it is welcome, that it is something around which all of them should mobilize, and that it provides a focus for serious opposition to an oppressive regime.

In a curious way, the Karamanlis intervention is being treated as though it were the intervention of a foreign power. He does have a special character among the Greek people today, a special status in the eyes of people of all political persuasions. There is nothing he has said that hasn't been said by many other people in Greece and out. But the fact that he has said it, after a silence of almost two years since his last intervention, is itself a political fact of great importance. The fact that it has been responded to the way it has, not only by the political people but by the country at large—even people one meets in the streets who have begun to hear of the statement despite its official exclusion from the Greek press—the fact that there has been this response is itself an indication of why Mr. Karamanlis is the only man who can provide at this time the means for a peaceful displacement of the present government without too great an uncertainty for the future of Greece and for the role here in the Mediterranean of its allies.

The question remains, however, whether the United States will do anything substantial, directly or indirectly, to help the oppressed Greek people exploit the Karamanlis intervention while there is time to do so effectively. I am afraid it will not.

ATHENS, GREECE, *October 5, 1969.*

STATEMENT (ORIGINALLY IN GREEK) BY THE FORMER PRIME MINISTER OF GREECE, CONSTANTINE KARAMANLIS

It is now one year since the famous plebiscite and, instead of making progress, the cause of democracy in Greece has moved dangerously backwards. The government has become more tyrannical and now identifies itself with democracy in the most cynical possible manner. Arbitrary rule has now become entrenched and the despairing opposition of the people has reached new heights.

In this situation I feel obliged once again to break my silence and to call attention to the serious dangers which threaten the country by the continuation of the present abnormality.

As I said on a previous occasion, the military government of Athens made an additional mistake from the very beginning: their determination to create a situation of permanency. But, lacking the courage to make this purpose openly known, they attempted to conceal it by their clumsy claims to be the flag-bearers of democracy. And by this contradictory and unreasoned policy they have created a tyrannical and illegitimate regime in which both the government and the country are rotting away. For the Athens regime, lacking among other things any clear ideological orientation, conforms to no kind of political pattern or purpose—not even that of the classical form of dictatorship. And this gap is not filled, of course, either by the government's medievally theocratic notions of the organization of the state, nor by the slogan "Greece of Christian Greeks", especially when both concepts are expressed by methods which are anything but Christian.

As a result of this initial mistake, the government has made a whole series of further mistakes. Thus:

1. It has dismembered the armed forces of Greece by subjecting them to a process of Sovietisation and by the dismissal of hundreds of highranking battle-experienced officers who might have hindered their objectives.

2. It has continued in an even more acute form the demagogic policies of its predecessors, thereby undermining the economic future of the country, increasing without a care consumer expenditures at the expense of investment, widening the balance of payments gap (making good the deficiency by borrowing on the most onerous terms), and, finally, permitting an enormous increase in the country's foreign exchange debt, now estimated at 1,870 million dollars, of which 420 millions are in the form of short-term commercial credits. All this must give rise to the gravest anxiety for the future.

3. It has isolated the country politically and morally. Greece, nucleus of the European spirit, is now being pushed out of the family of free nations. And to appreciate the full significance of this isolation, we must bear in mind the critical geopolitical position of our country and the fact that Greece will find herself excluded from the European groupings which are now taking shape, to the detriment not only of the economy but of her national security.

Finally, by their tyrannical rule, their idle boasting and their hit or miss methods, they have created an explosive situation in Greece and deprived Greece of any international repute.

Worst of all, the government clings to its initial error and, instead of searching for a solution of the problem, seeks ways and means to ensure the indefinite continuation of the present regime. Until recently, it believed it could succeed by an electoral coup. Indeed, it went in search of collaborators for that purpose. Now it seeks the same objectives by terrorization of the Greek people and by hood-winking international public opinion.

And the government clings to its errors because it does not realize that if the reactions against it—both domestic and international—have so far been of a moderate nature, it is because of the expectations that were created by the repeated assurances it gave about the restoration of democracy. But the deception is now plain for all to see, and the government, under the pressure of the gathering storm, will be forced to make a choice.

It would be far preferable if the choice were made in good time and in accordance with the interests of the nation. For if the delay is too long, there will no longer be a choice available. History teaches us that illegitimate regimes do not prosper: they become weaker and sicker as time goes on and finally crash to destruction, dragging with them the country which has been subjected to them.

In any event, the whole future of the Greek nation will be profoundly influenced by the decisions to be taken in the next few months. It is vital that these decisions should be the right ones. Otherwise, Greece will suffer evil days without end.

Some two years ago, at another critical moment for the nation, I made public my views about the political problem of Greece. I condemned the past, expressed my anxiety about the present, and sketched out a course for the future. At that time, I said, among other things:

The present troubled situation gives rise to the need, and at the same time presents the opportunity, to re-shape democracy in Greece. The present government must therefore give way to an experienced and strong government which will permit the functioning of democracy in Greece and allow the country to go forward in safety.

I would counsel the government, now that it has more experience, to study my proposals before the impasse becomes impenetrable both for itself and the country. I believe that those proposals not only facilitate the safe restoration of democracy but the foundation of a new and healthy political life which will combine freedom with order and progress with social justice.

It is time that the military men who are in power realize that the geopolitical position of Greece and the character of our people do not lend themselves to dictatorship of any kind; and it is time that the political forces of Greece realized that a return to the habits and political formations of the past would not be a restoration to normality, but only another kind of abnormality.

Under conditions as they exist in Greece today, the restoration of democracy can be achieved by two methods: either by the voluntary retirement of the present government, or by its overthrow.

The first solution is not only without danger, but positively constructive. The second, which might even be brought about by uncontrolled forces, may subject the nation to new trials and tribulations.

The government bears the responsibility for deciding, along with those who, directly or indirectly, support it.

If, therefore, those who govern at present, captivated by power, fail to appreciate their duty, it will have to be pointed out to them by those officers who joined them in good faith. But, beyond them, the whole of the country's armed forces must undertake the task. It is they who, having their origins among the mass of the people, bear the grave responsibility, on behalf of the nation, of protecting its freedom, security and independence.

I must take this opportunity also of assuring those who are anxious about the future that I would not have broken silence if I did not believe that the country can be restored without danger to conditions of normalcy, and if I were not prepared to make my personal contribution, if need be, towards that end.

PARIS, FRANCE, *September 30, 1969.*

INDIAN AFFAIRS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I read the remarks of Commissioner Bruce before the recent Conference on Modern American Indians with considerable interest. As my colleagues may be aware, Commissioner Bruce is restructuring the Bureau of Indian Affairs with a view toward delegating more responsibility to the Indians it is designed to assist.

Commissioner Bruce has taken a realistic look at the problems confronting Indian Americans and has concluded that their lasting solution depends upon the development of a sound economic base within every tribal community and family. Our goal should be one of eliminating the causes of Indian poverty and we should not be deterred in our efforts by those people who have discovered that it is both fashionable and profitable to use Indian misery as the rocket ride to personal publicity.

I include the remarks of Commissioner Bruce in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

REMARKS BY COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS LOUIS R. BRUCE BEFORE THE CONFERENCE ON MODERN AMERICAN INDIANS, CLAREMONT MEN'S COLLEGE, CLAREMONT, CALIF., FEBRUARY 27, 1970

My friends and fellow students: You were kind to offer me this platform today and invite me to present my views on issues and priorities affecting the lives and futures of Indian Americans. Other commitments prevented me from attending the opening of this conference, but I have followed the proceedings by moccasin telegraph. It is apparent from all accounts that the conferees are doing what they set out to do—that is, baring the modern-day realities of Indian life, good and bad. And who is more suited to undertake such a study than this assemblage of thoroughly modern American Indians?

Despite the fact that I have passed somewhat beyond the critical age of 30, I hope you will accept me, too, as a *modern* American Indian. I accept *these* times—not past history—as being the reality for all living Indians; and I, like you, know that what *we* do and say in our conduct of Indian affairs will establish the realities of the future.

You may think it whimsical of me to call myself one of your "fellow students." The dictionary offers more than one definition of the word. It says a student is "one who pursues learning in school." (That fits you.) But a student is also described as "one who is an attentive and systematic observer." (That fits me as well as you.)

I have been attentively and systematically observing the activities of Indian youth during the months since I became Commissioner of Indian Affairs. My new office has given me the opportunity to travel and visit in many parts of Indian America, and to become acquainted with the "now" generation of young Indian men and women.

One thing I have come to believe firmly: These young people should *not* be relegated to obscure functions, just because they are young. It isn't the number of gray hairs that counts, it's the gray matter *under* the hair we should value. Brainpower doesn't necessarily improve with age—and youthful minds need practice in the art of ideamaking.

We are making room for youthful Indian men and women in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Young Indian lawyers, teachers, sociologists, trained business managers and others with more generalized backgrounds are being fitted into positions where their ideas and ideals can contribute to new policy. They are engaging in activities that will give them experience in administration and opportunity for leadership within Government and *beyond* Government.

I find their company and their style stimulating. I also find myself in agreement with nearly all the "new thought" views. For this reason, I was particularly eager to take part in this conference. It offers me a chance to become acquainted with the segment of Indian youth who are *not* part of the bureaucracy and who have been vocal anti-establishmentarians.

We might have some differences of opinion here, but diversity of views is *good* when it results in the creation of fresh perspectives. And we all can agree that a lot of *stale* stuff has cluttered Indian affairs for a long, long time.

For example, there's the threadbare slogan: "The only good BIA Indian is a dead one." Such irresponsible statements as this stir passions and obscure facts. They are the tools of the "professional Indians" and their fellow travelers—people who have discovered that it is both fashionable and profitable to use Indian misery as the rocket ride of personal publicity.

Despite their hammering at the BIA, the fact remains that the BIA is the most enduring supporter Indians have. It is the means by which the special obligations of the Government toward Indian tribes are administered. This is not to deny that there is plenty of room for new perspectives in the administration. I hope this conference will produce some constructive recommendations for modernization of programs.

The BIA suffers from anemia—it doesn't have enough young blood despite sizeable budgets in recent years, Government policies and programs have been less than prolific in their social and economic successes—partly because they are outmoded in concept and partly because they originate from mores that do not relate fully to the Indian way. The various kinds of human salvage operations function at best as stop-gap measures which temporarily meet the Indian's physical needs. But they fail to anticipate future economic requirements and they fail to provide cultural and emotional substance for the distinctness of Indians.

The fault is not altogether with the white man—at least not with the modern white man. With missionary zeal, he has tried to lead Indians toward the "Great Society." But we Indians haven't really tried to explain that some of these methods and goals are just not our thing. There's a short-circuit in the communication system between Indians and non-Indians, and it is time for you and me to try to fix it. It is time for us to start thinking and talking about what *we* believe to be the course which the BIA and Federal policies should follow for the future.

We Indians are a miniscule minority, but we have power far in excess of that which our numbers would seem to warrant. Our strength is in *being Indian*. Not just another minority, riding the monentary bandwagon of minorities, paraphrasing the slogans and aping the techniques of other groups. *We are Indian. We* know what it means, but it is time for us to articulate it for the rest of America.

The exercise of articulating it for others would also help us scrt out our own thoughts. We owe it to ourselves to strip away all the emotion from "issues" in Indian affairs, and enunciate a set of priorities to which we can turn our closest attention.

The plain, unadorned fact, the front-line priority problem, is that most Indians don't have enough income to live in decency and self-respect.

In many ways Indians were worse off in the affluent 1960's than they had been in the depressed 1930's. In the 1960's many Indian communities looked like relics of the great depression, even though a lot of people kept telling Indians they were a part of the so-called "Great Society."

With few conspicuous exceptions, Indians are close to the bottom of the Nation's economic totem pole. Even where ample resources exist, those resources have not been developed to their fullest and are therefore not producing the jobs or the income Indian tribal members need for financial security.

Indian unemployment is ten times and more the national average, which at present is under four percent. Children are suffering—perhaps irreparable damage to their mental and physical powers—because of malnutrition, cold, and inadequate health care. Shacks and shanties are the shelter for entirely too many Indian reservation families—the same kind of miserable housing that existed thirty years ago.

The single most insistent issue in Indian affairs today is: How can we *eliminate the causes of Indian poverty?*

Incredible though it may seem, the BIA has never in the past defined its priority goal as that of seeking to eliminate the causes of Indian poverty. The mission statements of such basic and all-important programs as education and resources management fall short of stating that the ultimate responsibility is to create a job-producing economy and employable people.

The BIA is currently undergoing a realignment that will result in giving priority attention to priority needs. It seems that BIA had been organized into teams playing under various program banners. I want you to know that *I* don't regard Indian affairs as a game, nor the BIA as a political football. It must be reshaped into a *viable* structure. I choose this word, viable, because it means capable of living. Instead of continuing to draw its life from the Indian people, the BIA must become capable of breathing new life into Indian communities—making them viable.

Indians will never arrive at a happy level of association with the rest of American society until the last barrier to economic opportunity has been dropped.

There isn't going to be any real solution to Indian problems—social or otherwise—until there is a sound economic base under each and every family.

The perfectly obvious cause of Indian poverty today is unemployment. Indians in rural reservation communities are jobless because industrial and commercial development of such areas has lagged far behind the Nation as a whole. There has been pitifully little priming of the pump—capital for development—on the reservation, from either Federal or private sources. However, in the past year, I am pleased to report, the rate of industrial growth in Indian areas has mushroomed. A new industry is opening up on the average of once every ten days— and many of them among the big five hundred in assets and growth rates.

Lack of preparedness for the skills and professions of today's job market is another obvious cause of excessively high Indian unemployment. This is the fault of chronic deficiencies in elementary and secondary schools serving Indians—whether they be BIA schools, public schools or most mission schools. According to some of our best Indian teachers and administrators the quality and modernity of education programs actually *declined* below pre-World War II levels; Indian culture-oriented curriculums and English taught as a second language were commonplace in many BIA schools a quarter-century ago, and they are just now, this year and last, again being provided for in the Federal budget for Indian schools.

Whether the Indian man or woman worker chooses to remain in the home community or to move to an urban and industrialized area, the need for skills in order to get a job remains the same. The capability of the BIA to fund and operate an employment assistance program is limited by an annual authorization of no more than $25 million. But there are other sources of training funds that I do not believe have been tapped to their fullest by Indians. The National Council on Indian Opportunity, under the Chairmanship of Vice President Agnew, is the coordinating body for Federal efforts, and much attention has been given this past year to the crisis problems of the thousands upon thousands of Indians now drifting into cities in search of new jobs and new lives.

I have outlined a four-point set of goals that seem to me to be the ones deserving priority effort from this moment forward. I hope we will work together toward their fulfillment.

Our goal is that each Indian community be given an opportunity to expand into an economically viable and socially progressive environment—a place that can pridefully be called home, a place that emanates the spirit of modern Indian America.

Our goal is that no Indian shall be relegated to the ranks of unemployables because of lack of opportunity for training in occupations that are relevant to these times and relevant to Indian hopes. This means that the land and all its resources will be put to full use as a base for the Indian economy—in the spirit of the old Indian ways, but in the forms that are meaningful for today and the future.

Our goal is that every Indian child shall have the *best* in education, suited to his needs and talents and interests, and that all the signs of the second-rate in teaching methods, curriculums, materials and facilities will be replaced.

And our goal of goals is to provide the base within Government and within the private sector for Indians to be full participants in the planning and execution of all policies and programs affecting their destinies.

In conclusion, may I offer a reminder: In six years this Nation will be celebrating its 200th Anniversary of Independence. In the ensuing two centuries since the Declaration of Independence, the spiritual and economic independence of *Indian* Americans has declined. Let us pledge that the year 1976 will signal the re-emergence of Indians to the forefront of American life.

THE LAW IS THE LAW

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration has not provided the moral leadership in implementing the promise of equality in America. The firing of the former head of HEW's Civil Rights Section, Leon Panetta, who attempted to implement court ordered desegregation, serves as a glaring symbol of this administration's lack of determination to end this unconscionable practice. It is fortunate that Mr. Panetta has not been silent on the issues involved in getting equal education for all our citizens. It is a sad commentary, however, that an ex-Nixon official is attempting to partially fill this moral leadership gap that should be filled by the President himself.

In the absence of any clearcut statement from the President, Mr. Panetta's statements on the problems facing the school system are a welcome and constructive addition to the discussion of these issues. For the readers of this RECORD I am including two of Mr. Panetta's statements on this topic:

HOW TO INTEGRATE: FORMER "RIGHTS" OFFICIAL OFFERS RECIPE TO IMPROVE EDUCATION FOR BLACKS

(By Robert P. Hey)

WASHINGTON.—Here is one recipe for school integration:

Desegregate faculty.

Provide classroom desegregation "where possible."

See that federal financial assistance really is used to improve local education, "not just to pay bills."

This is the three-prong approach Leon E. Panetta forcefully advocates for big-city school systems—the "real crunchy problems," he calls them.

He believes it would provide the maximum desegregation feasible, as well as be the best way to bring about much-needed improvement in education for slum children. He does not advocate massive bussing.

OTHERS ALSO RESIGN

Through February Mr. Panetta was chief desegregation enforcement official of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), resigning under conservative pressure. In his government position he was on the cutting edge of school desegregation efforts.

J. Stanley Pottinger, HEW's regional attorney in San Francisco, has been named to succeed Mr. Panetta.

Following hard on the heels of the Panetta resignation, Paul M. Rilling of Atlanta, head of HEW's southeast regional Office of Civil Rights, resigned with a blast at the administration. So, too, did C. Peter Gall, Panetta press aide in Washington. And some 125 members of HEW's Office of Civil Rights sent President Nixon a letter expressing "bitter disappointment" with his administration's civil-rights record to date.

SCHOOLING STRESSED

In an interview, Mr. Panetta expressed concern that current acrimony over school bussing, and the problems of achieving racial balance in Northern cities with heavily Negro systems have obscured the true issue of school desegregation—obtaining the best possible education.

He attempted to set the problem in perspective.

"The fight on education," he said, "has always been the spearhead of the civil-rights movement." He noted that the major civil-rights decision by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1954 concerned education; that schooling, too, was the subject of the first major civil-rights legislation of Congress in 1964. "So it really was education that broke the ground.

"The law became very clear on education—education alone. That's where the principal enforcement area was, because that's where the law was: education." The courts have firmly established that "deliberate discrimination has to be proceeded against because it is a violation of law."

The intense Mr. Panetta acknowledges that de facto segregation—which grew out of residential patterns, rather than segregation laws—represents "a gray area." There, he said, the issue is "moral" and "educational" more than it is legal.

LEGAL AREA CITED

But he points out that "the courts are beginning to turn to the legal area here, too." He cited Los Angeles, now under court order to end racial imbalance in its schools.

"I think, first of all, that even in discussing big urban systems in the North, you have to define the subject. Because at San Francisco, or Seattle, or even at Denver, where the black population is relatively small—less than 20 percent—dsegregation is viable, a practical approach." He praised San Francisco's plan of establishing educational parks. This had the effect simultaneously of achieving integration and improving education.

IMPROVEMENT URGED

Mr. Panetta believes the "real crunchy problems" of cities like Chicago, Washington, and New York City can be faced up to—and must be. Cities like these have student populations 50 percent or more black.

"It seems to me," he says, "that in these situations it's indeed true that you can't have the real salt-and-pepper (desegregation) mix that the rural community can have . . . and the concentration here should certainly be on improving, developing the schools that are there in the community.

"And taking what steps can be taken to do some desegregating." He mentions holding joint assemblies, or other meetings perhaps two or three times a week between black classes and white classes. He also believes faculty desegregation is achievable in all cities.

"Some pupil desegregation, plus faculty desegregation, can play an important role . . . You have teachers (black and white) talking to one another. You have kids seeing what's being done in other schools."

CURBS ASSAILED

Most importantly, "You're not locking kids in two separate systems. This experience becomes very restrictive. Their understanding of the other race becomes very restrictive. If education in our times is going to become very meaningful, it can't be restricted just to the three R's. It's got to encompass education that goes on not just between teacher and child, but also between child and child."

One of the things that distresses Mr. Panetta most is the charge that money won't solve urban schools' problems—with its frequent implication that no money is needed. "One-half to two-thirds of all federal money that now goes to schools is supposed to go to black schools . . . to improve their education.

"And the fact is that report after report now points out that the money isn't hitting the target . . . It's just being used to pay bills (rather than to improve the quality of education). It's supposed to lift the black schools to the level of the white schools.

CHANGES CALLED NEED

"The dream that you can lift up all black schools just by desegregating is just that—a dream." He stresses that massive changes must be made in the way black schools educate.

Specifically, Mr. Panetta recommends: smaller classes; more team teaching; "as many remedial, compensatory education programs as possible"; and using the newest techniques in education in slum schools. "Today you can find (those techniques) in white suburbia where the money is. . . . It's time that that kind of teaching became a reality in black schools."

In casual conversation the youthful Mr. Panetta—he is 31—is friendly, jovial, witty. But when he talks about education he is soberly earnest.

He says the current—and recurrent—storm over busing really centers on one point: "Taking a child to an inferior school. The real question we should center on is not the busing, but what's at the end of the bus ride . . . how good an education will the child have after the busing?"

GOAL REEMPHASIZED

In his view, "The real question here is one of increasing the educational opportunities for every child . . . The trouble is, we have all these emotional crosscurrents tending really to detract from what is the goal here.

"And the goal—even of desegregation—in this country has got to be better educational opportunity for all children involved.

"What's happening is we're becoming so tied up in all these little arguments here . . . arguments that appeal to anxieties and prejudices . . . and when somebody starts to cater to all these fears and anxieties, the tendency is to pull away from" the central question. He considers this possibility "the most dangerous element of this current debate."

DIFFICULT TASK

Focusing national attention where it should be—on quality education—and keeping it there, Mr. Panetta considers "the most difficult challenge of our time."

He sees "parent participation in the educational process"—often for the first time—as essential if this challenge is to be met.

That's contrary to our experience, he points out, in which "as long as the child brings home a good report card, the parent tends to be satisfied that 'it's all working out.'

"And that's not it at all . . . parents have got to start looking at their child, and seeing what kind of an education he should receive."

Should it be largely vocational, as in the past, designed to prepare him for some job or profession?

QUESTIONS OFFERED

Mr. Panetta holds "No. This is no longer just the simple task of training kids for (job) security. It's a question of making kids understand what society is all about . . . if all we're producing is kids that are trained for professions, and have the same anxieties as we have, then eductaion is not really doing its job."

He recommends that parents become involved by finding out such information about their schools as:

What is the pupil-teacher ratio?

Are they using new techniques?

If there are black children in the school—how are they being treated?

What about school discipline?

To achieve the needed national goal of good education for all children, he thinks "what we really need is an era of greater community participation in education. . . .

"We're at this turning point. We can either retreat into the sanctuaries of white suburbia and black cities, or we can try" to figure out how to come to terms with each other.

"Sure there are problems. But you don't solve problems by yelling and screaming about them . . . you solve problems by sitting down and working together."

THE LAW IS THE LAW

(By Leon Panetta)

I believe that America must decide now whether equality under law is still its goal or whether it will again heed, as it did a century ago, the ugly cries of defiance.

The law of the land, after all the bloodshed, the marches, the demonstrations and the legal and legislative battles, is quite simple: discrimination in education will not and cannot be tolerated under the Constitution and must be effectively and affirmatively corrected now. This is not simply an educational whim or a social experiment, as some would have us believe. It is the mandate of the law.

This is the law that as chief of the Office for Civil Rights at HEW I was responsible for enforcing, and it was the strong enforcement of that law that led to my departure as director of that office. With a dedicated staff of only 300 people spread North and South, our task under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was to insure that federal funds were not going to school districts discriminating on the basis of race, color or national origin.

In 1954, 17 Southern and border states had such discrimination sanctioned by state law. Some three million black children were attending all-black schools. Ten years later, despite the Supreme Court, despite the repeal of many state laws and despite the Civil Rights Act, the situation remained relatively unchanged. But in 1965, the first staff members of the Office for Civil Rights began going from district to district—investigating instances of discrimination, negotiating desegregation plans, risking their lives in day-to-day confrontations. Their only support was the knowledge that their government and the courts were committed to the goal of equality.

The vast majority of the districts we have negotiated with since 1965—some 1,350—presented our office at HEW with voluntary plans for desegregation and proceeded to implement those plans. This process was not simple or free from challenge. But because of the cooperation, the will and the courage of thousands of local school officials, the challenges were successfully met.

The tragedy today is that the Administration is backing away from supporting exactly those who have worked so hard to achieve compliance with the law. By listening to the cries of the last recalcitrant districts, the Administration has undermined those superintendents and school board members who laid their personal prestige on the line when the going was the toughest. It has also encouraged the false hopes of the diehards that somehow compliance with the Civil Rights Act will not be required.

Southern congressmen and senators, White House aides, Southern Republican chairmen have pleaded for softer rules in key political districts. At HEW, campaign statements and White House promises were continually thrown in our faces as we attempted to negotiate desegregation plans. Each time an ambiguous, politically motivated statement came from a source with White House blessing, we had to try to correct the misunderstandings and confusion it created among state and local school officials who thought they knew what was required and were seeking to comply with the law.

In September of 1969, at the beginning of the school year, more than 300 voluntary plans negotiated by my office went into operation—the greatest amount of desegregation ever put into effect at one time. Today over 90% of the 4,466 school districts in the 17 Southern and border states are in compliance with the law or under a court or HEW commitment to comply with it. From less than one percent desegregation in 1954 and slightly more than one percent in 1964, more than one million of the three million black children in the South—between 35% and 40%—are now studying in desegregated schools. In addition, close to 100 Northern systems have been reviewed or investigated recently by HEW or the Justice Department with action brought on many of these to eliminate discrimination.

The present attack on the effort to end discrimination in education has focused chiefly on issues with high emotional content—busing, neighborhood schools, quality of education and desegregation—for which there are no easy answers. Many of the remaining 10% of school districts in the South, moreover, present some of the most difficult problems, either because they have heavy black majorities or because they are large urban systems. But it is important to recognize that the arguments are peripheral in that they have to do with details of how the law of the land is to be applied and not with what the law itself means. And it should also be clearly understood that every one of the objections now being raised has already been raised and faced, successfully, in communities all over the South, including some large cities.

Americans by nature appreciate straight talk, but they have not been getting it with regard to civil rights. The fact is that the 1964 Civil Rights Act is the law, that a tremendous amount of progress has already been made without disruption or violence, and that federal, state and local officials have shown that they can work together to give both black and white children a better and more equal educational opportunity.

There can be no strong or just enforcement without a national commitment to equal rights, and the time is long overdue for President Nixon to address himself squarely to this issue. His immediate predecessors each pledged their administrations to the vigorous enforcement of equal rights laws. Surely, he can do no less—and yet his promise to "bring us together" has long faded as a result of ambiguity and indirection, particularly as a result of Vice President Agnew's rhetoric that seeks to divide rather than unite, that seeks to wound rather than heal. And the total responsibility in this area cannot be placed on the already overburdened courts—they have for too long fought this battle alone. They have shown us what the Constitution requires. It is now the responsibility of both the executive and judicial branches of government to enforce that law.

OREGON VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the Oregon Veterans of Foreign Wars sponsors a "Voice of Democracy" contest along with VFW chapters throughout the Nation. One of the district winners was Ranee Martin of Dallas, Oreg. I am including her essay in the RECORD:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Ranee Martin)

The streets of our country are in turmoil, Chicago, our colleges are full of angry students, looting, burning, rioting, Berkeley, crime is at its peak, Washington D.C., our embassies are being stoned, England, France, Israel. Our country's people are all too often in fear for their lives, New York City, and we've been involved in winless battles spilling American blood on foreign soil, Korea, Vietnam. Our young men are dying for ideals that don't seem to mean much to Americans anymore. Yes, this is America, and mister, we're in trouble.

But the trouble doesn't lie in the battle fields of Vietnam, or in the masses of Red China. Our real trouble lies in our cities, in our rural areas, in our town, in our schools, and in your homes. The disease which is slowly eating away at the heart of America is everywhere.

The constitution of our country is still the same, people say we still stand for the same things. No, the basic idealism structure of our country hasn't changed, we have, you and me.

This is the age of the American cynic, the modern spirit of tolerance of all things with no idea of what is being tolerated, the year of the unbeliever, the day of doubt and an appalling vagueness of what we stand for. We've torn down all our idols, forgotten our heroes, and rejected all of our old ways. We've nothing left to respect.

Our people are actually offended when asked to stand for the flag salute, they stare at their shoelaces when our national anthem is playing, they're ashamed to be caught with their eyes closed in prayer, they wouldn't dare be caught at a political rally or a demonstration, by not wanting to get involved, they stand by while a fellow citizen is being mugged, they've decided the only way into public office is to buy it, and their heroes are the fast guys that get away with things.

Patriotism is a lost ideal. To tear away the fancy frills of the word, patriotism is just a simple pride. It's like having a better car, bigger house, prettier girl, a pride in your country and for what it stands, but we've even lost that.

The majority of our people have lost their pride, they've lost their standards, they've forgotten their morals, and they've forgotten how to live.

Our country is crumbling, and in the cracks of our walls our enemies are putting their steel wedges. Steel wedges that build for them, what we've destroyed. Yes, our country is crumbling, and our enemies do know it, in fact the new idea is—don't attack America, let it wear itself down gradually, and did you know? It's working!

Rome rose and fell. America has risen, let's don't let it fall. We, as people can do something, we can become involved with our country, it's people, and their problems. You, as a person of the United States of America can first become involved in your community affairs, take part in elections, stand up for your rights, know what goes on at the school board meetings, and most of all, try to help solve community problems. You can do your part in uniting a nation, by bringing together your own community.

You can install in your children a pride—a simple pride—called patriotism. Be proud of our flag and for what it means. Wave it proudly on your home on holidays, or just display it to show that you are proud to be an American.

The key words to building back the walls of our nation are: faith, involvement, and patriotism.

We must have faith in our country, we must become involved with it, and we must stand behind it wholeheartedly.

We can use a lot of singing, flag waving, and a lot of Yankee ingenuity to set our country straight. We've got a nation full of people—with a nation full of hearts, minds, and hands. Let's use them, to help rebuild our nation's walls, for that truly is Freedom's Challenge.

MIXED EMOTIONS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, this year will mark the 25th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, and the celebration will be greeted with mixed emotions if various press accounts are any criterion. The U.N. announced in January that official commemorative medals to mark its silver jubilee would be produced in three sizes in silver and bronze for worldwide sale to the general public and to collectors. Another news item in January reported on plans for a U.N. youth parley of possibly 1,000 young people of all ideologies in the United States in July for the commemoration. Undoubtedly more news of this type will be forthcoming as July approaches.

Perhaps not as enthusiastic with the event will be approximately 700 families in New York City who might be uprooted from their homes if the proposal to build a development for U.N. diplomats becomes a reality. Situated near the present U.N. complex, the new addition will cost approximately $300 million and cover an area of two square blocks.

Definitely not enthusiastic about the forthcoming event is the nationally syndicated columnist, speaker and author, James J. Kilpatrick, who, in a recent column in the Washington Star, commented on U.N. liabilities as far as the United States is concerned. He pointed out that we now pay one-third of the U.N.'s regular budget and about 70 percent of its spending overall. He suggested that perhaps now is the time to consider picking up our moneybags and going home.

Following is the above-mentioned column by James J. Kilpatrick entitled "Why Don't We Call It a (Pay) Day at U.N.?":

WHY DON'T WE CALL IT A (PAY) DAY AT U.N.?

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

It probably is futile even to raise the question, for the United Nations still twines our national reason in its morning glory sweetness, but isn't it time for the United States, in this field, to stop playing Uncle Sucker?

Tucked away in the President's budget for the coming fiscal year are his requests for tax funds to be paid out to the U.N. and its progeny. It will come as no surprise to anyone to learn that the items are up, up, up. And it may well be that short of withdrawing from the U.N. altogether, there is nothing the Congress can do about it.

Even so, permit a slow burn:

In the 1969 fiscal year, the United States put up $41 million in dues to the United Nations. For fiscal '71, the bill will be $50,379,000, a tidy increase of 23 percent in a span of two years.

In the World Health Organization, our contribution, as it is euphemistically described, will jump from $18 million to $21.7 million. In fiscal '69, we turned over to the U.N.'s Food and Agriculture Organization some $8.7 million. Next year, we get hit for $10.1 million. All told, the taxpayers in the coming fiscal year will fork over $109,116,000 as our "assessed share of the expenses" of the U.N. and its satellite agencies.

One hates to appear picayune or captious. But at a time when a hard-pressed President is reduced to terminating the jobs of four tea-tasters in the Food and Drug Administration, in an effort to save every possible dollar, some hard questions ought to be asked about our continued support of the Great East River Debating and Flim-Flam Society.

Henry J. Taylor, former ambassador to Switzerland, is a cogent student of these matters. In a recent column, he pointed to the absurdity that has resulted from the admission of mini-nations by the dozen. Within the U.N.'s General Assembly, a two-thirds' majority now can be mustered by "nations' with less than 10 percent of the world's population—and these nations pay less than 5 percent of the U.N.'s budget.

At the Assembly's last session, by Taylor's count, these come-and-get-it boys introduced no fewer than 61 proposals for money to go to themselves—the bill to be footed by the United States. "They raid our U.S. Treasury like Mongols," Taylor added, "with a sort of special zeal which is inborn and absolutely unquenchable."

Of the U.N.'s 126 members, 77 have failed to pay their dues or assessments. In any well-run gentlemen's club, the deadbeats would have been posted for 60 days and then expelled. But this is not how things are done at the United Nations.

No one ever is booted out. The expense is simply shouldered off to dear old Uncle Sam. We now pay one-third of the U.N.'s regular budget, and about 70 percent of its spending over-all.

Taylor makes the point that ought to be made by critics on Capitol Hill. The United States gains nothing—absolutely nothing—by this misguided generosity. Was there ever a hustler, con man or pickpocket who regarded his victim with affection? Never. Only with contempt. "Nothing is so dangerous to American security," Taylor remarks, "as to permit others to believe that we are an easy mark for anything."

At one point in his budget message, speaking of domestic spending, Nixon remarked with eloquent understatement that "government programs, once begun, tend to live on—sometimes long after their original reason for existence."

On the home front, said the President, "we must begin to cull from the budget mass those programs that are ineffective or poorly designed." Whereupon he took his ax to hospital construction, student loans, and Appalachia; and it was off with the tea-tasters' heads.

Well, the same sound principles apply to international clubsmanship. After 25 years of lofty ineptitude, perhaps the U.N. has outlived its usefulness. The possibility ought at least to be considered that it's time to pick up our money bags and go home.

A CHANCE TO LEARN

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the heat of recent congressional debates over the proper levels of funding for Federal education programs I was gratified to see that the majority of the Members of the House never lost sight of the basic fact that the opportunity for an adequate education is one of the oldest and most treasured of American traditions. The American people are not eager to see that tradition abandoned.

A recent Washington Post editorial which appeared on March 6, 1970, restates this basic conviction as it affects the opportunity for higher education. I place this editorial in the RECORD at this point and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

A CHANCE TO LEARN

Ignorance, it may reasonably be contended, is the root of all evil. From it flow poverty, pestilence, war and all the ills that man is heir to. Education is the obvious antidote. It is the most potent of all liberating forces. If men were universally educated, it is not too much to hope that they would find rational solutions to their conflicts and problems. From the beginning of the American political experiment, education has been recognized as the key to a capacity for self-government. Accordingly, schooling at the primary and secondary levels has been made universal and compulsory for American children; and higher education, at first the privilege of well-born elite, has gradually been made available to youth on an expandingly broad basis. "In 1900," the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education tells us, "four per cent of the 18- to 21-year olds in the United States were enrolled in higher education. In 1970, the figure is 40 per cent—a proportion greater than that of any other nation.

White Americans are more likely to get to college than black Americans; the children of families with income over $15,000 are five times as likely to get there as the children of families with income under $3,000. A lot of talent is wasted by this system of selection—apart from the inherent injustice of it. The Carnegie Commission recommends, therefore, as a goal for 1976, the 200th anniversary of the American Republic, that "all students with the motivation and ability to gain access to and complete higher education should receive the financial aid they need to do so; that economic barriers to college and university access be removed." And it wants to see all other barriers removed by the year 2000.

Much more than financial assistance will be necessary for realization of these goals. The commission points to the need for better trained and more sensitive teachers; and it puts in a good word for such neglected and under-funded programs as the Teacher

Corps and the Educational Professions Development Act. It urges experimental programs to stimulate the early development of potential ability and, particularly, of verbal skills, with a specific endorsement for Education Commissioner James Allen's "Right to Read" program. The prerequisite for going to college is wanting to go there.

The commission favors universal access "for those who want to enter institutions of higher education, are able to make reasonable progress after enrollment, and can benefit from attendance." It opposes universal attendance as a goal. There is implicit in this distinction, we fear, an acceptance of the idea that there are some who were born to be hewers of wood and drawers of water. Of course, everyone who wants higher education should be able to obtain it—should have a chance, this is to say, to realize this maximum potential. But perhaps the ultimate goal should be to make everyone want this—to inculcate in the country's youth, through its system of elementary and secondary education, a love of learning and a capacity to pursue it.

Would it not be the very definition of Utopia to have a society in which every citizen had a broad knowledge and understanding of his intellectual and cultural heritage, a familiarity with history and political institutions, with the arts and sciences? There are differences, to be sure, in innate capacities among human beings. But capacities can be fostered; and the utmost is the least that should be sought. Perhaps all that need be said on this subject is said in the quotation from Thomas Carlyle at the commencement of the commission's report: "That there should one man die ignorant who had the capacity for knowledge, this I call a tragedy."

RESOLUTION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the diocese of Washington, at its 75th annual convention in January, voted to express publicly its deep concern about our environment.

The secretary of the convention, Hilary J. Deason, has made a copy of the resolution available to me and I would like to share it with my colleagues by having its text appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Whereas, God has created the earth for His Glory, and for the use of man, and

Whereas, human life and that of plant and animal life is increasingly threatened by air and water pollution, destructive exploitation of natural resources to the point of crisis, and

Whereas, the Church has been rather indifferent to conservation and has not heretofore expressed a position regarding man's relation to his environment and his stewardship of Nature and natural resources, and

Whereas, there is ample scriptural and theological teaching which can enable Christians to develop an ethic in dealing with conservation, and

Whereas, there is sufficient technological knowledge and resources for cleansing air and water and preserving the earth's beauty and natural resources, be it

Resolved, that this Convention express publicly its deep concern for the conservation of our natural resources, the protection of our land from destructive exploitation, and the elimination of pollutants from air and water, especially in our urban centers, and be it

Resolved, that a Committee be appointed to develop ethical considerations which will assist the Church in teaching stewardship and responsibility toward Nature, so that our stand for conservation be informed and consistent; and be it further.

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be circulated throughout the Church, a copy sent to the President of the United States in support of his concerns, to the Department of the Interior, and other copies sent to appropriate members of the Congress who are working on the crisis of conservation.

ANTI-INFLATIONARY SAVINGS

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, UPI carried a story some time ago that implied that Paul McCracken, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, felt that acceptance of the Oil Import Task Force staff recommendation to use a tariff to break the price of crude to $2.50 would result in a large anti-inflationary savings. Admittedly, this implication was probably unintentional by UPI as the story concerned itself with one prominent Senator's analysis of a question he asked the Chairman regarding the price of gasoline. Nevertheless, the story has created widespread confusion in my State as to what the Chairman said.

In order to clarify the situation, Mr. Speaker, I would like this correspondence printed in the RECORD at this point:

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1970.

Hon. GEORGE BUSH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: Thank you for your letter of February 17. You were correct in assuming that I was simply responding to an arithmetical question. The exact question Senator Proxmire asked me was:

"Could you tell me what the anti-inflationary impact would be of a decrease in the retail price of gasoline of 2¢ a gallon?"

You will find enclosed a copy of my response to Senator Proxmire.

Sincerely,

PAUL W. MCCRACKEN.

FEBRUARY 7, 1970.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Thank you for your letter of January 29 asking for our estimate of the anti-inflationary impact of a 2 cent a gallon decrease in the price of gasoline.

The statistics involved are relatively simple. With annual consumption on the order of 80 billion gallons, a 2 cent cut at retail would translate into a reduction of about $1.6 billion in the total national bill for gasoline. Such a cut would be equivalent to a reduction of approximately 6 percent in the average retail price. This would affect the overall consumer price index directly by somewhat less than 0.2 percent.

Sincerely,

PAUL W. MCCRACKEN.

As you can see Chairman McCracken was simply asked an arithmetical question about what would happen if gasoline prices came down. In replying the Chairman did not address himself to the staff recommendation of the Oil Import Task Force. In other words, he did not suggest in any way that the staff recommendation would result in a 2-cent-per-gallon savings to consumers.

THE VOICE OF DEMOCRACY—FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, as many of our colleagues know, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest.

This year, over 400,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. The contest theme was "Freedom's Challenge."

The winning contestants from each of the States have now been brought to Washington for the final judging as guests of the VFW.

Among those State winners, I am delighted to note, is Miss Christine Larson of Westfield, N.J., a young constituent I am extremely proud to represent, for Miss Larson's essay won for her the privilege of representing New Jersey in the national competition.

Miss Larson's essay is a strikingly imaginative and thoughtful one, and it goes to the heart of freedom in a particularly contemporary and meaningful way. Whether or not her essay is awarded a national prize, she and her family have every reason to be immensely proud of her contribution.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe her essay is so good that I recommend it highly to the attention of our colleagues, and I am honored to include it herewith as a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

Miss Larson, a student at Westfield Senior High School, is one of three children of the Reverend and Mrs. Bruce Larson. Christine plans to attend the University of Pennsylvania and subsequently to work with the Peace Corps, a goal which, like her remarkable essay, typifies her very sensitive and responsible approach to life. I wish her the very best in the present competition and in her future career. As a representative of America's younger generation, she has given me great reason for hope and optimism.

The essay follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

I should like to tell you what freedom's challenge could mean to two little boys that I know. They are very different. The first one, Stevie, is an extremely proud and independent ten year old. He has a brown face, wooly hair, and large, beautiful eyes. Stevie also happens to live in a drab ghetto area, outside of a nearby city. I met him there last year when a group of high school students, including me, helped to run a club for boys in his neighborhood. Stevie and his seven brothers and sisters live in substandard housing on a street where no one has a decent set of clothes in which to go to school. He has never even seen the ocean, although he lives less than an hour away by car.

The second boy, Robbie, is tiny, like a little elf, with pink cheeks and brown curly hair. However, Robbie lives in the wealthiest section of a big city, surrounded by every material possession a child could want. He is pampered, protected, fairly smothered with affection. I met him last summer when I served his family as a children's nurse. Although the situations of these two boys are dramatically different, both boys have something in common. Neither is fully aware of freedom's challenge. Neither can truly appreciate freedom.

In America, the mention of the word freedom generally brings to mind a picture of our founding fathers as they bent to sign the Declaration of Independence. Or perhaps in a few cases, Americans can recall the Bill of Rights and the types of freedoms mentioned in this document. We take for granted the fact that we can speak as we please, assemble peaceably, bear arms, and petition our government for redress of grievances. We are in such constant touch with these freedoms that we scarcely notice them. We no longer feel grateful for them. In fact, like Robbie, we are unaware of our freedom because we take it for granted. Freedom is not a right but a privilege to be protected and treasured.

On the other hand, in this affluent society we often forget that there are others like Stevie, for whom freedom is not a reality. A ghetto mother, with eight children, has no awareness of freedom and little appreciation for the Bill of Rights. Unless we are free from the basic human wants we are not free men, we are prisoners in our poverty. In short, Freedom's Challenge is a double obligation. Every single day we ought to wake up in the morning joyful and grateful that we live in a free country. Perhaps if we compared ourselves with others in countries where freedom is a forgotten word, we could appreciate our good fortune. Secondly, in a democracy we must take the responsibility for seeing that the freedoms of others are respected and defended. Each of us can oppose hunger, poverty and disease where we find them, in our own communities. By so doing, we can create an atmosphere in which freedom, justice and equality can and do grow. These are two important ways in which we can meet Freedom's Challenge.

BETTER NEIGHBORHOODS, INC.

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, much concern has been expressed over the housing crisis that faces America and it is a concern justified by the widening gap between the number of housing units being built and the number needed. Experts estimate that 26 million new housing units must be built in the next 10 years. Our current construction rate of 1 million-plus per year will fall far short of that objective.

There have been many suggestions advanced for solving this problem. Most of them fall into the category of further Federal incentives to homebuilders. Federal help is needed, but few solutions advanced look beyond that point. What is needed is involvement at all levels of our economy, in the true sense of commitment, so that we can meet our Nation's housing needs.

In my own district, residents of Schenectady have tackled the housing problem at a local level. They created a local, nonprofit group dedicated to fighting housing blight, Better Neighborhoods, Inc., and their success has been the subject of a special article in the Wall Street Journal.

The significance of this local effort and the fact that in Schenectady it has worked, prompts me to include the Journal article here for the benefit of my colleagues:

SCHENECTADY TACKLES ITS HOUSING PROBLEM WITH LOCAL RESOURCES

(By Ronald Kessler)

SCHENECTADY.—When Lewis A. Clay, a Negro sanitation worker, moved into a duplex in a largely white area here last summer, the neighbors started taking action.

The people on both sides were caught up in the excitement. The woman in the house on one side painted her porch and steps. The couple on the other side had their house rewired. Moreover, the man across the street painted his entire house and installed storm doors.

The improvements had nothing to do with Mr. Clay personally. He just happened to have moved into a house renovated by Better Neighborhoods, Inc., a local nonprofit group formed to fight slums in this manufacturing city of 88,000 on the Mohawk River. The renovation was so complete, says Mr. Clay, that "all the neighbors went into competition with me."

Most urban improvement schemes rely on Federal funds and programs. Better Neighborhoods doesn't. It is privately financed—some 75% by mortgages obtained on standard terms from a pool of seven local banks and the rest by no-interest or low-interest bonds sold to local businesses and church groups. And Better Neighborhoods has another thing going for it: It seems to work. In the past year, the group has purchased and renovated 34 two-family houses like Mr. Clay's, providing housing for 316 low-income and lower middle-income people.

A HOUSING SHORTAGE

This city's housing problems, of course, can't be compared with those of big-city slums. The area where deterioration has occurred, Schenectady's Hamilton Hill section, consists of two-family and three-family houses on broad, tree-lined streets. Most of the city's blacks, who make up 5% of Schenectady's population, are concentrated in the area, but they live side by side with whites.

The city does have problems, however. Some 90% of its housing dates from before World War II. About 4,000 units will need demolition or rehabilitation by the end of next year, the Schenectady County Planning Department estimates.

Many houses in Hamilton Hill have been abandoned. Their smashed or boarded-up windows stare vacantly at the street. Many other houses are uninhabitable, contributing to an acute shortage of low-rent housing. Because of the shortage, Mr. Clay formerly lived with his six children and his wife in a small, uninsulated apartment equipped with a space heater that did little more than take the chill off. The family periodically went without water when the pipes froze.

Better Neighborhoods acquired Mr. Clay's present house in Hamilton Hill for $1,100. The city had confiscated the property for unpaid taxes. It looked like a dump, and renovation of the two units cost Better Neighborhoods $17,500.

This included installation of wood-grained hardboard panels on all inner walls, ceiling tiles, new partitions, two complete bathrooms and kitchens, two new furnaces, a new electrical system and new windows, closets, back porches, storm windows and insulation. The house got three coats of paint outside, and inside floors were sanded and varnished. Mr. Clay says he takes good care of the house because "your effort shows."

"LIKE A PALACE"

Another tenant of a Better Neighborhoods house, Gloria Bozek, a welfare mother, says her former apartment's toilet wouldn't flush and the walls were falling in. "This place is like a palace," says Mrs. Bozak. "Once I clean here, I'm proud."

Eventual ownership by some tenants is one goal of Better Neighborhoods. In each two-family house, it tries to place at least one tenant who might be able to obtain a mortgage and buy the dwelling from the organization someday. Mr. Clay, who now pays $110 a month rent, hopes to buy his house eventually.

Better Neighborhoods is largely the work of Bruce R. Laumeister, the 34-year-old president of the group. Mr. Laumeister is a new products executive with General Electric Co., several of whose officials have played key roles in the housing renovation effort.

Better Neighborhoods was established in 1967 but made almost no headway until Mr. Laumeister joined early last year. He quickly concluded that the major obstacle was a plan to rely mainly on financing from the Federal Housing Administration, which offers low-interest loans for such ventures. Red tape was causing endless delays and rigid FHA specifications for materials were raising costs, he asserts.

So he developed his own plan for local financing with bonds and mortgages. He then proceeded to sell the undertaking by presenting a slick sales talk, complete with movies, to some 100 local groups. William T. Westcott, industrial affairs manager of the Schenectady Chamber of Commerce, says: "Bruce sold Better Neighborhoods the same way he approaches General Electric's chairman with a new product."

Better Neighborhoods has a five-year plan that calls for rehabilitating 250 two-family houses at a total cost of $2.5 million. While the numbers are small, the group figures its projects will spur nearby homeowners to improve their properties and thereby arrest blight—as has already happened on Mr. Clay's block.

Crucial to Better Neighborhoods' whole effort is the selection of tenants who will keep up their new homes. A similar venture in Boston's Roxbury section failed recently, according to the project's sponsors, because tenants didn't maintain the properties. Mr. Laumeister says Better Neighborhoods has had problems with only two tenants, one of whom has been evicted.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, when a high Government official meets the issues head on, as in the manner of Vice President AGNEW, his support ranges across party lines, attracts independents and generally broadens his popular base. He has dared say what many politicians only venture to think, and his support, I believe, has been generally enthusiastic. To be sure, his statements, unlike Vice Presidents of recent vintage, are awaited, pondered, and digested. And, in the case of President Nixon's proposed family assistance plan, herein lies the problem.

In his prepared speech to the Order of Ahepa, on March 9 here in Washington the Vice President asserted that the idea of the work incentive proposal was a new idea "which makes you wonder why it has not been suggested before."

Unfortunately, it has been suggested before, and better still, tried. And, as a statement by the American Conservative Union indicates, the results were far from impressive. On an issue of such national importance our past experiences must be a basic part of our final judgment. For AGNEW supporters—and may their number continue to increase—and others, the record should be set straight. For this reason I insert at this point in the RECORD the statement by the American Conservative Union concerning Vice President AGNEW's March 9 speech here in Washington:

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN CONSERVATIVE UNION CONCERNING VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW'S PREPARED SPEECH TO THE ORDER OF AHEPA, MARCH 9, 1970

We are the last to question the right of Vice President Agnew to speak out on the issues of the day—as he did in his speech to the Order of Ahepa in support of President Nixon's proposed Family Assistance Plan (FAP).

But we must question his judgment in issuing a text which shows a profound lack of knowledge of American welfare practice, past and proposed. We quote from what we believe to be the central paragraph—and central misapprehension—of Mr. Agnew's speech: "Under the old system, every dollar you earned was subtracted from your welfare payments. This is 100% taxation, and the social planners who dreamed this up forgot that a profit motive is a powerful thing. But under our system, you keep 50 cents out of every dollar you earn as you work your way out of poverty, and a welfare recipient who goes to work is better off than one who does not. It didn't take a genius to figure this out—which makes you wonder why it hasn't been suggested before."

But not only has this been "suggested before," it has been an integral part of Federal welfare law since 1967. In hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee, Dr. Alice M. Rivlin of the Brookings Institution—a former Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and an announced supporter of Family Assistance—says this about the Nixon plan: "It continues in the direction of the WIN program and other things that you have enacted before. There are no stronger incentives in this bill to go to work than we have now, in terms of the amount of earnings which can be kept by somebody who is on welfare and the conditions under which someone who is on the margin of working or not working can receive aid."

The argument that the 1967 WIN program has not had enough time to work properly is equally untenable. Well before the 1967 law, New York City had a program for welfare recipients offering work incentives more generous than those in either WIN or the Nixon plan. Of New York's 200,000 welfare families, exactly 235 worked their way off the welfare rolls in the two years of this huge demonstration project. At the same time, other families were joining the welfare rolls by the tens of thousands.

This is why Family Assistance represents, not a new approach to the welfare ills of our nation, but the institutionalization and expansion of present unsuccessful practices. The only "new" feature in FAP is the costly and unnecessary plan for income supplements to the working poor—precisely the group where no crisis whatsoever exists. According to a recent Census Bureau study, in the period 1959–68 the number of people in poor families headed by fathers declined from 27.5 million to 13.7 million. It is FAP's central failing that it directs most of its attention, most of its money, and most of its "reform" to a group of families rapidly leaving poverty behind with little or no Government aid.

This is why the American Conservative Union has opposed, and will oppose, the Nixon welfare plan: not because it represents true change, but because it institutionalizes the present system by putting 15 million more Americans under an obsolete structure that has already imprisoned 10 million. We protest Vice President Agnew's misstatement both of the present situation, and of the true issues underlying the continuing Congressional debate on welfare reform.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY, DÉTENTE, AND THE RAPACKI PLAN

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Mr. Julius Epstein, who is research associate at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, located at Stanford University, has requested that his article which appeared in the Central Europe Journal, special edition, February 1970, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In accordance with Mr. Epstein's request, I am submitting his article, entitled "President Kennedy, Détente, and the Rapacki Plan," at this time:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY, DÉTENTE, AND THE RAPACKI PLAN

(NOTE.—Julius Epstein was born in Vienna on December 26, 1901. After studying in Jena and Leipzig he fled from Hitler Germany on March 17, 1933 to Prague. During the Munich crisis he left Prague for Zurich and Paris and arrived in New York on March 9, 1939. Epstein worked in New York as foreign correspondent for Swiss newspapers. During the war he worked as editor for the Office of War Information. After the war, he again became American foreign correspondent for many West Germany newspapers. Since 1963, Epstein is affiliated as Research Associate with the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University, Stanford, California. He has just finished the first comprehensive history of postwar forced repatriation of millions of anti-Stalinist prisoners of war and displaced persons.)

(By Julius Epstein)

One of the most interesting episodes in President Kennedy's attempts to accommodate the Soviet Union in the interest of a permanent détente has never been reported to the American people. Its documentary evidence is locked up in the vaults which house the Kennedy Papers in the Department of State. While this episode is a well guarded secret in the U.S., it is no secret to the Germans and other European peoples. It dominated the front pages of the German press for more than four years. During that time, the German Supreme Court in Karlsruhe tried to find out who the traitor was who had leaked secret cables and telegrams by the German ambassador in Washington, Professor Dr. *Wilhelm Grewe*, and the German ambassador to NATO in Paris, *von Walther*, to the press. Not until the Supreme Court had discovered that nobody else had leaked the secrets but Chancellor *Konrad Adenauer* himself, did the court cease to investigate the affair, an investigation which had cost the Federal Republic of Germany hundreds of thousands of D-marks. It will always remain a major puzzle, why for more than three years not a single American newspaper reported a single line about this German affair, since it has occupied the German press and the Bundestag for so long a time.

THE DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

What is the essence of the documentary evidence?—On October 3, 1961, the American ambassador to NATO, *Thomas K. Finletter*, asked the German ambassador to NATO, *Herr von Walther*—on behalf of President Kennedy and his Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, how the Adenauer Government would feel if Washington would propose the creation of controlled, demilitarized zones within the territory of the Bundesrepublik.

Finletter's question greatly irritated Bonn. Ambassador von Walther could hardly believe that the United States was serious about such a proposal which meant nothing less than the destruction of NATO. According to Herr von Walther's telegram to the Bonn Foreign Office, Ambassador Finletter told him in response to his boundless astonishment that "one can only understand this proposal if one has recently been in Washington. The people in Washington obviously have ideas as if they were living on the moon. Things which are unequivocally clear to us in Europe, are not clear to them; they simply don't understand them." This was, of course, nothing but a polite "explanation" of the unexplainable imputation, advanced by Washington.

President Kennedy's instruction to Ambassador Finletter to ask the question about such implementation of the Rapacki plan, not only shocked Bonn but was immediately recognized as a *ballon d'essay* whose real meaning could only be the start of a sellout of West Germany. To evaluate the shock Bonn suffered, it must be remembered that it had been the officially declared policy of the Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy Administrations to consider the Federal Republic of Germany and its Chancellor Adenauer as the staunchest European allies and the most important foundation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO. Finletter's question indicated that Washington might now abandon this policy, so many times solemnly and publicly professed. Could it be true that Washington really wanted to embark upon such new policy in order to appease *Khrushchev*, a policy which would trade de-nuclearization of West Germany and renunciation of its active rôle within NATO for the pottage of some vague Khrushchev "guarantees" concerning Berlin?

The answer to this question has to be "yes." Kennedy had embarked upon an unprecedented course of appeasement of the Soviet Union without regard to the true interests of the Federal Republic of Germany as well as the U.S. Had he ever succeeded, he would have scuttled NATO, opened West Germany to Soviet conquest and also weakened the strategic position of the United States toward the Soviet Union.

This evolves from the documents in the possession of the Bonn Government. They show that President Kennedy had a long talk with the Soviet Union's Foreign Minister, *Gromyko*, part of which was held in the White House patio without the presence of an interpreter.

Foy Kohler, who later became the American ambassador in Moscow, reported on the Kennedy-Gromyko conversation on October 7, 1961, to the ambassadorial steering committee meeting at the Department of State. Kohler told the assembled ambassadors of Germany (*Grewe*), France (*Alphand*), United Kingdom (*Lord Hood*), who had met together with the spokesman of the Pentagon, *Nitze*, and the American ambassador to Moscow, *Thompson*, that the Kennedy-Gromyko talks proved to be in various respects "more detrimental than one had expected." As Foy Kohler reported, Gromyko had insisted "the German frontiers as they exist today must be legally formalized, including, of course, the Oder-Neisse line as the permanent German-Polish frontier, as well as the border between the two German states." As Kohler told the steering committee, Gromyko had said that "there is no reason whatsoever why the decision concerning the frontiers should not be made in an absolutely clear and formal way, independently from the question of a peace treaty."

Then, Gromyko repeated the well-known Soviet point of view that "both German states should be forbidden to have or to manufacture nuclear weapons or rockets. An agreement to this effect is in the interest of the United States as well as the Soviet Union and the other European peoples." Gromyko repeated Khrushchev's old demand according to which "revanchists and militarists must be deprived of any possibility to demand the revision of these frontiers." In addition, Gromyko repeated Khrushchev's sufficiently known proposals for the creation of a "Free City of West Berlin." Its status should be guaranteed by Ulbricht's so-called "German Democratic Republic." Besides this, the Soviet Union was ready "to guarantee" the "Free City," independent of the peace treaty. As Foy Kohler told the ambassadors, Gromyko immediately added that "naturally" the rights of West Berlin should not be allowed to cause any ill effect upon the interests of other states, including Ulbricht's East Germany. Kohler also reported Gromyko's demand that the guarantee of the rights of the "Free City of West Berlin" by the four powers should be valid only for "a specific period of time." Gromyko did not spell out what would happen in Berlin after the expiration of the four-power guarantee, e.g. in the case of an occupation of West Berlin by Khrushchev's puppet *Walter Ulbricht*. But he called his proposal the "best solution possible."

According to Kohler, Gromyko then broached the problem of West Berlin's relations to the Federal Republic of Germany. Gromyko categorically stated that any particular and separate connections cannot be recognized. All claims to such connections between West Berlin and the Federal Republic are "completely unfounded" and lack even the slightest foundation. This assertion of Gromyko's was of special interest since it was new as the idea of the limitation of the four-power guarantee for the "Free City of Berlin." Up to the day of Gromyko's conversation with President Kennedy, neither Khrushchev nor Gromyko had ever mentioned any time limit of the four-power guarantees for West Berlin, nor any limitations of West Berlin's relation to the Federal Republic of Germany. On the contrary: Khrushchev had always asserted that the "Free City of West Berlin" should be completely at liberty to form her own relations with the external world, including the Federal Republic.

At this juncture, the President declared that "the problem of Berlin and Germany was too narrow a basis" and he stated his desire to include questions of European security. Gromyko, according to Foy Kohler's report to the ambassadors, was elated by this statement and expressed his immediate consent.

The documentary evidence shows what Gromyko had in mind when he accepted the President's suggestion to include questions of European security in the talks about Berlin and West Germany. Gromyko wanted an American agreement along the following lines:

(1) A non-aggression pact between the NATO nations and the nations of the Warsaw pact. This could be, as Gromyko said, "the topic of meaningful discussions."

(2) The abolition of military bases on foreign soil.

(3) Withdrawal or reduction of foreign troops of NATO and the Warsaw pact countries.

(4) The gradual withdrawal of troops.

(5) The best protection against aggression would be to forbid West and East Germany to have any strong armies with modern weapons but only a militia with light weapons, sufficient for the maintenance of order.

(6) Creation of nuclear- and rocketfree zones in Europe in which no such weapons would be manufactured or stationed. The idea, first proposed by *Rapacki*, did not find an echo in the West, as Gromyko said. However, the Soviet Union strongly supports it. The nuclear- and rocketfree zones must include Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Federal Republic of Germany and the "DDR." Gromyko assured the President that such implementation of the Rapacki plan would have the most salutary effect upon the whole world.

Concluding, Gromyko said that it was by no means necessary to unify his proposals into a single "package" with the problem of Germany. However, Gromyko stressed the necessity to bring the second world war to a legal end. Therefore, a peace treaty must be concluded; the problem of West Berlin must be solved on the basis of this peace treaty. The Soviet Union would also be willing—should the West so desire—"to combine the discussion of the German problem with the discussion of European security and to discuss such problems of European security which could lead to appropriate solutions."

As Foy Kohler now reported, President Kennedy thanked Mr. Gromyko for his exposition and said that "precise definitions" are required for the further progress of the dialogue. The President informed Gromyko that ambassador *Thompson* would soon return to Moscow where he would like to continue the bilateral talks. And Mr. Kennedy added that after the emergence of a common basis among the four Western allies (including the Federal Republic of Germany) an East-West dialogue of the four powers (U.S., U.K., France and the U.S.S.R.) should take place. The President remarked that he was aware that the allies of the Soviet Union were also "involved". The President than discussed the meaning of the word "compromise" which presupposes the will to relent on both sides. He pointed out that the Berlin situation and the West's right to free access to the city were results of the second World War. The United States wants to be sure that her position in Berlin would not be weakened. He believed that a good compromise would be that both parties create a clear and stable situation. He said it was hard to believe that the Soviet proposals really meant a compromise. The reasons were the following:

"AN ORCHARD FOR AN APPLE"

(1) The Soviets proposed the garrisoning of Soviet troops in West Berlin, while they consigned East Berlin to the "DDR".

(2) The new arrangement is supposed to be valid only for a limited period. According to the Soviets, there would first be negotiations about the Western rights, then these rights would be shared by the Soviets and finally validity of these rights would be limited. They would only be temporary rights. In this way, the rights would be curtailed.

(3) Likewise, the acceptance of the Soviet proposals concerning the frontiers would just represent a Western concession.

(4) The same goes for the demand of recognition of the partition of Germany, the acceptance of two German states and the "sovereignty" of East Germany. All that means giving up something. That is the opposite of reunification of Germany.

(5) The prohibition of nuclear weapons for Germany is no compromise either. Up to now, the United States alone disposed of NATO's nuclear arsenal. In his (Kennedy's) eyes, all this is no compromise. The Soviet Union obviously wants "an orchard for an apple." Her proposals serve only the interests of the Soviet Union. She wants that the West accept her proposals without being ready to reciprocate and meet the West's interests halfway. That means not a compromise but a retreat. It is now necessary to deliberate this with the allies. (Why the President considered it necessary to "deliberate" the very same Soviet proposals which he had clearly recognized as a "retreat," he did not say.)

Not satisfied with this, the President summarized once more the points which he considered to be a deterioration rather than an improvement:

(1) The time-limit of the troop contingents. (2) The stationing of Soviet troops in West Berlin. (3) Recognition of the "DDR" frontiers. (4) Perpetuation of the partition of Germany by recognition of the sovereignty of the "DDR". (5) West Germany's renunciation of reunification of Germany.

After the President's re-enumeration of Gromyko's proposals, Gromyko said that the Soviet proposals nevertheless represent a positive answer, at least in two points to which the West has always ascribed great importance, namely:

(1) Concerning the freedom, meaning the sociological structure of Berlin; (2) Concerning the access.

Gromyko repeatedly stated that Kennedy completely failed to recognize the fact that the Soviet position on these two points means a "positive" answer; that he should pay more attention to this fact. The "symbolical" troop contingents in West Berlin are the solution. They are the only possible solution of the problem. Both sides are agreed on this point. Then, Gromyko stressed again that the frontier problem must soon be solved. "To solve this problem, is not difficult." Gromyko agreed with Kennedy that the discussions of the bilateral talks should be continued by Thompson. "If both parties want a solution, an agreement will be possible".

President Kennedy admitted that the difficulties resulted from the geographical position of Berlin and that this was the reason for Eisenhower and Khrushchev to characterize the situation as "abnormal". However, neither he nor Khrushchev had created this situation in 1945. Now, the question is, how the freedom of the city and the access to Berlin can be secured. If the United States should participate in the regulation, there must be real guarantees. Berlin should not become an empty shell. The President expressed his hope that an agreement concerning the definition of the "freedom" of Berlin could be reached and one has to see how this goal can be achieved. After that, the problem of the frontiers could be examined.

BONN IRRITATED

These remarks, as reported by Foy Kohler to the ambassadorial steering committee, especially Kennedy's remarks about the "frontiers" irritated Bonn. They were immediately interpreted by Bonn as an indication of Kennedy's willingness to discuss the question of the Oder-Neisse frontier.

Foy Kohler reported that the President then took Mr. Gromyko to the patio of the White House where they continued the conversation for another ten minutes. During that time, no interpreter was present. According to Kohler's report, nothing new was added. Gromyko again emphasized the importance of an agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States as well as the importance of the Soviet "concessions", whereupon the President replied that the United States could not afford a setback. He understood that the presence of Soviet troops in West Berlin would be the sign of such a setback.

Kohler then gave the following comment: The series of talks had the effect of making the Soviet Union aware of the dangers. The warning had "arrived". It is now up to the West to remain adamant. The time factor had become a little more fluid. One had not yet entered into the phase of negotiating positions. It would now be desirable to clarify the question whether or not a basis for negotiations had been achieved to prevent the Soviet Union from unilaterally impairing the existing situation. Besides, one would have to get rid of "this thing concerning Soviet troops in West Berlin". "We are selling Germany down the river."

Charles Bohlen, who also participated in the deliberations of the ambassadorial steering committee, remarked that some points had become clearer: The Soviets thought of a Four-Power Conference without the "DDR". The stationing of symbolical troops in West Berlin, suggested by the Soviets as a remedy, represents an "absolutely rigid position"; the frontier questions turned out to be a quid pro quo. There was no more such talk about the sovereignty of the "DDR".

Ambassador *Grewe* (Federal Republic of Germany) interjected whether he had correctly understood that the U.S. had already entered into a "second round". Taking up this question, ambassador *Alphand* (France) asked Mr. Kohler whether the President had already made a binding agreement about the continuation of the bilateral U.S.-Soviet talks by ambassador Thompson. Kohler answered Grewe's and Alphand's questions in the affirmative. He added that "one would like to know" what the other Governments thought of it.

Mr. Nitze, representing the Department of Defense, said that the further course of the discussion would now depend upon the way one would continue the contingency planning and the military arrangements. Ambassador Grewe, keen of hearing, perceived this remark as a warning, addressed to Bonn. He envisioned all the possibilities to be hidden under the term "contingency planning" and "military arrangement". Kohler used the opportunity to point out that the President was disturbed by news dispatches from Germany and France which reported that "we are selling Germany down the river". The President does not understand how such an interpretation was possible. Each Government represented at the table knew exactly as much as the American Government. Grewe replied that this was reciprocal. As long as the speculation in the Western press continues as in this past, it is impossible to prevent such reactions.

ENTER LORD HOOD

Now, *Lord Hood* took the floor. He stated that one has to examine which line should be pursued concerning the following problems:

(1) Status of Berlin and guarantee of access. (2) Frontiers. (3) Nuclear armament.

Lord Hood proposed to discuss the following problems: How an "agreement" could be arrived at; which form it should have; how it should be incorporated into a peace treaty between the Soviet Union and the "DDR" and how the negotiations should be conducted. Kohler said that the dialogue showed that a Four-Power Conference should be possible without participation of the "DDR".

The French ambassador Alphand expressed his grave doubts that the statement about the non-participation of the "DDR" was correct. He based his doubts upon the fact that Gromyko had repeatedly referred to the "allies of the Soviet Union". Alphand raised the question whether the Thompson talks in Moscow should be conducted on the basis of agreements between the four powers or whether they would rather be a continuation of the bilateral talks "without mandate." Alphand recalled that General *de Gaulle* had declared that, after preliminary inquiries, a decision about further proceedings should be made. Should Thompson go deeper into the substance in his talks with Gromyko, he would certainly lack any mandate from the four powers. Foreign Minister *Rusk*, too, had a guidance for his conversations with Gromyko.

When Alphand observed that the price asked by the Soviets seemed to be rather high, Foy Kohler replied that it was the "opening price". The goal of the exploratory talks had been to explore the possibility of negotiations. Now, certain outlines became visible. When Alphand said that he was unable to see them, Kohler asserted that he, too, did not see any basis and that he had never maintained that there was one, but nevertheless, certain outlines became visible.

Ambassador Grewe suggested to undertake a common interpretation of those "outlines". Kohler expressed his confidence that the East-West dialogue would yield "some kind of modus vivendi". If the price seems to be too high, one should try to lower it. Where vagueness appears, one has to ask questions.

Lord Hood's remarks on the position of the British Government, made on October 6, 1961, had the immediate effect of greatly irritating Bonn. They were nothing but outspoken appeasement of the Soviets. Lord Hood did not hesitate to inform the steering committee that her Majesty's Government's (Macmillan) position was the following one:

(1) The "next step" must be the agreement between the Western Governments. Such agreement should be the "basis of further proceedings". Ambassador Grewe said that President Kennedy saw fit even to wait for such an "agreement"; he preferred to prejudice further talks with Gromyko by his suggestion that Thompson should continue the talks in Moscow. Lord Hood did not object to this procedure in the committee's session of October 7, 1961. Instead, he made it clear that he agreed with the continuation of the purely bilateral talks. The French ambassador Alphand who, in accordance with de Gaulle's policy, shared the German point of view, suggested—in contrast to Lord Hood—to ignore the American-Soviet dialogue.

(2) As Lord Hood made it clear in his exposition of the British position, the British were very eager to see to it that "more substance" be introduced into the Moscow talks. Ambassador Grewe remarked that this would be a transition from purely "exploratory" discussions toward direct negotiations, a practice which he euphemistically called "questionable".

(3) Now, Lord Hood suggested that the demand for unification of Germany be substituted by a formula, expressing only "hope" for the "eventual reunification". Grewe declared this proposal as completely "unacceptable". The proposal is unacceptable for the Germans, Grewe said, because it would mean that the West yielded not only in the sphere of practical-technical arrangements concerning the control of access, the strength of the troop contingents, etc., but also concerning the pure essence of the German problem.

(4) Since Lord Hood spoke of the "retention of general relations of West Berlin with the West", ambassador Grewe wanted to know whether or not this formula would include the relations to the Federal Republic of Germany. Even if so, Lord Hood's formula would be unsatisfactory because it would exclude the future incorporation of West Berlin into the Federal Republic. It would take away from the Berliners any hope for reunification. All that would remain would be the view toward the "Free City".

(5) Lord Hood had spoken of the "reliable Soviet guarantees" which were needed. (As if there could be such "reliable Soviet guarantees" after the experience of forty-four years of Bolshevism!) Grewe wanted to know whether the Western rights should now be based upon a new treaty. He reminded the meeting of the Geneva Conference, 1959, where one was agreed that the only question was recognition and confirmation of the Western occupation rights.

(6) Ambassador Grewe—and also Bonn—irritated by Lord Hood's demand to "respect the authority of the Government in East Germany". The effect on Bonn was that of an ice cold shower since Lord Hood's proposal came very near, as ambassador Grewe euphemistically stated, to "de-facto recognition".

(7) In the same vein, Lord Hood did not leave any doubt whatsoever that the recognition of the Oder-Neisse frontier must be presupposed as self-evident. Whether the Lord was aware of the fact that recognition of the Soviet occupied zone's frontiers implied a de jure recognition of the perpetual partition of Germany, is unknown. On the basis of Lord Hood's quoted remarks as well as on the basis of pure logic, it must be taken for granted.

II

This, then, is the record. The diplomatic reports came to light in an article by this author which appeared under the headline: "The Source of the Evil: A Documentation Concerning the Genesis of the German-American Discord" in the *"Rheinischer Merkur"* of August 31, 1962. The Article was reprinted by *"Der Spiegel"* of September 12, 1962.

A few days after the appearance of the article in "Rheinischer Merkur", the West German Foreign Minister, *Gerhard Schroeder* instructed the German Supreme Court in Karlsruhe to bring a charge against the "unknown" traitor of state secrets. The Supreme Court's investigation lasted about three years. Then, the Supreme Court stopped the investigation, satisfied that no one else but Chancellor Adenauer himself had leaked the secret documents to an American citizen whose name I still do not feel free to reveal.

However, with the exception of the identity of the American who handed me the photostatic copies of the cables and telegrams to the German Foreign Ministry, I can now reveal for the first time the dramatic and sensational story my informer told me on March 25, 1962, a story which he repeated in the presence of a third person on April 16 of that year.

THE "EPSTEIN AFFAIR" EXPLODES

The American whom I will call Mr. X, visited Chancellor Adenauer on October 8 or 9, 1961 in the Chancellor's home at Rhoendorf. Also present was Adenauer's State Secretary, Dr. *Globke*. During Mr. X.'s visit, a messenger arrived by motorcycle and handed Adenauer the just decoded dispatches from ambassadors Grewe and von Walther. Adenauer read them, was visibly shocked and handed them to Mr. X, for his opinion. Mr. X. said he would like to take the papers to his hotel to study them overnight, so he could give the Chancellor his opinion the next morning. Adenauer agreed.

Mr. X. left Rhoendorf, took a taxi and drove to Duesseldorf (about forty-five miles) where he entered the Mannesmann office where he went straight into the photostat room to which he had the key. There, he made photostatic copies of all the documents, given to him by the Chancellor, and raced back to Bonn, arriving early in the morning. He unmade his unused bed, so that Dr. Globke who was due any minute, would not be suspicious. A few minutes later, Dr. Globke arrived, retrieved the original documents and took Mr. X. to Adenauer's Bonn offices in the Schaumburg Palais.

After having talked to Adenauer, Mr. X. went straight to the American Embassy and handed one set of the photostatic copies to the American ambassador to Bonn, Mr. *Dowling*. Ambassador Dowling was grateful to Mr. X. because he realized that the possession of the clear text of the decoded telegrams and cables most certainly would enable the C.I.A. to break the German code.

Neither the German Supreme Court at Karlsruhe nor the German press ever dealt with this aspect of the affair, although it was clear from the beginning that Adenauer must have reckoned with the probability of the breaking of the German code.

During the long time of the Supreme Court's proceedings against "unknown", innumerable questions were asked of the Bonn Government. Especially the Social Democrats asked time and again why it took so long to find out who had leaked the documents "to Epstein". The Government always answered in an evading way, most of the time just stating that the investigation was difficult and would need more time. During that time, the *"Epstein Affair"*—as it was called throughout Europe—was an almost daily feature on the front pages of the German press. Nobody could as yet explain how it was possible that the American press never did print a single line about it. This fact, hard to believe in an age of electronic communications, forces one to draw certain conclusions regarding the efficiency of American foreign correspondents.

On August 4, 1965, after the Supreme Court had stopped investigating the "Epstein Affair", "Der Spiegel" published an article under the title "Everybody's Duty". It was a review of the whole affair which had shaken the Bonn Republic for so long a time. I quote the following parts of the "Spiegel's" article:

"The Epstein Report aroused Bonn and affected deeply the confidence of the Kennedy Administration in the loyalty of its German partner. Called to account before the German Bundestag, Foreign Minister Gerhard Schroeder outlined the circle of potential Epstein informants. He enumerated the people to whom the pertinent telegrams were accessible and did not forget to mention Chancellor Adenauer, 'who as you know, determines the guiding political principles of the Federal Republic'.

"The Federal Attorney General, instructed by Gerhard Schroeder to investigate, overlooked this intimation. Instead, the Supreme Court interrogated almost all the officials working in the German embassies in Washington and at NATO in Paris as well as the experts and assistants in Bonn's Foreign Ministry.

"The minutes of this investigation grew bigger and bigger. The Social-Democrats in the Bundestag who represented the opposition to Adenauer's coalition government of the CDU/CSU and FDP parties, became impatient. Months after months, the Social-Democrats asked about the status of the Epstein investigation.

"Not until July of last year (1964) had the investigators a hunch where Epstein's source may have been: In the Chancellor's Palais Schaumburg or in the offices of the chairman of the CDU/CSU parliamentary club, *Heinrich von Brentano* who was at that time seriously ill and died in November 1964.

"The Attorney General hesitated to approach former Chancellor Adenauer. The official reason was that Adenauer's parliamentary immunity prohibited his involvement in the Court's investigation. Adenauer had spoken in connection with the 'Spiegel Affair' of an 'Abyss of treason'. To ask the Bundestag now to lift Adenauer's immunity appeared much too risky.

"Therefore, the Attorney General asked Chancellor *Erhard* to assist him by asking Adenauer. However, Adenauer could no longer remember the details: Either he himself had given the secret documents to his American Public Relations adviser General *Julius Klein* or had asked Brentano to do so.

"At that time Julius Epstein was working in the Washington offices of Julius Klein. However, the Epstein articles did not appear before he was dismissed by Klein in the summer.

"Adenauer justified the indiscretion by stating that the allied deliberations, reported in the secret cables and telegrams had not only endangered the well-being and the security of the Federal Republic, but also German-American relations. Therefore, he had given the documents to a prominent American for appropriate use in conversations with American politicians. This was the only way to stop the intrigue going on behind the scenes. This was in the interest of the Federal Republic as well as of the United States.

"After this explanation, Erhard invited the three chairmen of the parliamentary clubs in the Bundestag (SPD, FDP, and CDU/CSU). Erhard took them into his confidence and they promised never again to ask any questions.

"The Federal Attorney, too, respected Adenauer's motives. Adenauer had given away secrets about which he alone could dispose as supreme 'bearer of state secrets' ('Geheimnisherr') in order to prevent imminent harm to the Bundesrepublik, the leaked secrets could not have been state secrets.

"Material state secrets are forbidden to be revealed; their essential criterion is the fact that their release would result in great harm to the Federal Republic. Since Adenauer, by his action, had prevented harm to the Bundesrepublik, the leaked secrets could not have been state secrets.

THE ADENAUER DENIAL

"Finally, Adenauer acted true to his oath to prevent harm to the German people. And that, the State Secretary for Justice said, is 'everybody's duty'."

A week after this article had appeared in "Der Spiegel", on August 11, 1965, the magazine ran a second one on the "Epstein Affair". The title was "Everybody's Duty II". This second article dealt with Adenauer's reaction to the article of August 4, 1965 with its sensational revelations.

"Der Spiegel" reported that Chancellor Adenauer had completely and categorically denied all the facts reported by the magazine. The same was true of the deputy federal press information officer, *Werner Krueger*. Besides, Adenauer instructed his assistant, Senior Civil Servant *Selbach* to declare "that he was neither directly nor indirectly the source of Epstein". "Der Spiegel" continued: "In reality Adenauer had admitted, as can be seen by his deposition, now in the possession of the General Attorney, that either he himself had given the documents to General Klein or that this was done at his behest by Brentano.

"Adenauer's denial was intended to hush up the unique case in Germany's judicial history that a Federal Chancellor had watched for almost three years the Supreme Court investigate, while he himself was the source of the very leak to be investigated.

"The truth became known last year, after the Attorney General *Martin* had reported to the Minister of Justice, Dr. *Ewald Bucher*, that all traces in the investigation of the 'Epstein Affair' led to three gentlemen: *Adenauer, von Brentano* and the then Secretary of State in the Chancellor's office, *Globke*. The Attorney General wanted the Government to give permission to the Chancellor, Brentano and Globke to testify.

"To grant permission met with difficulties, since Adenauer and Brentano were protected as members of parliament. Besides, Globke's taciturnity was a well established fact. The retired Globke told 'Der Spiegel': 'I refuse to give any information about this affair. It does not make any sense to dilate upon these things'.

"Not before spring 1965—Heinrich von Brentano had died in November 1964—was a legal way found to get authentic information with the help of Chancellor *Ludwig Erhard* who, as reported in Der Spiegel of last week, was requested to ask his precursor in office.

"Deputy press chief Krueger denied everything and declared that there was no discussion at all between Adenauer and Erhard about the affair, an allegation never made by Der Spiegel.

"The truth was that Ludwig Erhard, at the request of the new Minister of Justice *Weber* (Bucher had in the meantime resigned because of the new law extending the statute of limitation for Nazi criminals) had written to Adenauer and had asked him in his letter about the 'Epstein Affair'. Adenauer's written answer was conveyed to the Attorney General.

"Krueger also denied the Spiegel's report that the three chairmen of the parliamentary parties had been taken into Ludwig Erhard's confidence concerning the progress of the Epstein investigation as well as that they had promised to keep silent and never again to ask any questions. To this denial, the SPD deputy Mueller-Emmert, who himself had orally asked the Federal Government a question which he had withdrawn after Chancellor Erhard's intervention, remarked: 'The denial is a monstrosity'.

"In reality, Bucher, at the request of the Federal Chancellor informed the leadership of his own FDP parliamentary club as well as the chairman of the SPD deputies, *Fritz Erler*. Bucher: Before I could mention a name, Fritz Erler said: 'Adenauer'. Bucher could not remember who Erler's informant had been.

"Bucher declared to Der Spiegel last week: 'One cannot legally blame Konrad Adenauer. The leak of a secret by the chief of Government is a political event, but not a criminal fact.'"

III

THE REST IS SILENCE—ALMOST

The "Epstein Affair", as documented in this article, represents an unique case in the history of Government affairs. While the Chief of Government solemnly denies any knowledge or participation in the affair, some of the highest officials admit Adenauer's participation and the Supreme Court stops a three-year old investigation after it had been satisfied that Adenauer himself was the only source of the leak.

In order to ascertain the accuracy of the Spiegel presentation, I wrote to Spiegel's informants, former State Secretary in the Ministry of Justice, *Buelow*, former Minister of Justice, Bucher, former Chancellor Ludwig Erhard, as well as to former Minister of Justice, Gustav Heinemann.

Professor Dr. *A. Buelow* answered in a letter of March 11, 1968. He wrote that he regretted not to be able to help me. Then he added: "As you will see from the letterhead, I have already been retired. The information you expect could only be given in an official capacity, if it would be possible at all. I could never give this information because I am still bound by secrecy regulations."

Buelow's letter raised several questions. I therefore, wrote him a second letter under the date of April 24, 1968 from which I quote the following parts: "You write that you participated in the affair 'only in your official capacity.' I have therefore to assume that you acted in your official capacity when Der Spiegel referred to you as the source of its information." (Spiegel, August 4, 1965)

"Since you informed the Spiegel in your official capacity, I do not understand why it should now be impossible to confirm or to deny an action which you allegedly performed in your official capacity. When Adenauer denied everything the Spiegel had written, he implicitly accused you of having given wrong information to Der Spiegel. I can understand that you kept silent about this frightful insinuation. That you should still keep silent is rather hard to understand. One day, when German historians, too, will deal with this affair, the documentary evidence in the possession of the Ministries for Foreign Affairs and Justice as well as of the Bundesgerichtshof in Karlsruhe, will see the light of day. As you know, nobody in Germany and abroad ever believed Adenauer's denial. The SPD Bundestag deputy Mueller-Emmert called the official denial of the Spiegel report, issued on the behest of Erhard, 'a monstrosity'."

Buelow answered my letter on May 20, 1968. In his answer he wrote: "You obviously assume that the total article (Spiegel, August 4, 1965) has been based upon the information which I must have given to Spiegel. This assumption, however, is not correct. When the suspension of the investigation became known, an editor of Der Spiegel visited me and said that he had already prepared an article, dealing with the suspension. He just wanted to learn my judicial opinion on how the suspension can be justified. Whereupon I explained in a *completely abstract* way that the bearer of secrecy (Geheimnistraeger) has the right to release secrets if he decides that this is in the higher interest of the state in order to prevent harm. But no name was ever mentioned who came in question as the 'bearer of secrecy'."

"The Spiegel article shows that the editor had interspersed my purely abstract judicial comments. The article quotes me three times. The magazine did this without my knowledge and consent. The editor told me that my opinion was only of theoretical interest to him as background material. I had no influence upon the way in which my judicial exposition had been used in the article. After the article appeared, I considered a protest against the use of my jurisprudential explanations. I also intended to protest the manner in which this was done. However, for reasons which had nothing to do with the subject itself, I abandoned this idea.

"I again stress the fact that the article has not been based upon my information. The best proof that this is so must be seen in the fact that I have never been accused of any violation of my official duty not to divulge an official secret (*Amtsverschwiegenheit*). I would have exposed myself to such an accusation if I had acted in any other way. You will now understand that I never felt hurt when the denial by the former Federal Chancellor appeared. Besides, that denial had no bearing upon the judicial arguments. I believe that I have cleared up in this letter your error concerning my role in relation to the article."

Professor Buelow's letter did not convince me. Especially unconvincing is the argument that the fact that Buelow has never been tried by the Government for indiscretion proves that he had never committed one. The Adenauer Government must have been well aware that any prosecution of Buelow would certainly have stirred up a hornet's nest of revelations which would only have proved the Adenauer's official denial of any knowledge or participation in the "Epstein Affair" was nothing but a lie. The Government could have no interest in having this fact documented in any public proceedings against Buelow. It was this fear alone which prevented the Adenauer Government from prosecuting any officials who had informed Der Spiegel. I then wrote to the Minister of Justice, Dr. *Gustav Heinemann*, today's President of the Federal Republic of Germany. I sent Mr. Heinemann copies of the two Spiegel articles as I had sent them to Mr. Buelow and others. I asked the same questions: whether the Spiegel presentation was correct or not. I also asked the Minister of Justice whether I could have access to the documentary evidence in the possession of the Ministry of Justice.

Dr. Heinemann answered my letter of April 18, 1968 on May 28, 1968. He wrote: "I regret to inform you that the prerequisites under which ministerial documents are accessible to scholarly research now or in the foreseeable future do not apply to the events you are interested in as explained in your letter of April 18, 1968".

On March 4, 1968, I had already written to Ex-Chancellor Dr. *Ludwig Erhard* and had submitted the same request to him. Since I did not receive any answer, I wrote again on April 25, 1968. On May 20th Erhard answered my letter. I quote the following parts: ". . . although I have nothing to hide, but on the contrary, want to serve the truth, I am in no position to say whether the Spiegel presentation correctly describes the development of events."

"There are no documents at my disposal, nor have I personally and subsequently dealt with the events which occurred during the Chancellorship of Konrad Adenauer. I can only say that I had no discussion about this topic with Federal Chancellor Adenauer and that I had not informed the three chairmen of the parliamentary parties, at least not personally, about the status of the investigations and negotiations. I am sorry that I am for reasons of objectivity not in the position to give you any further information or confirmations."

Erhard denied what the Spiegel had never asserted: That he had *talked* to Adenauer. The Spiegel had reported that Erhard had written to Adenauer. This, Erhard did not deny, a fact which amounts to confirmation, albeit an indirect one. Erhard then states that he "had not informed the three chairmen . . . *at least not personally*." This ambiguous statement must be interpreted that he *did* inform the three party chairmen although not *personally*, a fact which is immaterial.

On March 6, 1968 I wrote to former Minister of Justice *Bucher* a letter almost identical with those I had written to Erhard, Buelow and Heinemann. Bucher's answer, dated March 22, 1968, distinguishes itself from all the answers I had received from the other high officials. Former Minister of Justice Bucher wrote:

"I regret to say that I am even as retired Minister unable to give information about events about which I had received information in my official capacity. However, I do believe that I am not violating my secrecy duty if I express *my* opinion that the presentations in 'Spiegel' of 4th and 11th August 1965 are essentially correct."

Bucher's letter was the *first* and *only admission* by a former Minister of Justice who was involved in the affair that the Spiegel's presentation was "essentially correct."

The year 1968 saw the publication of the fourth volume of Adenauer's memoirs. The volume covers the years 1959–1963. I checked the volume and especially the subject and name indices. There is no reference to the "Epstein Affair" in the volume. Nor does Adenauer deal with the "Spiegel Affair" in his memoirs.

A TRIBUTE TO BORGER, TEX.

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the city of Borger, a dynamic community in the 18th Congressional District of Texas, has been selected by Look magazine as an All-America City.

In my judgment, this tribute was a richly deserved one, for Borger, Tex., exemplifies the traditional qualities that have made our Nation great. The municipal government is dedicated to meeting community needs and providing community services rather than merely perpetuating its own existence. Local businesses strive to succeed within the guiding principles of private enterprise, rather than relying on the Federal Government as a commercial security blanket. Residents of Borger have a community spirit and pride which is singularly lacking in so many of our Nation's cities.

Taken together, the attitudes of Borger's government, its businesses, and its people, provide a creative combination which has been forcefully and directly brought to bear on community problems. As a result, Borger, Tex., has literally pulled itself up by its own bootstraps. It is a self-made community in the finest sense of the term. I am proud to represent the city and its people in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I insert in the RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues, the comments that Look magazine made about this award-winning city:

BORGER, TEX.—FROM BUST TO BIRTH PANGS IN THE PANHANDLE

Sometimes the concern of a whole nation can be found in the palm of a man's hand. In Borger, Texas, Warren Acker, manager of the world's largest carbon-black plant, stands at a conference table holding a small glass vial containing powdery black pellets. He unscrews the cap, drops one pellet on a clean white sheet of paper and carefully closes the vial. "This is carbon, or 'furance black,'" he explains. "It's extracted from boiling petroleum gas and used in making rubber." With one index finger, Acker crushes the pellet and spreads a black film across the paper and the palm of his other hand. "When you realize we produce over 300 million pounds of these pellets a year, you see the job we face keeping our plant and Borger clean."

There was a time when no such demonstration of industrial dirtiness would have been necessary in Borger, a rowdy town that popped up on the north Texas plains as soon as oil and gas were discovered in 1926. Once, 16 carbon-black plants, in addition to oil and gas refineries there, were belching dark fumes and rotten odors. "I just couldn't believe the dirt that rained down on the streets and windowsills and cars," says Mrs. Charles Cooley, who came here in 1943 and is now the peppy Women's Division president of the Chamber of Commerce. "No one dared buy a white rug."

Although Phillips Petroleum and J. M. Huber Corp., the two largest producers, were working on pollution control in the 1950's, their officials admit the big push to remove "those last few percentage points" did not come until Texas passed a clean-air law in 1967. "When the legal maximums of 125 to

175 micrograms per cubic meter came out, and our first tests showed 4,000 micrograms," says Acker, "we thought it was the end of the world." But by establishing Texas' first air-control zone and spending millions of dollars on glass filter bags, the companies cleared Borger's skies. Just complying with the regulations may not seem very All America—until you compare it with industrial foot-dragging elsewhere in Texas and the U.S. "After all," explains Acker quietly, "we live here too."

Far more important in recent years has been the civic cleanup by the citizens of Borger, a town whose attitude used to be reflected in the story of the barber who complained to a client about the dirty air. "If you don't like carbon money," said the man in the chair, "get out of town."

Borger boomed in the 1920's, sagged during the Depression, went bankrupt in 1940, boomed again with wartime industry, and in 1964, when automation appeared, began another period of declining population. "We faced unique problems," says Mayor Ed Lewis. "Unused Federal housing, declining school enrollment, a townful of empty shacks and storefronts. Paradoxically, income remained high and unemployment low, since people who lost jobs just picked up and left. What made you blue was the feeling Borger was still not here to stay."

Borger decided to shrug off the past. Over 900 citizens attended meetings to revamp the school system, assigning unneeded buildings to imaginative projects like a senior citizens' center in the midst of the community. Women's groups started a day-care center in empty FHA apartments. While on strike, laborers helped remodel a ranch house for homeless girls. Businessmen joined the city in removing over 250 deteriorated buildings and have attracted three new industries.

Today, Borger has a downtown shopping mall, where once stood flophouses, poolrooms and bars.

EDUCATION INEQUITIES FOUND IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the "separate and unequal" conditions existing in apartheid South Africa continue. A news article that appeared March 1, 1970, in the New York Times reveals that a severe gap exists in South Africa between the educational opportunities available for black and white students.

Black schools reportedly are overcrowded, have very high dropout rates, are staffed by unskilled teachers who must work with inferior facilities, and these schools are often too costly for poor black African households to afford.

Today, when education is becoming increasingly important, it is indeed an outrageous situation when children are deprived of that essential education solely because of the color of their skin.

The Times story follows:

SCHOOL GAP FOUND IN SOUTH AFRICA—UNLIKE WHITES, BLACKS PAY FOR CHILDREN'S BOOKS

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA, February 28.—A black African woman earning $192 a year as a domestic servant pays $90 a year to keep her four children in school.

When schools opened last fall, thousands of black African pupils were turned away because there was no place for them.

An examination of the black school system in South Africa indicates a wide gap between official doctrine—"separate but equal" societies for the races under apartheid—and the reality of education for the black majority.

Black African schools are overcrowded, especially in urban areas where blacks go to work for the white man. Teachers are often badly qualified and teaching facilities rudimentary. The situation is improving but not nearly quickly enough, critics of the Government's education policy believe.

BLACKS PAY FEES

The average black African earns the equivalent of $44.80 a month, and many cannot afford the schooling provided by the Bantu Education Department.

Unlike other racial groups, black Africans pay for their children's text books, writing and handicraft materials, secondary school examination fees and sometimes registration and sports fees. Whites, Asians and coloreds, better able to afford the additional fees, pay few of them unless they send their children to private schools.

With too many pupils for too few schools, those who cannot afford the rising costs are consigned to illiteracy.

A recent survey in a township in coastal Port Elizabeth showed that black Africans pay a third to a half of their wages on educating their children.

Books alone cost about $10 for junior school pupils and $30 to $50 for high school pupils. One school principal said he insists his pupils buy books on the first day of term.

"I must do it because parents take too long to buy books for their children. Those who have no books create a problem at school."

VACANCIES IN HOMELANDS

Under the Government's "separate development" plan, black Africans are being encouraged to move from the cities to segregated tribal "homelands," where they are eventually to be granted limited autonomy. School building for blacks is therefore not being encouraged in white urban areas.

Officials say there are enough vacancies in homelands such as the Transkei for pupils unable to enroll in the cities. But black families often cannot afford travel costs.

The Government had more than 9,500 schools for the country's 13 million blacks in 1968, and school spokesmen said they were educating 78 percent of the school-age population.

Yet the dropout rate is so high that only 30 percent of the children are educated past the fourth school year. Although the number of high school graduates increased by 10 percent last year, the figure was still only 1,593 of a total school-age population of about 2.5 million. Only 65 qualified for entrance to one of the Government's segregated tribal university colleges.

Critics say the system is "bottom heavy" and concentrates mainly on eliminating outright illiteracy. They feel that adequate secondary education is needed if black community leaders are to be trained for the homelands.

FULL CURRICULUM SCARCE

Of the 9,500 schools for blacks in 1968, only 89 provided a full high school curriculum. There were seven technical secondary schools, 30 vocational-training schools and 34 teachers' colleges.

Of 31,705 black African teachers outside the Transkei homeland in 1968, 87 percent had not been graduated from high school.

An education commission backed jointly by the South African Council of Churches and the Christian Institute recently found that school children of all races are being taught that apartheid is the only acceptable policy for South Africa. There are about 3.5 million whites, compared with the 13 million blacks.

The commission, under the chairmanship of Raymond Tunmer, a senior education lecturer at Johannesburg's Witwatersrand University, criticized Government education for attempting to insure the continuation of racial division and the retardation of "processes of change within these groups."

The commission also criticized the authorities for "making the least privileged group pay to a large extent for their own education."

CORRECTING THE RECORD

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD an editorial in the Rocky Mountain News along with a copy of a telegram which the president of the Massachusetts Medical Society directed to the attention of the senior Senator from Massachusetts. The two items which appeared in the March 9 American Medical News are basically self-explanatory.

It is my hope that congressional committee staff work be more objective and accurate than was evident in the case of the special Senate Finance Committee staff report. Perhaps it is not asking too much to have individual Members of Congress require accurate reporting from their subordinates.

The material referred to, follows:

FEBRUARY 12, 1970.

Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The physicians of the Massachusetts Medical Society urgently request that you exert your influence to put into proper focus the role of the physician in the implementation of the Medicare and Medicaid programs and to determine whether or not there is a deliberate attempt to disparage physicians on a national level by continuous attacks on their integrity and dedication.

The publicity resulting from the release of the report of the Senate Finance Committee on Medicare and Medicaid is the most recent case in point.

We resent being singled out as being responsible for the financial faults of Medicare and Medicaid. We resent the implication that fraud by physicians is rife in these programs when in fact evidence of fraud by physicians is demonstrably small and insignificant in relation to the cost of the overall program. The evidence is that the great majority of physicians do not overcharge, are not abusing the program and are dedicated to making Medicare and Medicaid work.

We are discouraged. We dislike being scapegoats. We look to our statesmen in Congress to set the record straight, to let it be known that they have faith in the medical profession, and that the vast majority of physicians are honest and dedicated to providing high quality medical care to all persons.

JACOB H. FINE, M.D.,
President,
Massachusetts Medical Society.

[From the Rocky Mountain News]

CORRECTING THE RECORD

Last Saturday [Feb. 7] our Washington correspondent, Dan Bell, was given a special Senate Finance Committee staff report on

Medicare and Madicaid payments to Colorado doctors.

The names of the doctors were not disclosed. Instead, the doctors were identified by Blue Shield numbers. The report indicated that each number represented a single doctor.

One of these numbers indicated that one doctor in Colorado had received $326,262 in Medicare payments and an additional $39,526 for Medicaid, and another Colorado physician received $144,195 in Medicare and $30,740 in Medicaid.

The Rocky Mountain News published these figures in a page one article in Sunday's edition. We published them in the best of faith. While they are admittedly high figures, we were reminded that exceptionally high payments have been made by Medicare and Medicaid to some other physicians in other parts of the country.

Both Sen. Dominick and Sen. Allott were given to understand, just as we were, that these figures represented single, individual doctors.

Now it is revealed that the authors of the Congressional report were in error in indicating that these figures represented single doctors. Instead, the first set of figures reflected payments made to Colorado General Hospital and the second set to Denver General Hospital, representing in both cases services performed by a number of doctors.

This is what is always likely to happen when an effort is made to conceal information. Why were anonymous figures used instead of names? Certainly, if the report had stated that Colorado General and Denver General were recipients of Medicare and Medicaid payments we would have printed this.

After all, there is nothing whatever improper in hospitals and doctors receiving such payments; that's how the Medicare and Medicaid programs have been set up, as they should have been. There is no reason whatever for using numerals rather than letters in a report that is supposed to enlighten the public.

A number of physicians have written us to say that they have been offended by our Sunday article on the report. We sincerely regret this. We want the Medicare-Medicaid program to work, and it cannot work without the services of the competent physicians we are fortunate in having in Colorado.

If we were handling this article again, I think we would not rely so completely on the federal report, and turn to members of the Medical Society for their observations, if they are available.

UGANDA—THE TRIBES ARE RESTLESS HERE AGAIN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, although there seems to be more recent news on the Rhodesia story than that which appeared in Saturday's papers an attempt to make an honest evaluation of the facts makes last week's stories of interest to the House.

The lead story, of course, is that the so-called "emerging nations" of Africa are throwing their "one-man, one-vote" weight around in the United Nations organization to demolish civilization in Rhodesia. Not content with the British ostracism resolution, they want blood. It is not too difficult to guess that the blood would be American, as invasions from Tanzania and Zambia have failed, assaults from such ferocious powers as Guinea, Ghana, or Cameroon are a laugh, and the British seem disposed to fight Rhodesia only to the last American.

Speaking of Uganda, which has been under a state of emergency for 4 years—ever since one Obote declared himself President and threw out the Kabaka of the Baganda—the natives are still restless. It seems that recently, perhaps as a demonstration over the death of the Kabaka, someone tried to kill Obote. A month later the second most powerful commander of the army, one Okoya, was murdered.

The story is the same familiar African pattern. The Baganda are the most civilized and advanced of the tribes, but they are outnumbered by the Langi and the Acholi, who want what others have produced. Obote is a Langi and his army boss is an Acholi, who runs the military establishment largely by seeing to it that his noncommissioned officers are properly supplied with whiskey.

For us to give credibility to such a sideshow as the government of a civilized nation, while we spurn the truly civilized government of the Republic of Rhodesia, is almost unbelievable.

The great majority of the American people have indicated that they do not approve of such stupidity. We have a duty to remember who we represent. We represent the American people—not the tribal potentates of Africa even when they sit in the United Nations organization.

I include in my remarks the pertinent news clippings:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1970]

AFRICAN NATIONS BLOCK U.N. RHODESIA MOVE

UNITED NATIONS, March 6.—The African members of the U.N. Security Council sidetracked today a British call for nonrecognition of the newly declared Republic of Rhodesia.

L. S. Mulka, delegate from Zambia, derided such a move as inadequate in dealing with the situation posed by the rebel white minority regime in Rhodesia. He declared the council should not be content "with merely creating pinpricks for the rebels" in Rhodesia.

"It will be disastrous if this council would prefer to entertain peddling in rhetoric rather than putting an end to that regime," he added.

At the request of the African members the Council adjourned until Tuesday without taking action on a British resolution asking U.N. members to refrain from extending recognition to the regime in Salisbury, and again expressing condemnation.

Lord Caradon, the chief British delegate, pleaded for immediate council action on the resolution. But he and other members of the 15-nation council did not oppose the request for adjournment put forth by Mulka.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1970]

UGANDA PLOT THEORIES GROW WITH NEW ARREST

(By Jim Hoagland)

KAMPALA.—Uganda's police have finally developed their first promising lead in the attempted assassination last December of the country's shrewd and tough president, Milton Obote, according to sources close to the government.

But the reported arrest and interrogation this week of a Ugandan soldier have shed little new light on one of Africa's strangest whodunits in recent times.

The suspect, reportedly is not talking. Until he does, sources say, the government, which so far has declined to confirm the arrest, will say nothing about the case.

MANY QUESTIONS ARISE

Since a would-be assassin shot and wounded Obote in the jaw on Dec. 19, this pleasant and handsomely landscaped East African country has been a bundle of jitters and questions which reinforce each other.

The main questions are:

Was the attempt on Obote part of a high-level plot to overthrow his government?

Was the still unsolved murder a month later of the second most powerful commander in the army related to the attack on the President?

Are the increasingly apparent fissures in Uganda's security forces related to these crimes and can Obote still count on the loyalty of the army?

When will Obote initiate his next purge of his government, as some informed sources here think is inevitable?

TENSION IS EASING

Much of the overt, widespread tension that gripped the country immediately after the assassination attempt and caused an estimated 20 to 30 deaths of civilians shot or beaten to death by panicky soldiers seems to have disappeared.

"Everything is back to normal," Uganda's Vice President John K. Babiiha insisted an interview this week. "People carry on their daily lives like always."

When asked about the state of emergency that has been declared throughout the country Babiiha pointed out that emergency conditions had been in effect in Kampala for four years, since Obote took power, and "people have become accustomed to them. It is nothing."

But there are some little signs of the apprehension that ripples beneath the surface. While Ugandans and foreigners resident here still discuss most of their ideas openly, and with a vigor rare in Africa, they ask not to be quoted in print.

TRAVEL RESTRICTED

Foreign diplomats now cannot travel outside of Kampala's city limits without written permission from the government. At least 40 persons have been jailed in the wake of the attack on Obote and the murder of Army Brig. P. Y. Okoya and his wife Jan. 26. Many of the detainees are political opponents of Obote.

"The way the government has handled the investigation makes it pretty clear that they think only a small group was involved," said one informed observer. "So there is no general tension among the people. But I've never seen people in this government so worried, or so unsure about what is going to happen next."

These events have arrested much of the apparent progress Obote had made in bringing stability and unity to this Oregon-sized country of 8 to 10 million people which attracted world attention last year by serving as host for the visit of Pope Paul VI.

The assassination attempt has frozen all political activity. Parliament has not met this year. Obote's heralded "move to the left" has been quietly shelved for the time being. More importantly, the President has wrapped himself in a shell, from which he began to emerge only this week with a scheduled public appearance and a meeting with a church leader.

His cabinet members have told friends that Obote seems to be completely recovered from the attack but that he seems to be deliberately hiding his feelings and plans from all but two or three associates.

"The President calls in his ministers, very abruptly and businesslike goes over a few points, and then dismiss them," said one source.

TWO WERE RELEASED

Few details of the investigation have leaked out. It is known that two civilians were arrested at the scene of the attack on Obote but were released within 10 days when police became convinced they were not involved.

Most observers discount one of the theories voiced when Obote was shot—that it was the work of a member of the Baganda tribe, which still resents Obote for having ousted their traditional ruler, the Kabaka, in 1966.

The Kabaka died in exile in London a few weeks before the shooting and it was feared that Obote might have been the target of a revenge attack. "But the government certainly does not seem to believe that," said one observer, "for it has made no moves against the Baganda."

In fact, the Baganda, who inhabit the south of Uganda and who provide many of the country's most educated and sophisticated people, have "been playing a passive role in this whole thing," says one diplomat, "watching with some satisfaction the family dispute between the northern tribes that dominate the army."

OTHER THEORIES

Some observers theorize that there is a link between unrest in the army and the two recent crimes.

The Acholi tribe traditionally dominated Uganda's armed forces, with their northern neighbors and often rivals, the Langi and West Nile tribesmen, playing subordinate roles. Four years ago, however Obote, who is Langi, ousted the Acholi head of the armed forces and made Maj. Gen. Idi Amin, who comes from the West Nile Region, commander. Amin and Obote have long and close relationship.

Since then, Acholi officers feel they have been bypassed in promotions and recruitment while the government brings in more West Nile and Langi soldiers.

There is another split in the armed forces that some observers rate as even more serious than the tribal frictions. Amin, a tough, slow-talking paratrooper who joined the army through the ranks, runs the army through his noncommissioned officers.

PLAYS UP TO NCO

"He knows the first name and birthday of every NCO in the army," says an acquaintance, "and on the birthday, he sees that a bottle of whiskey is at the sergeant's house."

But many younger officers here are well educated and have received advanced training from British, Soviet, Czechoslovakian or Israeli advisers. They would like to "modernize" the forces. They see Amin and his ally, Obote, as roadblocks.

One theory on the assassination attempt is that a small group of these officers thought that, with Obote out of the way, Amin could be removed and the army reorganized. Their aim would not have been to take over power.

The murders of Okoya and his wife in their home in Gulu in northern Uganda, could fit into this theory, some observers say. Okoya was an Acholi and one of the few alternatives in the army to Amin. He could have been viewed as a threat to the status quo.

But there is nothing approaching unanimity on these theories. For one thing, Okoya is also thought to have been close to Obote. "All we know about the murder is that it was well planned, well executed and committed by someone who knew the brigadier's habits."

"Unless it was an individual personal attack, which most people here do not believe, "he continued," then it would appear that it might have been planned by someone with enough confidence that, with Obote out of the way, the government would automatically fall to him or them.

CABINET PURGE EXPECTED

Such a theory would point the finger of suspicion at someone in Obote's cabinet, although there is no evidence to support it. But the general expectation here is that Obote is getting positioned for a purge of the cabinet.

In any event, the 44-year-old President, who is rated by observers here as one of the shrewdest politicians in Africa and who has an ability to turn crisis to his advantage, seems to have weathered his most severe challenge.

He even appears to have gained sympathy among the Baganda, who formerly were his severest critics, and he has provided some reassurance to them and others here by not using the tense situation as an excuse for a general wave of terror.

But even those close to him admit that uncertainties as thick as the morning mists that now rise above this city of seven hills cloud Uganda's immediate future, said one responsible source.

NO SIGNS OF REVOLT

Despite these splits in the army, most observers here do not think an open break or revolt will develop. "The northern tribes' first interest is to retain their hegemony over the country. If they start quarreling too much, they could lose everything and they know it. They may go to the brink, but they will pull back," says one of the keenest analysts of Uganda affairs.

To many, the most puzzling aspect of the attack on Obote is the fact that nothing else happened. "If you apply Western logic to the situation, it does not make sense. Obote was in the hospital for several hours and out of touch. Yet there was no attempt to follow the textbook coup pattern, no attempt to take the radio station or armories," a diplomat notes.

SPEECH BY HUGH C. RIDDLEBERGER

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the role of the private school has been discussed pro and con for many years. Recently I had the pleasure of hearing a speech by Mr. Hugh C. Riddleberger, who will shortly be installed as headmaster of Landon School. I thought the speech was good in many ways, but it was particularly pertinent as to the proper role and function of the private school in the scheme of total education in the 20th century. The speech follows:

LANDON SCHOOL FATHERS' CLUB SPEECH

Mr. Brown, Mr. and Mrs. Banfield, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to be able to join you for this meeting of the Landon Fathers' Club and to be given the privilege of speaking on any topic I wish. I hope I have something to say of importance and most certainly I hope to expose enough of my thoughts so that you go away from here with some indication of what sort of a man your trustees have chosen to carry on the traditions of Landon.

Before getting into the substance of my talk, may I say honestly how frightened I am at the prospect of following Banny. I hope I will avoid using cliches in describing the stature of this man, but it is sufficient to say that I would be a fool to believe that I could equal his leadership and his achievements. However, I am thrilled to have the opportunity to lead such a spendid institution.

Let me go back to a question which was asked me by a trustee one night in late December. What is the future of the independent school and what are the things which we can identify which we are doing or ought to do if we are going to survive as healthy and contributing institutions?

You know your history as well as I do, and you know that for most of the years of this republic, college preparatory work has been performed by independent schools. The effect that this small number of schools has had upon public education is enormous, and particularly upon the college preparatory portion of the system. It is equally true that there are literally hundreds and hundreds of outstanding public schools which today are providing a solid college preparatory education for those students who wish to profit by it. We have no monopoly in this day and age on that phase of our work.

Yet from the standpoint of preparation for college, this is still one of the very valid reasons for our continuing. All by itself, I doubt that this would be reason enough but that's an individual matter. Good schools, such as Landon, provide the teaching, the curriculum, the standards which are highly pleasing to colleges the country over, and there is little doubt in anyone's mind that graduates of this school have a competitive edge over most of their public school counterparts. The emphasis on top-notch college preparation will continue.

But there are changes that are taking place and we will have to keep abreast of those changes, sifting out the undesirable and incorporating the good ideas. We are keenly aware that we don't know very much about how a child learns, but we are certain that now and in the future we are going to emphasize learning rather than teaching. There are many media which we have only begun to learn how to use and to understand the effect upon the learning process and these media will have to be examined mose closely. There is no question that there is a healthy growth in the humanities and alert teachers will have to keep in touch with this development. When examined closely, it is difficult to dispute the premise that the major disciplines spring into life when they are studied as inter-related subjects and not treated in the fragmented way of the past.

Though we pride oursevles on a liberal arts curriculum in which relevance is not our major concern, we must be very sensitive tc the part that relevance can play in some of our offerings. Such a case in point is the growth of ecology in our secondary curriculum. Many schools I know have been heavily involved in the creation of courses in ecology for at least two years, and the stimulation and the excitement engendered by this study are beginning to have a decidedly good effect upon college preparatory science programs. The additional excitement generated by the computer and its use in a variety of secondary school work, as well as elementary school work, is another development which adds to the exicting possibilities of our academic programs.

It is unfortunately true that courses in history, all too often, are deadly dull. We seem to cling to worn out methods and courses as though they were "holy writ". We are deeply disturbed by the failure of the young to understand the place of the past in the interpretation of the present. Of all the courses of study which permit opportunities for creative approaches to learning history is it. Independent schools have the chance of doing something better for their students and perhaps for all education and maybe even for society.

I can't hold you all night for you might impeach me before I even begin. But let me add one other thing to these few scraps I have tossed out before leaving the academic arena. We will not ever endanger the orderly process of learning the fundamentals and creating tough, disciplined minds. But we want to add such excitement that ultimately children will learn because they want to. Such a goal will demand imaginative teachers, eager to get back to graduate school and eager to learn everything that holds promise.

There is no question in my mind that independent schools have a uniqueness which will continue to make them a powerful force in the world of pre-college education and will continue to make them attractive to an increasing number of parents. That uniqueness is bound up in the constant emphasis we place upon the creation of good values. Good schools everywhere are deeply concerned about the actions and reactions of their students in their relationships to one another. I feel so deeply for young people who are thrust so quickly into the world of ugliness, shame and sorrow. The instancy of communications and the stripping away of what used to be either private or relatively distant from us, causes our young people to be so easily disenchanted. How can you think heroic things about a president who bares his abdomen for the television cameras to zero in on, and how can you think of war as anything but the bloodiest of catastrophies when it is brought into your living room in living color? How can we teach the simple quality of thrift when instant credit through the use of a simple card is available to anyone? How difficult it is to teach love and respect for one another when we have to resort to the courts for the creation of human rights.

The independent school has at its finger tips the freedom to use all that is available in assisting children to create a value system worth possessing. We can use the institution of the church, we can bring into our midst the finest of minds available to us, and we can use what materials we wish without fear of the law saying no. I shall be deeply concerned about the quality of our lives and particularly of the quality of our human relationships. I trust that as Landon students are seen and judged by outsiders, that the most discernible quality will be that of compassion and genuine concern for the welfare of others. And let me say with reference both to academic achievement as well as the creation of strong and supportive values, we will judge our successes and failures by viewing our children after they leave Landon. We know, while we have these young people under our thumbs, we can hold the reins so tight that we can lull ourselves into the belief that we have done our job well. The true test is that moment in time when there is freedom; freedom to choose any path at all, and it is only when these choices are well made that we can commend ourselves.

As most of you are mothers and fathers of children presently enrolled, let me talk briefly of our relationship in the months and years to come. Though I am thought by many to have some fairly strong convictions, I want to assure you that I am no autocrat. I need you and you need me, and we are going to have to learn a good deal about one another in a very short time and discover from one another what each can do to assist in providing the best for our children. It is imperative that you understand what we are doing here and why. We don't deny you the right to debate with us at the appropriate place and time. But once you do understand and we do agree upon paths of action, we hope that we will get the fullest support you can provide, for this is the greatness of the independent day school. It is home and school working together. It begins with trust and understanding and ends with young people who have the capacity to give unselfishly to their world.

The confusion that inevitably results when a headmaster seeks suggestions from every source, is that inevitably those making the suggestions are silly enough to think that all the suggestions will be acceptable. This is particularly true when you allow students to participate in discussions on policy matters. I believe in open forums for students as long as those participating know that ultimately a decision must be made and sometime you win and most of the time you lose. One of the problems of the militants on the college campus is that they are poor listeners. They don't dispute, but they abuse and they so frequently lack a sense of humor which is based on humility and the ability to accept stumbling human nature. Here, with all working together, we hope we can assist our young people to enter the next level of learning, ready to doubt constructively, ready to listen intelligently, and ready to act unselfishly.

I don't know how this talk has come through to you. I really don't like to speak so seriously on our first meeting. I sound too much like the politician making campaign promises which so often are not fulfilled. I trust you won't leave here tonight pinning a short label on me by saying such things as "he's radical" or "conservative" or "traditional" or "progressive" or "old-fashioned" or "contemporary". If you single out one or two of these you're quite wrong, for I believe that I have a little bit of all of these characteristics. But one thing you can tell your sons, and tell them very clearly, is that I will have a very genuine interest in them—in them as total human beings, and I have the capacity to give them countless hours in the solution of their problems.

I might close with a quote that should bring delight to all of your hearts. It is from a former president of Harvard University and he says: "There is no place so safe as a good college during the critical passage from boyhood to manhood". Thus sayeth Charles William Eliot at his inaugural address in 1869. I trust that my remarks tonight have been equally comforting to you.

CONSUMER CREDIT

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Bill Gold, in his very readable column in the Washington Post, touches daily on a wide range of subjects that often spark thoughtful return comments from his readers. I found his column this morning on the subject of consumer credit of particular interest.

The article follows:

MONEY TALKS ALL RIGHT, BUT TO WHOM?

(By Bill Gold)

A man with a pretty good reputation for common sense charges that people like me haven't been doing right by people like you.

"You newspaper fellows don't hesitate to tell government people how to run their affairs, so I don't know why we shouldn't return the compliment occasionally," he says.

"But just to keep the peace, it would be best if you'd leave my name out of this.

"However, I do think you and your colleagues have been somewhat derelict in your coverage of the consumer credit situation.

"You refer to the consumer credit interest rate of 18 per cent a year as if it were monstrously excessive, and you do it in a way that shows little understanding of what is involved.

"If you take a taxi from Washington to Los Angeles and the driver charges you $500 for the trip, you might consider his price 'excessive' because it is much higher than plane fare; yet, considering the driver's time in deadheading back to Washington, he might lose money on the job. The driver would consider the price too low.

"Both parties to this kind of disagreement can be right, from their own viewpoint.

"A store may find that 18 per cent a year just barely covers the cost of credit investigations, bookkeeping, billing, collection expense, bad debts and 'hiring the money,' as Calvin Coolidge used to term it.

"From the customer's standpoint, on the other hand, 18 per cent is a mighty big chunk of expense. It should be avoided whenever possible—and very often it *can* be avoided through sensible planning and a modicum of restraint, just as common sense tells us to avoid running up 2,000-mile taxi fares.

"Don't complain that taxi fares are too high when the real problem is that you shouldn't have used a taxi in that instance. Don't complain that the cost of credit is too high when the real mistake is in using credit when it could have been avoided. The nub of all this is that it is foolish and expensive to use credit you don't need. This is what you writers should be stressing. Instead, you remain preoccupied with criticizing that 18 per cent rate, as if it were immoral per se. The real immorality is our tendency to go overboard on credit, to slip into 'easy credit' excesses that lay too heavy a mortgage on our futures.

"The cost of credit ought to be borne solely by those who use it, but these days we all pay for it. Its costs are becoming embedded in our pricing structure.

"Look at what has happened in one field after another. Restaurant meals used to be strictly cash transactions. Suddenly, it became the fashion to put them on the cuff. Now everybody pays more for his meal because so many meals are being bought on credit.

"Similarly, the corner filling station used to do a strictly cash business. So did the chain drug store and the supermarket. Now millions of people buy gasoline, cosmetics and food on credit, and retail prices edge higher to cover the cost. The cash buyer ends up subsidizing the credit buyer. He pays the same price for cash that the other fellow pays when he puts it on the cuff.

"What you newspaper people probably ought to do is urge people who buy for cash to ask the merchant for a cash discount. If he turns you down, say to him: 'Then put it on my charge card. That will cost you more than it would have cost you to give me a cash discount.' Money talks, and this is the cash buyer's opportunity to make himself heard."

Most of my friend's comments make sense. The only thing I would really challenge is his concluding suggestion. I think it is impractical.

He assumes that there is a face-to-face relationship between buyer and seller, and that the buyer is therefore able to negotiate with the seller. But for the most part, this is no longer a valid assumption.

Mr. Rockefeller doesn't fill your gas tank, Mr. High doesn't scoop ice cream into your cone, and Mr. Giant doesn't ring up your grocery order. The closest you'll come to meeting the "owner" of a department store will be when you're waited on by a clerk who is buying 10 shares of stock in the company through a deferred employee payment plan.

Yes, you can protest. But to whom? Who will listen, or care?

To achieve operating economies and efficiency, a business must grow to optimum size; but by the time it reaches that size, its owners and managers have lost their face-to-face relationship with customers. It just can't be helped.

So when your money talks, it talks to a clerk who doesn't make policy, doesn't know who does, isn't too sure what the policy is, doesn't really care whether the policy pleases you or displeases you, and wouldn't have the authority to do anything about it even if he did care. That's the situation at its best, when two human beings meet face to face. At something less than its best, the transaction is conducted by phone or mail. You don't even see a clerk, let alone the owner—but of course at the end of the month you do get to meet the store's computer.

I will concede that we writers have done little more than wring our hands about all this, and that we have not been clever enough to suggest any effective remedies. But then—who has?

SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM—PHASE II

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon have before it the Defense procurement bill. We will again be forced with a decision on the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system. This time discussion will center around the phase II plan which considers an extension of the curent ABM system to other sites.

This phase II plan still does not answer the central question raised by the entire ABM effort: Why should a complex weapons system be deployed before the most comprehensive tests have established that the entire system will work—the entire system, not just individual components. It was for this reason that I objected in 1966 to the preproduction of the Nike X, a precursor of the current ABM. At that time I voted against the Defense procurement conference report—on July 12, 1966.

Although the present ABM system is different from Nike X, I believe the same reasoning is valid: A weapons system should be completely operational before it is deployed. In addition, each weapons system should be analyzed taking into account its strategic and political implications. My own research has convinced me that the Safeguard system, as its predecessors Nike X and Sentinel, is not fully operational and, more importantly, serves to escalate the arms race in both the long and short run. Such an expenditure feeds the costly and, at times irrational, search for nuclear security. The final result of this search is usually an expensive and wasteful weapons system that ties up vast amounts of our scarce Federal resources which should be allocated for our more pressing domestic priorities. Thus, it was a serious mistake to proceed with the initial deployment of Safeguard and to proceed now with phase II merely compounds the initial error.

Considering our scarce resources, the $1.49 billion request for phase II seems to bring to graphic relief the fight to reorder our national priorities. How can a $1.49 billion request for an expanded ABM system be any less inflationary than the $1.2 billion this Congress voted to education and health? We are now asked to put these moneys into a system that many experts say is not functional. Incidentally, we must not fail to remember that the price tag for the entire system has been increased by $1.6 billion, although I am constrained to note that this announcement from the Department of Defense was not accompanied by the ruffles and flourishes that was used to herald the new Chinese threat used to justify phase II.

I wish at this point to insert two articles into the RECORD. The first is by William H. Stringer and deals with the first strike rationale used to justify the ABM; the second is by Ralph E. Lapp and deals with the Russian threat. I commend these articles to all readers of the RECORD:

"FIRST STRIKE" ILLUSION

(By William H. Stringer)

We have had so much speculation about the Soviet ability to reach a "first-strike capability"—to knock out the whole American nuclear arsenal in one fell onslaught with 20-megaton SS9 missiles—that some countervailing points seem to be wholly forgotten. To quote from Dr. Jerome Weisner, President Kennedy's science adviser, in a December speech:

"We have become numbed by the number games we play with nuclear weapons and have lost track of their power and what a few of them can do."

Let's get a few facts clear:

One, no amount of attainable "first strike" capability would prevent some missiles from being launched against the country attempting the all-out blow. At least a few retaliatory missiles would get launched and would get through. And one 1-megaton missile can knock out Moscow or Washington.

Two, in the days of Russia's rough-grained Joseph Stalin, it was quite clear that he was deterred from more serious aggression after World War II by the existence of a few "small" American atomic bombs, perhaps a half-dozen 20-kiloton, Hiroshima-size weapons.

How persuasive, then, is a so-called first-strike capability, in realistic terms? Dr. John Foster, Pentagon military scientist, has said that if the Soviets should build 420 SS9s and put multiple warheads on them, these could destroy 95 percent of America's 1,000-plus Minuteman arsenal in a first-strike onslaught. This however would seem to leave 50 Minutemen undestroyed.

If six Hiroshima-sized bombs deterred Stalin, what would 50 missiles of vastly greater power deter?

Or, if we or the Soviets are callously not impressed with that much deterrence, consider the fact that, in any present confrontation the American fleet of Polaris-type submarines, armed with multiple-warhead Poseidon missiles, would still be cruising undestroyed.

What then, in the name of common sense, is the Pentagon talking about when it suggests that the Soviets are nearing a successful first-strike capacity which can be defended against only by piling up more weapons of the independently-targeted MIRV variety, or by adding some rather ineffective ABM defensive missiles to the arsenal?

Of course there are generals who put their trust only in what has, perhaps inaccurately, been described as the Dr. Edward Teller strategy. This argues that the only safety for America is to run faster than the Soviets in nuclear weaponry—that since the United States has technological superiority it can build and develop and keep one jump ahead of Moscow. But considering the fact that the United States can deter without such escalation and considering all the domestic-urgency demands on government funds, this is rather sorry reasoning.

President Nixon has not quite embraced such a strategy. He apparently believes the United States can begin MIRVing its weapons and building an ABM system, and then call off the race if the Soviets seem genuinely ready to agree to arms limitation. The peril in this formula is that (a) it is desperately expensive, with domestic needs crying out, and (b) it could persuade the Soviets that they must continue escalating, so that the unhalted arms race spirals up still more.

Mr. Nixon says a "thin" system will protect against a limited Chinese onslaught. Actually, the existence of the massive American arsenal is more than enough to deter the Chinese unless they are madmen and then nothing will deter and nothing will protect.

We come back to the fact that today's nuclear weapons are so deadly that, if even a dozen "get through," the damage is such as to be unsustainable to any modern society. And the likelihood is that, given any combination of SS9s, MIRV's, or ABMs, more than a dozen missiles would "get through," in either direction. The sensible thing at, the next SALT talks, is to recognize this and get on with the business of cutting back—in the name of economy and common sense—on the overwhelming American and Soviet arsenals.

MISSILES 2: HOW GOOD ARE THE KREMLIN'S WEAPONS?

(By Ralph E. Zapp)

Marshal Andrei Grenchko, Soviet Defense Minister, last week added new superlatives to the war of words over the controversial issue of antiballistic missiles (ABM). "We possess weapons capable of reliably hitting enemy aircraft and missiles irrespective of height or speed of flight, at great distances from the defended targets," he asserted in Pravda, the Communist party newspaper.

During the past decade, Soviet spokesmen have boasted of their missile prowess, but the timing of Marshal Grenchko's pronouncement—one that interrupts a rather long stretch of silence on ABM—invites the speculation that it is:

(A) A riposte to President Nixon's claim on Jan. 30 for a "virtually infallible" area defense ABM system.

(B) A response to the Pentagon's expansion of the Safeguard ABM system into Phase 2.

(C) A gambit in the SALT (strategic arms limitation talks) set to resume next month in Vienna.

Soviet claims for possession of effective defense missiles are long standing. For example, C. L. Sulzberger's interview with Nikita Khrushchev in September, 1961, quoted the Soviet leader as follows: "I can only tell you that at the same time we told our scientists and engineers to develop intercontinental rocket, we told another group to work out means to combat such rockets."

Mr. Khrushchev expressed satisfaction with work on these defensive rockets and in the Oct. 25, 1961, issue of Pravda, his Defense Minister, Rodion Malinovsky, stated that "the problem of destroying missiles in flight has been successfully solved." This was a claim that Mr. Khrushchev dramatized in the summer of 1962 when he told a group of American editors that his antimissiles could "hit a fly in outer space."

United States orbiting cameras had by that time spotted the building of launchers at the Sary Shagan test range on Lake Balkash, where the Soviet ABM missile was first tested.

The NATO code name for this missile is Galosh.

A first generation ABM missile complex was started to protect Leningrad, but the Soviets had second thoughts about it and abandoned the project by 1962. Then, in October of that year, initial construction of Galosh launch sites and radars was begun around Moscow.

American observers got their first look at Galosh on Nov. 7, 1964, when a 65-foot-long missile, housed in a cigar-shaped cacoon, was trundled across red square.

The build-up of the Galosh ABM ring around Moscow continued through 1966 along with installation of radars. The Pentagon has designated this complex as ABM-1. The Soviet ABM-1 forced Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's hand, which had up to that time kept a firm leash on United States ABM deployment.

On Nov. 10, 1966, Mr. McNamara revealed that the Soviets had deployed their Galosh missiles and indicated the United States reaction would be production and deployment of Poseidon missiles. In other words, the Soviet defense measure would be counteracted by simply adding to the American missile power targeted at Soviet cities. Thus, the impact of the Soviet ABM innovation was to escalate the arms race.

The Galosh missile, itself, is not very formidable as a killer weapon. Last year, in the course of the great ABM debate, Mr. Herbert York, a noted weapons authority, said: "It is very much like the (American) Nike-Zeus system. Nike-Zeus was abandoned fairly early in United States ABM development and replaced by Spartan, a missile designed to explode a multi-megaton weapon at an altitude of over 100 miles and kill off incoming warheads with a huge burst of X-rays.

The Soviets are reported to be developing an improved Galosh but its characteristics are not known. So far the Soviets have not backed up their long-range Galosh with the equivalent of the United States Sprint—a short ranger killer missile. This is a severe defficiency in the Soviet ABM system, since their one-punch Galosh is easily outwitted in space by the deployment of radar-deflecting balloons or other decoys.

If the Soviets hope to cope with the retaliatory threat of United States missile power, they must find some way to fend off as many as 25,000 attacking "hostile" ballistic objects, i.e. nuclear warheads, MIRV's and decoys. The deployment of fewer than 70 Galosh missiles around Moscow must be expanded manyfold and duplicated at dozens of other sites in the Soviet Union if the Soviets plan a thick defense system. Actually, United States defense planners have already assumed the worst, namely, that this is what the Soviets will do.

VALUE QUESTIONED

In the vicious cycle of the arms race, the United States ABM program known as Safeguard is still embryonic. Its effectiveness was hotly contested in last summer's Senate debate and, in particular, the radars and missiles were challenged as to their real worth. Last week in testimony given before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Dr. John S. Foster Jr., the Pentagon's research chief, admitted that changes were necessary in Safeguard. Specifically, he indicated that a new Spartan missile would be needed to supplement the ABM defense and that more missiles and new radars would be required for Phase I of the Safeguard program. For both technical and political reasons the Administration has balked at plunging into a greatly expanded Safeguard program.

Soviet military experts like Gen. Talensky maintain that their ABM deployment is a purely defensive measure that is provocative only to a country committed to "an aggressive policy from positions of strength." But by now they must be aware that a sneeze in the Kremlin can produce pneumonia in the Pentagon.

The Soviet planners must also be aware that modern weapons often fail to live up to their notices. Their SAM (surface-to-air missiles) radio-controlled interceptors have scored only 2 per cent "kills" on aircraft over North Vietnam. Even if the improved version of their second-generation Galosh, reportedly now slated to be deployed, should chalk up a 10-fold better performance, it would take more than five cf them to kill a single United States nuclear warhead. Tens of thousands of Galosh missiles would be required to protect the Soviet Union from disaster.

A passion for defense was instilled into Soviet military thinking by Napoleon and Hitler. The Kremlin's obsession with defense is matched by the Pentagon's present obsession about a Soviet first-strike. Each nation seeks security through weapons whose sheer numbers represent overkill in staggering sum. More weapons do not spell more security—that's why the SALT talks next month are of critical importance to arresting the "mad momentum" of the arms race.

AMERICAN POLICY IN LAOS

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, we finally have an official explanation of American policy in Laos. It is remarkable that this administration—which boasts almost as much about its "new policies" and "new approaches" as it does about the majority support it alleges these policies enjoy—it is remarkable that this administration's explanation of its policy in Laos should turn out to depend so heavily on the theory that its policy there is simply a continuation of the policies of preceding administrations. If that were true, it would not do much to sustain the thesis that the policy has wide support, since the Southeast Asian policy of at least the immediately preceding administration was not distinguished by the public's enthusiasm for it.

But it really does not matter very much who started this policy. It would be as unacceptable if it were a carryover as it is if it is an innovation. And the responsibility for current policy belongs to the current administration. If this administration cannot explain its policy to the satisfaction of the Congress and the country, it has no business pursuing it.

The President should therefore be put on notice that neither his policy in Laos nor his explanation of that policy is satisfactory. One wonders if he is impervious to the lessons of history, or if he simply thinks the American people are.

If it is not yet too late to reverse course in Laos it soon will be. Whoever should be blamed for putting us on the course we are now on, there will be no question about who is to blame for keeping us on that course when it became clear that it was leading us into deepening disaster. I am including in the RECORD at this point the brilliant lead editorial from Sunday's Washington Post. I hope everyone will read it carefully and thoughtfully, especially the President.

LAOS: THE SAME OLD SHELL GAME

No sooner had President Nixon launched his explanation of American policy on Laos than he went over the side. "When we came into office, this Administration found a highly precarious situation in Laos," he said, heading for the rail along about the fifth paragraph. And then over he went:

"Its basic legal framework had been established by the 1962 accords entered into by the Kennedy Administration . . .

"In approving the 1962 arrangements, the Kennedy Administration in effect accepted the basic formulation which had been advanced by North Vietnam and the Soviet Union for a Laotian political settlement . . .

"In January, 1961, we thus had a military assistance program reaching back over six years and air operations dating over four years . . .

"It would, of course, have posed no political problem for me to have disclosed in greater detail those military support activities which had been initiated by two previous Administrations . . ."

So there it is, more than a year after the start of the Nixon Administration—a full, rich year in foreign policy to hear the Vice President tell it. And yet, as critical as Laos apparently was when Mr. Nixon inherited it, the best he can do is to tell us: look, no hands; Kennedy sold Laos down the river to the Communists eight yeasr ago and then he and Lyndon Johnson moved in with military aid in an effort to recoup; and the reason that we haven't been told more about it lately is not politics, because it's not this Administration's war, but because it wouldn't have been "in the national interest."

This doesn't quite explain why, when a political storm kicked up over Laos, in the past few weeks, it suddenly became "in the national interest" to tell us more, but no matter—the President didn't tell us that much more in any case. And a lot of what he did tell us was the same old shell game, terribly misleading at the least, if not in fact untrue.

John F. Kennedy didn't invent a Laotian crisis; he too inherited it, from the Eisenhower Administration, which Mr. Nixon, who was Vice President at the time, ought to know better than most men. The difference was that Mr. Kennedy didn't have the luxury of more than a year to deal with his legacy. In March, 1961, he told a press conference that "in my last conversation with General Eisenhower, the day before the inauguration . . . we spent more time on this hard matter than on any other thing." What the President didn't reveal was that in that conversation President Eisenhower expressed an American commitment to Laos in the most binding terms, that the conversation actually dealt with the specific possibility that American ground troops might be needed, that there was even talk about how quickly an American expeditionary force could be brought in. American military aid was a fact of life in Laos then—and that was something more than six years ago.

So it really isn't enough to try to hang Laos around the necks of "two previous administrations," or to say that "aid" is, in each and every instance, "requested" (as if we would be furnishing unrequested help) and "defensive" and "limited" and in "pursuit of peace" because we have heard all that about another war. And we have heard all about policies that are somebody else's; Lyndon Johnson used to hang Vietnam around the necks of *four* previous Presidents, right back to Franklin D. Roosevelt, by way of trying to prove that he was merely carrying out, unaltered, somebody else's policy.

And it also isn't enough to pin the blame on the Communists—on their "increasingly massive presence," on their "particularly escalatory" buildup to 67,000 North Vietnamese regular troops. It isn't enough, either, to argue that this is aggression, that the outsiders have taken over from indigenous forces because, for one thing, we have heard all that before, too, in the Johnson Administration's celebrated White Paper on Vietnam. And for another thing, you can't really make that point, unfortunately, without also making the point that the threat is real, and increasingly menacing. Our commitment is clear—the President emphasized that. Our involvement is deep—although we still don't know how deep because Mr. Nixon still talks about reconnaissance flights and "combat support missions" when the reports all confirm saturation bombing raids by B-52s. In any case, when you've said all that, you've raised, inescapably, the critical question of how we are going to deal with a "massive" and increasing Communist threat without doing something more ourselves.

The President doesn't answer that; instead, having devoted great chunks of his Laos statement to documenting Soviet and North Vietnamese perfidy, he tells us he is hoping that the Russians, as co-chairman with Britain of the 1962 Geneva conference, will do something to help.

"But most of all," he adds in closing, "it will require realism and reasonableness from Hanoi, for it is the North Vietnamese, not we, who have escalated the fighting."

Well, great: we are banking on realism and reasonableness from Hanoi—that, and on the policy of two previous Administrations. And this comes from a President who has named a doctrine after himself and explained, in 40,000 words, a "new approach" to foreign policy, a clean break with the follies and frailties of past work in this field. It will be argued, of course, that Laos doesn't count, because it was there before Mr. Nixon wrote his foreign policy encyclical. And there is some justice in that. But if that is accepted, then Laos, just because it is central to our interests in Vietnam and the rest of Southeast Asia, is a powerful argument for not filling our heads with 119 pages of visions about a new, dynamic, all-purpose, low-profile foreign policy.

GOD, MAN, AND POLLUTION

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, although the problems of population growth and environmental degradation have received a great deal of attention lately, we have perhaps overlooked one major area of concern. To combat the vitiation of our environment we must certainly make the facts available to everyone; yet, to make any substantial contribution in this area, it will be necessary to reassess some of our current values. One propitious sign has been the interest expressed in our environmental perplexities by churches across the country. Many clergymen are using the pulpit to inform their congregations of these matters and lead them in a proper evaluation of their own part in this quandry.

A sermon given by Canon Michael Hamilton at the Washington Cathedral on Sunday, February 1, 1970, is an example of the church's contribution to environmental improvements. Canon Hamilton has delivered a very lucid and stimulating sermon, in which he commends us to the examination of some of the values we have previously taken for granted. Commenting on the population explosion, Canon Hamilton states:

We must face up to the necessity which God has apparently built into this creation of his, that as parents we are not, and probably never intrinsically were morally free to have as many children as we would like.

If we are to abate the myriad of dilemmas that threaten the well-being of our environment, it is mandatory that both the public and the private sector share the responsibility. It is encouraging to see church leaders like Canon Hamilton addressing themselves to these matters and I have included his sermon for the benefit of my colleagues:

GOD, MAN, AND POLLUTION

Excerpts from President Nixon's State of the Union address—January, 1970.

"In the next ten years Americans shall increase our wealth by 50 per cent. The profound question is—does this mean that we will be 50 per cent richer in a real sense, 50 per cent better off, 50 per cent happier?

"Or does it mean that in the year 1980 we will look back on a decade in which 70 per cent of our people lived in metropolitan areas choked by traffic, suffocated by smog, poisoned by water, deafened by noise and terrorized by crime?

"These are not the great questions that concern world leaders at summit conferences. But people do not live at the summit. They live in the foothills of everyday experience. It is time for us all to concern ourselves with the way real people live in real life.

"The great question of the '70's is, shall we surrender to our surroundings, or shall we make our peace with nature and begin to make reparations for the damage we have done to our air, our land and our water?

"Restoring nature to it natural state is a cause beyond party and beyond factions. It has become a common cause of all people in America. It is a cause of particular concern to young Americans—because they more than we will reap the grim consequences of our failure to act on programs which are needed now if we are to prevent disaster later.

"Clean air, clean water, open spaces—these should once again be the birthright of every American. If we act now—they can be.

"We still think of air as free. But clean air is not, and neither is clean water. The price tag on pollution control is high. Through our years of past carelessness we incurred a debt to nature, and now that debt is being called."

When God walked the face of the earth in the person of Jesus of Nazareth and spoke to us about the meaning of human existence, it was no accident that he chose to illustrate his teaching with examples taken from the natural world around him. This was not only because he happened to live in a rural economy but also because the very things of nature lent themselves to be accurate conveyors of God's truth for man. The Jews deep within their hearts and minds, believed that man and the animals, man and his environment, man and the stars and heavens above him, were all one united creation made by a God who cherished every part of it. Thus sin in the book of Jeremiah in the Old Testament was likened to a pollution of the earth, and in the New Testament Paul says that not only do men cry out for help to rescue them from their enslavement to sin, but the very stones and ground seem to writhe in discomfort waiting for the day when a transformation would bring them to a total beauty and harmony. This morning when the story of the sower and the seed was read for the Gospel you remember we humans were likened to stony ground, or parched soil, or bare and inhospitable rock, or occasionally to receptive fertile soil. God's acts toward us were compared to grain seed which either was rejected by us or took root in the soil of good hearts and open minds.

However, is it not true that these metaphors, these kinds of stories are alien to our contemporary way of thinking? I suggest that this is for a deeper reason than because most of us happen to be city folk. Rather it is because we have changed our understanding of nature, our attitudes are different from the Jewish and early Christians as they looked at the world around them. If there were time one could trace the development of our present attitudes, and much of the story would be about Greek philosophy and how the Church appropriated some of their dualistic beliefs about body and spirit. The story would also speak about how the Church disowned their own children, the natural scientists of the Renaissance and later, who were often obliged to announce their truths about nature in conflict with ecclesiastical authorities. An so the great structure of scientific knowledge in the West developed largely without a conscious understanding of its religious roots and dimension, forgetful of a faith in the interdependance of man and the environment which God had created for him. Hence today we have a culture, one that is spreading over the face of the world, one that is technologically sophisticated but philosophically empty. Western technology does not have within its conscious knowledge the values and wisdom to know how best to use its own powers. Is it not true that until a crisis of smog or famine afflicts us we do not query the fundamental attitudes which have ultimately brought us to our present unhappy predicament?

And is it not also true, if we reflect upon our own national history, that we can recognize the signs of our alienation from nature? Granted life for our pioneers was not easy, they chose not just to cultivate the land where they settled, but to exploit it. The wilderness was not a place where they were to discover a reconciliation between their needs and ecological balance; rather they and the industries that followed them made war on the land as they did on the Indians. They harvested crops, cut down lumber, mined gold without concern for long-term agricultural and economic welfare. This attitude toward the resources of the earth as things to be used, exploited, was occasionally even justified as being a fulfillment of the Old Testament command of God to Adam to have dominion over the earth. What an ironic misuse of both the Bible and the land! If one-tenth of the energy and research funds which went into industrial development had been spent on learning how to conserve the raw materials upon which industry depended, we would be in a much healthier state today. If today we were willing to spend one-tenth of construction costs for buildings and roads on their beauty, we might begin again to learn what it is to feel and live like humans. In the ugliness of our present day cities we have become as savages, and the primitive cultures who have designed habitations with an eye to their esthetic, as well as functional aspects, have put us to shame.

But perhaps for the first time in our nation's history we have come to a public awareness of the plight we were in—a condition I suggest is a sickness not only of material pollution and scarcity, but also of a psychological and religious character. Hence today we welcome the President's State of the Union address and give thanks for the efforts and visions of many in the conservation, scientific and political world whose warnings over the past years we have at last become willing to hear. But words are not enough as the Gospel clearly tells us. They must be matched by deeds and in this case, by strong financial backing and legislation that will curb those industries and individuals who still strive to put private gain above public good. And these reforms, I believe, must be in addition to, not a substitute for, programs to remove poverty, crime, and racial discrimination, the major scourges of our nation.

I would be irresponsible, as a Christian or as a human, in speaking this morning about ecology and environmental controls if I did not also speak about population growth. If all the necessary funding was voted and made available (and I do believe the American public is willing to pay it), and if all the appropriate technology using that funding would indeed curb air, water and land pollution, if all this was done and we did not also reduce the size of American families, we would still be heading for disaster. I believe we must face up to the necessity which God has apparently built into this creation of his, that as parents we are not, and probably never intrinsically were morally free to have as many children as we would like. If as a nation we do not respond to influence in which parents would voluntarily have two or less children, then surely before the end of many of the lives of us who are here this morning, we will have to accept much more drastic measures including government intervention to achieve smaller families. I read with great apprehension the possibility of mass sterilization, through water or food, temporary and which can be reversed, or enforced therapeutic abortion if a mother has more than two children. These things are being discussed, not uncharitably, but rather out of charity because the alternatives are even more shocking to contemplate. The alternatives are overcrowding to a degree that only those who have lived in tenement slums understand, a low standard of living, and ultimately because of these kinds of pressures, political revolution and economic chaos. These conditions are already threatening some of the underdeveloped parts of the world today, particularly in larger cities.

What responsibility and what help can the Christian Church offer in relation to these problems? I can see three areas in which Church people can make significant contributions. Firstly, we must educate ourselves. We must bring together the information which has too long lain in the separated disciplines of demography or population analysis, agriculture theory, industrial technology and of psychology. We must bring these kinds of knowledge together so that any program planned is in relationship to the whole of our system of social organization.

Secondly, we must clean our own house and begin to rethink our theological beliefs about nature. We have relied too easily, too glibly, on Biblical passages without questioning their context in terms of time and place. For instance, the Old Testament command "to be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth" meant good sense in its time, but today we have replenished the earth and need no longer go on being fruitful and multiplying in the ways we have! Or in the phrase that I quoted earlier that we should have "dominion over the earth" must no longer be understood as license to use nature as we wish, but rather it should be seen in the context of man being part of an interrelated biotic system in which our survival depends upon careful stewardship as opposed to selfish exploitation. If we Christians can regain our own heritage in which man is seen as part of God's total creation and that he is inseparably bound up with animals and matter in one evolution, if we can love our land as God Himself cherishes His universe, if we can realize that we were never intended to be free to procreate except in relationship to the needs, not only of our individual families, but to the family of Man, then we can provide some sorely needed ideas and values by which our secular culture can guide itself.

Thirdly, the Churches in their national and local congregational units should accept the challenge of doing something about stewardship in terms of family size, pollution control and the required legislative reforms for the best use of natural resources. I hope for a new movement in our country in which the Churches take as active a part as they did in the Civil rights movement of days gone by.

In closing I would like to illustrate this attitude to nature, the closeness of man to things, in terms of the Eucharist meal we are gathering together to eat. Here I would like to express my thanks to a theologian, Dr. Conrad Bonifazi, for much of what I am about to say. For the Jew his own personal identity was intricately bound up with the people, his relatives and those with whom he lived, and also the material and land which he possessed. Things became extensions of himself, they stood as symbols of him before others. If a man laid claim to an object it was readily understood that an intrinsic relationship was established between him and that object. Hence it was not difficult for the disciples as they gathered together at the Last Supper to understand Christ when He took a loaf of bread and a pitcher of wine, and having thanked God for providing the food for this occasion, said to them: "Take this bread and eat it, and from now on it is to be for you a sign of myself, my body, my presence with you. And when you gather together again remembering me, drink the wine, and it shall be for you my blood, my very life given for you." This morning we are his disciples and we gather together around this table. We shall take bread and share it amongst us, and in so doing Christ will be present with us in a clear and practical way. We shall take wine and drink it and by these acts understand a little better our closeness and dependence upon the things of nature, our closeness to Christ who is amongst us, and our dependence upon each other as members all of the one family of man.

POPPING OFF ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, foreign policy used to be bipartisan in the days of Senator Arthur Vandenburg of Michigan. Issues best solved on a nonpolitical basis were handled in this manner in the interest of the country. In recent years there has been an increasing tendency on the part of Members of Congress in both bodies to try to make political capital out of sensational statements of a distinctly partisan nature relating to foreign affairs. As the distinguished columnist, David Lawrence, so well points out in the following from the Washington Star of March 9, 1970, such headline hunting is at the expense of the Nation and will likely create political problems with the constituency of the Member if the people back home understand the high cost to them of such slam-bang grandstanding.

Continuing highly irresponsible statements relating to the war in Vietnam and schedules for U.S. withdrawal therefrom do, indeed, as Mr. Lawrence says, give aid and comfort to the enemy.

The column follows:

"AID AND COMFORT" TO THE ENEMY

(By David Lawrence)

There are two ways for members of Congress to conduct themselves during a war. One is to seek answers to their criticisms privately from the executive branch of the government, and the other is to denounce policies openly and, in effect, give "aid and comfort" to the enemy.

Unfortunately, too many examples of the latter method—presumably a means of seeking popularity with uninformed citizens—have occurred recently in connection with America's alleged entry into "another war" in Laos.

President Nixon found it necessary to issue a 3,000-word statement giving the facts. But most newspapers printed only a summary, and the critics already had created disturbing impressions with fragmentary charges.

Why is it that some members of Congress consider their political speeches more important than the effect these utterances may have on the enemy, who has obviously been encouraged to believe that the United States will surrender in Southeast Asia? Military problems are not readily explained to the general public. Nor are the risks and dangers of letting the Communists believe the United States will throw in the sponge fully realized.

Nixon in his statement on Laos made these significant points:

1. North Vietnam in the last few months has raised the number of its troops in Laos to more than 67,000.

2. The North Vietnamese have been involved in Laos since 1961, when President Kennedy said:

"Laos is far away from America, but the world is small . . . the security of all Southeast Asia will be endangered if Laos loses its neutral independence."

3. In 1962, fourteen nations—including North Vietnam—signed the Geneva accords providing for the neutralization of Laos, but Hanoi has steadily violated the agreement.

4. Since 1964, over half a million North Vietnamese troops have moved down the Ho Chi Minh Trail in Laos to invade South Vietnam. This infiltration route "provides the great bulk of men and supplies for the war in South Vietnam."

5. The Nixon administration, on coming into office after six years of seasonal Communist attacks in Laos, continued the assistance program which dated back to 1963 and the air operations which began in 1964.

The President reiterated that the United States "has no ground combat forces in Laos," and that "we have used air power for the purpose of interdicting the flow of North Vietnamese troops and supplies on that part of the Ho Chi Minh Trail which runs through Laos."

The President made it clear that he has "no plans for introducing ground combat forces into Laos." He declared the total number of Americans directly employed by the U.S. government in Laos is 616. On the subject of air operations, the President asserted:

"As Commander-in-Chief of our armed forces, I consider it my responsibility to use our air power to interdict this flow of supplies and men (through Laos) into South Vietnam and thereby avoid a heavy toll of American and allied lives . . .

"In every instance our combat air operations have taken place only over those parts of Laos occupied and contested by North Vietnamese and other Communist forces. They have been flown only when requested by the Laotian government."

Nixon stated that he is continuing "the purposes and operations of two previous administrations," and that this has been necessary "to project American lives in Vietnam and to preserve a precarious but important balance in Laos."

Certainly every member of Congress, irrespective of party, has a responsibility to use his influence to prevent what he thinks is an unnecessary American participation in a war. But there is a right way and a wrong way to do it. Each house of Congress has a foreign affairs committee. When a majority of a committee thinks a resolution should be adopted limiting the power of the executive branch of the government to carry on any military operation, this can be adopted by a majority vote of Congress.

Under present practices, a small number of members of the House and Senate attack defense policies and give the enemy the impression that American public opinion is not supporting the executive. This encourages the Communists to prolong their warfare against American troops in Southeast Asia.

SEIZURE OF BALTICS RECALLED

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, Members of this great deliverative body have paid tribute to the preciousness of freedom by marking the observance of Lithuanian Independence Day on February 16. We join with Americans of Lithuanian descent in this celebration for 1970 is the 52d anniversary year of the Republic of Lithuania. It is a bittersweet observance, however, for 1970 also represents the 30th year since Russian occupation of the free States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Freedom is a precious thing. Its cost is dearly known to Lithuanians, who fought for over a century against czarist rule and fought again under Communist oppression. Freedom demands a reaffirmation in our belief that the right of self-determination belongs to all people. I addressed this principle in a statement conveyed through the RECORD on February 16, but a letter on this subject, published in the Schenectady Gazette, merits recognition. The sincerity and conviction of Mr. Edward W. Baranauskas has prompted me to offer his letter to the attention of my colleagues. It follows:

SEIZURE OF BALTICS RECALLED

EDITOR, GAZETTE:

The world's great powers have made proposals in the hope of achieving a settlement of the Middle East disputes between Israel and the Arab states. However, the Soviet Union insists that Israel must pull out of the areas it took from the Arabs in the 1967 war, before peace talks can begin. The Soviets emphasize that these lands were acquired by aggression; therefore, they must be returned to their former owners.

It is tragic, indeed, that while the Soviets do not hesitate to accuse other nations of aggression, or imperialism, they are content to overlook the fact that they occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by military force and made the people of these once-free nations vassals within the Soviet Union against their will.

Because the passage of almost three decades may have somewhat dimmed the memory of some people, I would like to review a little bit of the history of Lithuania.

For more than a century, Lithuania endured the oppression of Czars of Russia before finally regaining her freedom and independence on Feb. 16, 1918. A year later, thanks to help from the United States, her small army mustered the strength to drive the advancing Red Army from her soil. In 1920, the rulers of the "new" Russia—the Soviet Union—signed a peace treaty with Lithuania, recognizing the self-rule and independence of Lithuania without prejudice.

Lithuania fared quite well during the years of peace that followed. She was recognized, de jure, by the United States in 1921, and became a member of the League of Nations some months later. Her agricultural productivity even amazed the Russians, for Lithuania produced more, and exported more, than the rich Ukraine.

The clouds of war gathered over Europe once more, and in June of 1940, as the Nazis marched across Western Europe, the Russians decided that they should do a little marching too. Stalin's Red Army quickly invaded and overran Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and in one military sweep, the three Baltic States were swallowed up into the Soviet Empire.

This year, Feb. 16 will mark the 52nd anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. This would normally be a day of celebration, but instead, the people of Lithuania will commemorate this day in silence, and in fear. Once again, they are enduring another Russian occupation.

The Soviet Union must prove its concern for self-determination and independence of all nations, whether large or small. By withdrawing her own military forces and puppet rulers from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and restoring liberty to these lands, will the Soviet Union prove to the world that military conquest cannot be the basis for continued occupation of foreign territories.

EDWARD W. BARANAUSKAS.

SCHENECTADY.

A TRULY MERITORIOUS ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 6, the WMAL radio team of Harden and Weaver celebrated 10 years of working together on a show which is heard from 6 to 10 a.m. 6 days a week. This occasion was marked by a luncheon which it was my honor and privilege to attend.

I am sure that many of my esteemed colleagues and a host of my friends have not only listened to the lively antics and chatter of Frank Harden and Jackson Weaver, but have been thoroughly entertained and even enlightened in the early hours on the way to work as I have over the years.

For this reason, it is my feeling that living in the metropolitan area and having the opportunity to listen to this delightful team is certainly a fringe benefit to being on the Hill.

In these times of bold and risque material in much of the entertainment media, it is inspiring that we have here in the Nation's Capital two gentlemen whose humor is both amusing and clean. Not only can we feel free to tune them in during the early morning hours, but we can allow our wives and children to hear them also.

Harden and Weaver not only provide us with the time, news, weather, and miscellaneous items of interest including lost and found pets and the like, but also real entertainment over the airwaves which have in recent years in many instances been dull and lackluster since the advent of television.

While much more can be said in their honor, I, for one, think that you will agree with me that Frank Harden and Jackson Weaver are to be commended and congratulated for their fine show and their high degree of professionalism and fine spirit of public service. We are fortunate indeed to have two such excellent radio performers working together in this area and the First District of Georgia is especially proud of its native son, Frank Harden of Savannah and its adopted son, Jackson Weaver.

It is earnestly hoped that Harden and Weaver will continue on together as they have in the past to add to the joy and listening pleasure of early morning radio for they are a real credit to the broadcasting industry.

"BITING THE BULLET" OR JUST "BUZZ" WORDS?

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Hoosier Waltonian, published by the Indiana Division of the Izaak Walton League of America, in its 1970 winter issue carried a thoughtful article by Editor Thomas E. Dustin, entitled "President Nixon's Address, 'Biting the Bullet,' or Just 'Buzz' Words?" I would like to share this article with my colleagues and, therefore, request that its text appear at this point in the RECORD:

"BITING THE BULLET" OR JUST "BUZZ" WORDS?

(By Thomas E. Dustin)

On January 22, in a long-awaited State of the Union address, President Nixon said top priority is to be given to restoration of environmental qualities in America.

He said a $10-billion anti-pollution program is coming, and he included the need for open spaces and air quality among the highest priorities: he said the job has to be done "now".

Conservationists and the rest of the nation could only feel the greatest sense of support for such principles. But were principles enough? These problems have already been discussed for years. Was it not a time for clearing the desks of semantic uncertainties and for getting on with the job?

Conservationists have difficulty squaring the President's stated priorities with that portion of the record already established. They remember that although $200-million in dedicated money is now in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Administration is fighting use of anything more than $124-million—even though this Fund can be used for no other purpose than acquiring and developing the "open lands" the President says we must have now. They remember too the coolness of the Administration toward authorization of such "open space" proposals as Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan, and Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in Wisconsin.

Also recalled was the recent and continuing fight the Administration waged against full funding the 1966 Clean Water Restoration Act. While the law authorized $1-billion, the Administration proposed only $214-million be used this year—one fifth of what Congress promised in 1966. Though Congress overrode the President and provided $800-million, Administration spokesmen were now telling Indiana pollution officials that it will not spend more than $600-million, if that, depriving Indiana alone of $7-million in anti-pollution funds.

So what did the President mean when he said the job has to be done "now"?

While a non-defined $10-billion, five-year plan against water pollution has a clarion sound, the missing translation appeared less than hopeful. This would mean $2-billion for each year—about ten times more than the President asked only a few months ago, and more than twice the amount he is still fighting against as enacted in a bi-partisan Congressional drive.

Is $800-million four times too high this year, but less than half as much as needed in each of the coming five years? It's a puzzlement.

Or is the Administration really talking about something else entirely? Pending Administration legislation now in Congress is causing many cities great concern. The money would largely be for long-term loans instead of the direct grants stressed in the 1966 law. This would mean the cities would have to raise much more of the money from their own resources; but many are severely restricted in how much they can do, or are already bonded over their heads. Further, the bonding market is now ill, and cities might not be able to float the long-term indebtedness needed to pay off anti-pollution loans.

If loans, rather than grants are what the Administration has in mind, then the Federal commitment is in reality nothing like $10-billion, and the cities will be facing costs they cannot meet.

While such provisions as industrial tax incentives could be a valuable adjunct in an Administration program, concern might be expressed over why it seems necessary to go through another long, wrenching and tedious round of basic legislation and political hassling for new programs, when what is really needed is vigorous support of the ones already on the books. Why shelve concepts that are barely three years old, and that are just beginning to show results? Why not work in the context of the 1965 Water Quality Act and the 1966 Clean Water Restoration Act, making such perfecting changes as experience indicates are advisable?

The words of the State of the Union address were unquestionably inspiring: "Shall we surrender to our surroundings, or begin making reparations?" and "nature is presenting its bill" for environmental abuses. But conservationists have heard all this before. One conservation leader, writing the President days before the address, said he wouldn't be listening to learn that Mr. Nixon was against pollution or for parks; he would be listening for the outline of an action program to meet the long-recognized problems, and for a schedule of implementation.

The time for reviewing broad principles is long past; the hour is even late for action.

Rather than more research, which some observers felt is a principle Administration intent, Waltonians more easily understood Federal Water Pollution Control enforcement commissioner Murray Stein, when he addressed the Indiana Izaak Walton League convention in 1966:

"Trust your nose," Stein said; "you know polluted water when you smell it.

"The first thing to do in fighting pollution," he added, "is to get the 'dead hogs' out of the water."

In the advance publicity on the Administration's intent, Mr. Nixon seemed to be asking "what's a 'dead hog'?"

The President said the job would be costly, which wasn't exactly news. What is equally to the point is that any delays will be even more costly. Such delays would certainly accompany any basic re-scrambling of the ground rules or more re-tinkering with the philosophy and semantics of pollution.

The nation now has a better grasp of pollution than at any time in its history; and Indiana alone has 125 major polluting towns and cities which have applied for clean water grants and which have well-advanced plans for their cleanups. Under the President's request of last year only four of them could have been implemented.

Is all this planning and substantive motion now to be placed in limbo while partisan advocates of all stripes struggle to see whose thumbprints are to be on yet-undefined new programs?

A bird in the hand really is worth two in the bush, most conservationists would contend; and the 1966 Clean Water Restoration Act is still the best implementation idea produced.

No one claims the direct grant program of the 1966 law has produced any clean water Eldorados. How could it when President Johnson backed it to the tune of only 20% and when President Nixon repeated the act for the current fiscal year, failing, however, because conservationists and the nation at large are through with pollution tokenism.

It can be granted that the President is right in principle in favoring a five-year plan, even if the idea were undiluted with unrelated considerations; but his statement that "a one-year plan is no plan at all" is specious.

If that were true, part of the causes reside on the President's doorstep for refusing to support the authorized implementation. Further, it seems unlikely that future Congresses will surrender their legislative prerogatives on any five-year plans proposed by their prodecessors, any more than the present Congress gave up in regard to the earlier laws.

The nation would admire any Administration which accelerates environmental improvement and the quality of life; but it would be foolish to abate the thrust of present programs while waiting for the action vacuum to fill up with still more new angles.

America has "studied" pollution and the disappearance of open space for 150 years, and has only recently started to do anything about it. The machinery and technologies exist, and so do the funds for further action. As the President himself is fond of saying: "It's time to bite the bullet."

CHICAGO'S PROPOSED LAKE AIRPORT—VI

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, numerous Chicago conservation organizations, including the Illinois Audubon Society and the Open Lands Project, have expressed their opposition to Chicago's proposed lake airport.

Recently, they issued a statement which summarizes well the reasons why many Chicagoans opposed the proposed lake airport. I would like to bring their statement to the attention of my colleagues who are concerned about the problems surrounding airport development.

Their statement follows:

STATEMENT OF ILLINOIS AUDUBON SOCIETY

The Illinois Audubon Society, with a score of scientific, conservation and civic organizations, led by the Open Lands Project, opposes the airport in the lake for these among many other reasons:

1. A land site surrounded by a growing population on all sides is certainly preferable to a site surrounded by water that can be reached from only one direction.

2. Operations at a water-based airport would suffer from safety hazards due to weather conditions and to conflict with operations of other area airports. The professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization at a recent meeting resolved to oppose construction of the lake airport because of "severe air space conflicts with present operations at O'Hare International Airport".

3. Noise hazards, particularly to residents of Chicago's densely populated South Side, would be extraordinarily severe.

4. Air pollution from the visible contaminant of jet aircraft (carbon smoke) would be unsightly, if not actually a health hazard.

5. Runoff water would necessarily flow or be pumped back into the lake and could hardly have failed to mix with pollutants such as kerosene and oil that spill at all airports. And what satisfactory arrangements, if any, for handling airport sewage have been provided?

6. Scientists agree that pollution, actual and potential, of the South end of the lake is the worst of any section of any of the Great Lakes, since it is a veritable cul de sac without free out-flowing drainage. The airport which would be four miles in diameter, with its miles-long access causeway, would act like a draw-string narrowing the channels for winds and currents, compounding this pollution.

7. The chief sea-lanes used by cargo ships serving the South Shore of the lake would be partially blocked, requiring circuitous routes at greater expense and with possibly less safety.

8. Great inconvenience would result and safety would be jeopardized for skippers of pleasure craft sailing from South to North Shores and vice versa.

9. The cost of such an airport in the lake would be far more (some engineering experts say twice as much), and the time needed for construction much greater, than one of similar size at a safe distance south of O'Hara and about the same distance from the loop.

A NEW REGIONALISM

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, it is often the case that we in Congress are so involved in the detailed and complex problems of the Nation that we fail to give proper consideration to the more speculative approaches to government which are also our responsibility.

In occasional considerations of constitutional amendments we do examine the reasons why we have 50 States under a federal system. But we seldom seriously question whether another system might not, after 200 years, be better.

During a recent meeting of a Government Operations Subcommittee, I raised the question of whether our State governments were obsolete. I was surprised, and gratified, to find that my innocent question found a generous response among many scholars across the country who are examining exactly this question.

One of these men is Rexford G. Tugwell, a distinguished economist, political scientist, and author who served in the Roosevelt administration as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and as Governor of Puerto Rico. Mr. Tugwell is now at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions of the Fund for the Republic at Santa Barbara, Calif. Working with him on studies of regionalism is Piers von Simson who brings to this task British legal training and an inquiring yet sympathetic analysis of why we Americans govern ourselves as we do.

Mr. Von Simson has prepared a most interesting paper on how our States might better serve us reorganized into republics under a new Federal constitution. He gives his persuasive account of the reasons for this plan in the paper which follows. Because of its length, I include below part I on the reasons for reorganization. Tomorrow I will introduce the second and final part on the structure of the republics.

The paper follows:

THE REORGANIZATION OF STATES INTO REPUBLICS: PART I

(By Piers von Simson)

I. INTRODUCTION

(NOTE.—Piers von Simson is a British barrister with law degrees from Oxford and the University of California at Berkeley. He is currently working at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara, California, with Governor Rexford G. Tugwell on a revised constitution for the United States. They have taken a basic premise the fact that the present constitution, a brilliantly ambiguous document concocted in difficult circumstances two hundred years ago to induce thirteen different states with widely diverging interests to unite against a common enemy, is an inadequate foundation for the present day government of a technological-urban society with a population of over two hundred million.)

A proposal central to this revised constitution is the abolition of the states as presently defined, and the substitution of a smaller number of regions entitled, for the purposes of discussion "Republics". The problems involved in such reorganisation are obviously enormous, and the present paper is intended merely as an outline of such a scheme. Whatever its shortcomings, however, it cannot fail to be more rational and less arbitrary than the present system of fifty states, widely differing in size, population and wealth.

II. CHANGED PURPOSES

The arguments for abandoning the states as presently constituted include assertions that states are inefficient and corrupt, that they have outlived their original purpose, and that they do not correspond to any actual economic or social interests, and that they no longer inspire either public interest or public confidence. Their validity as units of organization and representation is open to serious challenge.

A central argument for regionalism is that the agrarian society which Jefferson regarded as the only safeguard against corruption, and on which he based his elaborate distribution of powers, has long ceased to be a reality. He regarded the cities as sores upon the body politic and expressed fervent hopes that workshops be kept in Europe. The present reality is somewhat different: the sores have multiplied so that as of 1966 there are 125 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas in the United States with populations of over 250,000. Almost seventy percent of the population lives in urban areas and the 'manufactures' of which he was so skeptical have long since become the mainstay of the economy. His theory of distribution of powers, by which the country is divided into states, the states into counties, the counties into townships, the townships into wards and the wards into farms has resulted in the creation of approximately one hundred and twenty thousands governmental units in the United States, from mosquito abatement districts to the national government in Washington.

For Jefferson, distribution of powers meant that each government "might do for itself what concerns itself directly, and what it can so much better do than a distant authority". (1) [1]

In fact, however, the eleven governments to which the citizen of Park Forest, Illinois pays his taxes are not subject to a neat division of functions. A closer inspection reveals that almost all governments are involved in almost all functions. Education provides an example. There are something like 50,000 school districts in the United States, a fact which might give rise to the idea that education is exclusively a local responsibility. In fact, however, the schools in any given local district are dependent upon state financial aid, state teacher certification, state prescription of textbooks and state inspection of performance. To this may be added the various federal aid programs, from milk to surplus property supplies and the county and city governments which often act as tax collecting agencies for the school districts, who certify that standards of health and safety are maintained on school property and who provide police protection for students. Since the Jeffersonian neatly structured three-layer cake of distribution of powers is in reality far more closely related to the marble cake described by Morton Grodzins, there is inevitably duplication and inefficiency in government at all levels which merits some drastic reforms. The States should probably be the first casualty.

Criticism of state governments does not have the virtue of novelty but their many deficiencies do not seem to be tempered by the passage of time. The states have been criticized for their inefficiency and corruption. Thus Professor Jerome Ellison wrote that "Our state legislatures are the least competent and most corrupt of all our constituted political bodies". He claimed that state legislators are known neither for their magnanimity or their probity, that state governments had allowed municipalities and subdivisions to proliferate and thus hamstring and harass each other, that their political obsolescence was matched only by their geographic obsolescence, and that they neither legislated nor administered well: "They have rarely been able to carry through administrative jobs more complicated than mailing out license plates". (2)

The states suffer from weak executives, fragmented fiscal procedures, insufficiently professional administration, oversized, undersalaried, malapportioned and badly staffed legislatures, poorly administered and politically selected judiciaries, and multifarious constitutional restrictions on their ability to meet or respond to demands. Most states have managed to write election laws that effectively minimize the weight of the parties in state government and all but deny the people access to the government through the ballot. It was not apportionment that V. O. Key was complaining about when he wrote: "The institutions and electoral procedures (of the states) . . . have been more or less deliberately designed to frustrate popular majorities".

Whether state governments are actually criminally corrupt or not, and the Massachusetts State Crime Commission in 1965 clearly suggested that they are, the fact is that non-governmental constellations of power have greater influence and importance at the level of state government than they have at the level of either national or local government. This is partly attributable to a lack of a sense of community in state constituencies, and a lower degree of visibility in state politics, but principally due to the influence of the size relationship of interest groups, corporations, professions and economic groupings to the state government. The automobile industry in Michigan, oil in Texas, gambling in Nevada and grass and cattle in Wyoming are examples of this kind of undue influence.

This is not to deny that in certain circumstances private interests can dominate congressional committees and government agencies. But so many interests and constituencies are represented at the national level, and there are so many legislative and administrative interconnections and so much media coverage, that the power of private groups is more easily contained than at the state level. Similarly, at the local level, the wants and needs of large power groupings are both more simple and more easily accommodated. It is at the state level that the correct size relationship operates, as there is both sufficient power to be worth channeling in a particular direction, and the requisite absence of supervision, criticism and opposition. At this level, therefore, well-organized interest groups can, and frequently do, subvert the public interest.

The states have consistently failed to come to grips with the problems of the cities. As Professor Merriam puts it:

"In many instances the state is a fifth wheel so far as city government is concerned. The state will neither grant autonomy to the cities nor will it assume the burden of administrative supervision over them. The state will neither rule or permit anyone else to rule over metropolitan regions." (3)

Although the apportionment decision takes much of the steam out of the old argument that state legislatures dominated by rural interests cannot be expected to be unduly concerned with the welfare of metropolitan regions in which the majority of the population lives, the fact remains that state governments are notoriously slow to take any action with regard to the problems of the cities. A single example will suffice. It has taken Governor Reagan until November 1969 to discover the air pollution over the Los Angeles basin.

So far from being laboratories of social change, as Holmes, Cardozo and Woodrow Wilson so fervently claimed, the state governments are noted for their orthodoxy. It is an observable fact that state legislatures adhere to economic policies long since discarded by the federal government and private industry. The states are notorious for their instinct to play the role of defenders of old style purity of mind and body, attempting to suppress materials that have not been found titillating by any but the most backward for thirty years. State legislatures seem inordinately fond of ideological witch-hunts which, until the Nixon Administration at any rate, most people had hoped and believed to be a thing of the past. Closely related to this latter phenomenon, most state legislatures continue to indulge in legislative and administrative efforts to intrude into the internal affairs of institutions actually under public control. Attempts are made to screen textbooks and library books for subversive influences, and the hiring practices and teaching at state universities are subjected to endless criti-

[1] The bibliography will appear at the end of part II.

cism and tampering. Similarly, liberty (read State's Rights) consistently outweighs welfare as a value goal in state politics. In this respect the ideals of Holmes and Cardozo are scarcely if every realized, and one is forced to agree with the conclusions of Frank Trippett:

"As a source of humor alone, the state legislature fulfills a valid social function, and as custodians of the obsolete and passé it has proved itself indispensable." (4)

Not everyone shares Mr. Trippett's sense of humor, however, and to them the abolition of the States as presently constituted is a more tempting proposal than their preservation merely for the sake of hilarity.

III. THE STATES TODAY

The states in the present day United States do not constitute economic and social entities to anything like the extent that the nation and the cities do. An effective governmental area must not only possess a sufficient diversity of interests to ensure effective debate, but also a substantial degree of internal logic, and of a sense of community. Clearly the problems and tasks of a governmental unit have little or no meaning unless they have some relationship to the areal jurisdiction of the unit. Yet state boundaries have little relationship to economic reality. East Chicago is part of Indiana in only a very limited sense. Social, economic and environmental problems have scant respect for state lines.

Although no governmental unit can possibly have boundaries which fit all of its varied functions, a necessary condition to its operating at all effectively is its relationship to some kind of constituency. The nation and the city both have the advantage of being social and economic entities which inspire a sense of belonging to an identifiable whole. The states do not. Quite apart from this sense of community, however, which will be considered in more detail later, some of the smaller states are difficult to justify in the context of their relationship to other states, and indeed to some cities.

There can be no dispute that from any logical point of view, the continued existence of, for example, the state of Nevada is merely the perpetuation of an anachronism. With considerable justification, one may question the maintenance of a unit of government entitled to send two senators to Washington which represents a population of less than half a million. There are over thirty cities in the United States with no less than twice the population of the entire State of Nevada. This is by no means unusual. The same argument applies to the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, North Dakota, South Dakota, Delaware, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Alaska and Hawaii. Nor is the argument confined to a mere head count. As early as 1930, when the urban migration had not progressed to present proportions, Professor Merriam wrote:

"Fiscally, the cities are more important than the states; the federal government outranks either. In 1930, the revenues of the national government were almost seven times greater than those of New York City, the second largest governmental unit in this country. The state of New York outranked Chicago and the State of Pennsylvania, but Los Angeles, Detroit and Philadelphia came ahead of California and Michigan. Thus the ten largest governments are the federal government, five cities and four states. One hundred and sixty-five governments must be listed to include all of the forty-eight states". (5)

These figures are clearly out of date, but the point is well taken, and a similar situation still prevails. Thus in 1967, of all of the fifty states, only New York State and California had greater revenues than New York City. The city with the next largest revenue, Los Angeles, surpassed seventeen states, and came within one hundred million dollars of another six states. Given the chaos of having fifty different state legislatures, the expense of maintaining as separate governmental units many which in terms of population and revenue are less important than metropolitan regions, and the unjust over-representation of the smaller states in the U.S. Senate, the arguments for abandoning the states in favor of regions becomes increasingly persuasive. To this one should couple the fact that the smaller states almost invariably are the most secure in terms of a Senate seat, and thus the seniority system ensures that senators from smaller states have disproportionate influence in Senate committees which makes the injustice of their mere presence in the Senate pale by comparison. The practical result of this is that rural and military interests are consistently favored over the cities and the poor. It leads to the fact that with over half the population living in cities and only 4.5% on farms, the Department of Agriculture still employs a vast bureaucracy of 86,000 but the Department of Housing and Urban Development, only 16,000. It leads to the fact that every cow in America must be tested every year for tuberculosis but children are not, and that the federal government spends over thirty-six million dollars annually to root out weeds on American farms, vastly more than it spends on rooting out juvenile delinquency. It leads to the situation in which Congress in 1968 increased farm subsidies by one billion dollars, and in the same year voted to slash food stamps, reduce spending on low income housing and reduce desperately needed Medicaid funds by $500,000,000.

At the same time, the continued existence of the states as presently constituted is hardly supported by the interest state government receives from its constituents. There is a marked disparity between James Madison's lofty claim that "the first and natural attachments of the people will be to the governments of their respective states", and Adlai Stevenson III's more down-to-earth assertion that "To a deplorable degree, the public lacks confidence in state government, particularly the legislature." While the delegates to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia may have been fiercely loyal to their states, the attitude of modern Americans can only be described as one of indifference. A survey conducted in a 1956 issue of Public Opinion Quarterly (6) revealed that no more than 4% of either category of persons interviewed (Active and Not Active in the Community) thought state problems more serious, interesting and absorbing of attention than local and national problems. In a similar vein, Key found that people hardly bothered to vote in state contests. He sampled the election returns of fifteen non-southern states over a long period, from 1926 to 1952. He found that in three out of four primaries not more than thirty-five percent of the potential electorate voted in the primaries of one or the other of the major parties. At best, more than fifty percent of the potential vote turned out in only one of the twelve primaries. The usual proportion of the potential electorate voting was twenty-five to thirty-five percent. It was with something of an understatement that he concluded that: "The American people are not boiling with concern about the workings of their state governments."

IV. INVISIBLE GOVERNMENT

Typically, state politics and state government operate at a low level of visibility. Press and television coverage of state capitals is minimal. The principal source of state revenue is special and general sales and use taxes; and these cause less concern and interest than either income or property taxes, the chief revenue sources for national and local governments respectively. The general tax structure therefore is of minimal interest.

It may be that this indifference is a product of the low quality of state government, or the reverse may be true. It may be that it is the inevitable result of a shifting of the political focus from state to national and international issues. Or it may be the result of the massive migration from rural areas to urban conglomerations that has taken place in this century. It may be the result of the incredible mobility of the American population which results in one person in five moving every year. Whatever the reasons, the fact is that a modern American is interested in two levels of government, the local level, where detailed decisions directly affecting his community are made, and the national level where decisions affecting his country are made.

* * * * *

There is no loyalty in most people towards their state government. They regard themselves as living and working together as units of a geographic region and are far more likely to think of themselves as living in the South or the West or the Northeast than they are to pride themselves in their citizenship of Utah. Their loyalty is local, regional and national. In none of these does the state figure. As John Burgess put it as early as 1886:

"The two natural elements in our system are now the community and the nation. The former is the point of real local self-government; the latter that of general self-government; and in the adjustments of the future these are the forces which will carry with them the determining power. The commonwealth government is now but a sort of middle instance. Too large for local government, too small for general, it is beginning to be regarded as a meddlesome intruder in both spheres." (8)

State government is distrusted, ignored, and irrational, and yet seemingly an indispensable part of the federal system, in a country which for all its dependence on the federal government, resents excessive centralization of power. A possible solution to the problem lies in regionalization, in the liquidation of existing states and the substitution of Republics with areas more closely corresponding to actual social and economic interests. The creation of such Republics would enable planning to be undertaken for regions as a whole, which are otherwise dissected by wholly arbitrary state lines. It would alleviate the chaos of fifty separate jurisdictions, while leaving ample opportunity for each republic to decide its own affairs and to act, to the extent that it is possible or desirable, as one of Cardozo's 'social laboratories'. The republics would be areas within which geographic fact, economic organization, social custom and political interest have established a sense of cohesiveness and community of interest which would revitalize and lend some logic to a unit of regional government which, within a federal system, must share the power and responsibility of governing the Union with a national government.

V. DE FACTO REGIONALISM

The fact that state governments have failed to respond to the needs of the people, and that regionalism is both possible and desirable, is illustrated by the development in recent years of a kind of *de facto* regionalism. This phenomenon takes two principal forms. The first is the increasing tendency of the federal government to bypass the states in its relationships with both local governments and individuals. The second is the increasingly widespread use of interstate compacts, the clearest possible demonstration that planning cannot intelligently respect state boundaries.

Direct federal-local relations have existed since the early nineteenth century but have multiplied many times over because of the increase in urban and hence local government problems in this century, as well as the vast increase in federal spending generally. The obstructionism of the states to many New Deal programs ultimately resulted in the Supreme Court performing an amazing volte face with regard to the limits of federal power under the commerce and general welfare clauses of the Constitution. It was perhaps an example of what de Tocqueville noted over a century ago: "I have never been more struck by the good sense and the practical judgment of the Americans than in the manner in which they elude the numberless difficulties resulting from their federal Constitution". It is no exaggeration to claim that the policy-making authorities of the national government have replaced the Supreme Court as the arbiter of the limits of the federal spending power. The cause of this spread of federal spending is, however, almost entirely the inability of state governments to see the writing on the wall. The result is a proliferation of between 400 and 1000 federal aid programs, depending on how they are classified. On the local level, the following is a by no means exhaustive list of federal activity, much of which wholly bypasses the state governments:

Old Age and Survivors Insurance.
Veterans Benefits.
Mail Delivery.
Taxation.
Licensing.
Soil Conservation.
Grazing Service Advice.
Selective Service.
Civil Defense.
Public Housing and Urban Redevelopment.
Welfare.
Highways.
Employment Security.
Vocational Education.
Public Health.
Airport Maintenance.
Flood Control.
School Construction.
Disaster Relief.
Technical assistance in many fields.
Services by contract.

It is clear that in most areas the federal government is closer to the people as a provider of services than any other. The farm sector of the population is clearly something of an exceptional case, but it is instructive to examine the farmers' relations with the federal government, of which Morton Grodzins (9) compiled such an impressive picture. If he wished to take full advantage of what was offered, an individual farmer could assemble a veritable convention of government helpers in his home and fields. He could have a soil-conservation technician make a survey of his property, prepare plans for conservation practices and watershed protection, and give advice on crops, growing practices, wood-lot plantings and wild-life maintenance. A Forest Service Officer collaboratively with a state forester would provide low-cost tree stock. Extension workers would aid the farmer's wife on all aspects of home management, including gardening, cooking and sewing; instruct the children with respect to a whole range of health, recreational and agricultural problems; provide the farmer himself with demonstrations and information aimed at reducing costs, increasing income, and adjusting production to market demands, and give the entire family instruction with respect to "social relations, adjustments, and cultural values".

An officer of the Agricultural Conservation Program would arrange federal grants for part of the cost of his soil and conservation practices, including ditching and building ponds. Another official would supply fish at little or no cost with which to stock the ponds. A Commodity Stabilization Service worker would arrange for loans on some crops, for government purchase of others, and for special incentive payments on still a third category; he would also pay the farmer for constructing crop storage facilities. Another officer from the same agency would arrange cash payments to the farmer under the soil-bank program, if he takes out of production acres devoted to designated basic crops (the "acreage reserve"), or puts the general cropland to conservation use (the "conservation reserve"). An official of the Farmers Home Administration, if credit is not elsewhere available, will make loans to the farmer for the operation, improvement and enlargement of his property, and will 'service' the farmer-borrower by providing him with comprehensive and continuous technical advice on how to make his operation as profitable as possible.

VI. FEDERAL EXPANSION

This lengthy, though only partial, list of the federal involvement with farming is admittedly an extreme illustration of federal spending at a purely local level. It gives food for thought however, when contrasted with Jefferson's elaborate hierarchy of division of powers, in which the state was assigned such a prominent position. In one exposition of this division, Jefferson ended with what to him must have seemed the argument to end all arguments on the matter: "Were we directed from Washington when to sow, and when to reap, we should soon want bread." (10) Now we can say with absolute certainty, partly as a result of the industrial revolution, partly due to the inability of the states to respond to changing circumstances, that were we *not* directed from Washington when to sow, and when to reap, we should soon want bread.

The illustration also serves to illustrate the fact that a number of federal employees are "on the scene" at the local level. This applies to every single federal program, and not just to agriculture. We thus find that in 1968, there were 2,709,872 paid civilian employees of the Federal Government, of which a mere 313,806 lived and worked in Washington, D.C., the remaining 2,396,066 being scattered over the fifty states. This has inevitably led to a process of administrative regionalization, because these employees are directed from regional offices and not from Washington. This *de facto* regionalization might be expected to be of great use in determining what, if any, definable regions of the United States there may be, with which the Republics could be drawn to correspond.

The difficulty, however, as will be seen in the second part of this paper, is that different regional structures obviously are required for different functions. A region which makes sense to the Bureau of Mines for safety districts, will clearly be of little value to the Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Animal Industry when deciding where to locate its regional meat inspection laboratories. The extent of the problems facing anyone attempting to define regions of the country from which to construct logically defensible Republics, may be illustrated by the fact that in the appendix of the National Resources Committee report on "Regional Factors in National Planning", there are no less than eighteen pages with six maps on each page showing various regional divisions of the country for administrative purposes. There are thus one hundred and eight different schemes discussed in a volume published in 1935, when the extent of federal spending and regulation had not yet reached anything like its present level.

VII. INTERSTATE COMPACTS

A second major form of *de facto* regionalism is the increasingly widespread use of interstate compacts. The legal and political problems inherent in interstate compacts, and their effectiveness or otherwise, are beyond the scope of the present paper. Nevertheless their mere existence indicates some measure of recognition by both state and federal governments, that state lines, being arbitrarily drawn, often interfere with the exploitation of natural resources, the control and effective use of the water in river basins, the management of transportation facilities, and the resolution of social and economic problems. There are four main types of compact.

Regulatory compacts exist to plan policies, to recommend adoption of regulations by compacting states, and to prescribe and enforce standards. Examples of this kind of compact are the Interstate Oil compact, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries compact, the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation compact, and the Waterfront of New York Harbor compact. Metropolitan area compacts which exist to plan and administer urban programs include the Port of New York Authority compact, the Delaware River Port Authority compact and the Bi-State Development Agency compact by which the states of Missouri and Illinois attempt to tackle some of the problems of the St. Louis metropolitan area. A third type of compact, to administer river basins and manage water resources is in operation with respect to the Colorado, the Delaware, the Tennessee-Tombigbee and Wabash Rivers among others. A final category is the State Service Compact, in which educational, crime control, health and welfare programs are coordinated.

The use of interstate compacts is clearly increasing. Between 1783 and 1920, the states entered into thirty-six compacts. Between 1921 and 1955, they entered intc sixty-five, and since then about twenty-five more have been established. These compacts illustrate both the need and the possibility of regional planning. The Republics, it is hoped, by embracing whole regions would be able to perform the same function as the various states with their compacts, but at the same time have the advantage of planning for the region as a whole and for a diversity of purposes, and not simply on the basis of one single function, and a part of the region. There is a tendency for both interstate compacts and governmental administrative regionalism to result in redundance and lack of coordination in administration and to self-seeking sectionalism in legislation. Too often, while the immediate function or region may have gained, the nation as a whole has lost. For this reason, there is much to be said for the creation of Republics. They offer an alternative to the many deficiencies of state governments already mentioned, which they would avoid by virtue of their greater size and more rational composition. They also offer an alternative to *de facto* regionalism, permitting the federal government to maximize its resources by channeling its programs through one region for a whole variety of purposes, and allowing regional planning to take place without the cumbersome and often ineffective device of interstate compacts.

Felix Frankfurter and J. M. Landis, in an article in the *Yale Law Journal*, on interstate compacts, stated the need for such compacts, and also, it is suggested, the ultimate justification for regionalism:

"No one state can control the power to feed or starve, possessed by a river flowing through several states . . . The whole economic region must be the unit of adjustment; continuity of supervision the technique . . . the regional characteristic of electric power as a social and engineering fact must find a counterpart in the effort of law to deal with it . . . The overwhelming difficulties confronting modern society must not be at the mercy of the false antithesis embodied in the shibboleths 'State's rights' and 'National supremacy' . . . Our regions are realities. Political thinking must respond to those realities. Instead of leading to parochialism it will bring a fresh ferment of political thought whereby national aims may be achieved through various forms of political adjustment." (11)

VIII. THE NOW REPUBLICS

This inability of single states to carry out planning programs necessary for conserving our national resources, both material and human, as illustrated by widespread use of interstate compacts dealing with watershed, oil conservation, labor standards and crime prevention; the development of an extensive interstate cooperation movement, the rise of interstate metropolitan planning, the establishment of more than one hundred types of federal regional areas dealing with administration and departmental planning, the creation and the success of the TVA, and the pressure of economic distress and unbalance in various agricultural areas of the United States, all point to the need for the kind of regional politics which would be possible under a system of Republics.

These Republics could not fail to be more effective general instruments of government. They could stand in a far more meaningful position in their relationship with the federal government. They would facilitate planning for a region and not just a part of it. They would have the motivation and the machinery to solve some of the problems of the city. They would by virtue of their size and importance alone, both encourage popular interest and support and govern on a greater level of visibility than state governments do now. They would be able to stave off private interest groups and at the same time be more responsive to the ballot box. They would constitute geographic, social and economic realities, and hence be founded on more logical grounds and enjoy a greater sense of community than do the present states. They would make a much greater contribution to the cohesion and social purpose of the nation as a whole.

AGE OF REASON

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 20, 1969, carried the text of an article from the Michigan Natural Resources magazine entitled "Ten Years To Save Mankind" by Ralph A. MacMullan, Director of the Michigan Natural Resources Department. The January-February 1970 issue of the Michigan Natural Resources magazine carries a followup article by Dr. MacMullan entitled "Age of Reason?" I include the text of the article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AGE OF REASON?

(By Ralph A. MacMullan)

Man is an animal who may very well be driven to extinction in this century by natural and physical forces over which he now exhibits almost no control. Man is also a higher form of life with reason, spirit, courage, and the will to survive.

In the decade ahead, in ten short years, the age-old struggle of man versus nature will pass through what may be a final crisis. In this decade, we will discover whether man the animal will ultimately be destroyed by nature, or whether man the reasoning spirit will once again conquer those vital earth forces with which he has grappled for nearly two million years. For all that enormous length of time—20,000 centuries—man's long struggle as a species has been to survive by producing more children at all times than disease, famine, weather, and all the adverse forces of nature could kill off. Man has been successful in this approach to survival, and the human population of the earth has increased steadily over the centuries. When plagues slashed at human populations, succeeding generations responded by sharp increases in reproduction. The same has been true following wars, with World War II providing the most notable recent example. In the U.S., for example, the gross birth rate shot up to record levels in the years immediately after World War II. Other nations, such as Russia, Germany, England, France, and Japan—all of which were hard hit in that war—experienced similar surges in the late 1940's and 1950's.

Now, however, in the brief span of this century, the struggle for survival has entered a new arena. It is a battleground on which man has only his reason to guide him, and virtually no experience whatever. The solution is simple, but not easy. Man must alter his basic approach to survival and bring population growth to a virtual standstill. He must do this now, in this century, if he intends to survive as a species on this planet. The next ten years will tell us whether man in fact intends to adopt this course, or whether nature will be allowed to provide the answer through starvation, pestilence, or—perhaps because of the horrors of crowding—through nuclear holocaust.

Signs of impending population disaster are everywhere. Already each year millions of humans on this earth die of starvation while man with his reasoning spirit does little or nothing to control population growth. Already the oceans of the earth are being changed by excesses of pollution and exploitation so insidious and so poorly understood that the future of those enormous bodies of water are in doubt. One-third of the earth's three billion people obtain their major source of animal protein from seafoods. Through pollution and exploitation, we are threatening the continued existence of both that seafood and that third of the world.

We continue to pollute the air as well, and are perhaps changing irretrievably this gaseous envelope surrounding the earth. We all see it happening, yet to date we have taken almost no collective action toward correction. One grimly humorous comment read recently: A newspaper columnist notes that our accomplishments in outer space may soon lead us to the planet Venus, where the possibility exists for life as we know it, except for the surrounding gases, which lack oxygen. Wouldn't it be interesting, he comments, if when we arrived there we found long lines of stalled automobiles, left when a previous civilization finally ran out of oxygen.

So we continue to pollute our air and water, and we fail to control population growth, and our appetite for ease and comfort and the good life requires exploitation and pollution of ever-increasing quantities of the earth's resources. Man, the animal, is indeed in charge of man the reasoning spirit.

In the decade ahead we will see these trends continue—at least for awhile. We are as yet, for example, nowhere near any sort of reasoning control over population growth, and this is the most serious natural resource problem we face as a world community. Man's reason, man's courage and will to survive, man's higher spirit will have no meaning or value when the food runs out, or pernicious man-made chemical combinations corrupt the environment, or the oxygen is depleted, or we are buried in our own garbage. The natural world offers us too many examples of what happens when the population of a species rolls ahead unchecked. The lemmings, those mouse-like creatures of the far north, over-populate their range disastrously every four or five years and then destroy themselves by migrating *en masse* to any nearby convenient open water. When the drowned carcasses clear away, a remnant lemming population starts the cycle all over again. The result is a predictable mass disaster to lemmings four or five years hence. Dozens of such examples exist in the annals of wildlife. Right here in Michigan we have been witnessing what is practically the same situation with the white-tailed deer. Back in the 1930's and 1940's, Michigan's deer herd thrived on the brushy new growing forest, and with sufficient food deer populations increased rapidly. Then the forest grew up, the food supplies thinned out, and annual starvation problems began to appear. At times in Michigan we have lost an estimated 50,000 to 75,000 deer in a single winter, most of that loss going to starvation. The deer that are lost, however, comprise only one portion of the problem. An even larger number of deer suffer extreme malnutrition and squeak through the winter by the narrowest margin. These deer then are marked for easy starvation the following winter, or are open to disease because of their weakened condition, or their ability to produce healthy fawns is severely damaged. Further, deer-food plants are so badly over-eaten each winter that the total supply of food gradually dwindles, thereby pinching the population downward even further. To overcome the worst of these problems, to create a healthier, if smaller deer herd, and to save what deer foods remain, the Department of Natural Resources began to hold special any-deer seasons in 1952 designed to harvest these "surplus" deer each fall before trouble develops. Here, then, in the deer herd, are all the classic aspects of the problem mankind now faces: Over-population and failure of food supplies leading directly to malnutrition, starvation, and disease. But man has added another problem that goes beyond the straight facts of biology faced by creatures such as lemmings and deer. Man's boundless yen for technology has added several extreme forms of pollution which in and of themselves may prove at least as destructive to the entire life process as over-population.

The picture I have painted for the coming decade is indeed gloomy, yet virtually every student of world population, of conservation affairs, of ecology and the environment agrees in principle with what I have said. Time and time again, these specialists have spoken out, yet we have not heeded their warnings, nor do we give even the vaguest indication that we ever will.

Nowhere on earth is there a nation known to me where the human population has stabilized at present levels. On the contrary, every nation is showing a steady, and in most cases, rapid increase in population. Mexico, a nation of 50 million, will double in 20 years. India, where starvation now claims an estimated three million persons per year, is adding 15 to 18 million new mouths each year. Already India is importing a large portion of the food it consumes, but how much longer this importation can continue is uncertain. Costa Rica will double its population in 20 years, Indonesia in 31 years, the Philippines in 20 years, Brazil in 22 years. The so-called "developed" nations of the earth are increasing in population more slowly, but rates are still high. At present rates, the U.S., Russia, and Japan will all double their populations in 63 years. Denmark, Norway, Poland and Spain will double in 88 years. The United Kingdom will require 140 years to double its population, and Austria, slowest of all, will double in 175 years.

Such human increases necessarily mean natural resources will be rapidly depleted, and that pollution of the environment will increase just as steadily. Under present patterns of use and technology, that conclusion is certain, clear, and inescapable.

There is now no hope that we can avoid

additional serious damage to both our environment and to mankind in general during the coming decade. On the other hand, there has to be hope that we can apply the brakes soon, that we can slow down human population increases, and that we can begin to repair some of the damage to both our environment and to mankind in general during environment. This is the crucial task facing the coming generation. Right now, 40 percent of the world's population is 15 years old or younger. In the next ten years, most of these youngsters will enter their fertile, family-creating years. If they fail to control population, man with all his reason, his spirit, and his will to survive will go the same path as the lemmings and the deer.

It is not my position to suggest a program for carrying out the mandates nature is now demanding of us. I can offer no ready-made solutions, no panaceas nor utopias. Yet it is clear that all of us must contribute to the total effort in some way, and that the course of our little spaceship must be changed very, very soon.

Man has been described as a "reasoning animal." Thus far, he has proved himself an animal capable of reason on certain subjects, but blind on others. It remains to be seen whether there is yet time to learn, to correct, to overcome. Certainly, there isn't much time left. Will it be ten years or twenty? Will we go out with a whimper or a bang? Or will we begin now to control those forces that can decide man's destiny on this planet? The answers to these questions, I submit, will soon appear, provided if not by man, then by nature. It's the alternative that must frighten us all.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, March 11, 1970*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Exalt the Lord our God, and worship at His holy hill; for the Lord our God is holy.—Psalm 99: 9.

O Lord, our God, whose glory is in all the world and whose goodness continues forever, we commend ourselves and our Nation to Thee that being conscious of Thy presence, governed by Thy spirit, and living in Thy love we may dwell secure in peace and good will.

Bless our land with wise government, sound learning, and vital religion. Save us from discord and disunity, from pride and prejudice, and from vice and violence. Strengthen the bonds of friendliness between the citizens of our beloved land and make strong the ties of fellowship between the nations of the world. Plant love in every heart, truth in every home, faith in every church, justice in every nation, and peace in all our world. And may the love of Thy dear name hallow every noble endeavor for good.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6543) entitled "An act to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists on its amendment numbered 13 to the foregoing bill.

TRAVEL ALLOWANCES

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, unlike many Federal executive agencies and most business corporations whose officials serve in locations far from their homes, the Congress makes no "home leave" provision for the immediate families of its Members. Particularly for Members whose home districts are far from Washington or who have large families living with them here in Washington, the expense of allowing their families even to go home for Christmas can be considerable. For those of our colleagues whose districts are outside the contiguous 48 States the cost is prohibitive.

I have made an informal survey of the policies of the various agencies of the Federal Government and a few corporations with regard to providing travel allowances for families to visit their homes. In general, such family travel allowances are provided every 2 years. This is true in effect, for example, of the Foreign Service. Some organizations underwrite a trip home for families of their officials once a year.

With these considerations in mind, it seems reasonable that Members should be reimbursed for one round trip each term for the members of his or her immediate family between Washington and the Member's home district, and I am introducing a bill to that effect tomorrow.

O'LORD

(Mr. HOWARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, in an age where we live in constant fear of a possible nuclear confrontation; where we read that life on this planet will end in the foreseeable future unless we end pollution; and when many of our people live in abject poverty, we are bound to feel that everything is going poorly.

Then along comes some young person whose generation will soon lead this world and help deescalate the fear of nuclear war—will do something meaningful to end pollution, and will see that all people are given the opportunity to live a decent life.

Such a person is Patricia Eileen Sullivan, an 8-year-old second grader at Marymount Junior School in Arlington, Va.

Patricia has written a simple poem entitled "O'Lord" and it is one of the most moving and inspiring poems I have ever read. Its author may be but 8 years old, but she sees life in the context which all of us wish we could. I commend it to my colleagues for reading:

O'LORD

O'Lord, thank you for my brothers and sisters.
O'Lord, thank you for my mother and father.
O'Lord, thank you for the flowers and grass and trees.
O'Lord, thank you for the moon and sun and stars above us.
O'Lord, thank you for my house and my teachers.
O'Lord, thank you for the love that I get from everyone, and winter and fall and summer.
Oh, and Lord, thank you for this lovely world.

1970 VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNERS

(Mr. McCLURE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, last night I was privileged to attend a dinner sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and honoring the 1970 Voice of Democracy winners. Seeing all of those young people at the table of honor, I was reminded again that the vast majority of today's youth are responsible and patriotic, and not in the mold that the news media so frequently paint them.

I would also like to comment on the unscheduled appearance of President Nixon at the dinner. Other men might have been content to speak briefly and then wave goodby. But not Mr. Nixon. Not only did he stay for the introduction of each State's Voice of Democracy winner, but he went to their table and shook the hand of each one as his or her name was called.

Such acts on the part of the President inevitably close the so-called generation gap. It gave me personally a deep sense of pride in my country, its President, and its youth.

TRIBUTE TO LEWIS DESCHLER

(Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in humble and sincere tribute to our Parliamentarian.

Statesman, yet friend to truth; of soul sincere,
In action faithful, and in honor clear;
Who broke no promise, serv'd no private end,
Who gained no title, and who lost no friend.
—*Alexander Pope.*

The occasion demands eloquence, and I have only sincerity to offer. "Truth is